NOTICE OF MEETING

Meeting 6/2017 of the Academic Board will be held from 1:00pm – 3:00pm on Tuesday 29 August 2017 in the Professorial Boardroom, Quadrangle. Members who are unable to attend are asked to notify Matthew Charet at the above address. Enquiries concerning this meeting may also be directed to Dr Charet.

The agenda for this meeting is below.

Dr Matthew Charet  
Executive Officer to Academic Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> WELCOME AND APOLOGIES</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>1:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> PROCEDURAL MATTERS</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>1:05pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Adoption of unstarred items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Minutes of Previous Meeting</td>
<td>attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 2017 Membership of the Academic Board</td>
<td>attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Academic Board Election Timeline</td>
<td>attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 2018 Meeting Dates</td>
<td>attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> STRATEGIC ITEMS OF BUSINESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Charter of Academic Freedom</td>
<td>Chris Murphy</td>
<td>attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 The PhD: Graduate Qualities and Destinations</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> REPORT OF THE CHAIR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Report of the Chair</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Student members’ report</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Honours and Distinctions</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> REPORT OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Vice-Chancellor &amp; Principal</td>
<td>verbal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respect is a core value of the Academic Board
6 QUESTION TIME
Questions to the Vice-Chancellor and Chair of the Academic Board.

7 REPORT OF THE ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE
The Admissions Committee has not met since the last meeting of the Academic Board.

8 REPORT OF THE UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE
8.1 DVC Education Portfolio: proposed use of AAM for Dalyell stream
8.2 Faculty of Science: Bachelor of Liberal Arts and Sciences
8.3 Faculty of Science: Bachelor of Science/Master of Nutrition and Dietetics
8.4 Faculty of Science: Bachelor of Science (pre-2018) – Neuroscience Table 1

9 REPORT OF THE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE
9.1 Engineering and IT: Graduate Certificate and Graduate Diploma in Computing
9.2 Arts: Master of Development Studies
9.3 Arts: Master of Political Economy
9.4 Arts: Postgraduate Specialisations
9.5 Dentistry: Doctor of Dental Medicine
9.6 HDRESC: Col Process for HDR Examinations
9.7 HDRESC: Thesis Examination Guideline amendment
9.8 Medicine: Infection and Immunity embedded Course sequence
9.9 Science: Doctor of Veterinary Medicine
9.10 Science: Master of Clinical Psychology and Master of Clinical Psychology/Doctor of Philosophy
9.11 Science: Master of Nutrition and Dietetics
9.12 Education Strategy: Refined R Implementation
9.13 Medicine: Elective Units for various courses – for noting

10 REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY COMMITTEE
10.1 Assessment Procedures 2011 – Amendments
10.2 Higher Education Standards Framework and University Policy

Respect is a core value of the Academic Board
10.3 Charter of Academic Freedom see 3.1 above

10.4 Election Candidates’ Conduct Procedures 2017

10.5 2016 Consolidated Summary of the Student Experience and Graduate Outcomes

11 GENERAL BUSINESS 2:55pm

11.1 Nursing: 2018 Academic Calendar Donna Waters attached

11.2 Any other business
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RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Board adopt the minutes of the previous meeting held on 25 July 2017 as a true record.

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

ACADEMIC BOARD

1:00 pm, Tuesday 25 July 2017
Professorial Boardroom, Quadrangle (A14)

Members Present: The Chair (Associate Professor Tony Masters); the Vice-Chancellor (Dr Michael Spence); the Chairs of the Standing Committees (Associate Professor Wendy Davis; Professor Jane Hannahan; Associate Professor Michael Kertesz; Associate Professor Tim Wilkinson; Helen Agus (Science); Marco Avena (Student, Science); Associate Professor Thomas Balle (Pharmacy); Professor Kathy Belov (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Global Engagement)); Associate Professor Jacqueline Bloomfield (Nursing); Isabella Brook (President, SRC); Professor Tyrone Carlin (Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar)); Dr Jeanell Carrigan (Conservatorium); Associate Professor Alex Chaves (Veterinary Science); Dr Jen Scott Curwood (Education & Social Work); Dr Frances Di Lauro (Arts & Social Sciences); Associate Professor David Easdown (Science); Professor David Emery (Veterinary Science); Professor Alan Fekete (Engineering & IT); Professor Robyn Gallagher (Sydney Nursing School); Associate Professor Mark Gorrell (Medicine); Dr Scott Grattan, (Law); Associate Professor Thomas Grewel (Sydney Law School); Professor Margaret Harris (Acting Dean, Sydney College of the Arts); Dr Anne Honey (Health Sciences); Professor Shane Houston (Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Indigenous Strategy & Services)); Professor Annamarie Jagose (Dean, Arts & Social Sciences); Professor Archie Johnston (Dean, Engineering & IT); Patty Kamvounias (Business); Associate Professor Chenguang Lei (Engineering & IT); Tong Li (Student, Health Sciences); Professor David Lowe (Engineering & IT); Associate Professor John O’Byrne (Science); Associate Professor Susan Park (Arts & Social Sciences); Associate Professor Maurice Peat (Business); Ivana Radix (Nominee, SRC); Professor Iqbal Ramzan (Dean, Pharmacy); Professor John Redmond (Head of School and Dean, Architecture); Professor Joellen Riley (Head of School & Dean, Law); Dr Carl Schneider (Pharmacy); Oliver Smith (Sydney College of the Arts); Dr Ilektra Spandagou (Education & Social Work); Associate Professor Rebecca Suter (Arts & Social Sciences); Associate Professor Marjorie Valix (Engineering & IT); Professor Donna Waters (Dean, Nursing); Professor Greg Whitwell (Dean, Business).

Attendees: Dr Glenys Eddy (Acting Executive Officer); Rebecca Johnson (SUPRA nominee); David Pacey (Secretary to Senate); Lynda Rose (Associate Director Operations, Office of the Provost); Leah Schwartz (Program Manager, Education Strategy); Mark Try (Program Manager, Culture Strategy).

Apologies: Dr Douglass Auld (Engineering & IT); Professor Tina Bell (Agriculture); Professor Adam Bridgeman (Director, Educational Innovation); Associate Professor Rachel Codd (Medicine); Associate Professor Ross Coleman (Director, Graduate Research); Professor Arthur Conigrave (Acting Dean, Sydney Medical School); Dr Jinlong Gao (Dentistry); Professor Stephen Garton (Provost); Dr Nerida Jarkey (Arts & Social Sciences); Associate Professor Annette Katelaris (Medicine); Associate Professor Mark Krockenberger (Sydney School of Veterinary Science); Tilly Lees (Student, Sydney College of the Arts); Professor Diane Mayer (Head of School & Dean, Education & Social Work); Professor Alex McBratney (Director, Sydney Institute of Agriculture); Professor Robyn McConchie (Sydney Institute of Agriculture); Dr Rhonda Orr (Health
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UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

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

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The Chair welcomed members and noted the apologies received, asking that any further apologies be communicated to the Acting Executive Officer.

2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

2.1 Adoption of unstarred items

Two items had been starred for discussion: Item 4.1, the report of the Chair, and Item 8, the Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee. The Academic Board resolved as recommended with respect to all unstarred items.

Item 8, the report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee, had been starred as a result of some typos and minor mistakes being detected in Table As from Science and FASS. The Chair sought the meeting's approval for a rearrangement of the agenda for the purpose of bringing Item 8 forward. Item 8 was discussed immediately after Item 2.

The Chair noted that due to the large volume of material that had been submitted in a variety of formats, it had not been possible to conduct the routine editorial and compliance checks beforehand. Editorial and compliance questions will be dealt with after the meeting, and any substantial matter will be dealt with by circulation by the Chair to the Academic Board.

Item 8 was approved by the Academic Board.

Resolution AB2017/5-1
That the Academic Board resolve as recommended with respect to all unstarred items.

2.2 Minutes of Meeting 4/2017, 13 June 2017

The minutes of the meeting of 13 June 2017 were accepted as a true record of the meeting.

Resolution AB2017/5-2
That the Academic Board adopt the minutes of the previous meeting held on 13 June 2017 as a true record of that meeting.

2.3 2017 Membership of the Academic Board

The Chair thanked Professors Roger Stancliffe and Patrick Brennan for their service to the Academic Board, and welcomed Associate Professors Steven Cumming and Sarah Lewis as new members. The Chair also welcomed new Co-Presidents of SUPRA, Mariam Mohammed and Kiriti Mortha to the Academic Board.

Resolution AB2017/5-3
That the Academic Board approve the changes to membership of the Board and its committees, as amended.

3 STRATEGIC ITEMS OF BUSINESS

3.1 Respect Now, Always

The Chair welcomed the Registrar to the meeting and invited him to address the Academic Board. With the forthcoming release on 1 August of the Australian Human Rights Commission...
(AHRC) survey about sexual assault on Australian university campuses, the Registrar wished to inform the Board about the actions the University is taking to address the matter on its own campuses. The Registrar reported that a recent survey conducted by the AHRC revealed a deep reticence among students to report this type of experience and a relatively low awareness about what to do and to whom to report such incidents.

The University has put a number of measures in place to promote awareness of the matter, to encourage students to report incidents of sexual assault, and to seek help. Information about University policies, how the University deals with disciplinary matters, and what support students can expect, has been circulated. New processes address matters of transparency and timeliness, and the outcome of any complaint is now shared with the complainant. The process has changed to ensure separation between the recipient of the complaint and the accused.

The University has also developed means of extending support by: ensuring that students have access to the necessary information (including how the University deals with disciplinary matters); ensuring that policies and procedures are coherent and not discouraging to students; making the complaint process less confronting for students by implementing an anonymous call-back process; and the release of a new guide, Specialist Advice for Staff and Students. The University is also introducing some coordinator roles, the position description for which is currently being developed by HR, and was expected to evolve over time. The University has conducted around a dozen training sessions to date, with the training material to be incorporated into staff inductions. All staff will be provided with a link to a short video via Staff News. A new Consent module for students is also live and will be administered through the Canvas Learning System.

In discussion it was suggested that sexual assault is often under-reported, and therefore the level of reporting illustrated in the AHRC survey might also under-estimate the actual occurrence of sexual assault on campuses. The Registrar responded that whilst the University is respectful of the context that might lead a survivor to not report an incident, it wishes to achieve a greater level of reporting by ensuring that University communication is inclusive and supportive and, for students in a trauma situation, ensuring that the content is in ‘plain English’ and accessible in one location. To ensure that this information is transmitted to all staff, a multi-layered communication strategy is being implemented and staff are asked to transmit the information to their departments, schools, and faculties.

University policy will deal with staff involvement and a key element of the new procedures is an awareness campaign among staff to ensure that everyone knows how to respond if they are made aware of an incident. Although coordinators have access to University survey results, anonymity of the respondent will still be assured, as it will be for students who wish to report incidents of sexual assault. The Registrar emphasized two matters in relation to this: the University regards these disclosures as confidential, but under circumstances where it must exercise its legal reporting obligation (such as reporting incidents to the police), staff are still bound by confidentiality.

It is also hoped that the Consent module will work toward prevention by helping to embed policy and values in the curriculum and in student culture.

Resolution AB2017/5-4
That the Academic Board note the presentation by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar).

4 REPORT OF THE CHAIR
4.1 Report of the Chair

At the meeting held on 13 June 2017, Clause 4.1(4) of the proposed new University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017 was discussed. This clause establishes the electorate for the role of Chair of Academic Board, and in discussion, the exclusion of ex officio members from the electorate for the Chair was discussed. At that meeting, members were advised that no reason was evident as to why ex-officio members cannot participate in the Academic Board Chair election but it was decided to leave this clause unchanged from the draft Rule as presented. To investigate the matter further, at that meeting the Chair commissioned an Academic Board Election Working Party, specifically to consider and report on reasons for the exclusion of ex officios from the electorate. This Working Party was convened and had met since the previous
meeting, and a copy of the Working Party’s discussion was circulated with the agenda for the current meeting as part of the Chair’s Report.

Professor Refshauge thanked the Working Party for its deliberation, but disagreed with its recommendation which was to accept that ex-officio Board members cannot vote for the Chair. At this point, Associate Professor Masters declared a potential conflict of interest and offered to vacate the Chair for the duration of the discussion. The meeting agreed to his continuing as Chair. Professor Refshauge suggested two possible motions: to amend the Working Party’s recommendation or to amend the Academic Board Rule. The Chair stated that he would rule the latter motion out of order, as it was effectively a rescission motion and had not been included in the agenda, noting that if members disagreed they could move a motion of dissent. Professor Refshauge then proposed an amendment of the Working Party’s recommendation, and formally moved the motion “that ex-officio staff Academic Board members be allowed to vote in the election of the Chair”. The motion was voted on by show of hands and carried by majority.

The Chair noted that, ordinarily, the decision of the meeting would be referred to Academic Board Committees and the University Executive and an amended University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule be brought to the next meeting of the Academic Board before being forwarded to Senate. However, in this case, there would be no time to do this, as the draft Rule needed to be considered by Senate at its next meeting in order that elections be held in second semester. The University Policy Manager considered that the drafting needed to implement this change to the Academic Board Rule (2017) would be straightforward, and that an amended version of the Rule could be provided to the Chair and to the Secretary to Senate with advice of the Academic Board’s decision. The Vice-Chancellor supported this suggestion, noting that the amendment was approved by the Academic Board by an overwhelming majority.

The Board agreed to the University community being informed about the decision before it was submitted to Senate, and expressed its approval for the Vice-Chancellor, the Chair and Professor Fekete to consult on how this will be actioned.

The Chair thanked the members of the Working Party for their input.

Resolution AB2017/5-5
That the Academic Board note the Report of the Chair.

Resolution AB2017/5-6
That the Academic Board endorse the amendment to the proposed University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017 to allow ex-officio members of the Academic Board to vote in the election of the Chair, with a proposed amendment to be developed prior to submission to Senate.

Action 37/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval of the motion to amend the University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017 to allow ex-officio members of the Academic Board to vote in the election of the Chair. Responsible: Executive Officer. Timing: Immediately.

4.2 Student Members’ Report

In response to the imminent release of the AHRC survey on 1 August 2017, Isabella Brook wished to emphasize that because it cannot be known in advance in whom a sexual assault survivor might confide, it is crucial to ensure that the relevant information about student support and confidentiality reaches as many University personnel as possible. It has been reported that with the transfer of material from faculty websites to the central University website, some students are having trouble accessing information. The Vice-Chancellor requested that staff circulate the ‘red brochure’, Specialist Advice for Staff and Students, as widely as possible as it contains straightforward instructions.

Mariam Mohammed and Kiriti Mortha reported that the new SUPRA Council will endeavour to increase student engagement with awareness and prevention of sexual assault on campus where possible.

Resolution AB2017/5-7
That the Academic Board note the report of the student members of the Academic Board.
Non-Confidential

4.3 Honours and Distinctions

Members noted the honours and distinctions circulated with the agenda. The Chair noted that several members of the University staff had been appointed to various grades of Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy and invited the DVC (Education) to comment on these achievements. The DVC (Education) offered her congratulations to all those awarded. This process of academic recognition at the international level provides staff with the opportunity to document their expertise in teaching. The DVC (Education) stated that support exists within the University for those who wish to apply.

Resolution AB2017/5-7
That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Board on honours and distinctions and congratulate the recipients.

Action 38/2017: Write to recipients congratulating them on their honours and distinctions. 
Responsible: Chair of Academic Board. Timing: Immediately following meeting.

5 REPORT OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR

The Vice-Chancellor delivered this report and informed members of the outcomes of the 5 July 2017 meeting of Senate. He advised that Senate:

- approved the proposed name for the Payne-Scott Professorial Distinctions;
- received an update on student safety;
- received an update from the DVC Education on the Education Strategy;
- noted that the Enterprise Agreement negotiations were proceeding along constructive lines;
- held discussions about the establishment of a presence in Western Sydney; a report, to be released in August, will be discussed at the forthcoming University Leadership Retreat;
- noted that St Pauls Council is discussing the possibility of conducting another review and a potential change to their governance arrangement with Elizabeth Broderick.

Resolution AB2017/5-8
That the Academic Board note the report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal.

6 QUESTION TIME

Professor Fekete queried changes to the promotions process over the past few years, particularly the change whereby the report by a Head of School on an applicant is not seen by the applicant. He asked whether the matter could be addressed by bringing the Promotions Policy and Procedures, currently owned by the University Executive, under the authority of the Academic Board. It was noted that this would require a change in the Senate Delegations of Authority to be authorised by Senate.

Georgia Mantle wished to pursue a question she had raised at the previous meeting concerning the centralization of Student Services such as Special Consideration. She asked why Student Services has not provided a designated phone number for students in need of help navigating the Special Consideration system instead of just directing them to the 1800 line. She noted that such a facility was provided by FASS to staff members dealing with Special Consideration. The Registrar noted the disjunction between different processes for dealing with Special Consideration throughout the University, and assured the meeting that strategies are being developed to ensure effectiveness and timeliness of the procedure.

Isabella Brook, observing that other universities had provided student briefings on the AHRC survey data, asked why the University had not done so. The Vice-Chancellor responded that he was not currently at liberty to disclose specific data or information, but could provide student organisations with verbal updates about some matters. The Registrar reported that a briefing would be given to a working group meeting the following morning, but would nonetheless be respectful of the terms of the embargo.

Resolution AB2017/5-9
That the Academic Board note the responses provided to questions raised.
7 REPORT OF THE ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

Resolution AB2017/5-10
That the Academic Board note the report of the Admissions Committee meeting held by circulation on 11 July 2017.

7.1 Arts: Master of Economic Analysis
This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-11
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Economic Analysis and embedded courses and approve amendments to the Course Resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 39/2017: Note the Academic Board's approval to amend the Master of Economic Analysis and update the course resolutions in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Timing: Immediately.

8 REPORT OF THE UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE

Resolution AB2017/5-12
That the Academic Board note the report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee meeting held on 4 July 2017.

8.1 DVC Education Portfolio: Common Degree Table Template
This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-13
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Deputy Vice Chancellor Education Portfolio and approve this template for use by all faculties where streams, programs, majors and minors are represented in degree resolutions.

Action 40/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to implement the common degree table template where streams, programs, majors and minors are represented in degree resolutions in CMS. Responsible: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education). Timing: Immediately.

8.2 DVC Education Portfolio: Table S / Dalyell stream units
This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-14
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Deputy Vice Chancellor Education Portfolio and approve the updates to Table S/Dalyell stream units arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 41/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Table S (shared pool) that result from amendments to Table As elsewhere in this agenda and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) Timing: Immediately.

8.3 DVC Education Portfolio: Table O
This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-15
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) Portfolio and approve the Table O amendments arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 42/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend Table O in CMS. Responsible: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education). Timing: Immediately.
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8.4 Architecture: Bachelor of Design Computing and Bachelor of Design Computing / Bachelor of Advanced Studies

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-16
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Bachelor of Design Computing and Bachelor of Design Computing / Bachelor of Advanced Studies and approve the amendment of the unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 43/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Design Computing and Bachelor of Design Computing / Bachelor of Advanced Studies and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Head of School & Dean and School General Manager, Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning. Timing: Immediately.

8.5 Architecture: Bachelor of Architecture and Environments

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-17
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Bachelor of Architecture and Environments and approve the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 44/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Architecture and Environments and update the course resolutions and unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Head of School & Dean and School General Manager, Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning. Timing: Immediately.

8.6 Architecture: Bachelor of Design in Architecture (Honours) / Master of Architecture

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-18
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Bachelor of Design in Architecture (Honours) / Master of Architecture and approve the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 45/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Design in Architecture (Honours) / Master of Architecture and update the course resolutions and unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Head of School & Dean and School General Manager, Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning. Timing: Immediately.

8.7 Arts: Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Arts / Bachelor of Advanced Studies

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-19
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Arts / Bachelor of Advanced Studies and approve the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 46/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Arts / Bachelor of Advanced Studies and update the course resolutions and unit of study tables in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Timing: Immediately.

8.8 Arts: Bachelor of Education / Bachelor of Arts

This proposal was approved as presented.
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Resolution AB2017/5-20
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Education / Bachelor of Arts and approve the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 47/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Education / Bachelor of Arts and update the course resolutions in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Timing: Immediately.

8.9 Arts: Bachelor of Economics / Bachelor of Advanced Studies course resolution amendment
This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-21
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Economics / Bachelor of Advanced Studies and approve the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 48/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Arts / Bachelor of Advanced Studies and update the course resolutions and unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Timing: Immediately.

8.10 Arts: Diploma of Arts
This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-22
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Diploma of Arts and approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 49/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Diploma of Arts and update the course resolutions in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Timing: Immediately.

8.11 Arts: Diploma of Language Studies
This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-23
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Diploma of Language Studies and approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 50/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Diploma of Language Studies and update the course resolutions in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Timing: Immediately.

8.12 Arts: Diploma of Social Sciences
This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-24
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Diploma of Social Sciences and approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 51/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Diploma of Social Sciences and update the course resolutions in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Timing: Immediately.
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8.13 Business: Bachelor of Commerce and Bachelor of Commerce / Bachelor of Advanced Studies

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-25
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Sydney Business School to amend the Bachelor of Commerce and Bachelor of Commerce / Bachelor of Advanced Studies and approve the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 52/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Commerce and Bachelor of Commerce / Bachelor of Advanced Studies and update the course resolutions and unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Head of School & Dean and School General Manager, Business School. Timing: Immediately.

8.14 Sydney College of the Arts: Bachelor of Visual Arts and Bachelor of Visual Arts / Bachelor of Advanced Studies

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-26
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Sydney College of the Arts to amend the Bachelor of Visual Arts and Bachelor of Visual Arts / Advanced Studies and approve the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 53/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Visual Arts and Bachelor of Visual Arts / Bachelor of Advanced Studies and update the course resolutions and unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Head of School & Dean and School General Manager, Sydney College of the Arts. Timing: Immediately.

8.15 Engineering & IT: Bachelor of Advanced Computing

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-27
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Advanced Computing and approve the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 54/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Advanced Computing and update the course resolutions and unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

8.16 Engineering & IT: Bachelor of Project Management

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-28
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Project Management and approve the amendment of the unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 55/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Project Management and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

8.17 Engineering & IT: Bachelor of Engineering Honours Core Unit Table

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-29
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours Core Unit Table and approve the
amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 56/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours Core Unit Table and update the course resolutions and unit of study tables in CMS. **Responsible:** Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. **Timing:** Immediately.

8.18 **Engineering & IT:** Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Aeronautical)

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-30**
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Aeronautical) and approve the amendment of the unit of study table arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 57/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Aeronautical) and update the unit of study table in CMS. **Responsible:** Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. **Timing:** Immediately.

8.19 **Engineering & IT:** Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Biomedical)

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-31**
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Biomedical) and approve the amendment of the unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 58/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Biomedical) and update the unit of study table in CMS. **Responsible:** Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. **Timing:** Immediately.

8.20 **Engineering & IT:** Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Chemical)

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-32**
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Chemical) and approve the amendment of the unit of study table arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 59/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Chemical) and update the unit of study table in CMS. **Responsible:** Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. **Timing:** Immediately.

8.21 **Engineering & IT:** Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Civil)

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-33**
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Civil) and approve the amendment of the unit of study table arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 60/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Civil) and update the unit of study table in CMS. **Responsible:** Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. **Timing:** Immediately.

8.22 **Engineering & IT:** Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Electrical)

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-34**
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information
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Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Electrical) and approve the amendment of the unit of study table arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 61/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Electrical) and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

### 8.23 Engineering & IT: Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Mechanical)

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-35**

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Mechanical) and approve the amendment of the unit of study table arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 62/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Mechanical) and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

### 8.24 Engineering & IT: Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Mechatronic)

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-36**

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Mechatronic) and approve the amendment of the unit of study table arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 63/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Mechatronic) and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

### 8.25 Engineering & IT: Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Software)

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-37**

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Software) and approve the amendment of the unit of study table arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 64/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Software) and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

### 8.26 Engineering & IT: Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Humanitarian Engineering)

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-38**

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Humanitarian Engineering) and approve the amendment of the unit of study table arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 65/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Humanitarian Engineering) and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

### 8.27 Engineering & IT: Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Environmental) (Geotechnical) (Information Technology) (Internet of Things) (Mechatronic) (Structural Engineering))

This proposal was approved as presented.

Respect is a core value of the Academic Board
Non-Confidential

Resolution AB2017/5-39
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Environmental) (Geotechnical) (Information Technology) (Internet of Things) (Mechatronic) (Structural Engineering) and approve the amendment of the unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 66/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours (Environmental) (Geotechnical) (Information Technology) (Internet of Things) (Mechatronic) (Structural Engineering) and update the unit of study tables in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

8.28 Engineering & IT: Bachelor of Engineering Honours Flexible First Year
This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-40
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours Flexible First Year and approve the amendment of the unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 67/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Engineering Honours Flexible First Year and update the unit of study tables in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

8.29 Health Sciences: Bachelor of Applied Science (Speech Pathology)
This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-41
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Applied Science (Speech Pathology) and approve the amendment of the unit of study table arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 68/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Applied Science (Speech Pathology) and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Health Sciences. Timing: Immediately.

8.30 Health Sciences: Bachelor of Applied Science (Physiotherapy)
This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-42
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Applied Science (Physiotherapy) and approve the amendment of the unit of study table arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 69/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Applied Science (Physiotherapy) and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Health Sciences. Timing: Immediately.

8.31 Health Sciences: Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise and Sport Science) / Master of Nutrition and Dietetics
This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-43
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Health Sciences to amend the Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise and Sport Science) / Master of Nutrition and Dietetics and approve the amendment of the unit of study table arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 70/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise and Sport Science) / Master of Nutrition and Dietetics and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Health Sciences. Timing: Immediately.
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8.32 Nursing: Bachelor of Arts / Master of Nursing

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-44
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery to amend the Bachelor of Arts / Master of Nursing and approve the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study table arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 71/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Arts / Master of Nursing and update the course resolutions and unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty Manager, Sydney Nursing School. Timing: Immediately.

8.33 Nursing: Bachelor of Science / Master of Nursing

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-45
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery to amend the Bachelor of Science / Master of Nursing and approve the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study table arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 72/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Science / Master of Nursing and update the course resolutions and unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty Manager, Sydney Nursing School. Timing: Immediately.

8.34 Pharmacy: Bachelor of Pharmacy; Bachelor of Pharmacy (Honours); Bachelor of Pharmacy and Management; Bachelor of Pharmacy and Management (Honours)

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-46
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Pharmacy to amend the Bachelor of Pharmacy; Bachelor of Pharmacy (Honours); Bachelor of Pharmacy and Management; Bachelor of Pharmacy and Management (Honours) and approve the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 73/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Pharmacy; Bachelor of Pharmacy (Honours); Bachelor of Pharmacy and Management; Bachelor of Pharmacy and Management (Honours) and update the course resolutions and unit of study tables in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Pharmacy. Timing: Immediately.

8.35 Science: Bachelor of Science; Bachelor of Science / Bachelor of Advanced Studies, including Table A amendments

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-47
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science; Bachelor of Science / Bachelor of Advanced Studies, including Table A amendments, and approve the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 74/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Science; Bachelor of Science / Bachelor of Advanced Studies, including Table A amendments, and update the course resolutions and unit of study tables in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Science. Timing: Immediately.
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8.36 Science: Bachelor of Science; Bachelor of Science / Bachelor of Advanced Studies; Bachelor of Science (Advanced Mathematics), including Table 1 amendments

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-48
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science; Bachelor of Science / Bachelor of Advanced Studies; Bachelor of Science (Advanced Mathematics), including Table 1 amendments, and approve the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 75/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Science; Bachelor of Science / Bachelor of Advanced Studies; Bachelor of Science (Advanced Mathematics), including Table 1 amendments, and update the course resolutions and unit of study tables in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Science. Timing: Immediately.

8.37 Science: Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Laws

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-49
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Laws and approve the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 76/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Laws and update the course resolutions and unit of study tables in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Science. Timing: Immediately.

8.38 Science: Bachelor of Science and Doctor of Dental Medicine

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-50
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science and Doctor of Dental Medicine and approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 77/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Science and Doctor of Dental Medicine and update the course resolutions in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Science. Timing: Immediately.

8.39 Science: Bachelor of Science and Doctor of Medicine

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-51
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science and Doctor of Medicine and approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 78/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Science and Doctor of Medicine and update the course resolutions in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Science. Timing: Immediately.

8.40 Science: Bachelor of Science in Agriculture

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-52
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science in Agriculture and approve the amendment of the unit of study table arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.
Action 79/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Science in Agriculture and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Science. Timing: Immediately.

8.41 Science: Bachelor of Science in Agriculture, Bachelor of Science in Agriculture (Honours), Bachelor of Food and Agribusiness, Bachelor of Food and Agribusiness (Honours)

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-53
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science in Agriculture, Bachelor of Science in Agriculture (Honours), Bachelor of Food and Agribusiness, Bachelor of Food and Agribusiness (Honours) and approve the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 80/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Science in Agriculture, Bachelor of Science in Agriculture (Honours), Bachelor of Food and Agribusiness, Bachelor of Food and Agribusiness (Honours) and update the course resolutions and unit of study tables in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Science. Timing: Immediately.

8.42 Science: Bachelor of Environmental Systems

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-54
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Environmental Systems and approve the amendment of the unit of study table arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 81/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Environmental Systems and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Science. Timing: Immediately.

8.43 Science: Bachelor of Animal Veterinary Bioscience

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-55
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Animal Veterinary Bioscience and approve the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study table arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 82/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Animal Veterinary Bioscience and update the course resolutions and unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Science. Timing: Immediately.

8.44 Science: Bachelor of Veterinary Science

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-56
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Veterinary Science and approve the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study table arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 83/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Veterinary Science and update the course resolutions and unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Science. Timing: Immediately.

8.45 Science: Bachelor of Science (Veterinary) and Bachelor of Science (Veterinary) (Honours)

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-57
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the
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Bachelor of Science (Veterinary) and Bachelor of Science (Veterinary) (Honours) and approve the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 84/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Science (Veterinary) and Bachelor of Science (Veterinary) (Honours) and update the course resolutions and unit of study tables in CMS. **Responsible:** Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Science. **Timing:** Immediately.

8.46 **Science:** Bachelor of Veterinary Biology / Doctor of Veterinary Medicine

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-58**
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Veterinary Biology / Doctor of Veterinary Medicine and approve the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 85/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Veterinary Biology / Doctor of Veterinary Medicine and update the course resolutions and unit of study tables in CMS. **Responsible:** Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Science. **Timing:** Immediately.

8.47 **Science:** Bachelor of Medical Science; Bachelor of Medical Science (Honours)

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-59**
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Medical Science; Bachelor of Medical Science (Honours) and approve the amendment of the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 86/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Medical Science; Bachelor of Medical Science (Honours) and update the course resolutions and unit of study tables in CMS. **Responsible:** Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Science. **Timing:** Immediately.

9 **REPORT OF THE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE**

**Resolution AB2017/5-60**
That the Academic Board note the report of the Graduate Studies Committee held on 4 July 2017.

9.1 **Arts:** Master of Crosscultural & Applied Linguistics

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-61**
That the Academic Board:

1. approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to introduce the Master of Crosscultural and Applied Linguistics, Graduate Diploma in Crosscultural and Applied Linguistics and Graduate Certificate of Crosscultural and Applied Linguistics;
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 Certificates in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences; and
3. approve the introduction of course resolutions arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 87/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to introduce the Master of Crosscultural and Applied Linguistics, Graduate Diploma in Crosscultural and Applied Linguistics and Graduate Certificate of Crosscultural and Applied Linguistics and to implement the course resolutions into the CMS. **Responsible:** Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. **Timing:** Immediately.
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**Action 88/2017**: Recommend that Senate endorse the Academic Board’s approval to introduce the Master of Crosscultural and Applied Linguistics, Graduate Diploma in Crosscultural and Applied Linguistics and Graduate Certificate of Crosscultural and Applied Linguistics and approve amendments to the Resolutions of Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty of Medicine. **Responsibility**: Chair of Academic Board. **Timing**: Next meeting of Senate.

**9.2 Medicine: Master of Medicine / Master of Science in Medicine (Pain Management)**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-62**

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from Sydney Medical School to amend the Master of Medicine / Master of Science in Medicine (Pain Management) and approve the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 89/2017**: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Medicine / Master of Science in Medicine (Pain Management) and update the course resolutions in CMS. **Responsibility**: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Sydney Medical School. **Timing**: Immediately.

**9.3 SCA: Deletion of Master of Film and Digital Image (MFDI) and Master of Interactive and Digital Media (MIDM)**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-63**

That the Academic Board:

1. approve the proposal from the Sydney College of the Arts to delete the Master of Film and Digital Image (MFDI) and Master of Interactive and Digital Media (MIDM);
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 Certificates in the Sydney College of the Arts; and
3. approve the deletion of course resolutions arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 90/2017**: Note the Academic Board’s approval to delete the Master of Film and Digital Image (MFDI) and Master of Interactive and Digital Media (MIDM), delete the course resolutions from and update the Senate resolutions in CMS. **Responsibility**: Head of School & Dean and School General Manager, Sydney College of the Arts. **Timing**: Immediately.

**Action 91/2017**: Recommend that Senate endorse the Academic Board’s approval to delete the Master of Film and Digital Image (MFDI) and Master of Interactive and Digital Media (MIDM) and approve amendments to the Resolutions of Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in the Sydney College of the Arts. **Responsibility**: Chair of Academic Board. **Timing**: Next meeting of Senate.

**9.4 Architecture: Master of Architectural Science and embedded programs**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-64**

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Graduate Certificate in Architectural Science, Graduate Diploma in Architectural Science and Master of Architectural Science and approve amendments to the course resolutions and unit of study table arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 92/2017**: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Graduate Certificate in Architectural Science, Graduate Diploma in Architectural Science and Master of Architectural Science and update the unit of study table in CMS. **Responsibility**: Head of School & Dean and School General Manager, Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning. **Timing**: Immediately.

---
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9.5 **Architecture: Bachelor of Design in Architecture (Honours) / Master of Architecture**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-65**

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Bachelor of Design in Architecture (Honours) / Master of Architecture and approve amendments to the course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 93/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Bachelor of Design in Architecture (Honours) / Master of Architecture and update the course resolutions and unit of study tables in CMS. **Responsible:** Head of School & Dean and School General Manager, Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning. **Timing:** Immediately.

9.6 **Architecture: Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-66**

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts and related programs and approve the amendments to the unit of study table, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 94/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Interaction Design and Electronic Arts and related programs and update the table of units of study in CMS. **Responsible:** Head of School & Dean and School General Manager, Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning. **Timing:** Immediately.

9.7 **Architecture: Master of Urban Design and embedded programs**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-67**

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Graduate Certificate in Urban Design, Graduate Diploma in Urban Design and Master of Urban Design and approve amendments to the Course Resolutions and table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 95/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Graduate Certificate in Urban Design, Graduate Diploma in Urban Design and Master of Urban Design and update the course resolutions and tables of units of study in CMS. **Responsible:** Head of School & Dean and School General Manager, Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning. **Timing:** Immediately.

9.8 **Architecture: Master of Urbanism**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-68**

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Master of Urbanism and approve the amendments to the table of units of study arising from the proposal with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 96/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Urbanism and update the table of units of study in CMS. **Responsible:** Head of School & Dean and School General Manager, Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning. **Timing:** Immediately.

9.9 **Architecture: Master of Urban and Regional Planning and embedded programs**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-69**

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning to amend the Graduate Certificate in Urban and Regional Planning, Graduate...
Diploma in Urban and Regional Planning and Master of Urban and Regional Planning and approve the amendments to the tables of unit of study, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 97/2017**: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Graduate Certificate in Urban and Regional Planning, Graduate Diploma in Urban and Regional Planning and Master of Urban and Regional Planning and update the tables of units of study in CMS. Responsible: Head of School & Dean and School General Manager, Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning. **Timing**: Immediately.

### 9.10 Arts: Master of Creative Writing

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-70**
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Creative Writing and embedded courses and approve amendments to the course resolutions and table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 98/2017**: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Creative Writing and embedded courses and update the table of units of study in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. **Timing**: Immediately.

### 9.11 Arts: Master of Human Rights

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-71**
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Human Rights and embedded courses and approve amendments to the course resolutions and table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 99/2017**: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Human Rights and embedded courses and update the course resolutions and table of units of study in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. **Timing**: Immediately.

### 9.12 Arts: Master of International Relations

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-72**
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of International Relations and approve amendments to the course resolutions and table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 100/2017**: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of International Relations and update the course resolutions and table of units of study in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. **Timing**: Immediately.

### 9.13 Arts: Master of International Security

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-73**
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of International Security and approve amendments to the course resolutions and table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 101/2017**: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of International Security and update the course resolutions and table of units of study in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. **Timing**: Immediately.
9.14 **Arts: Master of International Studies**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-74**

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of International Studies and approve amendments to the course resolutions and table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 102/2017**: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of International Studies and update the course resolutions and table of units of study in CMS. **Responsible**: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. **Timing**: Immediately.

9.15 **Arts: Graduate Certificate in Political Economy**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-75**

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Graduate Certificate in Political Economy and approve amendments to the course resolutions and table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 103/2017**: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Graduate Certificate in Political Economy and update the course resolutions and table of units of study in CMS. **Responsible**: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. **Timing**: Immediately.

9.16 **Arts: Master of Public Policy**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-76**

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Public Policy and approve amendments to the course resolutions and table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 104/2017**: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Public Policy and update the course resolutions and table of units of study in CMS. **Responsible**: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. **Timing**: Immediately.

9.17 **Arts: Master of US Studies**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-77**

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of US Studies and approve amendments to the course resolutions and table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 105/2017**: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of US Studies and update the course resolutions and table of units of study in CMS. **Responsible**: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. **Timing**: Immediately.

9.18 **Business: Master of Commerce and embedded programs**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-78**

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend the Master of Commerce, Graduate Diploma in Commerce and Graduate Certificate in Commerce and approve the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January, 2018.

**Action 106/2017**: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Commerce, Graduate Diploma in Commerce and Graduate Certificate in Commerce and update the course resolutions and unit of study tables in CMS. **Responsible**: Dean and Faculty General Manager,
Non-Confidential

**Business School. Timing: Immediately.**

**9.19 Business: Master of International Business and embedded programs**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-79**

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend the Master of International Business and Graduate Certificate in International Business and approve the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January, 2018.

**Action 107/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of International Business and Graduate Certificate in International Business and update the course resolutions and unit of study tables in CMS. **Responsible:** Dean and Faculty General Manager, Business School. **Timing:** Immediately.

**9.20 Business: Master of Logistics and Supply Chain Management and embedded programs**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-80**

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend the Master of Logistics and Supply Chain Management, Graduate Diploma in Logistics and Supply Chain Management and Graduate Certificate in Logistics and Supply Chain Management and approve the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January, 2018.

**Action 108/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Logistics and Supply Chain Management, Graduate Diploma in Logistics and Supply Chain Management and Graduate Certificate in Logistics and Supply Chain Management and update the course resolutions and unit of study table in CMS. **Responsible:** Dean and Faculty General Manager, Business School. **Timing:** Immediately.

**9.21 Business: Master of Management and related programs**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-81**

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend the Master of Management, Master of Management (CEMS) and Graduate Certificate in Management and approve the amendment of course resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January, 2018.

**Action 109/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Management, Master of Management (CEMS) and Graduate Certificate in Management and update the course resolutions in CMS. **Responsible:** Dean and Faculty General Manager, Business School. **Timing:** Immediately.

**9.22 Business: Master of Professional Accounting and embedded programs**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-82**

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the University of Sydney Business School to amend the Master of Professional Accounting, Graduate Diploma in Professional Accounting and Graduate Certificate in Professional Accounting and approve the amendment of course resolutions and unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January, 2018.

**Action 110/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Professional Accounting, Graduate Diploma in Professional Accounting and Graduate Certificate in Professional Accounting and update the course resolutions and unit of study tables in CMS. **Responsible:** Dean and Faculty General Manager, Business School. **Timing:** Immediately.
Engineering & IT: Graduate Diploma in Computing

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-83

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Graduate Diploma in Computing and approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 111/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Graduate Diploma in Computing and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

Engineering & IT: Master of Professional Engineering (Civil) (Fluids) (Geomechanical) (Structural)

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-84

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Civil), (Fluids), (Geomechanical) and (Structural) programs and approve the amendment to the tables of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 112/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Civil), (Fluids), (Geomechanical) and (Structural) programs and update the unit of study tables in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

Engineering & IT: Master of Professional Engineering (Electrical) (Power) (Telecommunications)

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-85

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Electrical), (Power) and (Telecommunications) programs, and approve the amendment to the tables of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 113/2017: Note the Academic Board's approval to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Electrical), (Power) and (Telecommunications) programs and update the unit of study tables in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

Engineering & IT: Master of Professional Engineering (Software)

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-86

That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Software) and approve the amendment to the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 114/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Software) and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

Engineering & IT: Master of Information Technology, Master of Information Technology Management, Master of Information Technology / Master of Information Technology Management

This proposal was approved as presented.
Resolution AB2017/5-87
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend core units in the Master of Information Technology, Master of Information Technology Management and Master of Information Technology/Master of Information Technology Management and approve the amendment to the tables of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 115/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the core units in the Master of Information Technology, Master of Information Technology Management and Master of Information Technology/Master of Information Technology Management and update the unit of study tables in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

9.28 Medicine: Doctor of Medicine
This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-88
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from Sydney Medical School amend the Doctor of Medicine and approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 116/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Doctor of Medicine and update the course resolutions in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Sydney Medical School. Timing: Immediately.

9.29 Sydney Nursing School: Master of Nursing
This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-89
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from Sydney Nursing School to amend the Master of Nursing and approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 117/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Nursing and update the course resolutions in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Sydney Nursing School. Timing: Immediately.

9.30 Pharmacy: Course and Faculty Resolutions
This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-90
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Pharmacy to amend the Master of Pharmacy, Graduate Certificate in Pharmacy Practice, and Graduate Certificate in Evidence-Based Complementary Medicines; approve the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal; and approve the amendment of the Resolutions of the Faculty of Pharmacy for coursework awards, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 118/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Pharmacy, Graduate Certificate in Pharmacy Practice, and Graduate Certificate in Evidence-Based Complementary Medicines and update the faculty and course resolutions in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Pharmacy. Timing: Immediately.

9.31 Dentistry: Doctor of Dental Medicine
This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-91
That the Academic Board approve the proposal from the Faculty of Dentistry to amend the Doctor of Dental Medicine and approve the amendment of course resolutions arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 119/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Doctor of Dental Medicine and update the course resolutions in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of
9.32 **Engineering & IT: Master of Complex Systems**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-92**

That the Academic Board note the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Complex Systems and note the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 120/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Complex Systems and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. **Timing:** Immediately.

9.33 **Engineering & IT: Master of Data Science**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-93**

That the Academic Board note the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Data Science and note the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 121/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Data Science and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. **Timing:** Immediately.

9.34 **Engineering & IT: Master of Engineering (Biomedical)**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-94**

That the Academic Board note the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Engineering (Biomedical) and note the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 122/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Engineering (Biomedical) and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. **Timing:** Immediately.

9.35 **Engineering & IT: Master of Engineering (Chemical and Biomolecular)**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-95**

That the Academic Board note the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Engineering (Chemical and Biomolecular) and note the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from Semester 1, 2018.

**Action 123/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Engineering (Chemical and Biomolecular) and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. **Timing:** Immediately.

9.36 **Engineering & IT: Master of Engineering (Civil) (Fluids) (Geomechanical) (Structural)**

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-96**

That the Academic Board note the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Engineering (Civil) (Fluids) (Geomechanical) (Structural) and note the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.
Action 124/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Engineering (Civil) (Fluids) (Geomechanical) (Structural) and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

9.37 Engineering & IT: Master of Engineering (Electrical) (Power) (Telecommunications)
This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-97
That the Academic Board note the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Engineering (Electrical) (Power) (Telecommunications) and note the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 125/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Engineering (Electrical) (Power) (Telecommunications) and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

9.38 Engineering & IT: Master of Engineering (Mechanical)
This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-98
That the Academic Board note the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Engineering (Mechanical) and note the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 126/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Engineering (Mechanical) and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

9.39 Engineering & IT: Master of Engineering (Software)
This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-99
That the Academic Board note the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Engineering (Software) and note the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 127/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Engineering (Software) and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

9.40 Engineering & IT: Master of Professional Engineering (Aerospace)
This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-100
That the Academic Board note the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Aerospace) and note the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action 128/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Aerospace) and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

9.41 Engineering & IT: Master of Professional Engineering (Biomedical)
This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-101
That the Academic Board note the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Biomedical) and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

Respect is a core value of the Academic Board
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Technologies to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Biomedical) and note the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 129/2017**: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Biomedical) and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

9.42 **Engineering & IT**: Master of Professional Engineering (Chemical and Biomolecular)

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-102**

That the Academic Board note the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Chemical and Biomolecular) and note the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 130/2017**: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Chemical and Biomolecular) and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

9.43 **Engineering & IT**: Master of Professional Engineering (Mechanical)

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-103**

That the Academic Board note the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Mechanical) and note the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 131/2017**: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Professional Engineering (Mechanical) and update the unit of study table in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

9.44 **Engineering & IT**: Master of Project Leadership and Master of Project Management

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-104**

That the Academic Board note the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to amend the Master of Project Leadership and the Master of Project Management and note the amendment of the tables of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

**Action 132/2017**: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Project Leadership and the Master of Project Management and update the unit of study tables in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies. Timing: Immediately.

9.45 **Medicine**: PG Coursework Programs

This proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-105**

That the Academic Board note the proposal from Sydney Medical School to amend the Master of Medicine/Science in Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology), Master of International Public Health, Master of Health Communication, Master of Health Policy, Master of Medicine/Science in Medicine (Metabolic Health), Master of Public Health, Master of Public Health (Professional Practice) and Master of Surgery (Surgical Sciences) and embedded courses and note the amendment of unit of study tables arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.
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**Action 133/2017:** Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Master of Medicine/Science in Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology), Master of International Public Health, Master of Health Communication, Master of Health Policy, Master of Medicine/Science in Medicine (Metabolic Health), Master of Public Health, Master of Public Health (Professional Practice) and Master of Surgery (Surgical Sciences) and embedded courses and update the unit of study tables in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty General Manager, Sydney Medical School. **Timing:** Immediately.

10 REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY COMMITTEE

**Resolution AB2017/5-106**

That the Academic Board note the report of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee held on 11 July 2017.

10.1 **Semester Dates 2019 and beyond**

Discussion of this proposal took place after Item 4.2, Student Members Report. The Registrar presented a revised Semester Dates proposal to the Academic Board, as originally presented to the 28 March 2017 meeting.

Professor Fekete commended the paper’s identification and discussion of the potential risks associated with the implementation of the proposed model. However, whilst possible ways of dealing with potential risks were outlined, Professor Fekete felt that the paper should also demonstrate how risk would be avoided. In response, Professor Jagose reported that the preliminary issues had been addressed by information provided by faculties.

SUPRA considered that the schedule did not account for the schedule of postgraduate students intending to go on exchange. The Registrar explained that the University’s mobility strategy concerned the shorter term-mobility of all students rather than thinking in terms of domestic or international, and aimed to provide 50% of all students with a mobility experience. However, the University is currently working on the development of exchange partnerships, with the aim of sending a large number of students on exchange in the future.

It was stated that the impact on student placement needed more explanation and immediate attention. The Vice-Chancellor expressed the view that the information available indicated that the timetable was workable, and also observed that the University had no intention of introducing trimesters for the time being.

The Registrar noted that as the Australian University common dates were not known when the Semester Dates model was first conceived, some minor changes will be needed to the dates given in the model.

With the caveat that the appropriate date corrections are made, the proposal was approved as presented.

**Resolution AB2017/5-107**

The Academic Board approve the semester date model as proposed, noting the commentary on both risks and benefits associated with the change.

**Action 134/2017:** Note and inform relevant stakeholders of the Academic Board’s approval to implement the Semester date model. Responsible: Executive Officer. **Timing:** immediately.

10.2 **Election Procedures 2017**

Professor Fekete raised a concern regarding security for electronic voting. The University Policy Manager reported that after extensive negotiations with Big Pulse and after the organisation of election simulations using the new Big Pulse software, the Office of the Provost, the University Secretariat and Office of General Counsel jointly considered the software to be suitable for the University’s purposes. The observation was also made that electronic voting does not carry the risk of eligible voters missing hard copy voting papers sent through the mail.

**Resolution AB2017/5-108**

That the Academic Board discuss the Election Procedures 2017 and note that they will come into
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effect from 7 August 2017.

Action 135/2017: Inform the Secretary to Senate of the adoption of the Election Procedures 2017. Responsible: Executive Officer. Timing: Next meeting of Senate.

10.3 Dentistry: Amendment of Resolutions of Faculty

This proposal was approved as presented.

Resolution AB2017/5-109
That the Academic Board approve the amendment of the Resolutions of the Faculty of Dentistry, as presented, with immediate effect.

Action 136/2017: Note the Academic Board’s approval to amend the Resolutions of the Faculty of Dentistry and update the faculty resolutions in CMS. Responsible: Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Dentistry. Timing: immediately.

11 GENERAL BUSINESS

11.1 Any other business

In closing the meeting, the Chair recognized the enormous work by faculties, the Secretariat, and members of the Academic Board put into the minor course amendments presented to the meeting.

There being no other business, the meeting closed at 3:16 pm.

A copy of the agenda pack for this meeting is available at sydney.edu.au/secretariat/pdfs/academic-board-committees/AB/2017/20170725-AB-Agenda-Pack-v2.pdf.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Matthew Charet (Executive Officer to Academic Board)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer/Approver</td>
<td>Associate Professor Tony Masters, Chair of Academic Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper title</td>
<td>2017 Membership of the Academic Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To advise the Academic Board of changes to membership of the Board and its committees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Academic Board approve the changes to membership of the Board and its committees, as presented.

**MEMBERSHIP OF ACADEMIC BOARD**

The Academic Board is asked to approve the following changes to membership:

- Associate Professor Steven Cumming replaces Professor Roger Stancliffe as a staff member from the Faculty of Health Sciences;
- Associate Professor Sarah Lewis replaces Professor Patrick Brennan as a staff member from the Faculty of Health Sciences.

In addition, Dr Shanika Nanayakkara and Dr Alexander Zavgorodniy have been nominated by the Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry to fill casual vacancies in representation from that faculty.

**MEMBERSHIP OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

The Academic Board is asked to approve the following changes to membership:

- Samay Sabharwal is appointed as the Nominee of the President, SUPRA, on the Academic Standards and Policy Committee
- Nicole Seebacher is appointed as the Nominee of the President, SUPRA, on the Graduate Studies Committee
- Rebecca Johnson is appointed as the Nominee of the President, SUPRA, on the Admission Committee
Submission To: Academic Board
Date: 29 August 2017
Item No: 2.4
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Author: Matthew Charet (Executive Officer to Academic Board)
Reviewer/Approver: Associate Professor Tony Masters (Chair, Academic Board)
Paper title: Academic Board Election Timeline
Purpose: To provide members of the Academic Board with the timeline for the election of new staff and student members and for the Chair, for terms of office commencing 1 January 2018.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Board note the timeline for Academic Board elections for terms of office commencing 1 January 2018, as presented.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Ballots for the election of academic and professional staff members to faculty boards and of student members to faculties, faculty boards, University schools and University school boards, as required under the University of Sydney (Governance of Faculties and University Schools) Rule 2016 (GOFUS) will be finalised on 19 September 2017.

The proposed University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017 stipulates that student members of the Academic Board be elected by and from the student members of faculty and University school boards. The finalisation of the elections required under GOFUS will provide the electorate for student members of the Academic Board for the term of office 1 January 2018 – 31 December 2018. The electorate for staff elections includes all academic staff as defined in the Rule, and will be for a term of office 1 January 2018 – 31 December 2019.

It is proposed to hold simultaneous elections for student and staff members of the Academic Board according to the schedule below. As provided by the University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017, the outcome of these elections will in part provide the electorate for the election of the Chair of Academic Board, the outcome of which is required to be announced at the final Academic Board meeting for 2017, currently scheduled for 28 November 2017.

Academic Board elections for staff and student members need to be conducted in semester 2, 2017 and results declared with effect from 1 January 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key milestones for Academic Board elections</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publish notice of election</td>
<td>Monday 25 September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close nominations</td>
<td>Monday 9 October 2017 @ 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue ballot papers</td>
<td>Monday 16 October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return ballot papers</td>
<td>Monday 30 October 2017 @ 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballots counted</td>
<td>Tuesday 31 October 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Election of Chair of Academic Board needs to be conducted in semester 2, 2017 and results declared with effect from 1 January 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key milestones for election of Chair of Academic Board</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publish notice</td>
<td>Monday 16 October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close nominations</td>
<td>Monday 30 October 2017 @ 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue ballot papers</td>
<td>Monday 6 November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return ballot papers</td>
<td>Monday 20 November 2017 @ 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballots counted</td>
<td>Tuesday 21 November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results announced @ Academic Board</td>
<td>Tuesday 28 November 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Board note the 2018 meeting schedule, as presented.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At its meeting of 23 August 2017, Senate will be asked to approve its 2018 meeting schedule. To align with the proposed Senate meeting dates, and to accommodate the new meeting frequency for the Academic Board as provided for in the University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017, the proposed 2018 meeting schedule for the Academic Board and its standing committees is as follows:

Academic Board: is to meet on Tuesday 1-3pm on the following dates:
- 6 March 2018
- 1 May 2018
- 12 June 2018
- 7 August 2018
- 2 October 2018
- 27 November 2018

Admissions: is to meet on Tuesday 10am-12pm on the following dates:
- 13 February 2018
- 10 April 2018
- 22 May 2018
- 17 July 2018
- 11 September 2018
- 6 November 2018

Academic Standards and Policy: is to meet on Tuesday 2-4pm on the following dates:
- 13 February 2018
- 10 April 2018
- 22 May 2018
- 17 July 2018
- 11 September 2018
- 6 November 2018

Graduate Studies: is to meet on Tuesday 2-4pm on the following dates:
- 6 February 2018
- 27 March 2018
- 15 May 2018 (final course proposal meeting)
- 10 July 2018
- 4 September 2018
- 30 October 2018
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Undergraduate Studies: is to meet on Tuesday 10am-12pm on the following dates:

- 6 February 2018
- 27 March 2018
- 15 May 2018 (final course proposal meeting)
- 10 July 2018
- 4 September 2018
- 30 October 2018

The closing dates for agenda papers and the dates for agenda distribution are to be publicised via the appropriate committee website, with the closing date set two three weeks before each meeting and the distribution date to be one week before each meeting.
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Board reaffirm its approval and endorsement of the Charter of Academic Freedom and its commitment to the University’s values of courage and creativity, respect and integrity, inclusion and diversity and openness and engagement.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The University of Sydney (Academic Governance Rule) obliges the Academic Board to "safeguard the academic freedom of the University". This requirement is reiterated in the draft University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule. This year is the 10th anniversary of the approval by the Academic Board and Senate of the Charter of Academic Freedom, as attached.

Accordingly, the Academic Board is asked to approve the following:

"The Academic Board reaffirms its approval and endorsement of the Charter of Academic Freedom and its commitment to the University’s values of courage and creativity, respect and integrity, inclusion and diversity and openness and engagement."
The University of Sydney declares its commitment to free enquiry as necessary to the conduct of a democratic society and to the quest for intellectual, moral and material advance in the human condition.

The University of Sydney affirms its institutional right and responsibility, and the rights and responsibilities of each of its individual scholars, to pursue knowledge for its own sake, wherever the pursuit might lead. The University further supports the responsible transmission of that knowledge so gained, openly within the academy and into the community at large, in conformity with the law and the policies and obligations of the University.

The University of Sydney, consistent with the principles enunciated in its mission and policies, undertakes to promote and support:

- the free, and responsible pursuit of knowledge through research in accordance with the highest ethical, professional and legal standards
- the dissemination of the outcomes of research, in teaching, as publications and creative works, and in media discourse
- principled and informed discussion of all aspects of knowledge and culture

This Charter of Academic Freedom is endorsed by the Senate and Academic Board of The University of Sydney.
RECOMMENDATION

*That the Academic Board note the set of Graduate Qualities and consider potential changes to the PhD student experience.*

BACKGROUND

The PhD, as it is experienced today, would be very familiar to academic staff and students from the University during the middle of the last century. As more than a few reviews have demonstrated\(^1\), the world of employment for PhD graduates is constantly changing and the presumption that the majority of PhD graduates will become academics is no longer tenable. The conjunction of two significant reviews from the Commonwealth and a strategic vision for the University has meant the Board's consideration of the nature of the PhD is timely.

Graduate Qualities for the PhD

The discussion around graduate qualities for the PhD at the University of Sydney came from three events. The first was the development of a view that Sydney could, and should, be a sector-leading institution in respect of its educational offerings (for example, arguments for this were set out in *A Distinctive Sydney Education in 2014*\(^3\)). This paper explicitly argued the need for the University to consider its degrees in the light of what graduates may need for careers in the knowledge-based economy.

The next driver was the report of the Australian Council of Learned Academies' review (*Safeguarding Australia’s Future 13: Review of the Research Training System*)\(^4\) to the federal government. This review, chaired by John McGagh, considered the PhD through the lens of (i) benefits to the discipline, (ii) benefits to the individual and (iii) benefits to the nation. Its consideration of the latter two aspects were important for our own thinking about the PhD. The review was extensive and thorough, and the implementation of its recommendations will change the Australian PhD. Finally, the future state of the University of Sydney and how we meet the needs of our students and society in general were critically considered in the development of the University of Sydney's Strategic Plan 2016-20\(^5\).

Attachment 1 summarises the background to the discussion of the graduate qualities associated with a Sydney PhD and also gives an international context to our consideration of graduate qualities.

From the latter half of 2016 to early 2017, we considered three major questions:

1. What qualities would we expect to exemplify our PhD graduates for the next few decades?

---

\(^1\) [https://royalsociety.org/topics-policy/projects/doctoral-students/](https://royalsociety.org/topics-policy/projects/doctoral-students/)


\(^3\) [https://intranet.sydney.edu.au/strategy-planning/education.html](https://intranet.sydney.edu.au/strategy-planning/education.html)
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2. How would such qualities integrate with an articulation of qualities we expect of our Bachelors graduates and those we have established in the 2016-2020 Strategic Plan for University of Sydney researchers?

3. How might these qualities influence the shape and delivery of a Sydney PhD education?

Note: We explicitly excluded research doctorates other than the PhD and masters level HDR provision from our deliberations, since these degrees have to reflect faculty and discipline level variations.

The attached review of the graduate qualities for the PhD were developed by the Education Portfolio and then presented to key university communities during Semester 1 2017. We did this to agree a set of qualities that would embody a vision of the PhD in Sydney. The next stage was a series of discussion events held at various locations and open to all members of the university. The series of discussions were supported by Yammer conversations (#phdgraduatequalities).

Table 1. Locations and dates of consultation events to discuss Graduate Qualities for the PhD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 July 2017</td>
<td>11:00-12:00pm</td>
<td>Camperdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 July 2017</td>
<td>12:00-1:00pm</td>
<td>Westmead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 July 2017</td>
<td>11:30-12:30pm</td>
<td>Camperdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 July 2017</td>
<td>2:30-3:30pm</td>
<td>Northern Clinical School (RNSH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 July 2017</td>
<td>12:30-1:30pm</td>
<td>Camden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The key points from the discussions were:

1. The consideration of graduate qualities was explicitly not about creating a culture of ticking boxes/badge-collecting and imposing more mandatory coursework in the PhD.

2. The community supported our desire to create and foster an ecosystem of opportunities, such that students and supervisors could plot a development trajectory relevant for each candidate as (s)he moved through his/her research and settled on possible career options post-PhD.

3. The means by which the university delivers opportunities for students to develop their graduate qualities would need monitoring to check that workload and the capacity of students to meet their research goals were not negatively affected.

4. There may need to be internal funding adjustments to ensure that all development opportunities for HDR students are sustainably resourced.

5. We also discussed whether a statement of graduate qualities would lead to some changes to the PhD experience, and if so, what these changes may be.

6. We asked the community if changes to methods of examination were required. Notably, this included the provision of an oral examination. No clear consensus emerged.

7. Content of the graduate qualities – it was felt that that the graduate qualities were not explicit enough about some of the skills that are required as a good researcher. Project management, entrepreneurship, and business skills were specifically mentioned. The Education Portfolio will consider how best to respond to these comments in finalising the PhD graduate qualities.

8. Composition of the PhD – There was concern that adopting graduate qualities would require greater focus on coursework and less on research, and that a checklist approach was proposed to building graduate qualities with limited relevance to the student’s field of research or consideration of the student’s existing level of competence. However the intended approach is for the supervisor to work

---

with the student to identify where they need to develop more capability in each of the graduate qualities, and to develop a plan for achieving that.

9. **Increasing the requirements for award** – it was noted that students enrolling in a PhD have highly variable levels of competence in each of the graduate qualities, and some students might find it challenging to achieve the graduate qualities even at the end of the PhD. It was perceived that articulating graduate qualities raises the bar for the standard that needs to be achieved to receive a PhD, and this would probably result in supervisors taking greater care in the selection of students, because more work would be required to manage achievement of the graduate qualities.

10. **Assessing the graduate qualities** – questions about how to measure and assess the graduate qualities were raised, and also how the impact of the graduate qualities once implemented will be measured. This will be the focus of a forthcoming project on the implementation of the graduate qualities.

As a result of the consultation and deliberation of the proposed graduate qualities, we have updated the draft graduate qualities to incorporate the feedback received. Table 2 below will likely form the recommended set of Graduate Qualities we will present to the governance committees of the University for consideration and adoption.

**QUESTION 1: Would you add or subtract anything from this list of proposed qualities for University of Sydney PhD graduates?**
Non-Confidential

Table 2. Proposed Graduate Qualities for the PhD.

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

**Next steps**

November 2017: We will define outlined the components for implementation so that we can evaluate, measure and record achievement against graduate qualities and present an implementation road map to the University Executive and Academic Board.

2018: During this year, we will need to examine the HDR Policy and Governance framework to update the HDR Rule and associated policies. Simultaneously, we will propose operational changes to better embed delivering the opportunities for PhD students to meet the graduate qualities.

**Enhancing the PhD Experience**

There is a huge amount to be proud of with respect to our Ph.D. education, but there is always room for improvement. We propose three key challenges that, if solved, would enhance the Ph.D. experience.
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**QUESTION 2.** What are the options for the University to help improve completion times?

Timely completions are both a driver of funding efficiency success\(^3\) and a proxy for the quality of the Ph.D. programme\(^7\). An urgent and key challenge, therefore, is to consider how to increase the proportion of PhD graduates completing in under four years and therefore ensure good outcomes for students, enhance efficient use of RTP resources, and improve University indicators concerning outcomes for PhD students.

![Figure 1. The distribution of over-time candidatures (in red; > 4 years EFTSL for research doctoral degrees and > 2 years EFTSL for research masters degrees) by faculty/university school for completions in 2016/7, as reported to the Commonwealth and used to drive Research Block Grant funding.](image)

**QUESTION 3.** How can we better integrate engagement activities into the PhD programme?

The government’s innovation agenda\(^8\) and the impact and engagement component of ERA\(^9\) have identified how Ph.D. candidates engage with the end-users of research as a performance metric for universities.

**QUESTION 4:** What can change in our examination practices to reduce the duration of the examination period without compromising the integrity of the evaluation?

The core aspects of the Ph.D. examination, that of an ‘anonymous’ peer review by three experts, has not changed in the last 70 years. The University’s Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015 requires examiners to be replaced if a report is not returned within 12 weeks of receipt. This is aimed at delivering an expected thesis examination time of 2-3 months. Our current performance is not consistent with this expectation.

---


\(^8\) [https://www.innovation.gov.au/](https://www.innovation.gov.au/)

### Duration of Examination (months)

**from submission to determination of award**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty (pre 2017)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture Design and Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Business School)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law (Sydney Law School)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (Sydney Medical School)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (Sydney Nursing School)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total**

| 29 | 356 | 415 | 277 | 152 | 94  | 52  | 33  | 21  | 16  | 13  | 9   | 9   | 2   | 4   | 30  | 1512        |
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This also leads to a negative Ph.D. experience for many of our graduates. We examined all of the comments made in the Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire and extracted those that addressed the examination component. These are given below:

- The thesis examination process has so far taken seven months without any actual feedback being received. This is far too long, especially if I need to make changes to the thesis or re-run experiments."
- Formalised timing of return of feedback on draft chapters of thesis from supervisor; more opportunity for feedback on performance of supervisor.
- Complete lack of communication once thesis was submitted. No updates on progress of examination and unreasonable delays in receiving results.
- The school allowed one reader to take a full 6 months to read my thesis even when the other readers turned in their reports on time. A shockingly unprofessional move on the part of <faculty name removed>?
- Divided examination results have held up my award, which I understand, but the department overall seems to be either overburdened with responsibility or understaffed, as the processing of my thesis seems to have taken an inordinately long time. It took 5 months for my thesis to get distributed to examiners and when the examinations were returned another couple of months elapsed before it was processed. After originally submitting at the beginning of August 2014 I was finally advised in Sep that the matter was in arbitration. It is nearly Dec now and I am still waiting.
- In Needs Improvement: Thesis examination process and timing.
- Examiners took 6 months to examine my thesis - too long!
- The examination has taken nearly 6 months! The university would only pay for surface mail delivery to one of the examiners in South Africa when the examiner requested a hard copy version of my thesis!
- Thesis is taking over 5 months due to one examiner, that is not sufficiently being followed up by the faculty and is only addressed when I question the delay.
- Thesis examination took too long
- Thesis examination has taken 8 months and counting, without any real tangible updates.
- The marking process took a long time which has significantly impacted my ability to obtain employment in my chosen field.
- Delay in sending out thesis to examiners
- The thesis submission and marking process was terrible. The person at the HDR centre was often unhelpful, and even sent my thesis feedback (with the corrections that needed to be made) back to the wrong email address (so it was undelivered). I had to get my supervisor to forward it to me.

ISSUES

1. Are the proposed graduate qualities sufficient and complete?
2. What are the things we do at Sydney that, if changed, may increase the proportion of our Ph.D. graduates completing in under four years.
3. How can we better integrate engagement activities into the Ph.D. programme?
4. What can change in our examination practices to reduce the duration of the examination period?

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Identifying, embedding and reporting graduate qualities for the Sydney PhD – Paper presented to the Graduate Studies Committee on 23 May 2017.
A set of qualities is proposed here along with strategies for embedding their development. These qualities are informed by the University's Bachelor graduate and researcher qualities¹ and by contemporary discussions of the nature of PhD outcomes².

This paper was presented to the University Executive Education Committee on 8 May. Members were broadly supportive of the proposed graduate qualities, noting that further work on implementation will be needed following endorsement.

---

² See, for example, the Australian Qualifications Framework http://www.aqf.edu.au/aqf/in-detail/aqf-qualifications/ and Vitae (https://www.vitae.ac.uk/).
1. Why graduate qualities for the PhD?

For most students, committing to a 3-4 year program of study for a PhD occurs at a time when other major career, further study and life transitions are also being considered. It is important, therefore, to be able to provide a clear answer to the question, "Why do a PhD?". Often, the answers to that question are not that different from a related question asked by industry – “Why employ a PhD graduate?”. Governments and research agencies may ask why they should fund a PhD. While the answer to the latter question generally refers to the development of human capital and the transition towards a knowledge-based economy, answers to the first and second questions are more nuanced. Those considering a PhD education may be seeking diverse outcomes, such as meeting professional requirements, acquiring deep knowledge and understanding of a discipline, and developing personally and professionally. This paper is intended to prompt discussion of what a University of Sydney PhD education offers and how completing a PhD at the university prepares a graduate for a diversity of familiar and as yet unimagined career paths ahead.

2. The Purpose of the PhD at Sydney

The PhD is the primary degree for developing research capability and contributing to the research ecosystem within the University of Sydney as well as broader national and international systems for research and innovation. A thriving PhD cohort ensures a successful research system within the University and the broader systems of which it is a part.

The University is pursuing three strategies to ensure excellence in PhD outcomes. The first is to ensure recruitment of those students most likely to succeed; actions put in place with respect to the Strategic Plan 2016-2020 aim 2.2 have addressed this, as will continued engagement with faculties and the central recruitment team. The second approach is to ensure that PhD students work in an exciting, intellectually demanding and enriching environment. The third is to ensure that PhD outcomes are fit for the purposes for which the degree prepares students, including careers in universities, the broader research and innovation sector, and industry, community and government more generally. The University’s Strategic Plan 2016-2020 makes these latter two work streams a key priority for 2017-18. This paper takes the first step towards clarifying the purpose of the PhD and ensuring that the PhD experience is designed to deliver on that purpose for students, the University and external stakeholders, including future employers.

The function of the PhD as an educational offering has changed markedly over the last decade or so. The primary function of the degree of PhD was, until very recently, seen to be preparing students for an academic research role and, implicitly therefore, for a teaching and research role. The PhD was reviewed by the Graduate Studies Committee Academic Board in 2005; this review noted 7 key attributes of a PhD graduate from the University of Sydney - (i) the acquisition of research skills; (ii) an appreciation and understanding of the research environment; (iii) an understanding of the management of research (iv) enhanced personal effectiveness; (v) a range of effective communication skills; (vi) team working and leadership skills; (vii) planning, career development skills, introspection. The Group of 8 Research Intensive Universities also reviewed the changing nature of the PhD, and this review also argued convincingly for a development plan to embed transferable/generic skills within the PhD experience and to make the relevance of the PhD explicit for both the student and society at large.

---

5 Minutes of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held on Monday, 22 August 2005
More recently, the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Training commissioned the Australian Council of Learned Academies (ACOLA) to produce a comprehensive review of higher degree by research (HDR) training. The ensuing report was accepted in its entirety by the current Minister on 4th November 2016, although it should be noted that none of the recommendations have yet been acted on. The review, known as the ACOLA review or SAF137, had as its top two priorities (1) to ensure that Australia’s HDR training models are comparable with the best in the world and (2) to ensure that research graduates are equipped for and achieve employment outcomes in a range of sectors, including academic teaching, research and industry. It is not the function of this paper to recycle the detailed analysis given in the ACOLA report, which distils the results of extensive consultation and consideration of the key issues. The relevant key findings (KF) of the ACOLA review were as follows (with emphases added):

KF 1: Universities have a duty of care to communicate the likely outcomes of HDR training prior to candidates commencing their training. The information currently available to aspiring candidates is inadequate. Candidates need to be provided with information on the career outcomes of past HDR graduates, as well as comparative information on the quality, performance and components of HDR training provided by each university. The Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching website provides a potential opportunity to communicate this information to candidates in a clear and effective way.

KF4: Broader transferable skills development is a necessary aspect of HDR training. Although many universities have made significant investments in this area, transferable skills development is not as strongly embedded in our research training system as it is in some other comparable research training systems around the world. Skills development must be flexible and candidate-directed, and take into account the diverse backgrounds and experience of candidates. The UK Vitae Researcher Development Framework is an established and comprehensive approach that provides a useful model that could be adapted for use in Australia.

KF 9: The current examination system ensures Australia’s HDR outputs are of high quality, but a statement of the skills and knowledge gained by the candidate is also needed. The Australian Higher Education Graduation Statement (AHEGS) provides a potential vehicle for such information, the evidence base for which can be built through HDR milestones (confirmation of candidature, mid-candidature, and final), preparation of a skills portfolio, seminar presentations, industry and international placements, and oral examinations.

By explicitly identifying the key features and benefits of a PhD from the University of Sydney, we will be better able to articulate a value proposition for a PhD at the University of Sydney. This coupled with our increasing excellence in research will help make us a first choice for aspiring PhD candidates.

A number of possible qualities for PhD graduates were identified in the discussion papers leading up to the Strategic Plan8; in addition, the qualities of University of Sydney Bachelor graduates and University of Sydney researchers articulated in the 2016-2020 Strategic Plan provide anchors between which the qualities of PhD graduates might be articulated.

In the next section, therefore, we propose a constellation of broader learning outcomes of a PhD education and seek to link these outcomes to an ecosystem of possible skill and professional development activities. Attention must be given to processes for ensuring that appropriate opportunities are provided to maximise the potential of individual candidates. In particular, we need to identify the means by which we can provide support for the development of the required
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capabilities and how we can best add intellectual depth and breadth to the PhD experience. For example, should we, as articulated in the 2016 strategy discussion papers, encourage participation in additional seminars, workshops, discussions, hackathons and innovation opportunities not just within the field of enquiry but also in areas of contemporary interest and concern, including in interdisciplinary domains? And should these also include, for example, a range of methodological skills, communication skills, fundamentals of project management, fundamentals of commercialisation, entrepreneurship, research integrity, effective teamwork, mentoring skills and leadership development?

The University also needs to have an understanding of how we might capture, measure, record and report the successes and benefits to a candidate’s professional development from doing a PhD at Sydney. This will help graduates better understand and articulate how their PhD education has prepared them for the next stages of their life.

Ensuring that successful completion of HDR units in the Open Learning Environment can be included on the academic transcript will meet this requirement, in part, but we will need to determine what other activities are also to be recorded. Importantly, the University has not committed at this point to the production of an AHEGS, so the question of alternative means of reflecting broader developments and milestones is especially pertinent in our case.

Full time employment levels of HDR graduates may be improved if there is a greater appreciation in industry for HDR graduate qualities and a greater emphasis on transferable skills development during candidature.

The Australian postgraduate destination survey for 2015 indicated that out of those that were available, 72.7% of doctorate holders were in full-time employment four months post-graduation compared to 85.6% in 2010. The percentage of University of Sydney HDR graduates in full time work four months post-graduation has also declined consistently for the last 4 years, from 77% in 2012 to 69% in 2015 (GDS trend report 2012-2015). This reflects an 8% decline for domestic students and a 10% decline for international students (GDS trend report 2012-2015).

Given the increasing flows of PhD graduates into non-academic careers, there is likely also more we can do to prepare students to make productive transitions post-completion of the PhD or post-doctoral fellowship. For example, as proposed in the strategy discussion papers, can we support students to spend more time in relevant industry or community settings, and hence provide opportunities to develop and build skills for alternative career pathways? Can we also develop more systematic support for international mobility experiences for PhD students (for example, international visits, short courses, conference attendance) to accelerate connection to international expertise and networks in students’ fields of study?

3. PhD Graduate Qualities

Background

The degree of PhD is an Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) level 10 award. The AQF defines the PhD with respect to a prescribed set of skills; viz -

Graduates of a Doctoral Degree will have:

- cognitive skills to demonstrate expert understanding of theoretical knowledge and to reflect critically on that theory and practice
- cognitive skills and use of intellectual independence to think critically, evaluate existing knowledge and ideas, undertake systemic investigation and reflect on theory and practice to generate original knowledge
- expert technical and creative skills applicable to the field of work or learning
- communication skills to explain and critique theoretical propositions, methodologies and conclusions
communication skills to present cogently a complex investigation of originality or original research for external examination against international standards and to communicate results to peers and the community

expert skills to design, implement, analyse, theorise and communicate research that makes a significant and original contribution to knowledge and/or professional practice

In the 2016-2020 University of Sydney Strategic Plan, the term ‘graduate qualities’ is used to describe broad degree-level learning outcomes and this term is adopted here too to reflect the broader and often less tangible aspects of a successful PhD experience such as cultural and ethical awareness.

In Australia and the University of Sydney, the only part of HDR candidature that is currently assessed is the thesis. Annual progress reviews are conducted to evaluate major milestones on the path to submitting a thesis. There are certain activities that are considered an important part of HDR training – presenting at a conference, giving talks to the department, group discussions, workshops etc. – but these are not formally assessed nor necessarily required. Currently students are assumed to develop broader skills and capabilities through development of the thesis and associated activities, but we do not have a way of ensuring the opportunity exists for these qualities to be developed in students consistently across the University. By seeking to develop an explicit set of PhD qualities in all students, we can ensure that these qualities are characteristic outcomes of the PhD at the University of Sydney.

As described above, it is clear that transferable skills training is needed in order to keep HDR degrees attractive and relevant to the modern work force. The University of Sydney 2011-2015 Strategic Plan recognized that a 4 year PhD would afford the capacity for broader development, but this idea was rejected on the basis of funding constraints. Customised research training for PhD students was then identified as a viable short term alternative to a 4 year PhD program (University of Sydney, August 2015). The Roberts review of research education in the UK suggested that PhD students should have at least two weeks of transferable skills training per year. Our 2016-2020 Strategic Plan has proposed a research-track coursework masters pathway to the PhD to broaden opportunities for development.

Research training needs analysis for HDR candidates is already being implemented at the University of Sydney. From January 2016, some online modules are now compulsory for commencing HDR students in order to satisfy the requirements for their degree. I.e. Work, Health and Safety – Induction; Responsible Research Practice; Human Ethics. There are also compulsory and optional courses offered for students in different faculties. However, questions remain regarding how to resource and organise research training in order to embed the development of graduate qualities.

While there are opportunities to take advantage of existing programs and systems, including:

- Counselling and Psychological Services (CAPS) e.g. presentation skills, procrastination, postgraduate research success;
- Learning centre e.g. Working with your thesis supervisor, procrastination and managing time; and
- The Open Learning Environment units targeted towards PhD and other HDR students;

there is likely also a need for a more systematic suite of development opportunities for PhD students that ensure we can support all students to acquire the graduate qualities on which the University agrees.

---

A proposed set of qualities for the PhD

What qualities should a PhD graduate have developed? Arguably, a PhD graduate should have developed the University of Sydney Bachelor graduate qualities to a higher level and also have begun to develop some of the agreed qualities of a University of Sydney researcher. A suggested initial list of qualities is proposed in Table 1, drawing on the University of Sydney Bachelor graduate qualities, the University of Sydney researcher qualities and the UK Vitae project. A number of these capabilities were proposed in the 2015 University of Sydney Strategy Discussion Papers, including Towards a Distinctive Sydney Education and A Culture of Research Excellence.

Specifically, the proposed qualities for a University of Sydney PhD graduate are as follows.

**Deep expertise:** To possess expert, world standard, knowledge of a specific field of enquiry, a mastery of relevant research methods, and the capability to contribute to scholarship and knowledge discovery.

This quality is an important outcome of sustained enquiry in the field of the PhD and demonstrates a capacity to develop and execute a systematic research plan.

**Broader skills:** To have developed broader, high level and widely applicable skills, including:

- critical thinking and problem solving;
- oral and written communication;
- information and digital literacy; and
- inventiveness.

These broader skills are developed to a high standard in the PhD because of the novel and challenging nature of the research undertaken and the need to create novel insights in the area of study. Through the research process, advanced skills are developed as students develop an accurate and globally informed understanding of the state of current relevant knowledge, employ contemporary and effective methods for summarising and analysing evidence, and communicate research findings to a variety of different audiences.

As a consequence, PhD graduates have the capability to solve problems that we may not yet know exist, as well as the many wicked and pernicious challenges that beset industry and society. The capacity to identify fruitful questions and develop feasible pathways to solution is a key manifestation of this quality.

PhD graduates are also aware of the needs of different audiences for communication and they must have the skills to pitch their ideas and findings in ways that are both accurate and impactful. They must also have expertise in accessing digital information resources and in utilising and keeping abreast of tools and technologies that support advancement in their broader field.

Innovative solutions often require boldness and courage. PhD graduates must therefore have the confidence to experiment with new approaches in ways that are informed by evidence, take intellectual risks and challenge current paradigms.

**Cultural competence:** To display high levels of cultural competence and embody best practice with regard to cultural competence in research.

PhD graduates must develop the capabilities to work in global scholarly networks, and understand the cultural context of their work and its impact in different cultural settings. Given the university’s commitment to cultural competence, these capabilities should be global in scope but also well-developed in relation to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island cultures.
Interdisciplinary effectiveness: To work effectively in interdisciplinary settings and to develop broader perspective, innovative vision and a capacity to work within national and international research and innovation systems.

To contribute to a broad range of industry and community problems, PhD graduates need the capability to work effectively with those possessing other forms of expertise so that they can together develop solutions that are unlikely to emerge from a single expert alone. They also need a sophisticated understanding of national and international research and innovation systems, including relevant legal and business frameworks.

Integrated professional, personal and ethical identity: To exercise integrity, confidence and resilience.

The University of Sydney aims for the highest standards of ethical behaviour. PhD graduates need not only work ethically, but also bring out ethical behaviours in others. This will come from developing each student’s ethical self and from making the ethical and responsible basis of research explicit.

Influence: To be professionally and socially responsible and make a positive contribution to society.

Whether a research activity solves a societal/economic problem or adds to knowledge, PhD graduates must understand and contribute to the production of new knowledge as a positive change for society. This entails a capacity to exercise intellectual leadership.

These qualities are summarised in Table 1 alongside the qualities of the University’s Bachelor graduates and researchers, and the UK Vitae project.

Comparative information from other universities is presented in Appendix 1. Relevant University of Sydney policies are listed in Appendix 2.

4. Embedding graduate qualities

A combination of methods for embedding the development of graduate qualities in the PhD experience is recommended. While some qualities are developed primarily through the research undertaken by the student, others can be supported by the Open Learning Environment (through a mix of online resources and courses and associated workshops and masterclasses) or by enrichment activities such as Hackathons, 3-minute thesis or other competitions, innovation and entrepreneurship challenges, industry and community placements and projects, conference presentations, international experiences, external training opportunities, mentoring programs and student-led seminars and activities.

Ideally, some means of documenting the development and achievement of the PhD graduate qualities will be available, perhaps through use of the HDR progression software and/or an ePortfolio solution. This should enable the development of a report that includes experience and training relevant to the attainment of each quality. Table 2 provides an illustrative list of activities that might support the development of each quality.

The development of a set of PhD graduate qualities will provide a clear value proposition for a PhD at the University of Sydney and will inform the establishment of an ecosystem of development activities, using a mixture of formal units of study, open learning units, international mobility activities and entrepreneurial/engagement opportunities.
Table 1: Proposed graduate qualities for the University of Sydney PhD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Sydney Bachelor graduate</th>
<th>University of Sydney researcher</th>
<th>Vitae</th>
<th>Proposed University of Sydney PhD graduate qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depth of disciplinary expertise</strong> - To excel at applying and continuing to develop disciplinary expertise</td>
<td>- creation and application of new knowledge and understanding</td>
<td>- Subject knowledge</td>
<td>Deep expertise – To possess expert, world standard knowledge in an area of specialisation, a mastery of relevant research methods and the capability to contribute to scholarship and knowledge discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broader skills - critical thinking/problem solving</strong></td>
<td>- asking important and difficult questions, challenging existing paradigms and dogma</td>
<td>- Analysing - Synthesising - Critical thinking - Evaluating - Problem solving</td>
<td>Broader skills – To display high level capabilities in critical thinking and problem solving and a commitment to lifelong learning and discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broader skills - communication (oral and written)</strong></td>
<td>- share research findings - continually learn - engage with the relevant stakeholders and end-users</td>
<td>- Academic literacy and numeracy - Communication methods - Communication media - Publication</td>
<td>Broader skills – To have excellent oral and written communication skills relevant to specialist and general audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broader skills - information/digital literacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Information seeking - Information literacy and management</td>
<td>Broader skills – To evaluate and utilise contemporary digital tools, resources and technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broader skills – inventiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Inquiring mind - Intellectual insight - Innovation - Argument construction - Intellectual risk</td>
<td>Broader skills – To be innovative and creative in response to novel problems, and to be willing to take risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural competence – To work productively, collaboratively and openly in diverse groups and across cultural boundaries</strong></td>
<td>- display high levels of cultural competence - embody best practice with regard to cultural competence in their research activities - professional and collegial manner</td>
<td>- Equality and diversity - Society and culture - Global citizenship - Collegiality - Team working</td>
<td>Cultural competence – To display high levels of cultural competence and embody best practice with regard to cultural competence in research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interdisciplinary effectiveness – To work effectively in interdisciplinary settings and to build broader perspective, innovative vision and more contextualised and systemic forms of understanding</strong></td>
<td>- a positive and dynamic research and workplace culture - inspire collaboration</td>
<td>- Collaboration</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary effectiveness – To work effectively in interdisciplinary settings, to develop broader perspective, innovative vision and the capacity to work effectively within national and international research and innovation systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional, ethical, personal identity – To build integrity, confidence and personal resilience, and the capacities to manage challenge and uncertainty</strong></td>
<td>- Code of Conduct and research policies, - ethics and integrity policies - responsible research practice - managing research data and managing conflicts of interest</td>
<td>- Appropriate practice - Enthusiasm - Perseverance - Integrity - Self-confidence - Self-reflection - Professional responsibility</td>
<td>Professional, ethical, personal identity – To exercise integrity, confidence and resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Influence – To be effective in exercising professional and social responsibility and making a positive contribution to society</strong></td>
<td>- where appropriate, engaging constructively in public debate on matters related to their research expertise to help inform public discourse and policymaking.</td>
<td>- Teaching - Public engagement - Influence and leadership - People management - Mentoring - Social responsibility - Positive contribution to society</td>
<td>Influence – To be professionally and socially responsible and make a positive contribution to society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Some illustrative activities for embedding the development of PhD Graduate Qualities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed PhD qualities</th>
<th>Embed/provide evidence/report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deep expertise</strong> – To possess expert, world standard knowledge in an area of specialisation, a mastery of relevant research methods and the capability to contribute to scholarship and knowledge discovery</td>
<td>Thesis, research publications, oral examination, seminars, conference presentations, OLE units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broader skills</strong> – To display high level capabilities in critical thinking and problem solving and a commitment to lifelong learning and discovery</td>
<td>Thesis, research publications, oral examination, seminars, seminar participation, seminar organisation, conference presentation, conference organisation, additional coursework, participation in hackathons and innovation challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broader skills</strong> – To have excellent oral and written communication skills relevant to specialist and general audiences</td>
<td>Thesis, research publications, seminars, conference presentations, three-minute thesis competition, higher education teaching and learning development, higher education teaching experience, public engagement, other outreach activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broader skills</strong> – To evaluate and utilise contemporary digital tools, resources and technologies</td>
<td>Thesis, research publications, OLE units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broader skills</strong> – To be innovative and creative in response to novel problems, and to be willing to take risks</td>
<td>Thesis, research publications, participation in hackathons and innovation challenges, entrepreneurship experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural competence</strong> – To display high levels of cultural competence and embody best practice with regard to cultural competence in research</td>
<td>OLE units, staff development activities, thesis, fieldwork experience, research publications, mobility experience, international internships, dual degree completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interdisciplinary effectiveness</strong> – To work effectively in interdisciplinary settings, to develop broader perspective, innovative vision and the capacity to work effectively within national and international research and innovation systems</td>
<td>Interfaculty seminars, hackathons and innovation challenges, internships, public engagement, other outreach activities, OLE units, participation in scholarship, fellowship and research grant applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional, ethical, personal identity</strong> – To exercise integrity, confidence and resilience</td>
<td>Thesis, research publications, online training modules, OLE units, staff development activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Influence</strong> – To be professionally and socially responsible and make a positive contribution to society</td>
<td>Thesis, research publications, public engagement, other outreach activities, internships, contribution to academic, professional &amp; learned societies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Measurement, Recording and Reporting of Graduate Qualities

The ACOLA report suggested that the reporting of a PhD student’s graduate skills and attributes could be delivered by text on the Australian Higher Education Graduation Statement (AHEGS). This would require production of an AHEGS by the University of Sydney, a capability that is not yet available for our systems and one that is not formally required by the Higher Education Standards Framework.

The problem of how to capture, record and report graduate qualities for a given student is not unique to PhD candidature. Whilst academic achievement can be recorded via performance in a unit of study and curriculum mapping can relate unit of study content to graduate attributes, the less tangible aspects of a Sydney graduate’s successes are less easy to pin down.

For PhD students, we currently only record the success of the thesis and any mandatory compliance and/or safety training. Australia is possibly the only country that examines the thesis only. At the annual meeting of the Council of Deans and Directors of Graduate Studies Australia (DDOGS) 2016, concerns were raised that Australian research PhDs may be regarded less favourably in some other countries due to our examination methods. As noted by the ACOLA review, the current system is possibly out-dated and only measures the thesis, not the student and their abilities. Introducing an oral examination is one way this could be addressed in part, although this idea has often been met with resistance. An oral examination allows examiners to probe the extent to which the candidate has wider knowledge of the discipline, how (s)he can frame an argument verbally, respond to questions and critically review other aspects of candidature not reported in the thesis (teamwork, authorship and intellectual ownership, cultural implications,
relevance for end-users, transferability of core approaches etc). The current thesis examination policy permits oral examinations, including the possibility that they be supported via internet media.

Once the University has adopted a set of Graduate Qualities for the PhD, these can then inform a wider discussion on developing and reporting graduate qualities for all PhD students from the University. The value of utilising supporting technological solutions, such as ePortfolio tools for students to record the development of graduate qualities, should also be considered. A record of graduate qualities would give students an advantage when preparing their CV or job application, making their value to potential employers clear. It would also promote the value of a HDR degree from the University of Sydney.

6. Conclusion

As of the 4th of November 2016 the federal government has accepted the six recommendations of the ACOLA review. This will require action from the University to implement changes that are geared towards higher engagement with industry and better preparation of PhD candidates for the workforce. Establishing and embedding postgraduate research qualities will be a major step in incorporating these changes. In addition to developing the undergraduate qualities to a higher level, we have suggested the addition of qualities specific to the investigative skills unique to PhD graduates. The PhD qualities can be embedded with a variety of methods as outlined above. Establishing and embedding postgraduate qualities will ensure that the PhD degree at the University of Sydney is attractive to high quality candidates, elicits high student satisfaction ratings and produces graduates who are prepared for the contemporary work force.

CONSULTATION

The original draft of this report was prepared by Dr Natalie Soars (DVC-Ed Portfolio). We consulted with the Universities listed in the Appendix. We also thank the Chair of Academic Board and the University Secretariat for the re-finding of the ‘Magnificent Seven’ paper.

This paper was presented to the University Executive Education Committee on 8 May 2017. The Committee was broadly supportive of the proposed graduate qualities. Discussion focused on how the graduate qualities might be incorporated into the PhD program, potential options for measurement and assessment.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Financial considerations are yet to be developed. Once the architecture for managing, reporting and delivering on PhD graduate qualities has been determined, then a more detailed financial review will be presented.

RISKS / BENEFITS

The risks arise from inaction. First, we suffer a reputational risk if our PhD programs and graduates are seen as less relevant to a modern society and economy, with corresponding falls in recruitment of top talent and employment of our PhD graduates. This will be exacerbated by our competitor institutions taking effective action. UQ has a graduate qualities working group, Melbourne has already articulated a graduate qualities framework and UNSW is developing a graduate qualities framework via its graduate school. Next, we are at financial risk through the research block grants. The RTP component is determined by research grant income (25%), engagement metrics (25%) and HDR completions (50%). Completions are solely determined from those candidatures of ≤4 years FTE. A failure to address completion rates will affect block grant funding and via the UEM, faculty research allocations.
The benefits are simply the consequences of taking action. First, we will be better position to articulate why a PhD from Sydney is the best career option for a candidate wishing to develop deep level research and cognitive skills. The consequence of this is better recruitment. Second, the identification of graduate qualities will lead to interventions to ensure HDR candidates have the opportunity to undertake development actions to ensure they can achieve against those qualities. A study in the University of Newcastle (UK) demonstrated that if students engaged with skill development actions, both completion and publication rates improved. The authors also report better graduate satisfaction, although the data underpinning this assertion are not presented. Developing and articulating the graduate qualities for a PhD will facilitate the University and faculties to develop strategic inputs aimed at enhancing HDR candidate performance and satisfaction.

**COMMUNICATION**

The consultation forums on Graduate Qualities for the PhD will be advertised widely, including via yammer and Staff News with digests placed on the DVC-Ed Portfolio (Graduate Research) web pages. Communication of the outcomes of the consultation process will be communicated as part of the final proposal on PhD Graduate Qualities.

---

APPENDIX 1. CURRENT PRACTICE WITH RESPECT TO GRADUATE QUALITIES AND TRANSFERABLE SKILL DEVELOPMENT FOR PHD STUDENTS IN THE UK AND AUSTRALIA

Below, we present an analysis of a few specific examples. Due to the close match of styles and academic progression for PhDs in the UK and Australia, we concentrated on these two jurisdictions. Although, there is much excellent work being done in the USA on enhancing the learning experiences for PhD students\footnote{National Science Foundation Graduate Education programs: https://www.nsf.gov/div/index.jsp?div=DGE; Bosque-Pérez, N. A., P. Z. Klos, J. E. Force, L. P. Waits, K. Cleary, P. Rhoades, S. M. Galbraith, A. L. B. Brymer, M. O'Rourke, S. D. Eigenbrode, B. Finegan, J. D. Wulfhorst, N. Sibelet, and J. D. Holbrook. 2016. A pedagogical model for team-based, problem-focused interdisciplinary doctoral education. Bioscience 66:477-488.} (e.g. Bosque-Pérez et al 2016), this is not necessarily transferrable to the Sydney experience owing to the dramatically different structure and duration of the two different degree systems.

HDR Graduate qualities and methods for developing, embedding and reporting them were collected from UK and Australian universities (Tables A1 and A2). These qualitative data were collected chiefly from Group of Eight universities and those that have similarities to the University of Sydney in term of size, structure, ranking and HDR degree structure. Universities that did not have published information on HDR graduate qualities or training programs were excluded. Not all universities had available information on how their qualities were developed and some did not provide comment when contacted.

Postgraduate qualities in the UK or Australia may have other labels such as attributes, skills or capabilities and can be roughly grouped into 7 categories:

- Deep knowledge of the study area
- Specific skills required to conduct research
- Personal and professional Integrity and ethics
- Critical thinking and problem solving
- Digital and information literacy
- Effective communication and collaboration skills
- Innovation and creativity

Typically, the list of qualities is developed by a working group, may involve a literature review and will be informed by undergraduate qualities and postgraduate qualities from other universities. Some universities, including many in the UK, do not have an explicit list of qualities and instead utilise the Researcher Development Framework by Vitae or its predecessor the Joint Skills Statement. The Vitae Researcher Development Framework (RDF) and Vitae Researcher Development Statement (RDS) were developed from an extensive consultation process using a phenomenographic approach. The result is system that can be utilized by researchers at any stage of their career to plan their skills training and reflect on the skills and qualities they already have.

The methods used to embed qualities can be summarized as:

- Traditional methods - APR, milestones, thesis production and assessment
- Self-assessment - Students reflect on a quality and record situations where they demonstrated that quality, this may be a hard copy form or online module
- Personal Development Programs – An action plan based on reflection and goal setting, such as the Vitae PDP
- Workshops and Courses - Providing access to existing courses or offering courses specifically aimed at qualities
- Award or certificate - Points are accrued for certain activities such as work placement, volunteer work, courses, workshops
In the UK there is already an emphasis on transferrable skills training for HDR students in response to the changing demands of the job market. UK Postgraduate Research Experience Survey results from 2015 indicate that 77% of students received research skills training, 46.5% received transferrable skills training and 45.5 % had a personal training or development plan (UK PRES 2015). Some Group of Eight universities have also established programs for research and transferrable skills training (Table A2).

**Table A1. PhD Graduate Qualities for a sample of International Universities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UK University</th>
<th>What are their qualities?</th>
<th>How did they develop them?</th>
<th>How do they embed/capture/report?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U of Edinburgh</td>
<td>Short version of Vitae</td>
<td>Short version of Vitae</td>
<td>Self-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Manchester</td>
<td>Vitae RDF</td>
<td>Vitae</td>
<td>Workshops, courses, Vitae PDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial College</td>
<td>21 Attributes for ALL degree programs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Courses (not strictly enforced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Strathclyde Glasgow</td>
<td>Vitae RDF</td>
<td>2012 working group, Vitae RDF</td>
<td>Researcher Development Program and the compulsory Postgraduate Certificate in Researcher Professional Development (60 credit pts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Oxford Brookes U | • Academic literacy  
• Research literacy  
• Critical self-awareness and personal literacy  
• Digital and information literacy  
• Active citizenship | Lit. review, working Group, extension of 3 of the 5 undergraduate attributes | Training needs analysis, Vitae RDF, courses, 70 h per year, planner used as a report |
| U of E Anglia | • Academic excellence  
• Research capabilities  
• Critical self-awareness and personal attributes  
• Digital Literacy | Based on UK Doctorate Guide and Vitae RDF | Training needs assessment, courses mapped to the vitae RDS |
| Cambridge     | • Transferable skills instead | Joint Skills Statement     | PDP, courses                      |
### Table A2. PhD Graduate Qualities for a sample of Australian Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australian University</th>
<th>What are their qualities?</th>
<th>How did they develop them?</th>
<th>How do they embed/report?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U of Melbourne</td>
<td>• conduct and report original research</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online self-assessment, ePortfolio used as a report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• international context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• evaluate and synthesize literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• disciplinary and multi-disciplinary norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• problem-solving •analyse critically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• oral and written communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• cooperate and respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• intellectual integrity, ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Digital literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• national and international relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• intellectual property, commercialisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Write applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Queensland</td>
<td>• Knowledge and skills in the field of study</td>
<td>• General/ discipline</td>
<td>milestones, thesis, APR, research seminars, ethical and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effective communication</td>
<td>• diversity of disciplines</td>
<td>research integrity guidelines, skills training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Critical judgment and research skills</td>
<td>• international benchmarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Independence, creativity and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ethical and social understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Adelaide</td>
<td>• The capability to conduct research independently</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thesis, customised Career and Research Skills Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A deep knowledge of the field of study</td>
<td></td>
<td>(CaRST), based on Vitae RDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The ability to communicate research significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of WA</td>
<td>• 16 for undertaking research</td>
<td></td>
<td>Courses, pebblepad online CV for reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 8 for professional attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANU</td>
<td>Not stated, but training is based on Vitae RDF</td>
<td>Vitae RDF</td>
<td>Research Skills and training program, Vitae RDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith U</td>
<td>• A deep knowledge of their field,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Completion, Milestones Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Intellectual capabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communication and collaboration skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Research skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professionalism and integrity in the conduct of research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCU</td>
<td>• Knowledge and skills in the field of study</td>
<td>Past attributes JCU and UQ</td>
<td>PDP, typical PG student activities e.g. conference, teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effective communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Critical judgement and research skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Independence, creativity and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ethical and social understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Canberra</td>
<td>• Innovation and creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td>PDP, APR, Canberra Award (points system)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Critical judgement and reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Management of research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professionalism and social responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2. RELEVANT POLICIES

http://sydney.edu.au/policies/

- Essential Resources For Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2016
- Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015
- Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Procedures 2015
- University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011 (as amended)
- Supervision of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2013
- Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Policy 2015
- Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Procedures 2015
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Matthew Charet (Executive Officer to Academic Board)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer/Approver</td>
<td>Associate Professor Tony Masters, Chair of Academic Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper title</td>
<td>Honours and Distinctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To advise the Academic Board of honours and distinctions awarded to staff and students of the University of Sydney.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Board on the honours and distinctions and congratulate the recipients.

**HONOURS AND DISTINCTIONS**

**Professor Phyllis Butow**, Faculty of Science  
Presented with the prestigious Elizabeth Blackburn Fellowship – Clinical Award by the National Health and Medical Research Council.

**Dr Angela Crean**, School of Veterinary Science  
Named the 2017 Young Tall Poppy of the Year in NSW for her pioneering research into sexual selection and non-genetic parental effects on sperm and reproduction.

**Associate Professor Alexandre Lefebvre**, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences  
won the 2017 Australasian Association of Philosophy Prize for Innovation in Inclusive Curricula.

**Associate Professor Muireann Irish**, Brain and Mind Centre / School of Psychology  
Named a Superstar of STEM [science, technology, engineering and mathematics] by Science and Technology Australia.

**Dr Nicky Ringland**, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies  
Named a Superstar of STEM [science, technology, engineering and mathematics] by Science and Technology Australia.

**Dr Qianhong She**, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies  
Recipient of the 2017 North American Membrane Society (NAMS) Young Membrane Scientist Award.

**Professor Xiaoke Yi**, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies  
Named by Engineers Australia as one of Australia’s most innovative engineers in the Australia's Most Innovative Engineers 2017 awards.

**Recipients of 2017 Vice-Chancellor's Awards for Excellence**

**Outstanding Teaching and Research:**
- **Associate Professor Alexandre Lefebvre**, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
- **Dr Ollie Jay**, Faculty of Health Sciences
- **Professor Kate Jolliffe**, Faculty of Science

**Outstanding Teaching:**
- **Dr Kate Edwards**, Faculty of Heath Sciences
- **Professor Peter Gerangelos**, Sydney Law School
- **Dr Paul Rickard-Ford**, Sydney Conservatorium of Music

Respect is a core value of the Academic Board
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Outstanding Research:
- Professor Benjamin Eggleton, Faculty of Science
- Associate Professor Jun Huang, Faculty of Engineering & IT
- Professor John Simes, NHMRC Clinical Trials Centre
- Professor Richard Payne, Faculty of Science

Outstanding Early Career Teaching:
- Dr Alycia Fong Yan, Faculty of Health Sciences
- Dr Renee Lim, Sydney Medical School
- Karen Lansdown, Faculty of Dentistry

Outstanding Early Career Research:
- Dr Melody Ding, Sydney Medical School
- Dr Rona Chandrawati, Faculty of Engineering and IT

Outstanding Educational Engagement and Innovation:
- Poche Centre for Indigenous Health, Sydney Medical School
- Centre for English Teaching MOOC Team
- Sydney Southeast Asia Centre

Outstanding Research Engagement and Innovation:
- Professor Michael Kassiou, Faculty of Science
- The Prevention Research Collaboration (PRC), Sydney Medical School

Outstanding Research Higher Degree Supervision:
- Associate Professor Catriona Elder, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
- HDR Team from the Discipline of Child & Adolescent Health, Sydney Medical School

Outstanding Mentoring and Leadership:
- Professor Gregory Warr, Faculty of Science
- Professor Ariadne Vromen, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
- Strategic Promotion Advice and Mentoring Program, Faculty of Science and Sydney Medical School

Outstanding Contribution to Educational Excellence:
- Tanya Doulaveras, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
- Dr Ellen Braybon and Dr Shane Wilkinson, Faculty of Science
- Science Outreach and Engagement, Faculty of Science

Outstanding Contribution to Research Excellence:
- Eleanor Kable, Research Portfolio
- Dr Nicholas Proschogo, Faculty of Science
RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Board note the report from meeting 2017/04 of the Undergraduate Studies Committee held on 1 August 2017 and:

(1) approve the proposal from the Deputy Vice Chancellor Education Portfolio to make a minor amendment to the progression and entry requirements for the Dalyell Stream in course resolutions and unit tables, as presented;
(2) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Liberal Arts and Sciences and approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
(3) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science / Master of Nutrition and Dietetics and approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018; and
(4) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Bachelor of Science and approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal (Neuroscience Major Table 1), with effect from 1 January 2018.

ITEMS FOR DECISION

8.1 **DVC Education Portfolio: proposed use of AAM for Dalyell stream**

It is proposed to approve a minor amendment to the entry and progression requirements in course resolutions and unit of study tables for degrees offering the Dalyell stream, to replace references to the Weighted Average Mark (WAM) with the Annual Average Mark (AAM).

8.2 **Faculty of Science: Bachelor of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

It is proposed to approve amendments to the table of units of study, necessitated by the creation of new units for 2018.

8.3 **Faculty of Science: Bachelor of Science/Master of Nutrition and Dietetics**

It is proposed to approve amendments to the table of units of study, necessitated by the creation of new units for 2018.

8.4 **Faculty of Science: Bachelor of Science (pre-2018) – Neuroscience Table 1**

It is proposed to approve amendments to the table of units of study for the Neuroscience Table 1 major, necessitated by the creation of new units for 2018.

ITEMS FOR NOTING

The USC also:
- received a report from the Chair; and
- received a report of the 25 July 2017 Academic Board meeting.
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Full agenda papers are available from the Undergraduate Studies Committee website, at sydney.edu.au/secretariat/pdfs/academic-board-committees/undergraduate-studies/2017/20170801-USC-agenda-pack.pdf.

Associate Professor Wendy Davis
Chair, Undergraduate Studies Committee
RECOMMENDATION

That the Undergraduate Studies Committee recommend to the Academic Board:

1. that a minor edit be made to progression and entry requirements for the Dalyell Stream in course resolutions and unit tables to replace the term ‘Weighted Average Mark’ ‘WAM’, and ‘Weighted Average Mark over each 48 credit point block’ with ‘Annual Average Mark’ and ‘AAM’ in line with the current practice for measuring progression requirements.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the Undergraduate Studies Committee (USC) meeting on July 4 2017, the Academic Model team suggested that the entry and progression requirements for the Dalyell stream be more clearly communicated in the relevant course resolutions and tables.

These requirements will be calculated using an average mark calculated at the end of each academic year or 48 credit point block. This is commonly called the AAM, while the WAM is used more broadly.

Currently the course resolutions and tables for the degrees offering Dalyell use the term WAM in the description of stream progression and entry requirement. However, the USC noted that as the WAM calculated at the end of the each 48 credit points of study, in line with progression and entry requirements, it is essentially, the same as the AAM. As a result, the measure used in SITS is AAM, and this has been communicated to faculties and on the Curriculum Frequently Asked Questions. To avoid any further confusion, it is recommended that the resolutions of the degrees below are adjusted to more accurately reflect the measure used.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

The Dalyell stream is a targeted stream for high achievers that will be offered from 2018 into selected degrees.

In 2018, these degrees will be:

- Bachelor of Advanced Computing
- Bachelor of Advanced Computing/Bachelor of Commerce
- Bachelor of Advanced Computing/Bachelor of Science
- Bachelor of Arts
- Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Advanced Studies
- Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Laws
- Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Social Work
- Bachelor of Arts and Doctor of Medicine
- Bachelor of Arts/Master of Nursing
- Bachelor of Commerce
- Bachelor of Commerce/Bachelor of Advanced Studies
- Bachelor of Commerce/Bachelor of Laws
- Bachelor of Design Computing/Bachelor of Advanced Studies
- Bachelor of Economics
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- Bachelor of Economics/Bachelor of Advanced Studies
- Bachelor of Economics/Bachelor of Laws
- Bachelor of Education (Secondary: Humanities and Social Sciences)/Bachelor of Arts
- Bachelor of Education (Secondary: Mathematics) and Bachelor of Science
- Bachelor of Education (Secondary: Science) and Bachelor of Science
- Bachelor of Engineering Honours
- Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Arts
- Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Commerce
- Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Design in Architecture
- Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Laws
- Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Project Management
- Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Science
- Bachelor of Science
- Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Advanced Studies
- Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Laws
- Bachelor of Science and Doctor of Dental Medicine
- Bachelor of Science and Doctor of Medicine
- Bachelor of Science/Master of Nursing
- Bachelor of Science/Master of Nutrition and Dietetics

IMPLEMENTATION

If the Undergraduate Studies Committee agrees to this change, it will be progressed to Academic Board, and on approval the secretariat will progress this as a minor edit to all relevant resolutions.
Non-Confidential

Submission To: Academic Board  
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Item No: 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Dr Matthew Charet (Executive Officer to Academic Board)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer/Approver</td>
<td>Professor Kirsten McKenzie (Chair, Graduate Studies Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper title</td>
<td>Report from Graduate Studies Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>This report summarises for the Academic Board the business of the meeting of the Graduate Studies Committee held on 1 August 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Academic Board note the report from meeting of the Graduate Studies Committee held on 1 August 2017 and:

1. approve the proposal from the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies to introduce the Graduate Certificate in Computing and amend the Graduate Diploma in Computing; 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 Certificates in the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies; approve the implementation or amendment of course resolutions arising from the proposal; and approve the implementation or amendment of the tables of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;

2. approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Development Studies; approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal; and approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;

3. approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Political Economy; approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal; and approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;

4. approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Human Rights, Master of International Relations, Master of International Security, Master of International Studies, Master of Public Policy, Master of Political Economy, Master of Development Studies and Master of United States Studies; approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal; and approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;

5. approve the proposal from the Faculty of Dentistry to amend the Doctor of Dental Medicine; recommend that Senate approve the amendment of the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014; and approve the amendment of the faculty resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;

6. approve the proposed amendments to the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures; and approve the proposed workflow for appointment of examiners and adopt the modified appointment of examiners form to reflect the new process;

7. propose the proposed amendments to the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Guidelines for Examiners 2017; and approve the proposed amendments to the Higher Degrees by Research Examiner's Report on Thesis;

8. approve the proposal from the Sydney Medical School to amend the Master of Medicine / Master of Science in Medicine (Infection and Immunity); approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal; and approve the amendment of the table of units of study arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;

9. approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine; and approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;

10. approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Master of Clinical Psychology and Master of Clinical Psychology/Doctor of Philosophy; and approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;
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(11) approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Master of Nutrition and Dietetics; and approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018;

(12) approve the proposal from the DVC Education Portfolio to amend the procedure for the implementation of R to the award of HDR scholarships;

(13) note the proposal from Sydney Medical School to amend the Master of Medicine/Science in Medicine (Clinical Epidemiology) (Metabolic Health), Master of International Public Health, Master of Health Policy, Master of Public Health, Master of Public Health (Professional Practice) and Master of Surgery and related embedded programs; and note the changes to the unit of study tables arising from this proposal, with effect from 1 January 2018.

ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>School/Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Engineering and IT</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate and Graduate Diploma in Computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Master of Development Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Master of Political Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Postgraduate Specialisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>Doctor of Dental Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>HDRESC</td>
<td>Col Process for HDR Examinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>HDRESC</td>
<td>Thesis Examination Guideline amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Infection and Immunity embedded Course sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Doctor of Veterinary Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Master of Clinical Psychology and Master of Clinical Psychology/Doctor of Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Master of Nutrition and Dietetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>Education Strategy</td>
<td>Refined R Implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITEMS FOR NOTING

9.13 Medicine: Elective Units for various courses, for noting

The Committee also:
- noted the Report of the Chair;
- noted the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 25 July 2017;
- noted the report of the HDR Examinations Sub-Committee meeting of 27 June 2017;
- noted the verbal report of HDR Scholarships Sub-Committee meetings of 26 May, 22 June and 18 July 2017; and
- noted the proposed creation of a Collaborative Education and Research Training Agreements Policy 2017 (provisional name); note amendments to the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015; and noted amendments to the Student Placement Policy (new name Student Placement and Projects Policy).

NOTE: The full agenda pack for this meeting is available from the Graduate Studies Committee website, at sydney.edu.au/secretariat/pdfs/academic-board-committees/graduate-studies/2017/20170801-GSC-Agenda-Pack-v3.pdf.

Professor Kirsten McKenzie
Chair, Graduate Studies Committee
Rationale for the course amendment

The current Graduate Diploma in Computing is a bridging degree for non-IT graduates who aim for a career shift to information technology, but lack the technical background for direct admission into an IT master degree. The University of Sydney offers two master degrees in IT, the Master of Information Technology (MIT) and the Master of Information Technology Management (MITM), which are both accredited by the Australian Computer Society (ACS) at the professional level. Both degrees are 72 credit points long (1.5 years fulltime study duration) and require a previous IT degree for admission.

As part of their accreditation, the ACS requires a pathway into the master degrees for non-IT graduates which ensures that the ACS’ core-body-of-knowledge is covered. This was achieved by ensuring that non-IT graduates commence studies in the GDC before they gain admission into the MIT or the MITM. The learning volume of the GDC and the subsequent masters overlap, so that reduced volume of learning is available to GDC graduates for such subjects beyond the first 24 credit points of foundational units, which cover introduction to programming, databases, networking, and system analysis. The following figure visualizes this:

Current GDC + MIT(M) Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AQF 7</th>
<th>AQF 8</th>
<th>AQF 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-IT Bachelor degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDC</td>
<td>24 cp foundation units</td>
<td>24 cp IT / ITM specialist units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT(M)</td>
<td>24 cp core and specialist units</td>
<td>24 cp specialist units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the GDC and the subsequent master degrees do not completely overlap, because the first 24 credit points of the GDC are required to cover the foundational IT skills required for non-IT graduates to meet the admission requirements of the (72cp) MIT or MITM. Consequently, for GDC graduates, RVL is only possible for specialist units of study that overlap with the master degrees. Also note that the current duration of 60 cp does not allow students to study a GDC+MIT(M) combination within 2 years because they cannot be enrolled in two degrees concurrently.

As we cannot change the master degrees because of its current professional accreditation and we also cannot change its RVL rules because of its limited duration of 72 credit points, this course proposal addresses this situation by (a) reducing the length of the GDC to 48 credit points and (b) by introducing an embedded Graduate Certificate in Computing (GCC) covering the initial 24 credit points of foundational computing units of study:

Proposed GDC + MIT(M) Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AQF 7</th>
<th>AQF 8</th>
<th>AQF 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-IT Bachelor degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDC</td>
<td>24 cp foundation units (GCC)</td>
<td>24 cp IT / ITM specialist units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT(M)</td>
<td>24 cp core and specialist units</td>
<td>24 cp specialist units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This would allow a study progression from a non-IT Bachelor to a master degree either via GCC + MIT (or MITM), or alternatively GDC + MIT (or MITM) with 24cp RVL for the specialist units studied in the completed GDC.
FAQ

Why do we not change the Master degrees instead?
Our master degrees (MIT and MITM) are professional degrees accredited by the Australian Computer Society. Changes to their duration or structure would require re-accreditation which is only due in two years time.

Why do we not change the RVL rules for the MIT and MITM?
The first 24 cp of the GDC are required to meet the admission criteria of the MIT or the MITM which are both targeting IT graduates. This was a condition of the ACS accreditation for these master degrees to guarantee the coverage of the ACS Core-body-of-knowledge (ACS CBoK) for non-IT graduates. Besides, there is simply not enough space for granting RVL to 24 credit points of foundational units in the MIT and the MITM which both encompass only 72 credit points and only allow for a maximum of 12 cp of foundation units.

Can this change not wait until re-accreditation time of the master degrees?
Unfortunately this change is urgent as we have been approached by several of our international students for whom the current arrangement is a problem when applying for working visa after their studies.

Can students not already study the current GDC followed by the MIT or MITM with corresponding RVL?
Indeed they could do so – but not within two years. Because the current GDC is 60 credit points (which by the way is a clear outlier among all graduate diplomas in the University of Sydney), and as students are not allowed to enrol in two separate degree programs at the same time, GDC students need to study their third semester part-time for their final 12 cp of the GDC before they could be admitted to the MIT or MITM.

What is the distinction between the AQF8 and the AQF9 awards?
Both the GDC and the proposed GCC would be AQF 8 awards because their admission criteria specifies a previous AQF-7 Bachelor degree and all units of study available in the GDC, whether categorised as foundational or as specialisation unit of study, are taught with a focus on the development of professional skills as required for AQF level 8. The learning outcomes of each unit include contextualised evaluation of technical solutions with regard to their suitability for a given situation, critical comparison of different technical approaches, and the discussion and communication of these results to a professional audience.

The master degrees (MIT and MITM) are on AQF level 9 as they include 18 credit points of compulsory core units on professional IT topics (such as project management and IT innovations), and a mandatory 12 credit point capstone project, all of which are not available to the GDC or the GCC.
### Resolutions of the Senate

1. Degrees, diplomas and certificates of the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies

(1) With the exception of the Doctor of Engineering 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 Engineering and Information Technologies. The Doctor of Engineering 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, 2018. 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>RHENGINE</td>
<td>Doctor of Engineering</td>
<td>DEng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPPHDENG</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMPHLENG</td>
<td>Master of Philosophy</td>
<td>MPhil</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAENGINE</td>
<td>Master of Engineering</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINFTEC</td>
<td>Master of Information Technology</td>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINFTMG</td>
<td>Master of Information Technology</td>
<td>MITM</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAHLTCIN</td>
<td>Master of Health Technology Innovation MHT1</td>
<td>MHTI</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADATASC</td>
<td>Master of Data Science</td>
<td>MDS</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPRJMG</td>
<td>Master of Professional Engineering</td>
<td>MPE</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPCSTECN</td>
<td>Bachelor of Computer Science and Technology*</td>
<td>BCST</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGINE</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours</td>
<td>BEHons</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPINFTEC</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology^</td>
<td>BIT</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPENCHBM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Project Management*</td>
<td>BPM</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPPRMCES</td>
<td>Bachelor of Project Management (Civil Engineering</td>
<td>BPM</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPPRMBEN</td>
<td>Bachelor of Project Management (Built Environment)</td>
<td>BPM</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>MAINFITM</td>
<td>Master of Information Technology/Master of Information Technology Management</td>
<td>MIT/MITM</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGART</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>BEHons/BA</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGCOM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Commerce</td>
<td>BEHons/BCom</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGDAR</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Design in Architecture</td>
<td>BEHons/BDesArch</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGLAW</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Laws</td>
<td>BEHons/LLB</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGMSC</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Medical Science</td>
<td>BEHons/BMedSci</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGGSCI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>BEHons/BSc</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPITCART</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology/Bachelor of Arts*</td>
<td>BIT/BA</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPIITCOM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology/Bachelor of Commerce*</td>
<td>BIT/BCom</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPIITCLAW</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology/Bachelor of Laws*</td>
<td>BIT/LLB</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPITCMSC</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology/Bachelor of Medical Science*</td>
<td>BIT/BMedSci</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPIITSCI</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology/Bachelor of Science*</td>
<td>BIT/BSc</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGPRM</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Project Management*</td>
<td>BEHons/BPM</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHENGMST</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering Honours/Bachelor of Music Studies*</td>
<td>BEHons/BMusStudies</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### 4. Graduate diplomas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GNCOMPUT</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Computing</td>
<td>GradDipComp</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENGINE</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Engineering</td>
<td>GradDipEng</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNENPROF</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Engineering (Professional Engineering) (Last intake 2013)</td>
<td>GradDipEng(ProfEng)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNINFTEC</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Information Technology</td>
<td>GradDipT</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNINFTMG</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Information Technology Management</td>
<td>GradDipTM</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNPRJMGT</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Project Management</td>
<td>GradDipPM</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNPRJLEA</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Project Leadership</td>
<td>GradDipPL</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNHLCIN</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Health Technology Innovation</td>
<td>GradDipH</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Complex Systems</td>
<td>GradDipCXS</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Graduate certificates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Credit points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENGINE</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Engineering</td>
<td>GradCertEng</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCINFTEC</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Information Technology</td>
<td>GradCertIT</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCINFTMG</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Information Technology Management</td>
<td>GradCertITM</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCDATASC</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Data Science</td>
<td>GradCertDS</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCPRJMGT</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Project Management</td>
<td>GradCertPM</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCPRJLEA</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Project Leadership</td>
<td>GradCertPL</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tba</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Computing</td>
<td>GradCertComp</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate Diploma in Computing

These resolutions must be read in conjunction with applicable University By-laws, Rules and policies including (but not limited to) the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2010 (the 'Coursework Rule'), the Resolutions of the Faculty, the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended) and the Academic Board policies on Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism.

Course Resolutions

1. Course codes
[List the codes and course names covered by these resolutions.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course and stream title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCCOMPUT</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNCOMPUT</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Computing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

3. Embedded courses in this sequence
The embedded courses in this sequence are:
- the Graduate Certificate in Computing
- the Graduate Diploma in Computing

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

4. Admission to candidature
Available places will be offered to qualified applicants based on merit, according to the following admissions criteria.

(1) Admission to candidacy for the Graduate Certificate in Computing requires:
(a) a bachelor's degree or higher award in any discipline from the University of Sydney, or qualifications deemed by the School of Information Technologies to be equivalent, with at least a credit average, and including units of study with a mathematical foundation demonstrating significant numeracy skills.

(2) Admission to candidacy for the Graduate Diploma in Computing requires:
(a) a bachelor's degree or higher award in any discipline from the University of Sydney, or qualifications deemed by the School of Information Technologies to be equivalent, with at least a credit average, and including units of study with a mathematical foundation demonstrating significant numeracy skills; or
(b) a bachelor's degree or higher award in any discipline from the University of Sydney, or qualifications deemed by the School of Information Technologies to be equivalent, with at least a credit average. Applicants must also provide evidence of prior learning which is considered to demonstrate the knowledge and aptitude required to undertake this course; or
(c) applicants to have qualifications and/or experience which are sufficient, in the view of the Dean or a suitable nominee with Information Technology expertise, to successfully undertake the award; or
(d) completion of the requirements of the embedded Graduate Certificate in Computing with at least credit average.

5. Requirements for award
The units of study that may be taken for the course are set out in Table of units: Graduate Diploma in Computing.

(1) To qualify for the award of the Graduate Certificate in Computing, a candidate must complete 24 credit points of COMP, INFO, or ISYS coded units of study at level 5xxx or higher.

(2) To qualify for the award of the Graduate Diploma in Computing, a candidate must complete 48 credit points including:
(a) a maximum of 24 credit points of Foundation units of study; and
(b) a minimum of 24 credit points of Information Technology or Information Technology Management Specialist units of study.

(3) If a reduction in the volume of learning is given:
(a) candidates will be required to apply any reduction in the volume of learning to the Foundation units of study only.
(b) the candidate will then be required to complete the required volume of learning based on the course requirements.

6. Recognition of prior learning
The following Coursework Rules (for conferred qualifications) replace the Faculty Coursework Rules for "Credit for previous study" within the "Resolutions of the Faculty (of Engineering and Information Technologies)" for the Graduate Diploma in Computing:
(a) Candidates for the Graduate Diploma in Computing may be eligible for a reduction in the volume of learning of up to 12 credit points for an equivalent conferred volume of learning after an entry assessment is made for prior learning and/or work experience that is deemed by the School of Information Technologies to be relevant.

Approved by the Academic Board, 3 December 2014
7. Suspension of candidature
A student may suspend candidature in this course for a maximum of one year.

8. Cross-institutional study
Cross-institutional study is not available in this course except where the University of Sydney has a formal cooperation agreement with another university.

9. Credit for previous study
The credit transfer provisions of the Coursework Rule apply except that where the study has been undertaken at postgraduate level and no award has been conferred, credit to a maximum of 50% of the prescribed credit points may be transferred, provided:
   (a) the study has been undertaken at the University of Sydney, or at an external institution recognised by the University of Sydney, within the previous three years; and
   (b) the units are equivalent to units of study offered under the degree being taken, subject to approval of the Academic Director.

10. Satisfactory progress
The Dean may require any student who has failed a cumulative total of 18 credit points or more at any stage of enrolment in the Graduate Certificate in Computing or the Graduate Diploma in Computing to show good cause why he or she should be allowed to re-enrol.

11. Time limit
A candidate for the Graduate Diploma in Computing shall complete the requirements for the award in a minimum enrolment of two semesters and a maximum enrolment of ten semesters.

12. Transitional provisions
These resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature after 1 January, 2018 and students who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2018 who elect to proceed or graduate under these resolutions.
Graduate Certificate in Development Studies
Graduate Diploma in Development Studies
Master of Development Studies

These resolutions must be read in conjunction with applicable University By-laws, Rules and policies including (but not limited to) the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014 (the ‘Coursework Rule’), the Coursework Policy 2014, the Resolutions of the Faculty, the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended) and the Academic Board policies on Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism.

Up to date versions of all such documents are available from the Policy Register: http://www.sydney.edu.au/policies.

Course resolutions
1 Course codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCDEVSTD-01</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Development Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDDEVSTD-01</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Development Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADEVSTD-01</td>
<td>Master of Development Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

4 Embedded courses in this sequence
(1) The embedded courses in this sequence are:
   (a) the Graduate Certificate in Development Studies
   (b) the Graduate Diploma in Development Studies
   (c) the Master of Development Studies
(2) A candidate for the graduate certificate or graduate diploma may apply to progress to a longer course in this sequence, providing the candidate meets the admission requirements for that course. Only the longest award completed will be conferred.

5 Admission to candidature
(1) Available places will be offered to qualified applicants based on merit, according to the following admissions criteria. In exceptional circumstances the Dean may admit applicants without these qualifications but whose evidence of experience and achievement is deemed by the Dean to be equivalent.
(2) Admission to candidature for the Graduate Certificate in Development Studies requires a bachelor's degree in any area.
(3) Admission to candidature for the Graduate Diploma in Development Studies requires:
   (a) a bachelor's degree with a minimum 60% average calculated over the whole degree, from the University of Sydney, including a major in a relevant subject area in the humanities or social sciences, or an equivalent qualification; or
   (b) completion of the Graduate Certificate in Development Studies with a minimum credit (65%) average, or an equivalent qualification.
(4) Admission to candidature for the Master of Development Studies requires:
   (a) a bachelor's degree with a minimum credit (65%) average calculated over the whole degree, from the University of Sydney, including a major in a relevant subject area in the Social Sciences, or an equivalent qualification; or
   (b) completion of the requirements for the embedded Graduate Certificate or Graduate Diploma in Development Studies with a minimum credit (65%) average, or an equivalent qualification.

6 Requirements for award
(1) The units of study that may be taken for these courses are set out in the Postgraduate Table of Units of Study for the Development Studies subject area.
(2) To qualify for the award of the Graduate Certificate in Development Studies a candidate must complete 24 credit points of units of study, including:
   (a) 12 credit points of core units of study; and
   (b) 12 credit points from elective units of study.
(3) To qualify for the award of the Graduate Diploma in Development Studies a candidate must complete 48 credit points, including:
   (a) 24 credit points of core units of study; and
   (b) 6 credit points from core elective units of study; and
   (c) 18 credit points from elective units of study.
(4) To qualify for the award of the Master of Development Studies a candidate must complete 72 credit points, including:
   (a) a minimum of 24 credit points of core units of study; and
   (b) a minimum of 6 credit points from core elective units of study; and
   (c) a maximum of 30 credit points from elective units of study. With the permission of the Degree Coordinator a maximum of 12 credit points can be taken as elective units from units of study outside those listed in the Development Studies subject area of the Postgraduate Unit of Study Table, including units of study from other faculties; and
   (d) a minimum of 12 credit points from capstone units of study.
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7 Recognition of Prior Learning

(1) Waivers and reductions in the volume of learning may be granted or the volume of learning may be reduced in recognition of prior learning.

(2) Credit may be granted for up to 50% of course requirements for relevant incomplete postgraduate qualifications.

(3) Candidates offered direct admission to the Master of Development Studies may be eligible for a reduction in the volume of learning of up to 24 credit points, subject to the following:
   (a) The maximum permissible reduction in the volume of learning is 24 credit points for a qualification at level 8 of the Australian Qualifications Framework in a relevant discipline as defined by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.
   (b) The maximum permissible reduction in the volume of learning is 24 credit points for relevant professional work experience deemed by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to have conferred a volume of learning equivalent to that of a Graduate Certificate in a relevant discipline.

(4) The maximum combined waiver and reduction in the volume of learning for prior study granted to a candidate will not exceed 50% of the requirements of the course.

8 Course transfer

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

8 Transitional provisions

(1) These resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature after 1 January 2017.

(2) Candidates who commenced prior to 1 January 2017 will complete the requirements in accordance with the resolutions in force at the time of their commencement, provided that requirements are completed by 1 January 2022. The Faculty may specify a later date for completion or specify alternative requirements for completion of candidatures that extend beyond this time.
Graduate Certificate in Political Economy

Graduate Diploma in Political Economy

Master of Political Economy

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

Course Resolutions

1 Course codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCPOLECN-01</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Political Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNPOLECN-01</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Political Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPOLECN-01</td>
<td>Master of Political Economy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Attendance pattern

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

3 Master's type

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

4 Embedded courses in this sequence

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

(2) A candidate for the graduate certificate or graduate diploma may apply to progress to a longer course in this sequence, providing the candidate meets the admission requirements for that course. Only the longest award completed will be conferred.

5 Admission to candidature

(1) Available places will be offered to qualified applicants based on merit, according to the following admissions criteria. In exceptional circumstances the Dean may admit applicants without these qualifications but whose evidence of experience and achievement is deemed by the Dean to be equivalent.

(2) Admission to candidature for the Graduate Certificate in Political Economy requires:
   (a) a bachelor's degree from the University of Sydney, or an equivalent qualification

(3) Admission to candidature for the Graduate Diploma in Political Economy requires:
   (a) a bachelor's degree with a minimum 60 percent average calculated over the whole degree, from the University of Sydney, including a major in the Social Sciences, or an equivalent qualification; or
   (b) completion of the Graduate Certificate in Political Economy with a minimum credit (65 percent) average, or an equivalent qualification.

(4) Admission to candidature for the Master of Political Economy requires:
   (a) a bachelor's degree with a minimum credit (65 percent) average calculated over the whole degree, from the University of Sydney, including a major in the Social Sciences, or an equivalent qualification; or
   (b) completion of the requirements for the embedded Graduate Certificate or Graduate Diploma in Political Economy with a minimum credit (65 percent) average, or an equivalent qualification.

6 Requirements for award

(1) The units of study that may be taken for these courses are set out in the Postgraduate Table of Units of Study for the Political Economy subject area.

(2) Candidates for the Graduate Certificate in Political Economy are required to complete 24 credit points, including:
   (a) a minimum of 6 credit points of core unit of study; and
   (b) a maximum of 18 credit points from core elective units of study.

(3) Candidates for the Graduate Diploma in Political Economy are required to complete 48 credit points, including:
   (a) a minimum of 12 credit points of core units of study; and
   (b) a minimum of 12 credit points from core elective units of study; and
   (c) a maximum of 18 credit points from elective units of study.

(4) Candidates for the Master of Political Economy are required to complete 72 credit points, including:
   (a) a minimum of 18 credit points of core units of study; and
   (b) a minimum of 18 credit points from core elective units of study; and
   (c) a maximum of 24 credit points from elective units of study. With the permission of the Degree Coordinator a maximum of 12 credit points can be taken as elective units from units of study outside those listed in the Political Economy subject area of the Postgraduate Unit of Study Table, including units of study offered by other faculties;
   (d) a minimum of 6 credit points of capstone units of study.
Cross-institutional study

Cross-institutional study is not permitted in the Graduate Certificate in Political Economy.

Recognition of Prior Learning

(1) Waivers and reductions in the volume of learning may be granted or the volume of learning may be reduced in recognition of prior learning.
(2) Credit may be granted for up to 50 percent of course requirements for relevant incomplete postgraduate qualifications.
(3) Candidates offered direct admission to the Master of Political Economy may be eligible for a reduction in the volume of learning of up to 24 credit points, subject to the following:
   (a) The maximum permissible reduction in the volume of learning is 24 credit points for a qualification at level 8 of the Australian Qualifications Framework in a relevant discipline as defined by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.
   (b) The maximum permissible reduction in the volume of learning is 24 credit points for relevant professional work experience deemed by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to have conferred a volume of learning equivalent to that of a Graduate Certificate in a relevant discipline.
(4) The maximum combined waiver and reduction in the volume of learning for prior study granted to a candidate will not exceed 50 percent of the requirements of the course.

Course transfer

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

Transitional provisions

(1) These resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature after 1 January 2015.
(2) Candidates who commenced prior to 1 January 2015 will 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. The Faculty may specify a later date for completion or specify alternative requirements for completion of candidatures that extend beyond this time.
RECOMMENDATION

That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board:

1. approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Master of Human Rights; Master of International Relations; Master of International Security; Master of International Studies; Master of Public Policy; Master of Political Economy; Master of Development Studies; Master of United States Studies;

2. approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal with effect from 1 January 2018; and

3. approve the amendment of the table of Units of Study arising from the proposal with effect from 1 January 2018.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences are presenting the collated specialisation proposals for endorsement.

The resolutions of the relevant degrees were submitted to the previous meeting (with the exception of Development Studies and Political Economy which are submitted to the August meeting) to ensure the specialisations can be introduced in 2018.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Postgraduate Coursework specialisation proposal
## Proposed Specialisation/s for 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Specialisation/s for 2018</th>
<th>Course/s</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Migrations</td>
<td>Master of Human Rights&lt;br&gt;Master of International Relations&lt;br&gt;Master of International Security&lt;br&gt;Master of International Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>Master of Human Rights</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Policy</td>
<td>Master of Human Rights</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>Master of International Relations&lt;br&gt;Master of International Studies</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>Master of Public Policy</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media and Cultural Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Research</td>
<td>Master of Development Studies&lt;br&gt;Master of Human Rights&lt;br&gt;Master of International Relations&lt;br&gt;Master of International Security&lt;br&gt;Master of International Studies&lt;br&gt;Master of Political Economy&lt;br&gt;Master of Public Policy</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>Master of United States Studies</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Postgraduate Coursework specialisation proposal

Proposed specialisation:
Global Migrations

Degree name/s:
Master of Human Rights
Master of International Relations
Master of International Security
Master of International Studies

Background and Rationale:
In 2016, the University of Sydney Academic Board rejected an application for a new Master of Migration Studies. It also made the recommendation that a migration specialisation should be embedded within existing MA programs. This proposal responds to this recommendation.

The proposed global migration specialisation will examine the relationship between global governance and global migration trends and challenges from an institutional and normative perspective. The specialisation allows MHR, MIR, MIntS and MIS students to focus on the role of key actors (inter-governmental and non-governmental) and regulatory frameworks in relation to two migration regimes: refugee/forced migration and economic migration. All units contribute to building a comprehensive knowledge and skills specialisation, through a compliment of lenses: global and regional migration governance (SCLG6700); global political economy structures (ECOP6015); comparative migration policy (GOVT6358); and economic migration imperatives in southeast Asia (GOVT6108). Global migration is presented as a complex phenomenon, strongly informed by the interaction between global (such as UN) and regional processes (such as ASEAN) and evolving normative politics and economic imperatives. Core debates relating to global governance, global political economy and global social justice norms are explored.

Details of the specialisation:
SCLG6700 Global and Regional Migration Governance [New Unit]
ECOP6015 Global Employment and International Migration [Existing Unit]
GOVT6358 Comparative Migration Policy [Existing Unit]
GOVT6108 Democracy and Development in Southeast Asia [Existing Unit with amended title from 2018]

Impact on current curriculum:
The proposal entails minor updates to the degree resolutions which you will see below.
Degree requirements:

(4) Candidates for the Master of Human Rights are required to complete 72 credit points including:
(a) a minimum of 24 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) a minimum of 12 credit points of core elective units of study;
(c) a maximum of 24 credit points from elective units of study. With the permission of the Degree Coordinator a maximum of 12 credit points can be taken as elective units from units of study outside those listed in the Human Rights subject area of the Postgraduate Unit of Study Table, including units of study from other faculties.
(d) 18 credit points from either the Internship or the Dissertation pathway
(e) an optional 18 credit point specialisation as listed in the unit of study table.

Candidates for the Master of International Relations are required to complete 96 credit points, including:
(a) a minimum of 30 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) a minimum of 24 credit points of core elective units of study; and
(c) a maximum of 30 credit points of elective units of study, which can include an optional minor specialisation as listed in the unit of study table. With the permission of the Degree Coordinator a maximum of 6 credit points of elective units can be taken from units of study outside those listed in the International Relations subject area of the Postgraduate Unit of Study Table, including units of study offered by other faculties and;
(d) a minimum of 6 credit points of capstone units of study.

Candidates for the Master of International Security are required to complete 96 credit points, including:
(a) a minimum of 24 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) a minimum of 18 credit points from core elective units of study; and
(c) a maximum of 48 credit points from elective units of study, which can include an optional minor specialisation as listed in the unit of study table. With the permission of the Degree Coordinator a maximum of 12 credit points can be taken as elective units from units of study outside those listed in the International Security subject area of the Postgraduate Unit of Study Table, including units of study offered by other faculties; and
(d) a minimum of 6 credit points of capstone units of study.

Candidates for the Master of International Studies are required to complete 96 credit points, including:
(a) a minimum of 12 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) a maximum of 78 credit points from elective units of study, which can include an optional specialisation as listed in the unit of study table. With the permission of the Degree Coordinator a maximum of 12 credit points can be taken as elective units from units of study outside those listed in the International Studies subject area of the Postgraduate Unit of Study Table, including units of study offered by other faculties; and
(c) a minimum of 6 credit points from capstone units of study.

Example student pathway:

It is proposed that the specialisation will require 18 credit points.
For students in the MIR, MInts and MIS they can undertake this specialisation within the electives stream and choose from all available units:

SCLG6700 Global and Regional Migration Governance [Semester 2]
ECOP6015 Global Employment and International Migration [Semester 2]
GOVT6358 Comparative Migration Policy [Semester 2]
GOVT6108 Democracy and Development in Southeast Asia [Semester 1]
For students in the MHR they will need to undertake the following:

6 credit points of core electives:
SCLG6700 Global and Regional Migration Governance [Semester 2]

12 credit points of electives from the following offerings:
ECOP6015 Global Employment and International Migration [Semester 2]
GOVT6358 Comparative Migration Policy [Semester 2]
GOVT6108 Democracy and Development in Southeast Asia [Semester 1]

Learning Outcomes:

See Attachment 1 for guidelines to completing table below (page 24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Graduate Qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Graduates will demonstrate knowledge of key terms and concepts commonly used in theory applied to migration studies.</td>
<td>A, B(i), D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Graduates will be able to analyse and interpret global, regional and country as well as government and non-government policies applying interdisciplinary theoretical lenses and methods.</td>
<td>B, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Graduates will be able to understand and critically compare migration regimes for (a) refugee/forced migration and (b) economic migration.</td>
<td>B(i), E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Graduates will demonstrate an understanding of the role of different actors spanning global (e.g. UN), regional (e.g. ASEAN), non-governmental and governmental actors.</td>
<td>B, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Graduates will demonstrate understanding of socio-cultural, political and economic imperatives that inform migration in Southeast and East Asia</td>
<td>B(i), C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Graduates will refine research and analysis skills through exposure to and application of interdisciplinary scholarship and methodologies in the field of migration</td>
<td>B, D, F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Postgraduate Coursework specialisation proposal

Proposed specialisation:

International Relations

Degree name/s:

Master of Human Rights

Background and Rationale:

The international relations specialisation will provide students with an understanding of how international relations apply in various political, social, economic and environmental contexts. Human rights are articulated in the UN declaration and gaining an understanding of the international system will help students frame debates around Human Rights in a global political, economic and cultural context. This specialization will allow Human Rights students to develop critical skills in the effective use of international relations tools and language to achieve specific changes in the world while gaining skills to apply to real situations and create workable solutions relating Human Rights in an international context. This specialisation addresses the operationalisation of the international relations theory, combining theoretical and practical aspects of the international system, structures of operations, organisational impact and key critical issues.

Details of the specialisation:

GOVT6137 Forces of Change in International Relations
GOVT6147 Foundations of International Relations
GOVT6116 International Organisations
GOVT6123 Globalisation and Governance
GOVT6156 Governance and Civil Society
GOVT6394 Development and World Politics
GOVT6357 International Policy Making

Impact on current curriculum:

All units proposed for this new specialisation in international relations are already listed in the MIR unit of study table. The framework of a ‘specialisation’ directs students with an interest in this area to strategically customise their masters program accordingly.

The proposal entails minor updates to the degree resolutions which you will see below.

Degree requirements:

(4) Candidates for the Master of Human Rights are required to complete 72 credit points including:

(a) a minimum of 24 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) a minimum of 12 credit points of core elective units of study;
(c) a maximum of 24 30 credit points from elective units of study. With the permission of the Degree Coordinator a maximum of 12 credit points can be taken as elective units from units of study outside those listed in the Human Rights subject area of the Postgraduate Unit of Study Table, including units of study from other faculties.
(e) 18 credit points from either the Internship or the Dissertation pathway
(d) a minimum of 6 credit points from capstone units of study.
(e) an optional 18 credit point specialisation as listed in the unit of study table.
Example student pathway:

It is proposed that the specialisation will require 18 credit points. For students in the MHR they can undertake this specialisation within the electives stream and choose from all available units:

12 credit points of core electives:
GOVT6137 Forces of Change in International Relations
GOVT6147 Foundations of International Relations

6 credit points of electives from the following offerings:
GOVT6116 International Organisations
GOVT6123 Globalisation and Governance
GOVT6156 Governance and Civil Society
GOVT6394 Development and World Politics
GOVT6357 International Policy Making

Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Graduate Qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Demonstrate a critical understanding of the key approaches to international relations from an interdisciplinary and practice-orientated perspective</td>
<td>(a), (d), (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Demonstrate knowledge of principles and methods specific to international relations studies.</td>
<td>(a), (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Demonstrate independent analytical and creative thinking through critical engagement with the currency of information.</td>
<td>(b), (c), (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Analyse and identify information needs as well as networks to assist in locating the most appropriate and up to date information and data.</td>
<td>(b),(d), (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Identify and critically analyse the advantages and disadvantages of various strategies involved in the maintenance and operation of global political systems.</td>
<td>(a), (b), (d), (e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Demonstrate effective written and oral skills in the development of strategic responses to international relations issues of concern.</td>
<td>(c), (d), (e), (f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Postgraduate Coursework specialisation proposal

Proposed specialisation:
Social Policy

Degree name/s:
Master of Human Rights

Background and Rationale:
The Social Policy specialisation will examine the relationship between governance and the distribution of welfare and wellbeing. The specialisation allows MHR students to focus on policies that affect inequality, poverty, social exclusion and social cohesion and to develop social policy analysis, advocacy and research skills. All units consider the wide range of local, national and international arrangements designed to meet social needs, including the development, expansion and contraction of welfare states. Social policy is presented as a contested process that involves public, private and non-government organisations, as well civil society. Core debates relating to social policy principles, social policy processes and social outcomes are explored.

Details of the specialisation:
SCLG6901 Citizenship Rights and Social Movements [existing unit]
SCWK6948 Social Policy Frameworks [existing unit]
SCWK6949 Global Social Policy [existing unit]
*SCLG6910 - Social Policy International Perspectives [existing unit]
*Subject to availability

Impact on current curriculum:
All units proposed for this new specialisation in social policy are already listed in the MHR unit of study table. The framework of a ‘specialisation’ directs students with an interest in this area to strategically customise their masters program accordingly.

The proposal entails minor updates to the degree resolutions which you will see below.

Degree requirements:
(4) Candidates for the Master of Human Rights are required to complete 72 credit points including:
(a) a minimum of 24 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) a minimum of 12 credit points of core elective units of study;
(c) a maximum of 24 30 credit points from elective units of study. With the permission of the Degree Coordinator a maximum of 12 credit points can be taken as elective units from units of study outside those listed in the Human Rights subject area of the Postgraduate Unit of Study Table, including units of study from other faculties.
(c) 18 credit points from either the Internship or the Dissertation pathway
(d) a minimum of 6 credit points from capstone units of study.
(e) an optional 18 credit point specialisation as listed in the unit of study table.
Example student pathway:

It is proposed that the specialisation will require 18 credit points, including the following:

6 credit points of core electives:
SCLG6901 Citizenship Rights and Social Movements [existing unit, semester 1]

12 credit points of electives:
SCWK6948 Social Policy Frameworks [existing unit, semester 2]
SCWK6949 Global Social Policy [existing unit, semester 1]
*SCLG6910 - Social Policy International Perspectives
*Subject to availability

Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Graduate Qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Graduates will demonstrate knowledge of key terms and concepts commonly used in the theory and practice in the discipline of social policy.</td>
<td>a, b(i), b(iv), c, f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Graduates will be able to analyse and interpret government and non-government policies and social programs using a range of analytic strategies and research methods.</td>
<td>A, B(i), B(ii), B(iii), F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Graduates will be equipped to identify and compare institutional arrangements for social policy across international settings and between policy sectors, such as income support, social services, health, education, housing assistance.</td>
<td>A, B(i), B(ii), B(iii), D, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Graduates will demonstrate an understanding of the rationale for government activity to address social needs, and be able to analyze the historical, contextual and philosophical bases of governmental activity across the range of local, national and international settings.</td>
<td>A, B(i), B(ii), B(iii), D, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Graduates will be able to apply analytical skills in discussing and assessing the potential and limitations of various social policies, including their consequences for diverse social groups, and be able to communicate their findings effectively for a general audience.</td>
<td>A, B, E, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Graduates will be able to communicate arguments for social policy reform and critiques of existing social policies to both a general and a specialist audience, and will have developed specialist policy writing and communication skills required to participate in policy making.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, E, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Graduates will be able to apply social policy theories, principles and methods to work and research in other relevant disciplinary communities and will draw upon theories and practices from other disciplinary communities in their policy analysis, policy development and policy advocacy.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, E, F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Postgraduate Coursework specialisation proposal

Proposed specialisation:

Human Rights

Degree name/s:

Master of International Relations
Master of International Studies

Background and Rationale:

The human rights specialisation will provide students with an understanding of how human rights apply in various political, social, economic and environmental contexts. This specialization will allow International Relations and International Studies students to develop critical skills in the effective use of human rights tools and language to achieve specific changes in the world while gaining skills to apply to real situations and create workable solutions. This specialisation addresses rights violations at the local, national, regional and global levels, combining social, scientific and legal approaches to provide a holistic perspective on human rights and social change.

Details of the specialisation:

HRTD6901 Human Rights Norms and Mechanisms
HRTD6903 Dynamics of Human Rights Violations
HRTD6916 Human Rights Simulation
SCLG6916 - Indigenous Rights - Global Issues
PHIL2616 - Philosophy of Human Rights

Impact on current curriculum:

All units proposed for this new specialisation in human rights are already listed in the MHR unit of study table. The framework of a ‘specialisation’ directs students with an interest in this area to strategically customise their masters program accordingly.

The proposal entails minor updates to the degree resolutions which you will see below.

Degree requirements:

Candidates for the Master of International Relations are required to complete 96 credit points, including:
(a) a minimum of 30 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) a minimum of 24 credit points of core elective units of study; and
(c) a maximum of 30 credit points of elective units of study, which can include an optional minor specialisation as listed in the unit of study table. With the permission of the Degree Coordinator a maximum of 6 credit points of elective units can be taken from units of study outside those listed in the International Relations subject area of the Postgraduate Unit of Study Table, including units of study offered by other faculties and;
(d) a minimum of 6 credit points of capstone units of study.
Candidates for the Master of International Studies are required to complete 96 credit points, including:
(a) a minimum of 12 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) a maximum of 78 credit points from elective units of study, which can include an optional specialisation as listed in the unit of study table. With the permission of the Degree Coordinator a maximum of 12 credit points can be taken as elective units from units of study outside those listed in the International Studies subject area of the Postgraduate Unit of Study Table, including units of study offered by other faculties; and
(c) a minimum of 6 credit points from capstone units of study.

Example student pathway:

It is proposed that the specialisation will require 18 credit points. For students in the MIR and MInts they can undertake this specialisation within the electives stream and choose from all available units:

12 credit points of core electives:
HRTD6901 Human Rights Norms and Mechanisms [Semester 1]
HRTD6916 Human Rights Simulation [Semester 1]

6 credit points of electives from the following offerings:
HRTD6903 Dynamics of Human Rights Violations [Semester 2]
SCLG6916 - Indigenous Rights - Global Issues [Semester 2]
PHIL2616 - Philosophy of Human Rights [Semester 1]

Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Graduate Qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrate a critical understanding of the key approaches to human rights from an interdisciplinary and practice-orientated perspective</td>
<td>(a), (g), (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstrate knowledge of principles and methods specific to human rights studies.</td>
<td>(a), (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Demonstrate independent analytical and creative thinking through critical engagement with the currency of information.</td>
<td>(b), (c), (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Analyse and identify information needs as well as networks to assist in locating the most appropriate and up to date information and data.</td>
<td>(b), (d), (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Identify and critically analyse the advantages and disadvantages of various solutions and strategies surrounding a particular human rights problem or phenomenon.</td>
<td>(a), (b), (g), (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Demonstrate effective written and oral skills in the development of strategic responses to human right violators and sensitivity to cultural dimensions.</td>
<td>(c), (d), (f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Postgraduate Coursework specialisation proposal

Proposed specialisations:

Economic Policy
Media and Cultural Policy
Social Policy
International Policy

Degree name:

Master of Public Policy

Background and rationale:

The Master of Public Policy (MPP) is a longstanding coursework degree taught in the Department of Government and International Relations. It is one of the most successful postgraduate teaching programs in FASS by any measure. Its continued strength owes much to the fact that, unlike most competitor degrees, it provides solid grounding in the core areas of policy making, governance and public administration. What has been missing is the possibility that, in addition to the core and in complement to it, students can specialise in a particular area of policy. Currently students can choose from a suite of available ‘minors’, but these generally focus on streams of units which may or may not be directly related to the core of the degree. The minors also generally do not provide specialist training in a sub-field of policy.

The purpose of this proposal is to re-formulate and to add greater clarity to the minors and to re-constitute them as ‘specialisations’. Doing so will better reflect the professional needs and aspirations and the intellectual interests of MPP students. The specialisations will be more attractive and more obvious to students, making the degree easier to market. Finally, the specialisations will be in professionally oriented, policy-specific areas. The proposal is for four specialisation options: economic policy, media and cultural policy, social policy, and international policy.

Details of the specialisations:

The current 96 credit point MPP requires 12 credit points of core units, a minimum of 30 credit points of core elective units, a minimum of 6 credit points of capstone units, and a maximum of 24 credit points elective units. It is proposed that the new specialisations will require 24 credit points and can therefore sit within the allotment for elective units.

It is anticipated that students who opt for the 12 credit point dissertation capstone will complete it within their area of specialisation, and therefore the specialisation can be awarded upon completion of 18 (rather than 24) credit points within the specialisation.

Impact on current curriculum:

The proposal entails minor updates to the degree resolutions which you will see below.

Requirements for award:

4) To qualify for the award of the Master of Public Policy a candidate must complete 96 credit points comprising:
(a) a minimum of 12 credit points of core units of study as specified; and
(b) a minimum of 30 credit points of core elective units of study; and
(c) a maximum of 48 credit points from elective units of study which can include an optional minor specialisation as listed in the unit of study table. With the permission of the Degree Coordinator a maximum of 12 credit points can be taken as elective units from units of study outside those listed in the Public Policy subject area of the Postgraduate Unit of Study Table, including units of study offered by other faculties; and
(d) a minimum of 6 credit points from capstone units of study.
Economic Policy

The Economic Policy specialisation will provide students with an understanding of key economic concepts and how they can be used to analyse public policy. The economic approach to policy analysis will complement the core units of study within the Master of Public Policy and broaden the range of analytical skills that can be developed within the degree.

12 credit points of core units:
- ECON5001 Microeconomic Theory
- ECON5002 Macroeconomic Theory

12 credit points of elective units:
- ECMT5001 Principles of Econometrics
- ECON5006 Economics of Law and Public Policy
- ECON5004 Communication in Economics
- ECON6016 Trade and Development
- ECON6018 Environmental Economics
- ECON6029 Health Economics and Policy

Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Graduate Qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Graduates will demonstrate knowledge of key terms and concepts commonly used in discussions of economic issues in policy fora and in the media (such as monetary and fiscal policy, supply and demand, market equilibrium, gains from trade, market failure).</td>
<td>A, B(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Graduates will be able to analyse and interpret economic events and government policies using economic models.</td>
<td>A, B(i), B(ii), B(iii), F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Graduates will demonstrate an understanding of the rationale for government activity in the economy, such as market failure, and be able to analyze the effectiveness of proposed policies using economic tools of analysis.</td>
<td>A, B(i), B(ii), B(iii), D, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Graduates will be able to apply analytical skills in discussing and assessing the limitation of various economic policies, including their distributional consequences, and communicate their findings effectively for a general audience.</td>
<td>A, B, E, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Graduates will be able to communicate economic arguments analyzing economic policy and government interventions, for example regulation of the labour market or the provision of healthcare, to both a general and a specialist audience.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, E, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Graduates will be able to apply economic thinking to work and research in other relevant disciplinary communities.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, E, F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Media and Cultural Policy

Increasingly, jobs in post-industrial economic arenas are formulated around service and brain work, replacing the manufacturing emphasis of former eras. Within this framework, questions about culture, including cultural production and the importance of our cultural heritage, are assuming ever-greater importance. At the same time, we are becoming increasingly aware of the importance of media and of media interactions in all spheres of public and political life. This specialisation offers students the opportunity to trace public policy making in a wide range of cultural and media arenas. It will explore questions such as: why the promotion of certain cultural offerings are good for the nation’s civic development, while other cultural forms are deemed ‘simply commercial’; the availability of broadcast licenses in the age of the internet; how we respond to and understand our own histories and cultural present. Questions of cultural and media policy and policy-making provide a framework for understanding the legal framework, classifications and institutions which underlie culture and promote or prevent an understanding of our cultural heritage and diversity. They also provide a framework for understanding public opinion and freedom of speech within a public sphere impacted by media disruption.

24 credit points of elective units, chosen from the following:
- GCST6901 Cultural Policy
- WMST6903 Gender, Media and Consumer Societies
- MHST6901 Museum and Heritage: History and Theory
- MUSM7035 Ethics of Cultural Property
- ARCH9081 Heritage Law and Policy
- MUSM7032 Museum and Gallery Administration
- ARHT6930 Film Theory: Art, Industry, Culture
- ARIN6902 Internet Governance
- MECO6913 Public Opinion, Policy and Public Sphere

Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Graduate Qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Have an understanding of the following disciplinary or practice developments in Cultural Policy and Media Studies: 1. Core concepts and contexts of their development. 2. The range of perspectives, debates, and cultural issues that are addressed in the field. 3. Longstanding and changing modes of thinking about culture, communication, citizenship and media agency.</td>
<td>A, C, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Have demonstrated that they can 1. Critically evaluate the sources, validity and currency of different theoretical approaches to cultural and media policy 2. Be intellectually curious, open to new ideas, methods and ways of thinking 3. Assess the value of theory to cultural practice and analysis of policy-making processes.</td>
<td>A, B (i) B(ii), C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Have demonstrated that they can 1. Identify critical, intellectual and ethical issues in cultural policy and ways of understanding them. 2. Search for relevant secondary literature, synthesise and apply it. 3. Develop qualified, well-informed arguments about multiple dimensions of culture, media and the role of the citizen in policy-making.</td>
<td>A, B (i) B(ii), D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Have demonstrated that they can 1. Formulate and analyse significant problems regarding the place of culture or of the media in the contemporary world. 2. Explain how cultural research contributes to and extends existing knowledge. 3. Take responsibility for their own learning and ongoing intellectual development. 4. Appreciate ethical responsibilities relating to their field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Student will recognise the implications of policy environments for media, culture and communications and scrutinise the role of power.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Policy

The social policy specialisation will examine the relationship between governance and the distribution of welfare and wellbeing. The specialisation allows MPP students to focus on policies that affect inequality, poverty, social exclusion and social cohesion and to develop social policy analysis, advocacy and research skills. All units consider the wide range of local, national and international arrangements designed to meet social needs, including the development, expansion and contraction of welfare states. Social policy is presented as a contested process that involves public, private and non-government organisations, as well civil society. Core debates relating to social policy principles, social policy processes and social outcomes are explored.

12 credit points of core units:
- SCWK6948 Social Policy Frameworks
- EDPA3018 Social Policy Process

12 credit points of elective units:
- SCWK6949 Global Social Policy
- SCLG6910 Social Policy International Perspectives
- SCLG6901 Citizenship Rights and Social Movements
- EDPB5016 Global Poverty, Social Policy and Education
- SCKW6910 Working with Communities
- SCLG6903 New Debates in Social Theory

Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Graduate Qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threshold Learning Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Graduates will demonstrate knowledge of key terms and concepts commonly used in the theory and practice in the discipline of social policy.</td>
<td>a, b(i), b(iv), c, f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Graduates will be able to analyse and interpret government and non-government policies and social programs using a range of analytic strategies and research methods.</td>
<td>A, B(i), B(ii), B(iii), F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Graduates will be equipped to identify and compare institutional arrangements for social policy across international settings and between policy sectors, such as income support, social services, health, education, housing assistance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Graduates will demonstrate an understanding of the rationale for government activity to address social needs, and be able to analyze the historical, contextual and philosophical bases of governmental activity across the range of local, national and international settings.</td>
<td>A, B(i), B(ii), B(iii), D, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Graduates will be able to apply analytical skills in discussing and assessing the potential and limitations of various social policies, including their consequences for diverse social groups, and be able to communicate their findings effectively for a general audience.</td>
<td>A, B, E, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Graduates will be able to communicate arguments for social policy reform and critiques of existing social policies to both a general and a specialist audience, and will have developed specialist policy writing and communication skills required to participate in policy making.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, E, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Graduates will be able to apply social policy theories, principles and methods to work and research in other relevant disciplinary communities and will draw upon theories and practices from other disciplinary communities in their policy analysis, policy development and policy advocacy.</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, E, F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
International Policy

The International Policy specialisation will examine policy making and governance at the interface between the nation-state and the international, trans-national and global arenas. All units examine the roles of inter-governmental organisations, non-government organisations, multinational corporations, and international regulation and treaties in shaping policy decisions. Core areas and challenges for policy making and international polities are explored. These include but are not limited to: the environment, the international economy, international security, and migration. The specialisation helps MPP students to understand how policy agendas diffuse from one state context to another and are responded to (or not) at the international level. It also examines why some grand global challenges remain difficult to resolve.

24 credit points of elective units, chosen from the following:

- GOVT6357 International Policy Making
- GOVT6116 International Organisations
- GOVT6123 Globalisation and Governance
- GOVT6135 Global Environmental Politics
- CISS6001 New Security Challenges
- GOVT6358 Comparative Migration Policy

Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Graduate Qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Graduates will demonstrate knowledge of key terms and concepts commonly applied to the theory and practice of policy making at the interface between the nation-states and the international, trans-national and global arena.</td>
<td>a, b(i), b(iv), c, f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Graduates will demonstrate capacity to analyse and interpret international policy events and developments using appropriate theoretical frameworks and case examples.</td>
<td>a, b(iii), c, d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Graduates will be able to identify and compare the roles of key actors and structures in international, trans-national and global governance.</td>
<td>a, b(i), c, d, f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Graduates will engage in independent evidence gathering using a range of methods and sources, including digital sources, to answer research questions about international policy.</td>
<td>a, b(iv), e, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Graduates will demonstrate effective oral and written skills in communicating ideas on international policy to academic and non-academic audiences using a range of media.</td>
<td>a, b(i), b(ii), b(iii), e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Graduates will demonstrate problem-solving skills, and interpersonal and communication skills through project work and interdisciplinary study.</td>
<td>a, b(i), b(ii), b(iii), b(iv), d, e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Postgraduate Coursework specialisation proposal

Proposed specialisation:
Social Research

Degree name/s:
Master of Development Studies
Master of Human Rights
Master of International Relations
Master of International Studies
Master of International Security
Master of Public Policy
Master of Political Economy

Background and Rationale:
The social research specialisation will offer applied skills in quantitative and qualitative research methods relevant to social research, program evaluation and policy research. The specialisation allows students in the MDvSt, MHR, MIR, MIS, MIntS, MPP and MPE programs to gain exposure to basic quantitative and qualitative research methods, as well as choose a pathway to explore more advanced disciplinary applications. The specialization takes advantage of the new School of Social and Political Sciences quantitative and qualitative research methods units, offering a coherent pathway for future social research professionals. The specialisation will also be a useful pathway for postgraduate coursework dissertation students interested in building skills for a future research degree.

Details of the specialisation:
12 credit points of core electives:
SSPS6001 Quantitative Methods in the Social Sciences
SSPS6002 Qualitative Methods in the Social Sciences

6 credit points of electives from the following offerings:
ECOP6031 Research in Political Economy
GOVT6139 Research Design
SCLG6902 Doing Social Research

Impact on current curriculum:
All units proposed for this new specialisation will be listed in the MDvSt, MHR, MIR, MIS, MIntS, MPP and MPE unit of study tables. The framework of a 'specialisation' directs students with an interest in this area to strategically customise their masters program accordingly.

The proposal entails minor updates to the degree resolutions which you will see below.
Degree requirements:

Candidates for the Master of Development Studies are required to complete 72 credit points including:
(a) a minimum of 24 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) a minimum of 6 credit points from core elective units of study; and
(c) a maximum of 30 credit points from elective units of study. With the permission of the Degree Coordinator a maximum of 12 credit points can be taken as elective units from units of study outside those listed in the Development Studies subject area of the Postgraduate Unit of Study Table, including units of study from other faculties; and
(d) a minimum of 12 credit points from capstone units of study.
(e) an optional specialisation as listed in the unit of study table

Candidates for the Master of Human Rights are required to complete 72 credit points including:
(a) a minimum of 24 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) a minimum of 12 credit points of core elective units of study;
(c) a maximum of 24 30 credit points from elective units of study. With the permission of the Degree Coordinator a maximum of 12 credit points can be taken as elective units from units of study outside those listed in the Human Rights subject area of the Postgraduate Unit of Study Table, including units of study from other faculties.
(d) 18 credit points from either the Internship or the Dissertation pathway
(e) an optional 18 credit point specialisation as listed in the unit of study table.

Candidates for the Master of International Relations are required to complete 96 credit points, including:
(a) a minimum of 30 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) a minimum of 24 credit points of core elective units of study; and
(c) a maximum of 30 credit points of elective units of study, which can include an optional minor specialisation as listed in the unit of study table. With the permission of the Degree Coordinator a maximum of 6 credit points of elective units can be taken from units of study outside those listed in the International Relations subject area of the Postgraduate Unit of Study Table, including units of study offered by other faculties and;
(d) a minimum of 6 credit points of capstone units of study.

Candidates for the Master of International Security are required to complete 96 credit points, including:
(a) a minimum of 24 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) a minimum of 18 credit points from core elective units of study; and
(c) a maximum of 48 credit points from elective units of study, which can include an optional minor specialisation as listed in the unit of study table. With the permission of the Degree Coordinator a maximum of 12 credit points can be taken as elective units from units of study outside those listed in the International Security subject area of the Postgraduate Unit of Study Table, including units of study offered by other faculties; and
(d) a minimum of 6 credit points from capstone units of study.

Candidates for the Master of International Studies are required to complete 96 credit points, including:
(a) a minimum of 12 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) a maximum of 78 credit points from elective units of study, which can include an optional specialisation as listed in the unit of study table. With the permission of the Degree Coordinator a maximum of 12 credit points can be taken as elective units from units of study outside those listed in the International Studies subject area of the Postgraduate Unit of Study Table, including units of study offered by other faculties; and
(c) a minimum of 6 credit points from capstone units of study.
Candidates for the Master of Political Economy are required to complete 72 credit points, including:
(a) a minimum of 18 credit points of core units of study; and
(b) a minimum of 18 credit points from core elective units of study; and
(c) a maximum of 24 credit points from elective units of study. With the permission of the
Degree Coordinator a maximum of 12 credit points can be taken as elective units from units of study outside those listed in the Political Economy subject area of the Postgraduate Unit of Study Table, including units of study offered by other faculties;
(d) a minimum of 6 credit points of capstone units of study.
(e) an optional specialisation as listed in the unit of study table.

4) To qualify for the award of the Master of Public Policy a candidate must complete 96 credit points comprising:
(a) a minimum of 12 credit points of core unit of study as specified; and
(b) a minimum of 30 credit points of core elective units of study; and
(c) a maximum of 48 credit points from elective units of study which can include an optional minor specialisation as listed in the unit of study table. With the permission of the Degree Coordinator a maximum of 12 credit points can be taken as elective units from units of study outside those listed in the Public Policy subject area of the Postgraduate Unit of Study Table, including units of study offered by other faculties; and
(d) a minimum of 6 credit points from capstone units of study.

Example student pathway:
It is proposed that the specialisation will require 18 credit points.
For students in the MHR, MIR and MInts they can undertake this specialisation within the electives stream and choose from all available units:
12 credit points of core electives:
SSPS6001 Quantitative Methods in the Social Sciences
SSPS6002 Qualitative Methods in the Social Sciences

6 credit points of electives from the following offerings:
ECOP6031 Research in Political Economy
GOVT6139 Research Design
SCLG6902 Doing Social Research

Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Graduate Qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Apply advanced knowledge and skills in social research methods in disciplinary and interdisciplinary contexts</td>
<td>(a), (b), (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstrate critical thinking and problem solving through written assessments and in-class tasks using advanced social research methodologies, including via digital media</td>
<td>(a), (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communicate effectively in settings comprised of diverse groups, including teams of professionals and academics from a variety of disciplinary and interdisciplinary backgrounds</td>
<td>(a), (c), (d), (e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Apply advanced knowledge and skills in social research methods in professional and social contexts to impact positively on society</td>
<td>(a), (b), (c), (f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Postgraduate Coursework specialisation proposal

Proposed specialisations:
- Politics
- Business
- Media

Degree name:
Master of United States Studies

Background and rationale:

The Master of US Studies (MUSS) was introduced by United States Studies Centre at the University of Sydney in 2008. It remains the only postgraduate qualification of its kind available from an Australian university. The degree provides an interdisciplinary approach to US Studies, drawing from the Faculty of Arts and Social Science’s expertise in American history, society, politics, economics and culture. Since 2014, the United States Studies Centre (USSC) has made internship placements available to its postgraduate students and postgraduate students from across the Faculty. Its coursework degree and internship capstones are designed to align students with professional outcomes in business, politics and media.

The strengths of the coursework degree lie in the flexible and interdisciplinary nature of the program, the access to professional visitors hosted by the USSC, and the internship organisations associated with it. What is lacking from the degree is the availability of specialisations that reflect the skills and professional outcomes the degree provides to students.

The purpose of this proposal is to organise three optional specialisations within the Master of United States Studies. These specialisations will present students with a clearer path through the degree that emphasises the research and teaching areas that appeal to their intellectual interests. This will aid in the marketing of the degree. Specialisations will also signal to prospective employers those particular graduate attributes and knowledge that the qualification provides.

The proposal is for three specialisation options: politics, business, and media. Since each specialisation will rely on cross-listed electives, they will facilitate a more meaningful, targeted integration of the MUSS with affiliated departments in FASS, such as the Department of Government and International Relations, and Media and Communications.

Details of the specialisations:

This proposal asks for the acknowledgment of three optional 18 credit point specialisations within the Master of US Studies: Politics, Business, and Media.
Politics

The Politics specialisation will provide the student with a deep knowledge of American political history, laws and institutions. Students will gain skills in contemporary policy analysis and become conversant in current issues within US domestic and foreign policy.

Core units:
- USSC6902 US Politics: Presidency and Congress
- USSC6903 US Foreign and National Security

Third unit can be selected from:
- USSC6907 American Exceptionalism
- USSC6921 US Strategy in the Asia-Pacific
- GOVT6359 US-China Relations
- CISS6001 New Security Challenges
- CISS6008 Population and Security
- CISS 6012 Civil-Military Relations
- GOVT6111 Chinese Foreign and Security Policy
- CISS6022 Cybersecurity
- GOVT6304 Development and World Politics
- GOVT6119 International Security
- CISS6018 Nuclear Arms Control and Proliferation
- ECOP6011 USA-Europe-Japan: From Growth to Crisis

Business

The Business specialisation provides practical knowledge of the American business environment, and enables students to understand how business cultures in the US differ from those in Australia and Asia. Students also gain knowledge of the history and legal norms of philanthropic organisations in the United States, as well as a wide understanding of US economic policy.

Core units:
- USSC6905 The Politics of Money in America
- USSC6908 The US Business Environment (to be revived 2019)

Third unit can be selected from one of the following:
- MKTG6020 Business Marketing
- IBUS5003 Global Business
- FINC6013 International Business Finance
- IBUS6001 International Business Strategy
- IBUS6002 Cross-Cultural Management
- IBUS6016 Social Entrepreneurship
- MKTG6013 International and Global Marketing
Media

The Media specialisation is designed to provide students with an understanding of the global influence of American culture and media. Students gain a historical understanding of the American media industry's adaptation to legal, cultural and technological change. The specialization fosters skills in media analysis and a strong knowledge of theoretical concepts to provide a sophisticated understanding of media production and consumption in America.

Core units:
- USSC6919 American Film and Hollywood;
- USSC6920 US Media: Politics, Culture, Technology

Third unit can be selected from:
- USSC6914 Key Issues in US Culture
- MECO6913 Public Opinion, Policy and Public Sphere
- WMST6903 Gender, Media and Consumer Societies
- ENGL6984 Creative Non-Fiction Workshop
- MECO6912 Political Public Relations
- MECO6915 Writing Features: Narrative Journalism
- WRIT6000 Professional Writing
- WRIT6001 Professional Editing
- CAEL5043 Screen Writing and Directing
- CAEL5045 Web Environment for Cultural Producers
- ARIN6904 Mobile Media and Games
- MECO6900 News Writing
- MECO6926 International Media Practice

The specialisations will be optional for students enrolled in the Master of US Studies, but will allow students to have the specialisation added to their transcript and Testamur.

Impact on Current curriculum

The proposal entails minor updates to the degree resolutions which you will see below.

(4) Candidates for the Master of US Studies are required to complete 96 credit points, including:
(a) a minimum of 6 credit points of core units of study;
(b) a minimum of 18 credit points from core elective units of study; and
(c) a maximum of 48 credit points from elective units of study. With the permission of the Degree Coordinator a maximum of 6 credit points of elective units can be taken from units of study outside those listed in the US Studies subject area of the Postgraduate Unit of Study Table, including units of study offered by other faculties.
(d) 24 credit points from capstone units of study.
(e) an optional specialisation as listed in the unit of study table.

Internship integration

The existing internship program provides capstone experiences to MUSS students, as well as internship electives for students from other degree programs. The establishment of specialisations will allow the professional placements to extend the curriculum logically, and direct student pathways toward professional outcomes in politics, business and media.
# Learning Outcomes and Example Student Pathway

## Business:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Threshold Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Graduate Qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demonstrate a deep knowledge of the history and economy of the United States, and apply that disciplinary knowledge to advance expertise in business and economics.</td>
<td>A, B (i-iv), C, D, E, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of the multiple disciplinary contexts for understanding the United States, with advanced capacity in the area of business and economics.</td>
<td>A, D, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demonstrate a capacity to work across disciplinary boundaries to solve specific and advanced analytic problems in the study of the United States.</td>
<td>A, C, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Demonstrate an ability to decipher complicated written, oral, visual, material and digital texts, and contribute to secondary literature about them.</td>
<td>B (i-iv), F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Construct an evidence-based argument in written, oral, visual, or digital form.</td>
<td>B (i-iv), F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>To relate the interdisciplinary methods of US Studies to issues encountered in professional context of business and economics</td>
<td>A, C, D, E, F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sem 1</th>
<th>Sem 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IBUS6016: Social Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>USSC6920: US Media: Politics, Culture, Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GOVT2445: US-China Relations</td>
<td>IBUS6002: Cross-Cultural Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sem 1</th>
<th>Sem 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAPSTONE PROJECT in one of three areas:</td>
<td>Based on .25 RPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Politics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Graduate Qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrate a deep knowledge of the history and politics of the United States, and apply that disciplinary knowledge to advance expertise in political science and international relations.</td>
<td>A, B (i-iv), C, D, E, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of the multiple disciplinary contexts for understanding the United States, with advanced capacity in the area of political science and international relations.</td>
<td>A, D, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Demonstrate a capacity to work across disciplinary boundaries to solve specific and advanced analytic problems in the study of the United States.</td>
<td>A, C, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Demonstrate an ability to decipher complicated written, oral, visual, material and digital texts, and contribute to secondary literature about them.</td>
<td>B (i-iv), F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Construct an evidence-based argument in written, oral, visual, or digital form.</td>
<td>B (i-iv), F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To relate the interdisciplinary methods of US Studies to issues encountered in professional context of government and international relations</td>
<td>A, C, D, E, F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Courses by Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Course 2</th>
<th>Course 3</th>
<th>Course 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Project Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sem 1</td>
<td>CAPSTONE PROJECT in one of three areas: Internship, Research, Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem 2</td>
<td>Based on .25 RPL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Media:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Graduate Qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demonstrate a deep knowledge of the history, media and culture of the United States, and apply that disciplinary knowledge to advance expertise in media and cultural studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of the multiple disciplinary contexts for understanding the United States, with advanced capacity in the area of media and cultural studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demonstrate a capacity to work across disciplinary boundaries to solve specific and advanced analytic problems in the study of the United States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Demonstrate an ability to decipher complicated written, oral, visual, material and digital texts, and contribute to secondary literature about them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Construct an evidence-based argument in written, oral, visual, or digital form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>To relate the interdisciplinary methods of US Studies to issues encountered in professional context of media and cultural production.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USSC6901: Fundamentals of US Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USSC6919: American Film and Hollywood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MECO6900: News Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WMST6903 Gender, Media and Consumer Societies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 2</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USSC6920: US Media: Politics, Culture, Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USSC6915: Key Issues in US Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARIN6904: Mobile Media and Games</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WMST6926: International Media Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPSTONE PROJECT in one of three areas:</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 2</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on .25 RPL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 1: Guidelines from the *Learning and Teaching Policy 2015*

(1) Learning outcomes articulate the specific achievements in skill, knowledge and application necessary to demonstrate graduate qualities in a particular discipline. They must be aligned with graduate qualities and must be assessed as part of the curriculum.

(2) Learning outcomes should be specified for award courses and for each of their components, including as relevant units of study, majors, programs and specialisations.

(3) Learning outcomes specified for the components of an award course should be aligned with each other and with the learning outcomes of the award course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Qualities</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Depth of disciplinary expertise.</td>
<td>To excel at applying and continuing to develop disciplinary expertise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (b) Broader skills:  
  i. Critical thinking and problem solving;  
  ii. Communication (oral and written);  
  iii. Information/ digital literacy;  
  iv. Inventiveness. | To increase the impact of expertise, and to learn and respond effectively and creatively to novel problems. |
| (c) Cultural competence. | To work productively, collaboratively and openly in diverse groups and across cultural boundaries. |
| (d) Interdisciplinary effectiveness. | To work effectively in interdisciplinary (including inter-professional) settings and to build broader perspective, innovative vision, and more contextualised and systemic forms of understanding. |
| (e) An integrated professional, ethical and personal identity. | To build integrity, confidence and personal resilience, and the capacities to manage challenges and uncertainty. |
| (f) Influence. | To be effective in exercising professional and social responsibility and making a positive contribution to society. |

Additional guidelines from the Education Portfolio can be found here:  
Resolutions of the Faculty of Dentistry for coursework awards

These resolutions apply to all undergraduate and postgraduate coursework award courses in the Faculty, 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 Coursework Policy 2014, the Resolutions of the School, the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended), the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 and the Academic Honesty Procedures 2016. Up to date versions of all such documents are available from the Policy Register: http://sydney.edu.au/policies.

Part 1: Course enrolment

1 Enrolment restrictions

   Students are only permitted to enrol for the units of study specified for each semester of their program of study.

2 Time limits

   (1) Maximum time limits for all Faculty of Dentistry courses are listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Full-Time/Part-Time</th>
<th>Time-Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Oral Health</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Dental Medicine</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Clinical Dentistry (General</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>4 semesters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reherence and Pain Control)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Clinical Dentistry (Oral</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>4 semesters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Clinical Dentistry (Oral</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>3 semesters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Missing data]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Clinical Dentistry</td>
<td>FT/PT</td>
<td>4 years/8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Philosophy</td>
<td>FT/PT</td>
<td>4 years/8 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   (1) The Coursework Rule defines the maximum time limits, and how time limits are affected by periods of suspension or absence.

3 Suspension, discontinuation and lapse of candidature

   (1) The Coursework Rule and Coursework Policy specify the conditions for suspending or discontinuing candidature, and return to candidature after these events. The Rule 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. Refer also to the specific resolutions for the Doctor of Dental Medicine.

   (2) For the Bachelor of Oral Health and Bachelor of Dentistry degrees, the provisions of the Coursework Rule apply except that the maximum suspension permitted from this course will be 12 months.

   (3) For the Bachelor of Dentistry degree exceptions may be made for candidates who wish to interrupt their studies, for up to 2 years, to complete another degree, acceptable to the faculty, at this or another institution.

4 Credit for previous study

   In this Faculty, there is no specially identified credit for previous study. Credit for previous study may be granted for the Bachelor of Oral Health degree. Refer to the specific resolutions for the Bachelor of Oral Health.

Part 2: Unit of study enrolment

5 Cross institutional study

   Cross institutional study is not permitted by the Faculty of Dentistry.

6 International exchange

   International exchange is not permitted by the Faculty of Dentistry.

Part 3: Studying and Assessment

7 Attendance

   (1) Students are required to be in attendance at the correct time and place of any formal or informal examinations. Non attendance on any grounds insufficient to claim special consideration will result in the forfeiture of marks associated with the assessment. Participation in a minimum number of assessment items may be a requirement of any unit of study.
Students are expected to attend a minimum of 90 percent of timetabled activities for each component of a unit of study. The Dean or academic staff member most concerned may determine that a student fails a unit of study due to inadequate attendance.

8 Late submission penalty
(1) It is expected that unless an application for an extension or special consideration has been approved, students will make submissions for a unit of study on the due date specified. Submissions may include assignments, application forms or log books. If the submission is made by the student within a period of approved extension, no academic penalty will be applied.
(2) Late assignments that have not been granted extensions will attract a penalty of 5 percent of the maximum mark each day they are late, except week ends and public holidays.

9 Special consideration for illness, injury or misadventure
Special consideration is a process that affords equal opportunity to students who have experienced circumstances that adversely impact their ability to adequately complete an assessment task in a unit of study. The Assessment Policy 2011 and associated procedures provide full details of the University policy. The Coursework Policy 2014 and Assessment Procedures 2011 provide full details.

10 Re-assessment
In this Faculty, opportunities for re-assessment are offered to students on the grounds as stated in the Faculty of Dentistry - Assessment and Progression Local Provision 2017.

Part 4: Progression, Results and Graduation

11 Satisfactory progress
The Faculty will monitor students for satisfactory progress towards the completion of their award course in accordance with the Student Academic Progression Coursework Policy 2014. 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 2014 Rule), students must meet any other requirements specified in the course resolutions as being critical to progress through the course.

12 Award of the bachelor’s degree with honours
The award of Honours is only available to meritotious candidates of the Bachelor of Dentistry degree. Further details are outlined in the Bachelor of Dentistry Resolutions.

13 University medal
The University medal is not awarded to Bachelor of Dentistry Honours candidates, because marks are not awarded to students throughout the duration of the degree.

12 Weighted Average Mark (WAM)
(1) The University has a formula for calculating a Weighted Average Mark and this is defined in the University Glossary uses the following formula for calculating the WAM. WAMs are used by the University as one indicator of performance. For example, WAMs can be used in assessing admission to and award of honours, eligibility for prizes and scholarships, or assessing progression through a course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WAM</th>
<th>( \frac{\text{Sum}(Wc \times Mc)}{\text{Sum}(Wc)} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WAM</td>
<td>( \frac{\text{Sum}(Wc \times Mc)}{\text{Sum}(Wc)} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Where \( Wc \) is the unit of study credit points x the unit weighting and \( Mc \) is the mark achieved for the unit. Pass/fail units and credited units from other institutions are not counted.
(3) The weight of a unit of study is assigned by the owning faculty. In the Faculty of Dentistry, all units carry a weighting value of one. For the Bachelor of Oral Health, all units starting with ORHL1 have a weighting of 1, ORHL2 have a weighting of 2 and ORHL3 have a weighting of 3. For the Doctor of Dental Medicine, all units starting with SDDM51 have a weighting of 1, SDDM52 (2), SDDM53 (3) and SDDM54 (4).

Part 5: Other

13 Special permission
These resolutions apply to all students enrolled in programs of study in the Faculty of Dentistry. However, in exceptional circumstances and at the Dean’s discretion, some exemptions may be permitted.

14 Transitional provisions
(1) These resolutions apply to students who commenced their candidature after 1 January, 2018 and students who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2018, who elect to proceed under these resolutions.
The most significant changes are:

1. examiners will no longer be asked for a CoI statement, instead we will revert to declarations by the supervisor;
2. conflicts of interest are specified in detail;
3. Appointment of examiner forms will now be independently audited for compliance with policy, with results reported back to HDRExSC.

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

In 2015, a new Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Student Policy and associated procedures were adopted by Academic Board. The new procedures shifted the responsibility for delivering statements on Col (perceived or actual) from the supervisor to the examiner. Such a change was implemented to solve a problem that supervisors were often ticking 'no' to questions as to whether any Col existed for a potential examiner, when in fact such Col did exist. In almost all cases, this was not due to deliberate misinformation from the supervisor, more a consequence of a superficial engagement with the documentation. The new process, although designed with the best of intentions, raised two significant issues.

1. A lengthening of process. In the 2015 scheme, a supervisor would contact a prospective examiner to see if (s)he would be available and willing to examine the thesis. After receiving an affirmative answer, the supervisor would then send a Col declaration to the examiner, who would then complete and return to the supervisor, and this would have to be done for each examiner before the request for
Non-Confidential

appointment of examiners could be sent onwards. This extra step has been reported to add time to the process as the University is attempting to find means to drive down examination times.

2. Professional Disquiet. The DVC-Education and the Director, Graduate Research have both been in receipt of messages of staff disquiet about the 2015 procedure of seeking a CoI statement from a potential examiner. University academics have claimed that potential examiners have reported feeling insulted and in addition, our academics have reported that asking examiners to complete a CoI declaration put the University in a bad light, setting a perception of lack-of-trust. It should be noted though that the University of Queensland asks examiners of its HDR theses to complete a CoI statement.

Solutions

A. Examiners must be suggested by supervisors, as these have the expert view of the discipline area. Hence, it is appropriate for supervisors to report that no CoI (perceived or actual) exists for any proposed examiners. This will necessitate a change of section 5(5)(h) in the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Students Procedures 2015.

B. The issue is to make the statement of conflict of interest obvious and upfront; this has been done in the new form where supervisors not only have to address individual, explicit questions of CoI for each examiner, they are also reminded of how minor or perceived CoI may be managed.

C. The new form confirms accountability for veracity of CoI statements

D. HDRAC can and will audit these forms and report errors to HDRExC.

CONSULTATION

These amendments are based on previous consultation with:
Prof. Philippa Pattison, DVC-Education
George Caryannopoulos, Manager – HDRAC
A/Prof. Kathleen Nelson, Chair HDR Examinations Sub-Committee
A/Prof. Michael Kertesz, Chair Graduate Studies Committee
Prof. Adrian Vickers, Fac. Arts & Soc. Sciences
A/Prof. Victoria Cogger, Assoc. Dean-Research Education, Faculty of Medicine and recent ex-chair PhDASC
Members of the University School of Architecture, Design & Planning

ATTACHMENTS

Attachments

1. Draft amendments to *Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedure 2015*
2. Draft Appointment of Examiners HDR form 2017
Note: - The coordinating supervisor must use this form to recommend the appointment of examiners to the Chair of Examination. Recommendations are then approved by the HDR Examination Subcommittee (for doctoral degrees) or the faculty committee (for masters by research degrees) prior to the examination process commencing.
- Please type answers on this form. Handwritten forms will not be accepted.
- Nomination of examiners should be made at least 4 weeks prior to submission of thesis.

Student Details

SID: Student’s Name: Degree:

Thesis title: Faculty: School/Department: Supervisor:

Anticipated date of thesis submission:

COORDINATING SUPERVISOR: Written Justification

As required, please provide your written justification for the nomination of examiner/s here:

WHEN TO PROVIDE WRITTEN JUSTIFICATION

The Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research 2015 Policy and Procedures require that further information be provided by the supervisor for the nomination of examiners who:

1. Are not affiliated with a university or degree-granting institution. Justification should detail the examiner’s expertise, and provide other relevant information which might include previous experience assessing theses, journal articles or other relevant experience; or any links to degree-granting institutions.
2. Are retired (Emeritus, Adjunct or Honorary appointments). Justification should demonstrate that examiners are research active. A short list (up to 4) of recent publications (from the last 5 years) is sufficient to demonstrate research activity.
3. Have no previous experience examining research higher degree theses. Justification should include details of examiners’ experience assessing the work of others, whether this be for masters or honours level theses, journal articles, or any other relevant experience.
4. Are not of obvious academic standing. That is, the examiner does not hold a qualification equivalent to the level being examined, or is not actively involved in the regular output of research. Justification should include details of the examiner’s relevant expertise, professional experience and where applicable, details of recent publications and/or a confirmation of whether the examiner has previous examined higher degree by research theses.
5. There is an actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest.

POLICY REQUIREMENTS

1. Examiners must be nominated at least 4 weeks before the submission of the thesis.
2. Every examiner must complete a conflict of interest declaration. The Chair of Examination and the HDR Examination Subcommittee will not consider the appointment of examiners who do not provide the declaration.
3. If the student has expressed a preference for certain examiners, this must be attached in writing.
4. The supervisor may nominate a reserve examiner.
5. Theses are provided to examiners electronically. If an examiner requires a hard-copy, this must be arranged.
6. The examiners must agree that the contents of the thesis, including any intellectual property rights contained in the thesis, remain strictly confidential and to use the thesis only for the purposes of performing the examination.
7. The thesis may be sent to the examiners only when the examiners have been approved by the HDR Examination Subcommittee (for doctoral degrees) or the Faculty Committee (for masters by research degrees).


8. Only one internal examiner.
9. Only one from any given university or institution,
10. At least one examiner from a university or degree-granting institution.
11. Examiner must be research active, or hold equivalent professional experience. This information must be included in the appointment of examiners form.
12. Examiner must have experience of or be familiar with the supervision and examination of research theses in Australia or Internationally. This information must be included in the appointment of examiners form.
13. Examiner should have a qualification appropriate to the discipline, either equivalent to the level being examined or equivalent professional/research experience. This information must be included in the appointment of examiners form.
14. Examiners must be free from bias, for or against the candidate or supervisor/s and be free from actual, potential or perceived conflicts of interest. This information must be included in the appointment of examiners form.
15. A person cannot be an examiner if they:
   a. have had involvement 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 circumstance which might jeopardise the independence, or the perceived independence of the examination;
   e. have supervised the student at any time;
   f. have been a research student of the supervisor within the last ten years.
# Examiner Details

The student has provided written notice of preferences regarding examiners (attached) | Yes | No
---|---|---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examiner 1</th>
<th>Examiner 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name (including title)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current position title</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution (Name and Organisational Unit where relevant)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postal Address</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>email</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>telephone</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the examiner:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently active in research?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated with a degree-granting institution?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the examiner:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have previous experience as examiner?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold an equivalent title to that being examined (e.g. PhD)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict of Interest. Has/Does the examiner:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>had any involvement in the student’s research?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been a co-author on any part of the work?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have a past or current close personal relationship with the student or member of the supervisory team?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervised the student at any time or been a research student of the supervisor within the last ten year?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>had substantial contact with the student or supervisor(s) in any other circumstance which might jeopardise the independence, or the perceived independence of the examination?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This could include circumstances in which the supervisors(s) and the examiner were co-applicants on grant proposals, have co-published or worked in the same academic unit within the last 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examiner 3</th>
<th>Examiner 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name (including title)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current position title</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution (Name and Organisational Unit where relevant)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postal Address</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>email</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>telephone</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the examiner:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently active in research?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated with a degree-granting institution?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the examiner:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have previous experience as examiner?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold an equivalent title to that being examined (e.g. PhD)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict of Interest. Has/Does the examiner:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>had any involvement in the student’s research?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been a co-author on any part of the work?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have a past or current close personal relationship with the student or member of the supervisory team?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervised the student at any time or been a research student of the supervisor within the last ten year?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>had substantial contact with the student or supervisor(s) in any other circumstance which might jeopardise the independence, or the perceived independence of the examination?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This could include circumstances in which the supervisors(s) and the examiner were co-applicants on grant proposals, have co-published or worked in the same academic unit within the last 5 years.

**DELEGATE AUTHORITY**

**Supervisor:** I declare that the information provided on this form is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge. *All Masters and Doctorate*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DELEGATE AUTHORITY</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Signed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Endorsed by/on behalf of <strong>Chair of Examination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELEGATE AUTHORITY</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved by/on behalf of <strong>Faculty Committee (All Masters)</strong> or <strong>HDR Examinations Sub-Committee (All Doctorate)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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 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.

chair of examination
means the person appointed by the associate dean to co-ordinate the examination, as defined in clause 15A of the policy.

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
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. Editors are not required to be accredited by the University or any professional organisation.

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.

relevant committee means the committee deciding the outcome of the examination, as defined in clause 23(1) of the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015 which states the relevant committee shall be:

(a) for masters degrees, as determined by faculty resolutions
(b) the faculty committee for examinations, except cotutelle examinations, where the examiners and the chair of examinations all recommend that the degree be awarded.
(c) the HDR Examinations Sub-Committee for all other examinations, including all cotutelle examinations.

PART 1: PROOF-READING AND EDITING THESESES

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 is aware of and 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
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.

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

4A Submission checks

(1) On receipt of a thesis submitted for examination, the administrative unit responsible for candidature management processes will:
   (a) review the format of the thesis;
   (b) apply similarity detection software; and
   (c) conduct a data integrity check.

(2) The administrative unit will then assess the outcomes of each, and will only forward the thesis to examiners if satisfied that the submission checks reveal no evidence of:
   (a) non-compliance with the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Policy 2015; or
   (b) possible inappropriate academic practice, code breach or research misconduct.

(3) Any possible inappropriate academic practice, code breach or research misconduct will be managed in accordance with the Academic Honesty Procedures 2016.

5 Approving examiners

(1) The chair of examinations must provide nominations for examiners to the faculty committee or HDR Examinations Sub-Committee (in accordance with clause 15(1)
of the policy) 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 15 of these procedures.

(3) The supervisor must:
   (a) nominate examiners in the form prescribed by the HDR Examinations Subcommittee; 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.

(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.

(5) The supervisor must provide the following 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;
   (g) the language (if not English) in which they would submit their report; and
   (h) a conflict of interests declaration signed by the nominated supervisor.

(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
   (d) an individual with an actual, potential or perceived conflict of interests.

(7) Where 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 administrative unit 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 HDR Examinations 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 detailed list of corrections required; or
   (d) the basis for revise and resubmit; or
   (e) the basis for non-award.
(7) Examiners who are submitting a report in a language other than English must provide their recommendation and 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 essential for the award of the degree.
8 Monitoring examiners’ reports

(1) When an examiner submits a report, the administrative unit 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 administrative unit will contact the examiner with a reminder of the due date.

(3) If an examiner has not returned a report within six weeks, the administrative unit 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 administrative unit 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 administrative unit will release the examiners’ reports to the supervisor and chair of examination after all examiners’ reports have been received. The Associate Dean or Chair of the faculty committee may release reports to the supervisor and chair of examination at an earlier date in exceptional circumstances.
Once all the examiners’ reports have been received, the chair of examination:
(a) will consider the reports; and
(b) should normally consult any of the supervisor, head of school or
postgraduate co-ordinator, who may provide a written report.

The chair of examination will then make a recommendation regarding the outcome of the award to the relevant committee. This report must include:
(a) details of the nature and extent of any consultation; and
(b) a copy of any written report received.

The chair of examination’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 corrections;
   (ii) non-award with provision to revise and resubmit; or
   (iii) non-award with the option to award another degree, where corrections are required.

After considering the examiners’ reports and the chair of examination’s recommendation, the relevant committee will determine whether:
(a) there is sufficient information to determine the outcome of examination 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 writing);
   (v) requesting additional information from the supervisor, chair of examination, associate dean, head of school or postgraduate co-ordinator;
   (vi) where the relevant committee is the faculty committee, consulting the HDR Examinations Sub-Committee; or
   (vii) obtaining any further information deemed necessary.

When the relevant committee determines it has sufficient information to do so, it will form an intention on the outcome of examination consistently with clause 23 of the policy.

If the intention is to award the degree (whether without qualification or with corrections), the relevant committee shall enact this decision as per clause 13 of these procedures.

If the intention is not to award (whether with or without an option to revise and resubmit or to award to another degree) the relevant committee must notify the student in writing of the intention, and:
(a) provide the student with de-identified copies of the examiners’ reports and the chair of examination’s recommendation and any written supervisor reports; and
(b) inform the student that they have
   (i) two weeks from the date of notification to state their intention to reply; and
   (ii) if the student has stated an intention to reply, six weeks from the date of notification to provide written comments to the relevant committee.

If the student provides comments within the specified time, the relevant committee will:
(a) further consider the examiners’ reports, the chair of examination’s report, and any comments provided by:
   (i) the student;
   (ii) the supervisor; and
   (iii) the head of school or postgraduate co-ordinator;
and
(b) confirm or revise its decision on the outcome of examination, consistently with clause 23 of the policy. The relevant committee will enact this decision in accordance with clauses 13, 14, 14A and 14B of these procedures.

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 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 examination of the thesis, the examiner-as-assessor must then consider:
   (a) de-identified copies of all examiners’ reports;
   (b) comments from the chair of examination;
   (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) response to the comments of the other parties.

(4) The chair of examination will consider the report of the examiner-as-assessor and provide a further report, including a recommendation regarding the outcome of the examination to the relevant committee.

(5) The relevant committee will then consider the examiner-as-assessor’s report and the chair of examination’s report in the manner required by clause 10 of these procedures.

13 Outcome of examination: award without qualification or with corrections

(1) If the outcome of an examination is that the degree be awarded without qualification, the relevant committee must:
   (a) set the latest date by which the final version of the thesis must be lodged with the University. The latest date will normally be three months from the date of notification of outcome of examination; and
   (b) notify the student in writing

(2) If the outcome of an examination is that the degree be awarded subject to corrections, the relevant committee must:
   (a) detail the corrections 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, 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.

(3) The chair of examination will review the final version of the thesis and either:
   (a) verify that the required corrections have been addressed to their satisfaction;
   or
   (b) notify the student in writing of the corrections required to be made and set the latest date by which the final version of the thesis must be lodged with the University.

(4) Where the student does not lodge the final version of the thesis by the set date, the Associate Dean 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: non-award with 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 relevant committee must:
   (a) outline the reasons for non-award;
(b) prescribe a maximum period of further candidature, normally one or two semesters;
(c) set the latest date for the student to resubmit their thesis for examination;
(d) set the date by which the student must re-enrol or apply for suspension of candidature consistently with subclause 14(3) of these procedures;
(e) detail the additional work or changes required;
(f) prescribe any other conditions that must be met by the student; and
(g) notify the student in writing within one week of the decision being made.

(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 Associate Dean must determine the result to be 'not awarded'.

(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 relevant 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.

(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.

(6) The HDR Examinations 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.

(7) No further opportunity to revise and resubmit the thesis is permitted as an outcome of the new examination.

**14A Outcome of examination: non-award with option to award another degree**

(8) If the outcome of an examination is that the degree not be awarded, but with the option to award another degree, the relevant committee must:

(a) outline the reasons for non-award;
(b) specify the other degree for which the student is eligible which may be awarded instead;
(c) detail any corrections required to be made to the final version of the thesis to the satisfaction of the chair of examination as per the process in subclauses 13(2), (3) and (4) of these procedures;
(d) set the latest date by which the final version of the thesis, including the corrections, must be lodged with the University. The latest date will normally be three months from the date of notification of outcome of examination; and
(e) notify the student in writing within one week of the decision being made.
14B Outcome of examination: non-award

(9) If the outcome of an examination is that the degree not be awarded, the relevant committee must:
   (a) outline the reasons for non-award; and
   (b) notify the student in writing within one week of the decision being made.

15 Communication with the student during examination process

(1) The administrative unit 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) the relevant committee is considering recommendations from examiners;
   (f) notification of the result of the examination;
   (g) awaiting comment from student regarding the result of the examination;
   (h) student to fulfil the conditions of the award, including lodgement in the University library;
   (i) student to re-enrol if required for a revise and resubmit outcome;
   (j) 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 administrative unit should provide the student with de-identified examiners reports:
   (a) as part of any consultation process with the student; and
   (b) at the notification of the result of the examination.

(4) Unless, in exceptional circumstances, the Dean or Associate Dean determine otherwise, the administrative unit will provide the student with the names of the examiners at the conclusion of the examination process.

PART 3: ORAL EXAMINATIONS

16 Conduct of oral examinations generally

(1) If an oral examination is to be held:
   (a) the supervisor must notify the examiners and student; and
   (b) the associate dean must appoint a chair of examination in accordance with clause 15A of the policy, noting that the chair of examination 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.

(6) 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.

(7) If one or more examiners do not submit their interim reports by the date required by subclause 16(6), the chair of examination 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.

(8) Unless local provisions prescribe otherwise, oral examinations should be between two to four hours duration.

(9) 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.

(10) 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.
(11) At the close of the oral examination, the chair of examination and examiners must meet in private to prepare a report and recommendation of the examination outcome.

(a) Only the chair of examination and examiners may attend this meeting. The head of school (if not the chair of examination) 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 chair of examination 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 or other conditions necessary for an award.

(12) 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.

(13) 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 chair of examination’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.

17 Role of the chair of examination in an oral examination

(1) The chair of examination is a representative of the faculty and has the following duties:

(a) to ensure that the examiners and student are informed of the arrangements for holding the oral examination;

(b) 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;

(c) 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;

(d) to assure the student that the examination is intended to be constructive and helpful;

(e) to explain the proceedings to the examiners and to the student;

(f) to chair the oral examination of the thesis, and any subsequent meeting of examiners;

(g) to provide a report to the relevant committee;
(h) to provide the head of school or postgraduate co-ordinator with the opportunity to append comments to the chair of examination’s report on the oral examination; and

(i) to inform the student about the examiners recommendations.

PART 4: JOINT AND COTUTELLE DEGREES

18 Examination of joint degrees and cotutelle degrees

(1) Where the examination of a joint or cotutelle degree is to be conducted by the partner institution:

(a) The faculty must notify the HDR Examinations 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 HDR Examinations 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.

(2) The award of the degree will be decided by the HDR Examinations Sub-Committee, in accordance with the policy, based on the notification from the partner institution.

(3) Where the examination of a joint or cotutelle degree is to be conducted by the University of Sydney, the relevant committee will be the HDR Examinations Sub-Committee.

(a) The examination will be conducted in accordance with the policy and these procedures.

(b) The faculty will notify the partner institution of the outcome of the examination in writing.

(4) Where a student enrolled in a joint or cotutelle degree subsequently transfers to a degree solely awarded by the University, the examination will be conducted according the policy and these procedures, but the HDR Examinations Sub-Committee may approve the use of any existing examiners’ reports in fulfilment of the applicable requirements.
PART 5: THESIS WITH PUBLICATIONS

19 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.

20 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.

21 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.
22 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

23 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) Where the examination of a creative work component includes a performance, installation or exhibition, the written component of the thesis should be provided to the examiners prior to the examination of the creative component.

(7) Where the examination of 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

24 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 required by the University addressed to the satisfaction of the chair of examination;

(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.


(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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This paper proposes amendments to the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research guidelines for examiners 2017 and the Higher Degrees by Research Examiner’s report on thesis to clarify language and help examiners in suggesting outcomes for examinations.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Graduate Studies Committee recommends that the Academic Board:

1. approve the proposed amendments to Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Guidelines for Examiners 2017
2. approve the proposed amendments to the Higher Degrees by Research Examiner’s Report on Thesis

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This paper proposes to streamline and improve the examination procedures for higher degrees by research by aiding examiners in deciding upon a recommendation. It does this by using language altered to differentiate more clearly between the recommendations of ‘corrections’ and ‘revise and resubmit’.

**BACKGROUND / CONTEXT**

The promulgation of the 2016 amendments in the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy and Procedures 2015 led to a reduction in the number of recommendations available to examiners. In particular, the previous ‘award subject to the making of minor corrections’ and ‘award subject to the making of emendations’ were collapsed into a single recommendation of ‘award subject to the making of corrections’. This was both previous outcomes were actually about the making of corrections. The distinction between ‘award subject to the making of minor corrections’ and ‘award subject to the making of emendations’ was based on an anachronistic delineation about whether a page needed to be re-typed or not.

**ISSUES**

In redrafting the guidelines as a consequence of change in policy (effective 1/1/2017), the language used did not sufficiently describe ‘award subject to the making of corrections’, as the language used was that of the previous ‘award subject to the making of minor corrections’. A examiner wanting to suggest a more severe outcome than ‘minor corrections’ was then forced to recommend a ‘revise and resubmit’ outcome. This has led to a greater number of ‘revise and resubmit’ decisions than would be expected (HDRAC, pers. observ.). The Director – Graduate Research, as owner of the Guidelines, has made changes to the Guidelines for the HDRexSC to consider. These changes have necessitated concomitant changes to the Examiners Report Form.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1: Draft amendments to Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Guidelines for Examiners 2017

Attachment 2: Draft amendments to the Higher Degrees by Research Examiner’s Report on Thesis
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Dated: 12 December 2014
Last amended: [this field remains blank until an amendment occurs]
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1 Introduction
(1) These guidelines have been developed to assist examiners when they are asked to examine a higher degree by research thesis. They will also assist examiners in reaching their conclusion regarding the outcome of the degree.
(2) These guidelines provide information about:
(a) Examining a thesis for the University of Sydney;
(b) Material sent to examiners;
(c) The examiner’s report;
(d) Examination requirements for thesis containing creative or artistic works;
(e) Examination requirements for oral examinations;
(f) Examination requirements for theses which include published works;
(g) Confidentiality and communication during the examinations; and;
(h) Recommendations regarding the outcome of the award.

2 Examining a thesis for the University of Sydney
(1) An examiner is required to assess a thesis presented for examination against the following criteria. The thesis must:
(a) be the student’s own work;
(b) embody the work undertaken by the student during their candidature;
(c) form a substantive original contribution to the area of knowledge concerned;
(d) afford evidence of originality by the discovery of new knowledge, and the exercising of independent critical ability;
(e) form a cohesive and united 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 both new and established knowledge;

(h) be written in a standard generally accepted to the discipline; and be written in English, unless it. However, if the student undertook their candidature in a language department of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, in which case it the thesis may be written in a language other than English.

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

(3) The thesis may contain:

(a) artistic or creative works, software, computer code, or models;

(b) material that has been published during candidature with the student as either sole or joint author.

Note: see Clauses 5 – 7 of these guidelines for specific information on the examination of theses containing creative or artistic works, or published materials.

(c) appendices.

(i) Appendices 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.

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

3 Material sent to examiners

(1) An examiner will be provided with the name and contact details of the relevant faculty administrative unit staff member. This is the person with whom the examiner should communicate during the examination process.

(2) An examiner will be sent the following:

(a) The thesis. This will generally be in electronic format. If an examiner does not have the technical facilities or does not wish to examine an electronic copy of the thesis, they may ask the faculty administrative unit to supply a paper copy.

(b) A form for reporting the result of the examination of the thesis to the University.

Note: All forms are available on the PhD Award Sub-Committee website at http://sydney.edu.au/ab/committees/PhD_award/phd_award_forms.shtml

(c) The Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015, the associated procedures and this document.

(d) The University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011, or

(e) For degrees other than the Ph.D, the relevant course resolutions for all other degrees which can be found in the applicable faculty handbooks.

(3) If an oral examination is planned, an examiner will be provided with details of the arrangements for the examination.
(4) If the thesis contains an artistic or creative component, an examiner will be provided with details of the exhibition, installation, performance or other components as required.

(5) An examiner will be provided with information about any specific conditions relating to the examination process.

(6) An examiner appointed as assessor will be provided with:

   (a) a copy of the thesis;

   (i) If the thesis contains a creative or artistic component, this will be provided as either a documentary recording or as an exhibition, installation or performance. The documentary recording will be of a standard sufficient for assessment purposes.

   (b) de-identified copies of all the examiners’ reports;

   (c) comments from the head of department/chair of examination;

   (d) comments from the supervisor and student (if received).

4 The examiner’s report

(1) An examiner must complete the examination of the thesis, and submit the report to the relevant faculty-administrative unit staff member, within six weeks of the receipt of the thesis.

(2) If an examiner feels that they are unable to examine a thesis, then they must return the thesis immediately to the relevant faculty-administrative unit staff member so that a replacement examiner can be appointed.

(3) If a report is not received within four weeks, the examiner will be contacted by the faculty-administrative unit to see if they will be able to complete their report within the required time frame.

   (a) If an examiner cannot meet this deadline, they must immediately return the thesis to the faculty-administrative unit so that another examiner can be appointed.

(4) In completing their report, an examiner must use the form provided by the University.

(5) The examiner’s report must be in English, except where the thesis is in a language other than English.

   (a) If the thesis is in a language other than English, the examiner should preferably write the report in English; however it may be provided in the language of the thesis.

   (b) If the examiner provides a report in a language other than English, then they must also submit a summary in English. This summary must be written so that reviewers can understand the key aspects of the report.

(6) The report must include:

   (a) a recommendation regarding the outcome of the award; and.

   Note: Recommended outcomes are found in Clause 10 of these guidelines.
(a)(b) a statement as to whether the examiner is satisfied that the thesis meets the required criteria as outlined in Clause 2 of these guidelines, and Clause 8 of the Policy.

(7) The report must specify:
   (a) the strengths and weaknesses of the thesis and the particular contribution made by the student;
   (b) the reasons for the recommendation;
   (c) a description of the types of minor corrections required, if any; and/or
   (d) a detailed list of any emendations required; or
   (e) a detailed list of recommended errors and deficiencies required to be corrected, when the recommendation is revise and resubmit; or
   (f) where appropriate, reasons for recommending that the degree not be awarded but be awarded for another degree for which the student is eligible; or
   (g) where appropriate, reasons for not awarding the degree;
   (h) suggestions for the next steps in research or improvements for publication that are not required for the award of the degree.

(8) If a thesis contains previously published work, in addition to the requirements in (4) and (5) above, the examiner must address the following in their report:
   (a) whether the thesis indicates that the student has made a substantial original contribution to the knowledge of the subject of the thesis;
   (b) whether the quality and extent of the student’s contribution to publications where there are multiple authors merits the award of the degree.

(9) The University considers all examiners’ reports and the provision of the detail listed in (6) – (8) above will assist the University in reaching a decision about the outcome of the examination.

(10) If an examiner does not return their report within ten weeks of the receipt of the thesis, they will be informed by the faculty-administrative unit that:
   (a) the report regrettably can no longer be accepted; and
   (b) another examiner will be appointed.

   Note: if they are an external examiner i.e. they do not have an affiliation with the University, they will not receive an honorarium be paid.

(11) If the outcome of the examination is revise and resubmit, the original examiners will normally be asked to re-examine the revised thesis. An examiner should indicate in their report whether they would be prepared to examine a revised thesis.

(12) The examination of a revised and resubmitted thesis is a new examination of the whole thesis, and must be carried out in accordance with the policy, procedures and these guidelines.
   (a) Examiners who examine a revised and resubmitted thesis are provided with a separate report form which does not provide the option of revise and resubmit.
5 Examination requirements for a thesis containing a creative or artistic component.

(1) If the thesis contains a creative or artistic component, the examiner’s report must relate to the whole thesis, including the creative or artistic component.

(2) An examiner will receive the written component of the thesis before the examination of the artistic or creative component. However, if the creative component were a recording or a set of scores or similar presentation, the examiner will receive both components at the same time.

(3) The artistic or creative work may be presented in the context of an exhibition, installation, performance or other context requiring in-person attendance.
   (a) An examiner is required to attend the examination of these types of creative components in person.
   (b) If in-person attendance is not possible, the examiner will be supplied with a documentary record of the exhibition, performance or installation.

(4) If an oral examination is held, an examiner may ask the student to discuss:
   (a) the contextualisation of their work, where the student presents the development of the thesis;
   (b) the creative or artistic component at the site of the exhibition;
   (c) the written component and related matters.

6 Examination requirements for oral examinations

(1) The faculty administrative unit will notify examiners if an oral examination is required.

(2) The purpose of an oral examination is to reduce the potential length of the examination process.

(3) When an examiner takes part in an oral examination, they should:
   (a) test the student’s understanding of the knowledge described in the thesis;
   (b) clarify points of principle or detail within the thesis;
   (c) assess the contribution made by the student to the contribution and presentation of the thesis.

(4) When an oral examination forms part of the examination process, the examiner will first be provided with a copy of the thesis. Based on the examination of the thesis, an examiner must provide an interim report at least seven days prior to the date of the oral examination. This interim report must include interim recommendations on the outcome.

(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.

(6) A convener of examination, who is a University of Sydney staff member, and not from the same department school as the student, will be appointed by the faculty. The convenor of examination chairs the examination and any subsequent meetings of examiners. The convenor of examination is not an examiner.
Note: See Clause 15A of the Policy and Clauses 16 and 17 of the Procedures.

An examiner must attend an oral examination in person, or by telephone, video, web or teleconference. Attendance in person is preferable.

When an oral examination has finished, the convenor and examiners must meet in a confidential session to prepare the examiners’ report and recommend an outcome.

(a) The convenor and the examiners are the only individuals who may attend this meeting. The University does not permit the head of department(school (if not the chair of examination), supervisor, or student to attend this meeting.

(b) The report prepared by the convenor chair of examination and examiners must be a single report, containing a consensus recommendation of the outcome of the examination.

In the event that the examiners fail to reach consensus regarding the outcome of the examination:

(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 chair of examination’s final report will be considered as if the examination had been a thesis-only examination.

7 Examination requirements for a thesis with publications

A thesis which contains previously published material must be assessed against the criteria set out in Clause 8 of the Policy and Clause 2(1) of these Guidelines.

Examiners are asked to note that the examination of a thesis with publications is a different process from the refereed assessment of material for publication. The fact that a thesis contains refereed publication does not necessarily imply that the thesis merits the award of the degree.

In examining a thesis with publications, an examiner must address the following:

(a) whether the thesis including previously published material indicates that the student has made a substantial 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.

8 Examiner-as-assessor

If an examiner is asked to act as examiner-as-assessor, they must complete an initial independent examination of, and report on, the thesis based on the criteria in Clause 2 of these guidelines and Clause 8 of the policy.

If the thesis contains an artistic or creative component, this will be provided either in the format in which it was originally examined or via a documentary recording of the original.

Once an examiner-as-assessor has completed the initial report, they must then consider:
(a) de-identified copies of all the examiners’ reports;
(b) comments from the head of department/chair of examination;
(c) comments from the supervisor (if received);
(d) comments from the student (if received);

and assess the validity of the concerns expressed about the work under examination.

(4) An examiner-as-assessor must provide the faculty-administrative unit with the following:
(a) an examiner’s report, including a recommendation about the outcome of the examination; and
(b) a report on the comments of the previous examiners, head of department, supervisor and student.

9 Confidentiality and communication during the examination

(1) The examination process is confidential.
(2) An examiner must not disclose the contents of the thesis, including any intellectual property contained in the thesis.
(3) An examiner will only use the thesis for the purpose of performing the examination.
(4) Where obliged by law, or by contract, the University may require an examiner to sign a confidentiality agreement.
(5) Examiners will not be informed about the names of other examiners of the thesis under examination except if required:
(a) by the use of an oral examination; or
(b) during the examination of a creative or artistic component of a thesis under requiring in-person attendance.
(6) Examiners must not correspond or communicate with other examiners regarding the examination of the thesis, except in discussion:
(a) at an oral examination; or
(b) at the examination of a creative or artistic component of a thesis.
(7) Communication between the examiner and the University should preferably occur with the notified contact person.
(8) Each examiner will submit an independent report. Examiners must not confer except as required by (6) above.
(9) Examiners must not ask any other individual to examine the material in the thesis on their behalf or to comment on it.
(10) An examiner’s report may be released to the student during or after the examination. Examiners will be informed that, under the Privacy Policy 2013 and the Privacy Management Plan, students have the right to access information about themselves, including their examination.
(11) University staff, including academic and professional staff, may contact an examiner to ascertain if progress of the report is delayed.
(12) If an examiner perceives that the student, or a person acting on behalf of the student, or a member of the University, is attempting to influence the outcome of the examination, they must report this to the identified faculty administrative unit contact.

(13) Examiners’ names will be provided to the student after the thesis has been submitted for examination.

(a) However, students will be informed that if the student, or any person acting on the student’s behalf, contacts an examiner during the examination about the examination, the examination will be discontinued.

(b) If a student, or a person acting on a student’s behalf, contacts an examiner about the examination during the examination process, the examiner must immediately inform the faculty administrative unit contact.

Note: It is possible that any or all of students, examiners and/or supervisors may meet, for example, at a conference or seminar. In this case, the thesis and examination must not be discussed but other communication or conversation is permitted.

(14) If a student has not submitted the thesis for examination three months after the examiners have been approved, the examiners will be contacted in writing by the faculty administrative unit to see if they are still willing to examine the thesis at a later date. Replacement examiners will be commissioned if the originally approved examiners are not able to examine the thesis at a later date.

(15) All examiners will be notified of the final outcome of the examination.

10 Recommendations regarding the outcome of the examination

(1) The student be awarded the degree without further conditions

(a) The thesis has fulfilled all of the criteria for a research thesis as listed in Clause 2 of these guidelines and does not require any corrections.

(b) The degree can be awarded without any further action required by the student.

(2) The student be awarded the degree subject to minor corrections of the thesis to the satisfaction of the University

(a) There are minor errors or omissions in the thesis, such as incorrect citations, omissions, or typographical errors which must be corrected, but which do not alter the conclusions of the thesis.

(b) If the examiner feels that the changes that need to be made are related more to the text than the research of the thesis, then award with minor corrections or award with emendations may be considered appropriate. Corrections may range in extent, this category includes minor and major corrections. Changes regarded as corrections do not require the student to undertake an additional period of research, and should not result in the conclusions of the thesis being significantly altered.

(b) Corrections may include:

(i) fixing errors or omissions in the thesis, such as incorrect citations, omissions, or typographical errors;

(ii) the addition or deletion of material in the text, tables, figures or appendices;
(iii) new or altered analyses of data, providing such analyses do not significantly alter the conclusions of the thesis;
(iv) updating of the literature review to incorporate more recent relevant publications;
(v) alterations in the structure of a chapter and some of its content;
(vi) explanation or clarification of certain questions raised by the examiner.

(b) The examiner must provide a detailed list of these corrections in Part D of the examiner’s report form.

(d) The degree can be awarded once these corrections have been addressed by the student to the satisfaction of the head of department.

Note: Changes as substantial as the addition, or re-writing, or a whole chapter, the provision of extra data, the possibility of altered conclusions, or the testing of conclusions, would normally be considered a revision requiring resubmission (see (3) below) and not corrections.

3. The student be awarded the degree subject to the emendations outlined in the examiner’s report

(a) Emendations include:
(i) the correction of errors or the addition or deletion of material in the text, tables, figures or appendices;
(ii) updating of the literature review to incorporate more recent relevant publications;
(iii) alterations in the structure of a chapter and some of its content; or
(iv) explanation or clarification as to certain questions raised by the examiner.

(b) Changes regarded as emendations do not require the student to undertake an additional period of research, and should not result in the conclusions of the thesis being significantly altered.

Note: Changes as substantial as the addition of, or re-writing a whole chapter, the provision of extra data, the possibility of altered conclusions, or the testing of conclusions, would normally be considered a revision requiring resubmission (see (4) below) and not emendations.

(c) If the examiner feels that the changes that need to be made are more related to the text than the research of the thesis, then award with minor corrections or award with emendations may be considered appropriate.

(d) The examiner must provide a detailed list of required emendations in Part D of the examiner’s report form.

(e) The degree can be awarded once all required emendations in the thesis have been addressed by the student to the satisfaction of the head of department.

4. The student not be awarded the degree, but be permitted to resubmit a revised thesis for examination following a further period of study

(a) Although the thesis may have redeeming features, in its current form it does not merit award. The thesis in its current form does not merit award, but does
have sufficient redeeming features to be reconsidered after further research and study.

(b) There are errors or deficiencies that, in the opinion of the examiner, substantially affect the argument or conclusion of the thesis.

(c) Deficiencies in the thesis may include, but are not limited to:

(i) the failure to include original data in the thesis;

(ii) inappropriate statistical analysis or incorrect or unsophisticated conclusions drawn from a statistical analysis significantly incorrect statistical analysis or erroneous or unsophisticated conclusions drawn from a statistical analysis;

(iii) missing or inaccessible data preventing the determination of sustainable conclusions;

(iv) inadequate experimental work;

(v) the necessity for new experimental work to be carried out.

Note: There may be practical issues preventing a student from being able to undertake more clinical or laboratory experimental work.

(d) The student demonstrates sufficient ability that, after an additional period of study, a thesis of the required standing may be achieved.

(e) The examiner is required to suggest an additional period of research, exclusive of the time required to re-write the thesis.

(f) The examiner is required to indicate whether they would be prepared to re-examine the revised thesis.

(g) The examiner must provide a detailed list of recommended errors and deficiencies that the student is required to address before the thesis can be re-examined in Part D of the examiner’s report form.

(h) This option is not available for a thesis that has already been revised and resubmitted for examination.

(5)(4) The student not be awarded a doctoral degree but be awarded another degree for which they are eligible.

(a) 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.

(b) The examiner must provide reasons for this recommendation in Part D of the examiner’s report form.

(c) The examiner must provide a detailed list of any errors or deficiencies that should be addressed before any degree can be awarded.

(6)(5) The student not be awarded the degree

(a) The thesis does not merit award of the degree; and does not demonstrate sufficient ability by the student for a resubmitted thesis to achieve this merit.

(i) The hypothesis and methods included in the thesis may be fatally flawed in their conception, design and execution.

(ii) The conclusions reached are not valid.
(iii) The thesis is not capable of being rectified by an additional period of study, experimental work or research work.

(iv) The thesis does not merit consideration for the award of another degree for which the student is eligible.

(b) The examiner must provide reasons for this recommendation in Part D of the examiner’s report form.

(c) Examiners are asked to note that, if the thesis contains a substantial amount of previously published material, then the recommendation of non-award may be questioned by the University’s PhD-Award Sub-Higher Degree by Research Examinations Sub-Committee.
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Higher Degrees by Research
Examiner’s report on thesis

Name of student: SID:
Faculty: Date of submission:
Title of thesis: Degree:

A CONTENT AND PRESENTATION OF THESIS
As described in Clause 8 of Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015, the thesis should:

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

B RECOMMENDATION
Please tick no more than one of the following recommendations:

1) The student be awarded the degree without further conditions

or

2) The student be awarded the degree subject to corrections of the thesis to the satisfaction of the University. Corrections may range in extent from ‘minor’ to ‘major’. Such corrections include errors or omissions in the thesis, such as incorrect citations, omission, or typographical errors, which must be corrected but which do not significantly alter the conclusions of the thesis. Corrections may also include additions or deletion of material in the text, tables, figures, or appendices. Changes should, in the opinion of the examiner, not require an additional period of research and should not result in the conclusions of the thesis being significantly altered. Corrections do not require the thesis to be returned to examiners, but can be adjudicated by the Chair of Examination.

or

3) The student not be awarded the degree, but be permitted to resubmit a revised thesis for examination following a further period of study. The thesis in its current form does not merit award. There are errors and/or deficiencies that, in the opinion of the examiner, substantially affect the argument or the conclusions of the thesis. Changes may include but are not limited to the provision of extra data or material. The student demonstrates sufficient ability that, after an additional period of study, a thesis of the required standard may be achieved. Following revision and resubmission, the thesis is re-examined.

I feel a further period of research extending over ... .... months would be necessary.

Please indicate whether you would be willing to re-examine a revised thesis if so invited... Yes No

Note: This option is not available for a thesis that has already been revised and resubmitted for examination.

or

4) The student not be awarded a doctoral degree but be awarded another degree for which they are eligible.

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.

or

5) The student not be awarded the degree.

The thesis does not merit award of the degree and does not demonstrate sufficient ability by the student for a resubmitted thesis to achieve this merit. For example, the hypothesis and methods may be fatally flawed, therefore rendering the conclusions completely invalid and not capable of being rectified by an additional period of study.

C RELEASE OF EXAMINER’S NAME AND COMMENTS TO THE STUDENT

Revised January 2017
I agree that the University may release my name and report to the student during or after the examination or as required by legislation. [In exceptional circumstances, the University may withhold information about the examiner]

Examiner name...............................................................................................................................   ................. Date

Signature........................................................................................................................................

D GROUNDS FOR RECOMMENDATION

Please complete the following sections. In cases where examiners are not unanimous in their recommendation, this information will form the basis of the decision made by the University on the award or non-award of the degree. Please note that the following boxes will expand according to the amount of text you type.

Is the content and presentation of the thesis consistent with the description in Section A of this form?

Yes……………. □   No……… □

Please state below the grounds on which you base your recommendation. You may also wish to provide suggestions for the next steps in research or improvements for publication that are not required for the award of the degree.

If your recommendation is for options 2 – 5, please provide detailed information relating to your recommendation in the appropriate box below. Only one section should be completed.

2) If the recommendation is to award with corrections, please list below the required corrections.

3) If the recommendation is for revision and resubmission of the thesis, please provide a detailed list of your recommended errors and deficiencies that the student is required to address before the thesis can be re-examined.

4) If the recommendation is for award to another degree, please provide the reasons for this recommendation.

5) If the recommendation is for non-award, please provide reasons for this recommendation.

Please attach additional pages if required

Thank you for completing this report. You will be informed of the outcome of the examination once a decision has been made by the University.

Revised January 2017
Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Sydney Medical School

Contact person: Dr Jim Manos
Coordinator of Infection and Immunity
T: +61 2 9351 8942
E: jim.manos@sydney.edu.au

1. **Name of award course**
   - Graduate Certificate in Infection and Immunity
   - Graduate Diploma in Infection and Immunity
   - Master of Medicine (Infection and Immunity)
   - Master of Science in Medicine (Infection and Immunity)

2. **Purpose of proposal**
   To amend course resolutions and the elective unit of study table, as outlined below.

3. **Details of amendment**
   The following changes are proposed:
   - To revise the resolutions for admission to the Graduate Certificate, so that all applicants must have a bachelor degree.
   - To clarify that admission to the Masters from either the Graduate Certificate or Diploma requires a credit average.
   - To clarify allowable credit from previous studies.
   - To remove the unit of study SEXH5202 (HIV) from the list of electives. The core unit INIM5002 (Virology and Cell Technology), taken by all infection and immunity students, covers much of the material provided in SEXH5202, resulting in unnecessary duplication for students that take the SEXH5202 elective. Current and future students will not be adversely affected by this change as there are a sufficient number of electives remaining for students to be able to complete the Masters.

4. **Transitional arrangements**
   These changes are proposed to take effect from 1 January 2018.

5. **Other relevant information**
   See attachment for proposed changes to resolutions and unit of study table.

6. **Signature of Dean**

   [Signature]

   Professor Arthur Conigrave
   Dean
Graduate Certificate in Infection and Immunity
Graduate Diploma in Infection and Immunity
Master of Medicine (Infection and Immunity)
Master of Science in Medicine (Infection and Immunity)

These resolutions must be read in conjunction with applicable University By-laws, Rules and policies including (but not limited to) the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014 (the 'Coursework Rule'), the Coursework Policy 2014, the Resolutions of the School, the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended), the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 and the Academic Honesty Procedures 2016. Up to date versions of all such documents are available from the Policy Register: http://sydney.edu.au/policies.

Course resolutions

1 Course codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course and stream title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCINFIMM-01</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Infection and Immunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNINFIMM-01</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Infection and Immunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMEINIM-01</td>
<td>Master of Medicine (Infection and Immunity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASMINIM-01</td>
<td>Master of Science in Medicine (Infection and Immunity)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Attendance pattern

The attendance pattern for this course is full time or part time according to candidate choice.

3 Master's type

The master's degrees in these resolutions are professional master's courses, 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 Infection and Immunity
(b) the Graduate Diploma in Infection and Immunity
(c) the Master of Medicine (Infection and Immunity); or
the Master of Science in Medicine (Infection and Immunity)

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

5 Admission to candidature

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

(2) Admission to the Graduate Certificate in Infection and Immunity requires:
- a medical degree from the University of Sydney or equivalent qualification;
- or a bachelor's degree in science, medical science, nursing, allied health, dentistry, veterinary science or agricultural science from the University of Sydney or equivalent qualification,
- or a minimum of 5 years professional work experience in a health-related field or pass a preliminary examination(s) as prescribed by the School.

(3) Admission to the Graduate Diploma in Infection and Immunity requires:
- completion of the requirements of the embedded graduate certificate, or equivalent qualification;
- or a medical degree from the University of Sydney or an equivalent qualification;
- or a bachelor's degree in science, medical science, nursing, allied health, dentistry, veterinary science or agricultural science from the University of Sydney or equivalent qualification.

(4) Admission to the Master of Medicine (Infection and Immunity) requires:
- a medical degree from the University of Sydney or an equivalent qualification.

(5) Admission to the Master of Science in Medicine (Infection and Immunity) requires:
- completion of the requirements of a credit average across all units of study in the embedded graduate certificate or graduate diploma, or equivalent qualification;
- or
a bachelor's degree with first or second class honours in science, medical science, nursing, allied health, dentistry, veterinary science or agricultural science form the University of Sydney or equivalent qualification;  
or  
a pass bachelor's degree from the University of Sydney, or equivalent qualification, and completion of a minimum of 12 months research or work experience in the field of infectious disease and immunology after the completion of the degree.

6 Requirements for award

(1) The units of study that may be taken for the course are set out in the Table of Units of Study: Infection and Immunity.

(2) To qualify for the award of the Graduate Certificate in Infection and Immunity a candidate must successfully complete 24 credit points of core units of study.

(3) To qualify for the award of the Graduate Diploma in Infection and Immunity a candidate must successfully complete 36 credit points, including:

(a) 24 credit points of core units of study; and

(b) 12 credit points of elective units of study.

(4) To qualify for the award of the Master of Medicine (Infection and Immunity) or Master of Science in Medicine (Infection and Immunity) a candidate must successfully complete 48 credit points, including:

(a) 24 credit points of core units of study; and

(b) 24 credit points of elective units of study.

7 Credit for previous studies

The maximum credit a candidate can receive for previous studies (not undertaken as a component of an embedded graduate certificate or graduate diploma) is not to exceed six credit points. Credit will only be awarded for units that are equivalent in content and level of study to that which they replace. Undergraduate degree units are not eligible for credit.

8 Transitional provisions

(1) These resolutions apply to persons who commenced their candidature after 1 January, 2018 and persons who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2018 who formally elect to proceed under these resolutions.

(2) Candidates who commenced prior to 1 January, 2018 and elect not to proceed under these resolutions will complete the requirements for their candidature in accordance with the resolutions and course rules in force at the time of their commencement, provided that those requirements are completed by 1 January 2020. The School may specify a later date for completion or specify alternative requirements for completion of candidatures that extend beyond this time.
Doctor of Veterinary Medicine

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

Course resolutions

1 Course codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAVETMED-01</td>
<td>Doctor of Veterinary Medicine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Attendance pattern
The attendance pattern for this course is full time.

3 Master's type
The master's degree in these resolutions is a professional master's course.

4 Admission to candidature
With approval from the Dean, available places will be offered to qualified applicants based on merit, according to the following admissions criteria:
(a) Admission to the degree requires a bachelor's degree from the University of Sydney, or equivalent qualification, and completion of one semester of study in general chemistry (physical and inorganic), organic chemistry, biology and biochemistry.
(b) Applicants must submit a veterinary science admission statement including relevant work experience and animal handling experience.
(c) English language requirements must be met where these are not demonstrated by sufficient qualifications taught in English.
(d) If some applicants are ranked equally according to the above criteria, the Faculty may further rank applicants according to the demonstration of their aptitude for the practice of veterinary medicine as assessed at an interview and make recommendations to the Dean for admission accordingly.

5 Requirements for award
(1) The units of study that may be taken for the course are set out in the table for the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine.
(2) To qualify for the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine a candidate must complete a prescribed program of 192 credit points, and:
(3) the prescribed extramural placements including:
   (a) 6 weeks of preparatory clinical placements and:
   (b) 12 weeks of farm placements

6 Progression rules
(1) Candidates for the degree may enrol in the units of study prescribed for Year 2 of candidature only after completion of Year 1.
(2) Candidates for the degree may enrol in the units of study prescribed for Year 3 of candidature only after completion of Year 1 and Year 2.
(3) Candidates for the degree may enrol in the units of study prescribed for the final year of candidature only after completion of Year 1, Year 2 and Year 3.

7 Reassessment
Students enrolled in a postgraduate unit of study prescribed for Year 1, Year 2, Year 3 or Year 4 of candidature of the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine, who fail one unit of study only within a semester may be offered the opportunity for re-assessment for the failed unit of study.
(a) The scope of the re-assessment will encompass all topics and learning outcomes within the unit of study. The methods used for re-assessment may differ from those used in the original delivery of the unit.
(b) Re-assessment will only be offered to eligible students on the dates prescribed in the year schedule, and it is the student’s responsibility to be available to attend at these times.
(c) The maximum mark awarded for a unit of study in these circumstances will be Pass (50 - PS for units of study with Mark and Grade assessment type or SR for units of study with Grade only (Pass/Fail) assessment type).
(d) Students who have been awarded an Absent Fail grade for a unit of study will not be eligible for re-assessment for that unit of study.

8 Award of the degree
The Doctor of Veterinary Medicine is awarded as a Pass degree only.
Master of Clinical Psychology

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

Course resolutions

1 Course codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course and stream title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MACLIPSY-01</td>
<td>Master of Clinical Psychology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Attendance pattern

The attendance pattern for this course is full-time or part-time. Both full-time and part-time students must follow a fixed timetable.

3 Admission to candidature

Available places will be offered to qualified applicants based on merit and interview, according to the following admissions criteria.

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 the degree of Bachelor of Psychology, Bachelor of Science (Honours), Bachelor of Arts (Honours), Bachelor of Economics (Social Sciences)(Honours) or Bachelor of Liberal Studies (Honours) from the University of Sydney with First Class Honours or Second Class Honours Division 1 in Psychology; and
   (b) satisfy the Head of the School of Psychology of his or her personal suitability for the practice of clinical psychology, as determined by 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 Dean or Associate Dean, are equivalent to those prescribed in sub-clause (1).

3. An applicant for admission to candidature must submit to the Faculty:
   (a) satisfactory evidence of the applicant's eligibility for admission; and
   (b) two referees' reports (two academic or one academic and one work experience related), as required by the Head of the School of Psychology.

4. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander applicants who wish to be considered for admission under the Cadigal program must additionally apply through the University's Koori Centre. Eligible applicants may be given priority for interviews.

4 Requirements for award

1. The units of study that may be taken for the Master of Clinical Psychology are set out in the table of units of study for the Master of Clinical Psychology course.

2. To qualify for the award of the degree of Master of Clinical Psychology, a candidate must:
   (a) complete 96 credit points of units of study as set out in the table of units of study; and
   (b) complete clinical placements as prescribed by the Head of School; and
   (c) conduct a research project on an approved topic.

5 Cross-institutional study

Cross-institutional study is not available in this course.

6 Course transfer

The Master of Clinical Psychology is completed as a stand-alone course. No transfer from the Master of Clinical Psychology to the Master of Clinical Psychology / Doctor of Philosophy is allowed.

7 Credit for previous study

1. Credit transfer for the Master of Clinical Psychology component is subject to the provisions of the Coursework Rule and the Resolutions of the Faculty of Science, except that:
   (a) no more than 48 credit points may be credited; and
   (b) the coursework must have been completed no more than three years prior to first enrolment in this course and not have been counted towards another award.

8 Time limits

Except with the permission of the Dean or Associate Dean, a candidate will complete the requirements for the Master of Clinical Psychology degree:

1. within a minimum period of four semesters and a maximum period of twelve semesters for full-time study; or
2. within a minimum period of eight semesters and a maximum period of twelve semesters for part-time study; and
3. within six calendar years of admission to candidature.

9 Progression rules

1. Candidates for the award course must satisfactorily complete all units of study
2. Candidates who fail to satisfactorily complete a practicum unit of study at the first attempt can, following remediation, make a second attempt at completing a practicum unit of study.
(3) Candidates who fail to satisfactorily complete two practicum units of study will be deemed to fail to meet progression requirements and may be asked to show good cause why they should be permitted to re-enrol in the award course.

(4) Coursework and research units of study will be dealt with under the Progression rules of the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014.

10 Transitional provisions

(1) These resolutions apply to persons who commenced their candidature after 1 January, 2018 and persons who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2018 who elect to proceed under these resolutions.

(2) Candidates who commenced prior to 1 January, 2018 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, or later date as the faculty may, in special circumstances, approve.
Master of Clinical Psychology and Doctor of Philosophy

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

In respect of the Master of Clinical Psychology component of the double degree, these resolutions must be read in conjunction with the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2000 and the Resolutions of the Faculty of Science.

In respect of the Doctor of Philosophy component of the double degree, these resolutions must be read in conjunction with the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011.

Course resolutions

1 Course codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course and stream title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MACLPPHD-01 / RPPHDSCI-04</td>
<td>Master of Clinical Psychology and Doctor of Philosophy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Attendance pattern

The attendance pattern for this course is full-time or part-time. Both full-time and part-time students must follow a fixed timetable in the Master of Clinical Psychology component of the double degree.

3 Admission to candidature

Available places will be offered to qualified applicants based on merit and interview, according to the following admissions criteria.

(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 the degree of Bachelor of Psychology, Bachelor of Science (Honours), Bachelor of Arts (Honours), Bachelor of Economics (Social Sciences)/(Honours) or Bachelor of Liberal Studies (Honours) from the University of Sydney with First Class Honours or Second Class Honours Division 1 in Psychology; and
   (b) satisfy the Head of the School of Psychology of his or her personal suitability for the practice of clinical psychology, as determined by 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 Dean or Associate Dean, are equivalent to those prescribed in sub-clause (1).

(3) An applicant for admission to candidature must submit to the Faculty:
   (a) satisfactory evidence of the applicant's eligibility for admission; and
   (b) two academic referees' reports, as required by the Head of the School of Psychology.

(4) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander applicants who wish to be considered for admission under the Cadigal Program must additionally apply through the University's Koori Centre. Eligible applicants may be given priority in ranking.

(5) The admission requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy must also be satisfied.

4 Requirements for award

(1) The units of study that may be taken for the Master of Clinical Psychology are set out in the table of units of study for the Master of Clinical Psychology course.

(2) To qualify for the award of the degree of Master of Clinical Psychology, a candidate must:
   (a) complete 96 credit points of units of study as set out in the table of units of study; and
   (b) complete clinical placements as prescribed by the Head of School; and
   (c) conduct a research project on an approved topic.

(3) The candidate must also satisfy the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy.

5 Cross-institutional study

Cross-institutional study is not available in this course.

6 Course transfer

(1) A candidate in the Master of Clinical Psychology and Doctor of Philosophy double degree may abandon the Master of Clinical Psychology component and continue in the Doctor of Philosophy.

(2) A candidate in the Master of Clinical Psychology and Doctor of Philosophy double degree may abandon the Doctor of Philosophy and transfer into the Master of Clinical Psychology standalone degree course.

7 Credit for previous study

(1) Credit for the Master of Clinical Psychology component is subject to the provisions of the Coursework Rule and the Resolutions of the Faculty of Science, except that:
   (a) no more than 48 credit points may be credited; and
   (b) the coursework should have been completed no more than three years prior to first enrolment in this course and not have been counted towards another award.

(2) Credit transfer for the Doctor of Philosophy component is subject to the provisions of the Doctor of Philosophy course resolutions relating to the degree of Master of Science and the HDR Rule.
8 Time limits
Except with the permission of the Dean or Associate Dean, a candidate will complete the requirements for the Master of Clinical Psychology component of the double degree:
(1) within a minimum period of six semesters and a maximum period of twelve semesters for full-time study; or
(2) within a minimum period of eight semesters and a maximum period of twelve semesters for part-time study; and
(2) within six calendar years of admission to candidacy.

9 Progression rules
(1) Candidates for the award course must satisfactorily complete all units of study
(2) Candidates who fail to satisfactorily complete a practicum unit of study at the first attempt can, following remediation, make a second attempt at completing a practicum unit of study.
(3) Candidates who fail to satisfactorily complete two practicum units of study will be deemed to fail to meet progression requirements and may be asked to show good cause why they should be permitted to re-enrol in the award course.
(4) Coursework and research units of study will be dealt with under the Progression rules of the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014.

10 Transitional provisions
(1) These resolutions apply to persons who commenced their candidature after 1 January, 2017 and persons who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2017 who elect to proceed under these resolutions.
(2) Candidates who commenced prior to 1 January, 2017 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, or later date as the faculty may, in special circumstances, approve.
Confidential OR Non-Confidential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Ms Veronica Boulton, Faculty of Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer/Approver</td>
<td>Professor Trevor Hambley, Dean of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper title</td>
<td>Master of Nutrition and Dietetics (MND) Minor Amendment to Course Resolutions Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>In plain language, provide the purpose of the submission (do not use acronyms, abbreviations or technical language). Content should be 1-2 sentences in length.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To advise the Graduate Studies Committee and the Academic Board of amendments required to the Master of Nutrition and Dietetics resolutions in the section “Admission to Candidature”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

That the Undergraduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board:

1. approve the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the Master of Nutrition and Dietetics; and
2. approve the amendment of the course resolutions arising from the proposal with effect from 1 January 2018.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The proposal is to amend the resolutions of the MND to add ‘12 credit points of pre-requisite units of study in junior human biology or equivalent’ under the Admission to Candidature heading. This will ensure that students have successfully completed all the pre-requisite units of study prior to entering the accredited MND program.

The Resolutions have been amended as follows:

- Inclusion of the following statement under “Admission to candidature” 4 (2) (b) ‘12 credit points of junior human biology, or equivalent; and’
- Updated dates in Transitional provisions

IMPLEMENTATION

The revisions as noted in Transitional Provisions are applicable for students commencing the MND in 2021. The Resolutions have been updated in order to inform the students of the new Biology admission requirements. Sydney courses has also been updated to reflect 2018 and 2021 requirements.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Master of Nutrition and Dietetics minor course amendment proposal
2. Amended course resolutions for MND
Minor Course Amendment Proposal

Faculty: Science

Contact person: Anna Rangan, Course coordinator Master of Nutrition and Dietetics

1. Name of award course
MANUTDIE-01 Master of Nutrition and Dietetics

2. Purpose of proposal

To amend the course resolutions for the MND degree to add:
- 12 credit points of pre-requisite units of study in junior **human biology** or equivalent.

Currently the course resolutions state
‘12 credit points of junior biology, or equivalent’; and do not stipulate **human biology**.

This will ensure that students have successfully completed all the pre-requisite units of study prior to entering the accredited MND program.

The new draft accreditation standards from the Dietitians Association of Australia released in January 2017 outline the minimum requirements for the undergraduate degree (see in italics below):

*Accreditation Standard 4 Curriculum:*
4.3 The award of a dietetic qualification at any level must enable the student to demonstrate learning in Human Biosciences and Food and Nutrition Science as described below:
a. Biochemistry content with Chemistry (0.25 EFTSL) followed by Biochemistry (0.25 EFTSL); b. **Human Physiology content with Human Biology (0.25 EFTSL)** followed by Human Physiology (0.25 EFTSL); and
c. Food and Nutrition Science content (0.25 EFTSL) that appropriately scaffolds to final integrated assessment against the NCS.

The human biology units of study underpin the intermediate physiology units of study (current prerequisites) in the undergraduate degree.

3. Details of amendment

Currently, first year pre-requisites in biology do not stipulate Human Biology.

Examples of human biology choices include:
BIOL1003 Human Biology
BIOL1007 From molecules to ecosystems
Or equivalent

See attached resolutions.

Webpage to be updated: ‘for future students’

4. Transitional arrangements

These amended pre-requisites will be applied to the MND program in 2021. This will allow prospective students from 2018 onwards to choose the required junior biology units in their first year of the Bachelor of Science and enable smooth progression to the MND program.

5. Other relevant information

6. Signature of Dean

Deputy Head of School - Madeleine Beekman

Digitally signed by Deputy Head of School - Madeleine Beekman.
Date: 2017/03/27 15:23:53 -11'00'

Prof T W Hambley
Dean, Faculty of Science
Master of Nutrition and Dietetics

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

Course resolutions

1 Course codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANUTDI-01</td>
<td>Master of Nutrition and Dietetics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Attendance pattern

The attendance pattern for this course is full time only.

3 Master's type

The master's degree in these resolutions is a professional master's course.

4 Admission to candidature

(1) With approval from the Dean, available places will be offered to qualified applicants based on merit, according to the following admissions criteria:
(2) Admission to the degree requires a Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Sydney, or equivalent qualification, with at least an average result of Credit. The degree must include successful completion within the last 10 years of:
   (a) 12 credit points of junior chemistry, or equivalent; and
   (b) 12 credit points of junior human biology, or equivalent; and
   (c) 12 credit points of intermediate or senior level Biochemistry and/or Molecular Biology, or equivalent; and
   (d) 12 credit points of intermediate or senior level Human Physiology, or equivalent; and
   (e) 6 credit points of intermediate or senior level Nutrition Science, or equivalent.

5 Requirements for award

(1) The units of study that may be taken for the course are set out in the table for the Master of Nutrition and Dietetics.
(2) To qualify for the Master of Nutrition and Dietetics a candidate must complete a prescribed program of 96 credit points, including:
   (a) 48 credit points of first year units of study; and
   (b) 24 credit points being the dietetics training placement; and
   (c) 24 credit points being the Nutrition Research Project.

6 Satisfactory progress

Successful completion of the training placement is a requirement of this course. Candidates who fail the training placement once will be identified as not meeting academic progression requirements and become subject to the Progression provisions of the Coursework Rule. Candidates who fail the training placement a second time will be permanently excluded from the course if they cannot show cause. Any further failures in the training placement will result in automatic and permanent exclusion from the course.

7 Transitional provisions

(1) These resolutions apply to persons who commenced their candidature after 1 January, 2021 and persons who commenced their candidature prior to 1 January, 2021 who elect to proceed under these resolutions.
(2) Candidates who commenced prior to 1 January, 2021 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, 2026, or later date as the faculty may, in special circumstances, approve.
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**RECOMMENDATION**

*That the Graduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board:*

1. approve the proposal from the DVC Education Portfolio to amend the procedure for the implementation of R to the award of HDR scholarships.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In response to a request from the Graduate Studies Committee of Academic Board, the Scholarships Framework working group reformed to consider implementation refinements. The new description of the process will enable an effective implementation of the intent described in the paper approved by Academic Board in 2016.

This new process will assist us in delivering a modest alignment of our HDR student recruitment with strategic research priorities.

**BACKGROUND / CONTEXT**

The University’s Strategic Plan clearly articulates the need for the institution to recruit and retain the best quality HDR students and researchers (Strategy 2, Initiative 2). By explicitly coupling the quality of research students with the University’s research priorities, we can align these two key elements of the research strategy. Such alignment will support a full and thriving research ecosystem in areas of strategic priority, and such ecosystems are outstanding environments for research education. This led to a new scholarship distribution model that was approved by Academic Board in November 2016 following extensive and comprehensive consultation. The implementation of the scheme has proved challenging and some modification of the scheme is required.

**ISSUES**

The new scholarships distribution model was approved by Academic Board in November 2016 and put into action in the start of 2017. As the HDR Scholarships Sub-Committee HDRSSC (Academic Board, Graduate Studies) and Scholarships Office (DVC Registrar Portfolio) attempted to implement the scheme, they identified challenges in the process that meant the award of scholarships under the thematic model was not possible; this resulted in a request from the HDRSSC to suspend ranking of applicants under the thematic scheme until such time as clarifying guidance could be provided. This request was approved by the Graduate
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Studies Committee GSC, and the GSC’s decision was subsequently endorsed by Academic Board in April 2017.

The key issues were

1. The paper approved by academic board in 2016 proposed an additional procedure for identifying prospective students and projects for support under the thematic award. This ‘investigator-led’ process is not appropriate for some disciplines where the research topic for an HDR project is defined by the student not the academic. Furthermore, the proposed mechanism may have created a duplication of process, leading to unnecessary demands on staff time and also leading to confusion among applicants in respect of having to provide the same information twice. This latter problem was counter to the key driver of simplifying and speeding up applications from the students we want to recruit.

Solution: The aim of the process was to encourage staff to seek out the best students and encourage them to apply to Sydney. This aim can be achieved without a complicated process, by Associate Deans and research leaders supporting prospective supervisors to be more proactive. Therefore, the existing application process is sufficient.

2. The original proposal suggested a supervisor’s membership of an approved research centre was sufficient to be considered an eligibility criterion for an applicant to be considered for a thematic award. The Scholarships office were supplied with an inaccurate list of centres and this made it impossible to disentangle strategic priority research institutes, as articulated in the strategic plan, from normal faculty activity.

Solution: The requirement for the strategically aligned thematic awards was to align HDR scholarship activity with the strategic priority research institutes of the University. These key, multidisciplinary research institutes are named in the Strategic Plan 2016-20 and so calling out membership of these ten institutes and centres will fulfil the aim of aligning scholarship distribution with the strategic plan and also simplify the process of determining eligibility for a thematic award.

3. The fit to faculty research priorities was supposedly determined by the faculty research compacts. Whilst faculty research priorities form the basis of the compact process, the priorities are not necessarily articulated in the final document. Moreover, because faculty compacts often name specific staff or research groups as priorities for investment, then the final research compact is treated as confidential and so not available to the HDRSSC for the purposes of ranking students. Additionally, the approved proposal placed the faculty research compact as having higher priority for determining R, than research excellence as measured by the Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) score. A field of research ranked 5 in ERA would automatically be an area of strategic priority for a faculty, thus should be more important. The strategic plan 2016-2020 clearly articulated that investment in research excellence should be targeted at ‘true research strength’; it can be argued that ERA 4 is not ‘research strength’ and so would not justify investment under research excellence.

Solution: Remove the faculty compact list as an eligibility criterion. This means the eligibility for an applicant to get an uplift (R) in their scholarship ranking score will be determined by their supervisor being either a member of a multidisciplinary research institute or whose research outputs are strongly associated with an field of research ranked as ERA 5.

MODIFIED FRAMEWORK

The HDR Scholarships Framework Working Group proposes the following model:

Applicants with a score greater than the level deemed to be ‘outstanding’ (P) will be offered a scholarship.

The committee is reminded that the processes described below refer only to scholarship awards; students will only make one application for scholarships and admission but the admission process is separate to the
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distribution of scholarships. Admission processes and activities are not considered here. The mechanism for distributing these scholarships is as follows

**Process for Distributing and Awarding Scholarships under the Open Model:**

1. This has not changed, so will not be discussed here.

**Mechanisms for Distribution and Awarding of Scholarships under the Thematic- Research Strategy Aligned model:**

1. Academic may offer a project suitable for a PhD student in a strategically aligned discipline area (see (2a) below, noting that some disciplines rely on student-generated project ideas rather than projects developed by staff.
2. Academic identifies talent and encourages applications by excellent applicants with a likelihood of getting a scholarship
3. Prospective PhD student makes a single application as per normal procedures
4. Scholarships office does eligibility check (using data provided by Research Reporting, Analysis, Data and Systems (RRADS) in the Research Portfolio)
   a. Is the proposed supervisor a member of a multidisciplinary research institute as identified in the strategic plan, namely Charles Perkins Centre, Brain and Mind Centre, Australian Institute for Nanoscale Science and Technology, the China Studies Centre, the Centre for Translational Data Science, the Sydney Environment Institute, Sydney Southeast Asia Centre and the Sydney Policy Lab? The list of membership will be supplied by the research portfolio and updated quarterly.
   b. Are the proposed supervisor’s research outputs strongly aligned with an ERA 5 ranked FoR code based on the determination by RRADS?
5. If eligibility check passed, Scholarships Office ranks student and applies research accelerator quantum \( R \) to the ranking score producing using the standard ranking methods developed by the HDRSSC. If this new score lifts student into Outstanding band (greater than \( P \)), the applicant is offered a scholarship as soon as the HDRSSC can review the award. Note that as above, this procedure would be applied to students yet to finish their degree (ranking scores based on predicted values) as well as to those whose results are known. The same caveat applies, that if students do not meet the conditions of the offer, then the scholarship offer is withdrawn.
6. If the addition of \( R \) does not lift the application to the outstanding band, then the application is allocated to the quarterly standard review meetings of HDRSSC. Such ranking will be done with \( R \) still included, unless the total number of scholarships awarded under this scheme would exceed 20% of total scholarship provision

All students with a ranking score greater than \( P \) should be awarded a scholarship as soon as practicable. The remaining applicants with a score between \( P \) and \( Q \) will be considered in order of their ranking scores, inclusive of the \( R \) uplift if applied, at quarterly review meetings of the HDR Scholarships Sub-Committee, where the top slice of that ranked list will be offered a scholarship.

In any one year, a maximum of 20% of applicants that would not otherwise have been offered a scholarship will be offered a scholarship due to the addition of the \( R \) uplift. Should the 20% be reached prior to the end of the admission period for any academic year, no further scholarships will be offered on this basis.

Note that the new procedures do not require a student to be in receipt of an unconditional offer of admission before a scholarship can be awarded. This scheme will also apply to situations where an applicant has not yet finished their degree, and performance is evaluated on the basis of expected marks issued by the awarding University. The Scholarships Office will make conditional scholarship offers subject to a subsequent offer of admission.

If the applicant does not accept the offer and secure admission before a given deadline, then the scholarship offer would lapse. That unused scholarship will then return to the available pool at the next review meeting.
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This version approved by HDR Scholarships Sub-Committee, UE-Research Committee and UE-Research Education Committee

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

This proposal operates within the current funding pool available for HDR scholarships, and requests no additional funding.

RISKS / BENEFITS

Benefits
1. Allows the university to implement its stated desire to align 20% of centrally awarded scholarships with areas of true research strength and strategic priorities.

Risks
1. A failure to make the scheme workable will mean we cannot deliver centrally allocated scholarships aligned to research excellence.

IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation will be delivered by the HDRSC and the Scholarships office. Note that each of these stakeholders were members of the working committee. Accordingly, each have commenced scoping out of changes needed to practice, processes and meeting schedules. This includes changes to Sydney Student/SITS to improve capture of relevant data.
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<td>This report summarises for the Academic Board the business of the meeting of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee held on 8 August 2017</td>
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**RECOMMENDATION**

*That the Academic Board note the report from the meeting of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee held on 8 August 2017; and*

1. approve the amendment of the Assessment Procedures 2011, and approve the adoption of the amended policy, with effect from 12 September 2017 (for Semester 2 examinations);
2. approve amendments to the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015, and recommend to the Vice-Chancellor the rescission of the Guidelines for Inter-Institutional Agreements 1997, as presented;
3. reaffirm its approval and endorsement of the Charter of Academic Freedom and its commitment to the University's values of courage and creativity, respect and integrity, inclusion and diversity and openness and engagement;
4. note the Election Candidates' Conduct Procedures 2017, as presented; and
5. note the 2016 Consolidated Summary of the Student Experience and Graduate Outcomes report.

**ITEMS FOR DECISION**

10.1 Assessment Procedures 2011 – Amendments

Amendments are proposed to the Assessment Procedures 2011, arising from a student-led working group on Special Consideration relating to replacement examinations. The amendments also incorporate changes regarding Disability Services and the centralisation of examinations administration.

The Committee endorsed this proposal for presentation to the Academic Board for approval.

10.2 Higher Education Standards Framework and University Policy

Following an audit earlier this year, gaps have been identified in the University's compliance with the Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF), especially relating to third party agreements and the qualifications of teaching staff. A suite of policy amendments was discussed at the meeting, and it was agreed to recommend the amendment of the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015, and to recommend to the Vice-Chancellor the rescission of the outdated Guidelines for Inter-Institutional Agreements 1997.

The committee endorsed this proposal for presentation to the Academic Board for approval.

10.3 Charter of Academic Freedom

It has been ten years since the Charter of Academic Freedom was endorsed by the Academic Board and Senate, and in light of recent bullying and death threats directed at several members of staff arising from their academic activities, it is timely to reaffirm the Academic Board’s commitment to academic freedom and the University's values of courage and creativity, respect and integrity, inclusion and diversity and openness and engagement.

If the Academic Board is comfortable to confirm its ongoing commitment to the Charter, Associate Professor Masters undertook to communicate that commitment to Senate at a future meeting.
ITEMS FOR NOTING

10.4 Election Candidates’ Conduct Procedures 2017

The Committee discussed the proposed Procedures and made a number of editorial comments, which have been incorporated into the attached document. The Academic Board is asked to note the Election Candidates’ Conduct Procedures 2017, the adoption of which is to be authorized by the Secretary to Senate.

10.5 2016 Consolidated Summary of the Student Experience and Graduate Outcomes

The committee was advised that the University has met KPI 2 but has not reached KPIs 1 and 3 relating to the student experience and graduate outcomes. It is of ongoing concern that considerable challenges remain in student support and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) intend to convene a group to investigate this. Challenges are also identified regarding learning resources and teaching quality, and although employability of undergraduate students is positive, international postgraduate students report dissatisfaction in this regard. An International Student Taskforce, chaired by Professor Greg Whitwell (Dean of the University of Sydney Business School), has been set up to further explore this. Positive feedback has been provided regarding clarity of assessment, and indicators confirm that there is a correlation between the assessment of graduate qualities and learning outcomes, which will continue to be further refined.

The Committee also:
- noted the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 25 July 2017; and
- discussed the paper Towards a University-wide Approach to Assessing the Graduate Qualities, presented by the Director, Educational Strategy.

Full agenda papers are available from the Academic Standards and Policy Committee website, at sydney.edu.au/secretariat/pdfs/academic-board-committees/academic-standards/2017/20170808-ASPC-Agenda-Pack.pdf.

Professor Jane Hanrahan
Chair, Academic Standards and Policy Committee
1 Purpose and application

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

(b) These procedures apply to:

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

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

2 Commencement

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

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

3 Interpretation

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

Note: See clause 5 of the policy.

(2) In these procedures:

academic unit means a faculty, University school, board of studies, school, department, centre or interdisciplinary committee of the University.

assessment rubrics means marking guides that state the criteria against which an assessment will be marked.

eexamination means the final examination of a unit of study, which is held during the formal examination period.
Examinations Office means the University administrative unit responsible for the management of all examinations held during the formal examination period.

formal examination period means weeks 15 and 16 of each semester.

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

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

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

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

Note: See also the University Recordkeeping Manual.

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

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

Note: See clause 7.

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

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

4 Application of implementation statements to assessment principles

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

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

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

(1) Standards or levels of expected performance should be described for assessment tasks in sufficient detail that students can improve the quality of their work.
2 Standards should typically be defined in the context of the discipline, course or level of the unit.

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

Note: See also the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6 Informing students – Principles 1 and 2

1 The scope and nature of the assessment for each unit of study should be explicitly stated in the unit of study outline and published no later than one week prior to the commencement of the semester or teaching period in which the unit is offered. This statement should include:

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

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

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

(c) an assessment table, with:

(i) the weighting of items and of tasks or papers;
(ii) the due date for submission or testing;
(iii) the conditions under which examinations will be sat;

(d) the conditions for extensions of time (if any); and
(e) the penalties for lateness or violation of assessment specifications (e.g. length).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 Marking and determination of grades – Principles 2 and 3

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

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

Note: See Learning and Teaching Policy 2015.

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

(4) In the interests of transparency of grading the University uses a standards-based approach to assessing the achievements of students.

(a) In this approach, grades are allocated using pre-determined standards. Students' grades are not determined in relation to predetermined distributions.

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

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

(b) If samples involve examples of real students' work, then a copy of the signed permission of the student author must be kept for as long as the example is used for this purpose.
(c) When it is not possible to provide samples of work, a suitable description of the task and expected standards associated with different levels of achievement should be provided.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8 Conduct of examinations - Principles 1 to 4

(1) The principal examiner is responsible for:

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

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

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

(d) accounting for all secure papers.

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

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

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

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

(6) In relation to all examinations, the Examinations Office is responsible for:
(a) managing examination venue bookings;
(b) security protocol and printing examination papers;
(c) retaining final examination papers in the University archives;
(d) scheduling examinations generally;
(e) scheduling examinations in postgraduate coursework units of study, as far as practicable, at times consistent with class times and
(f) recruiting and training examination invigilators

(7) All examinations must be of one of the following durations:
   (a) 1 hour;
   (b) 1.5 hours;
   (c) 2 hours;
   (d) 2.5 hours; or
   (e) 3 hours.

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

(9) All examinations must be invigilated by University trained invigilators.

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

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

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

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

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

(15) The week after the end of teaching in each semester will be a study break (Stu-Vac, week 14) with the formal examination period to commence the following week, week 15.

(16) Principal examiners seeking to directly administer written examinations without the involvement of the Examinations Office must obtain the Registrar’s written permission to do so each year. Such requests must:
   (a) set out the reason why the examination cannot be administered by the Examinations Office; and
   (b) detail the arrangements for secure printing and storage of examination papers.

(17) In relation to written examinations administered other than by the Examinations Office, the principal examiner is responsible for:
(a) providing the Examinations Office with all necessary information to schedule the examination, within the timeframes specified by the Examinations Office;
(b) arranging the Examinations Office to book an appropriate examination venue;
(c) arranging secure printing and storage of examination papers;
(d) providing a copy of the final examination paper to the Examinations office for retention in the University archives; and
(e) arranging for invigilation of the examination by University trained invigilators.

9 Security of examination papers - Principles 1 to 4

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

10 Emergency evacuations during examinations - Principles 1 to 4

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

(a) should make a note of the time at which the examination is stopped;
(b) should adhere to the instructions of precinct officers or security staff;
(c) if time permits, should attempt to contact the Examinations Office to inform them of the evacuation.
(2) Precinct officers and or security staff will direct students and invigilators to an appropriate area, where they must await further information. Unless otherwise instructed by precinct officers or security staff, students must remain in the immediate vicinity.

(3) Examination invigilators should inform students that, until otherwise instructed, there must be no communication between them and that the use of mobile phones or other communication devices, is not permitted except in exceptional circumstances and under strict supervision.

(4) If, after 20 minutes have elapsed from the time of evacuation, a student's circumstances require them to make electronic contact (for example, to telephone someone for whom they have carer’s responsibilities or to an employer so as to ensure their employment is not adversely affected), the student may make a communication which is:

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

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

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

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

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

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

(8) The examination will be deemed to have been abandoned if:

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

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

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

(11) When an examination is abandoned, students’ work (such as answer booklets or computer answer sheets) is deemed null and void for the purposes of marking.
(12) After an examination has been abandoned, the Examinations Office will consult with the examiners and departments concerned and make arrangements for the affected students to re-sit the examination(s) as soon as possible.

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

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

(15) Serious incidents affecting more than one examination location should be assessed immediately by the Registrar who should obtain the advice of the Campus Security Unit, the Examinations Office and the director of the Student Centre.

(a) The Registrar should determine as soon as possible whether some examinations may proceed or the entire examination session should be postponed.

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

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

11 Use of handheld computing devices in examinations - Principle 3

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

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

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

(a) A copy of this list must be provided to:

(i) students sitting examinations which permit use of non-programmable calculators;

(ii) principal examiners who specify that non-programmable calculators may be used by candidates for their papers; and

(iii) examination invigilators.

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

(4) Students who own a non-programmable calculator which they wish to use in an appropriate examination may take the unit to the Examinations Office for approval, where the unit will be marked indelibly if it is approved for use.
12 Accessible examination and assessment arrangements - Principle 3

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note: See schedule 3 of these procedures.
13 Special arrangements for assessment or examinations - Principle 3

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

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

(3) A student seeking special arrangements for assessment or examination should make a request:

(a) in the case of religious commitments that might have an impact on the types of assessment or examination they can undertake, at the date of commencement of semester; and

(b) in the case of other types of commitment, as soon as the student becomes aware of a requirement to be absent from the University.

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

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

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

(7) A request for special arrangements must be accompanied by sufficient and relevant supporting documentation, in English. This may include, but is not limited to:

(a) in the case of religious beliefs, a supporting letter from the student’s imam, pastor, rabbi or equivalent spiritual or community leader;

(b) in the case of compulsory absence, a copy of the summons, subpoena, court order or notice of selection for jury duty;

(c) in the case of sporting, cultural or political/union commitments, supporting documentation from the organising body;

(d) in the case of parental or adoption commitments, a certificate from a medical practitioner or midwife stating the expected date of birth or documentation from the relevant adoption agency stating the expected date of placement;

(e) in the case of defence force or emergency services commitments, supporting documentation from the student’s brigade or unit;

(f) in the case where continuing employment would be jeopardised, supporting documentation from the student’s employer;

(g) in the case of other situations, such documentation as is considered necessary by the University.

(8) Students requesting special arrangements must provide contact details for those individuals or organisations providing supporting documentation, so that further information or advice may be obtained.
14 Special consideration due to illness, injury or misadventure - Principle 3

(1) In this section, relevant delegate means:
(a) an Associate Dean;
(b) a Deputy Dean;
(c) a Pro-Dean;
(d) a Sub-Dean;
(e) a Head of Department;
(f) a Head of School;
(g) a Program Coordinator; or
(h) a Unit of Study Coordinator.

(2) All requests for special consideration will be considered in the same manner across the University, although the response may vary according to the circumstances.
(a) Schedule 3 to these procedures prescribes the standard responses to the most common circumstances.

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

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

(5) Requests for special consideration should be lodged no later than three working days after the assessment.
(a) Where circumstances preclude this, a student may still request special consideration but must provide a reasonable explanation for the delay.
(b) The University will not decline a request on the grounds of late lodgement where a reasonable explanation is provided.

(6) A request for special consideration must:
(a) use the electronic form specified for this purpose by the University;
(b) clearly set out the basis for the request;
(c) for illness or injury, provide an appropriate professional practitioner certificate completed by a registered health practitioner or counsellor operating within the scope of their practice and who is not a family member and which includes:
   (i) the practitioner’s name, contact details, provider number and signature;
   (ii) the date of consultation;
   (iii) an evaluation of the duration and degree of impact on the student’s ability to attend classes, learn or complete assessment requirements; and
   (iv) the date the certificate was written and issued; or
(d) where a professional practitioner certificate is not possible, include a statutory declaration:

(i) setting out the duration and degree of impact of the illness, injury or misadventure on the student’s ability to attend classes, learn or complete assessment requirements; and

(ii) attaching relevant supporting documents; and

(e) provide details of any group work which might be affected.

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

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

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

(9) International students suffering illness, injury or misadventure should also contact the University for information about possible impacts on visa and other arrangements.

(10) A student may withdraw a request for special consideration made prior to, during or immediately after an assessment (usually an examination) at any time prior to the earlier of:

(a) release of results for that assessment; or

(b) completion of a replacement assessment.

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

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

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

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

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

(a) Replacement assessment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(viii) If the faculty is unable to arrange any form of appropriate or appropriately timed second replacement assessment, the faculty will award the student a DC grade (ie discontinue not to count as failure), or the faculty is unable to construct a valid form of replacement assessment, the faculty will determine alternative means of assessment if it is reasonably practicable to do so. If not, the faculty will award a grade of DC (discontinue not to count as failure).

(b) Extension.

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

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

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

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

(c) Reweighting or averaging.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(c) If the relevant delegate considers that the functioning of the group is not impaired but that its ability to complete the task as assigned is impaired, an extension of time or an alternative assessment will be provided as appropriate.

(d) If the relevant delegate considers that the group can no longer function, the assessment task will be redefined for the remaining active members, based on the contributions they were to make.

(i) Assessment will then be based on the redefined task.

(ii) The lecturer or teacher may also allow an extension of time.

(iii) The group member(s) who suffered the illness, injury or misadventure will, if their request is accepted, be given an alternative assessment.

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

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

14A Simple extensions - Principle 3

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

(2) The faculty must determine the method for applying for simple extensions in that faculty, provided that the method must require written communication between the student and the relevant unit of study co-ordinator which records at least:

(a) the student’s name;
the student's student identification number; and
(c) the unit of study code.

15 Processing and release of results - Principles 1 to 4

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

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

Note: See Recordkeeping Manual.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

16 Appeals - Principles 1 to 4

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

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

17 Professional development - Principles 2 and 4

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

(2) Faculties should provide opportunities for recognition and sharing of effective assessment practices. The University will also provide such opportunities on a University-wide basis.
(3) Professional development support will be provided by Educational Innovation in collaboration with faculties for assessment review as part of course quality improvement process to facilitate effective learning.

18 Effectiveness of assessment policies - Principle 4

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

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

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

(c) through feedback from students on assessment (directly and via unit of study evaluations and related feedback tools).
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<tr>
<td>Various</td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(1), 6(2) (added)</td>
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<td>4 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 6(6)</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>29 June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 11A</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>29 June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 2(2)</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>3 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Commencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 3(2)</td>
<td>Definitions added for examination, Examinations Office, formal examination period, replacement examination period, Student Identification Number and test Definitions amended for academic unit, peer assessment, self assessment, standards-based assessment and test</td>
<td>3 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 5(7)</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>3 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 6(1)</td>
<td>Additional details added including updated references to other relevant documents and details regarding assessment tables</td>
<td>3 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 6(2)</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>3 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 7(3) and 7(4)</td>
<td>Clause broken into different clauses and details regarding how grades are not determined added</td>
<td>3 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 8</td>
<td>Amendments including addition of new clauses covering conduct of examinations and to reflect changes in terminology</td>
<td>3 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 10(13)</td>
<td>Amended to reflect changes in terminology</td>
<td>3 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses 10, 11 and 12</td>
<td>References to supervisors changed to invigilators throughout</td>
<td>3 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 11(1)</td>
<td>Amendments regarding hand held computing devices</td>
<td>3 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses 13(4)(5), 14(13)(a)(i), 14(13)(b)(i)</td>
<td>Minor amendments to reflect changes in terminology</td>
<td>3 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses 7(3)(4), 8(4)(15)(16)(17), 14(13)(a)</td>
<td>Amendments to clarify requirements regarding replacement examinations and to reflect changes in terminology</td>
<td>3 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 2</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>3 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 11A</td>
<td>Former clause 11A deleted and relocated to become clause 14A</td>
<td>3 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 14A</td>
<td>Former clause 11A becomes clause 14A</td>
<td>3 January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 7(4)(b)</td>
<td>Clause deleted</td>
<td>6 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Commencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 7(4)(c)</td>
<td>Former clause 7(4)(c) deleted and relocated to become clause 7(4)(a)</td>
<td>6 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses 14(2) and 14(2)(a)</td>
<td>Amendments including addition of new clause for schedule 3</td>
<td>6 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 13(c)(iii)</td>
<td>Amendment to clarify weighting of regular assessment components</td>
<td>6 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 17(3)</td>
<td>Reference to Institute for Teaching and Learning changed to Educational Innovation</td>
<td>6 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 2</td>
<td>‘Closing date’ column added</td>
<td>6 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 3</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>6 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 3; notes</td>
<td>Administrative amendments only</td>
<td>20 April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Reference to By-law changed to University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016</td>
<td>20 April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 3</td>
<td>Administrative amendments only</td>
<td>4 May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 12</td>
<td>Amendments including addition of new clauses covering conduct of examinations and role of Disability Services</td>
<td>29 August 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 13 (a)(i) and (v)</td>
<td>Amended to clarify possibility of replacement assessment</td>
<td>29 August 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 3</td>
<td>Administrative amendments only</td>
<td>29 August 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SCHEDULE 1 – IMPLEMENTATION TABLE

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

(4) Assessment practices address issues of equity and inclusiveness to accommodate and build upon the diversity of the student body so as not to disadvantage any student.

4. Assessment practices must be continuously improved and updated

(1) Assessment tasks and outcomes are moderated through academic peer review and used to inform subsequent practice.

(2) Assessment is regularly updated to ensure alignment with program learning outcomes or graduate attributes.

(3) Professional development opportunities that are related to design, implementation and moderation of assessment are provided to staff.
# SCHEDULE 2 – STANDARD ASSESSMENT TABLE FOR ALL NEW UNITS OF STUDY COMMENCING SEMESTER 1, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment title</th>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Example of Assessment type</th>
<th>Description of Assessment type</th>
<th>Exam / Quiz type</th>
<th>Individual or Group</th>
<th>Length / duration</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Due date and time&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Closing date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free format text to name each assessment</td>
<td>Exam</td>
<td>Final exam</td>
<td>Written exam, written exam with non-written elements, or non-written exam, however administered. Worth 30% or greater. Written exam, written exam with non-written elements, or non-written exam, however administered. Worth 30% or greater.</td>
<td>Final exam</td>
<td>Specify for each assessment (select one)</td>
<td>Specify word limit or time limit for each assessment</td>
<td>Specify percentage contribution to final mark (%) for each</td>
<td>Specify for each</td>
<td>Specify for each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of assessment task</td>
<td>Exam</td>
<td>Final exam</td>
<td>Written exam, written exam with non-written elements, or non-written exam, however administered. Worth 30% or greater. Written exam, written exam with non-written elements, or non-written exam, however administered. Worth 30% or greater.</td>
<td>Final exam</td>
<td>Specify for each assessment (select one)</td>
<td>Specify word limit or time limit for each assessment</td>
<td>Specify percentage contribution to final mark (%) for each</td>
<td>Specify for each</td>
<td>Specify for each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of assessment task</td>
<td>Skills-based assessment</td>
<td>Placements</td>
<td>Professional experience placement, internship, or site visit. Clinical skills assessment or lab skills assessment. Performance, recital or jury-assessment performance, or exhibition.</td>
<td>Placements</td>
<td>Specify for each assessment (select one)</td>
<td>Specify word limit or time limit for each assessment</td>
<td>Specify percentage contribution to final mark (%) for each</td>
<td>Specify for each</td>
<td>Specify for each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of assessment task</td>
<td>Skills-based assessment</td>
<td>Skills base evaluation</td>
<td>Clinical skills assessment or lab skills assessment. Performance, recital or jury-assessment performance, or exhibition.</td>
<td>Skills base evaluation</td>
<td>Specify for each assessment (select one)</td>
<td>Specify word limit or time limit for each assessment</td>
<td>Specify percentage contribution to final mark (%) for each</td>
<td>Specify for each</td>
<td>Specify for each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of assessment task</td>
<td>Skills-based assessment</td>
<td>Creative assessments / demonstrations</td>
<td>Performance, recital or jury-assessment performance, or exhibition.</td>
<td>Creative assessments / demonstrations</td>
<td>Specify for each assessment (select one)</td>
<td>Specify word limit or time limit for each assessment</td>
<td>Specify percentage contribution to final mark (%) for each</td>
<td>Specify for each</td>
<td>Specify for each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

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

A special consideration report listing all assessments and the form of consideration granted is available to UOS Coordinators.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</th>
<th>Assessment description</th>
<th>Form of consideration</th>
<th>Conditions for standard decision</th>
<th>SAS</th>
<th>Faculty, University school, school or department</th>
<th>UOS Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>Final exam</td>
<td>Written exam</td>
<td>Replacement exam</td>
<td>Final exam scheduled and managed centrally</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Where the student is unable to attempt the replacement exam and a valid form of replacement assessment or alternative means of assessment is not possible, award a grade of DC (discontinue not to count as failure) if appropriate</td>
<td>Provide replacement exam paper by specified deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule and manage replacement exam</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manage and implement Disability Services adjustments</td>
<td>Construct a valid form of replacement assessment or an alternative means of assessment where the student is unable to attempt the replacement exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment category</td>
<td>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, school or department</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>Final exam</td>
<td>Written exam with non-written elements or non-written exam</td>
<td>Replacement exam</td>
<td>Final and replacement exams may be managed by faculty, University, school, school or department</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>For final and replacement exams managed by faculty, University school, school or department the relevant area will schedule and manage the exam including managing and implementing Disability Services adjustments; and inform student of the schedule; Where the student is unable to attempt the replacement exam and a valid form of replacement assessment or alternative means of assessment is not possible, award a grade of DC (discontinue not to count as failure) if appropriate</td>
<td>Provide final and replacement exam paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment category</td>
<td>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, school or department</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>In-semester exam</td>
<td>Written exam, worth 30% or greater (refer to section 14.13(c)(iii) above) Exam type could be any of the following: written exam, written exam with non-written elements, or non-written exam, however administered.</td>
<td>Replacement exam for in-semester exam</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report Schedule and manage replacement exam Provide replacement exam Inform student of replacement exam schedule Manage and implement Disability Services adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placements</td>
<td>Professional experience placement, internship, or site visit</td>
<td>New or varied placement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report Schedule and inform student of new or varied placement details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills based assessment</td>
<td>Skills based assessment or lab skills assessment</td>
<td>New or varied evaluation</td>
<td>Not on “non-repeatable” list</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report Schedule and inform student of new or varied evaluation details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment category</td>
<td>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, school or department</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills based assessment</td>
<td>Skills based evaluation</td>
<td>Clinical skills assessment or lab skills assessment</td>
<td>Alternative assessment</td>
<td>On “non-repeatable” list (e.g. evaluations with specialised resource requirements)</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Determine appropriate alternative assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills based assessment</td>
<td>Creative assessments/ demonstrations</td>
<td>Performance, recital or jury-assessment performance, or exhibition</td>
<td>New or varied evaluation</td>
<td>Not on “non-repeatable” list</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Schedule and inform student of new or varied evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills based assessment</td>
<td>Creative assessments/ demonstrations</td>
<td>Performance, recital, jury-assessment performance, or exhibition</td>
<td>Alternative evaluation</td>
<td>On “non-repeatable” list, (e.g. assessments/ demonstrations with specialised resource requirements)</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Determine appropriate alternative evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted work</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Essay, report case study, proposal, literature review, portfolio or design</td>
<td>Extension of time (refer to section 14.13(b) above)</td>
<td>1. Impacted period is 20 or fewer working days (refer to section 14.13(b)(iii) above) and</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Apply extension of time to due date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment category (refer to schedule 2 above)</td>
<td>Assessment type</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, school or department</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted work</td>
<td>Honours Thesis</td>
<td>Non-HDR thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. The new due date is prior to the return date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Essay, report, case study, proposal, literature review, portfolio or design</td>
<td>Determined by faculty or University school</td>
<td>1. Impacted period is more than 20 working days (refer to section 14.13(b)(iv) above) or</td>
<td>Refer to UOS Coordinator for form of consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Where the student is unable to attempt the replacement assessment or alternative means of assessment is not possible, award a</td>
<td>Determine appropriate form of consideration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 New due date is the revised submission date for the assessment and is calculated using calendar days to be consistent with the return date.
3 Return date refers to the date when an assignment or the answers are returned to the cohort and is usually within 10 working days (14 calendar days) from the original due date of the assessment, unless otherwise specified by the faculty or University school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</th>
<th>Assessment description</th>
<th>Form of consideration</th>
<th>Conditions for standard decision</th>
<th>SAS</th>
<th>Faculty, University school, school or department</th>
<th>UOS Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Honours Thesis</td>
<td>Non-HDR thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. The new due date is after the return date</td>
<td>Grade of DC (discontinue not to count as failure) if appropriate</td>
<td>Assessment in cases where remaining student cohort would be disadvantaged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class assessments</td>
<td>Tutorial quiz, small test or online task</td>
<td>Worth less than 30%</td>
<td>Mark adjustment (refer to section)</td>
<td>Not on “no mark adjustment allowed” list</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Make mark adjustment (re-weight, average)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 New due date is the revised submission date for the assessment and is calculated using calendar days to be consistent with the return date.
5 Return date refers to the date when an assignment or the answers are returned to the cohort and is usually within 10 working days (14 calendar days) from the original due date of the assessment, unless otherwise specified by the faculty or University school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</th>
<th>Assessment description</th>
<th>Form of consideration</th>
<th>Conditions for standard decision</th>
<th>SAS</th>
<th>Faculty, University school, school or department</th>
<th>UOS Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small continuous assessment</td>
<td>to check with their unit of study coordinator if any repeat sessions will be available before submitting a special consideration application.</td>
<td>14.13(c) above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>etc.) Provide an alternative assessment where a student has missed more than one third of the regular assessment components</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial quiz, small test or online task</td>
<td>Worth less than 30% (refer to section 14.13(c)(iii)</td>
<td>New or varied assessment</td>
<td>On “no mark adjustment allowed” list</td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report Determine new or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment category</td>
<td>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</td>
<td>Assessment description</td>
<td>Form of consideration</td>
<td>Conditions for standard decision</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Faculty, University school, school or department</td>
<td>UOS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small continuous assessment</td>
<td>above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>varied assessment Schedule and inform student of new or varied assessment details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Oral presentation</td>
<td>New or varied presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Select standard form of consideration from Decisions Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report Schedule and inform student of new or varied presentation details Provide alternative assessment if new or varied presentation is unable to be provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class assessments</td>
<td>Optional assignment or small test</td>
<td>Includes formative assessments</td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Procedures 2011
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment category</th>
<th>Assessment type (refer to schedule 2 above)</th>
<th>Assessment description</th>
<th>Form of consideration</th>
<th>Conditions for standard decision</th>
<th>SAS</th>
<th>Faculty, University school, school or department</th>
<th>UOS Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Group work (refer to section 14 above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Provide the extension of time or alternative assessment for impacted student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on other group members to be noted during marking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Written, non-written elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Download special consideration report</td>
<td>Provide the extension of time or alternative assessment for impacted student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on other group members to be noted during marking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An audit of University policies on educational matters against the Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF) revealed several areas where University policy could be strengthened to bring greater clarity to the University’s aspirations against the standards and set out its obligations.

Areas that would benefit from greater clarity are:

- Expectation on the knowledge, skills and qualifications of teaching staff (Standard 3.2)
- Scope of seven-yearly comprehensive reviews of accredited courses (Standard 5.3)
- Framework for education and research training agreements with other parties (Standards 5.2, 5.4, 7.3 (j) including placement and project arrangements.

To improve the University’s education policy framework in relation to the HESF, the following policy work was carried out in July and August:

- Amendments to the Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 will be made to clarify expectations on knowledge, skills and qualifications for teaching staff and the scope of comprehensive course reviews;
- The Student Placement Policy 2015 will be amended to cover student projects as well as placements;
- The Guidelines for Inter-institutional agreements 1997 will be replaced by a policy on Collaborative Education and Research Training Agreements.

The Academic Standards and Policy Committee considered these three policies at its meeting of 8 August and resolved to recommend them to the Academic Board subject to revision by the Policy Unit. Amendments to the Learning and Teaching Policy are presented to the Board for approval at the meeting of 29 August. The Students Placement and Project Policy and the Education and Research Training Agreements Policy (with new name as appropriate) will be presented to the Board on 10 October pending further revision by the Policy Unit.

Notwithstanding the delay in finalising the Education and Research Training Agreements Policy to allow further review by the Policy Unit (and possible combination with the Educational Services Agreements Policy), it is appropriate to rescind the Guidelines for Inter-institutional Agreements 1997 immediately. This policy is out of date and makes reference to authorities and structures in the University that have been superseded and it no longer acts as a meaningful guide to the shaping of agreements.
Non-Confidential

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

The Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF) is established under the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011 and sets out threshold standards for higher education in Australia. Universities are required to meet or exceed the threshold standards and are audited in this regard by TEQSA. Meeting the standards is one of the minimum requirements for accreditation as an Australian University as set out in Part B of the standards.

An internal audit of the standards carried out in 2017 suggested some areas where policies relating to education could be strengthened in order to bring greater visibility to the University’s obligations and as one of several mechanisms to ensure quality and compliance.

These are set out in the Table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section of the HESF</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Suggested action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>3.2 Staffing</td>
<td>(3) Staff with responsibilities for academic oversight and those with teaching and supervisory roles in courses or units of study are equipped for their roles, including having: (a) knowledge of contemporary developments in the discipline or field, which is informed by continuing scholarship or research or advances in practice (b) skills in contemporary teaching, learning and assessment principles relevant to the discipline, their role, modes of delivery and the needs of particular student cohorts, and (c) a qualification in a relevant discipline at least one level higher than is awarded for the course of study, or equivalent relevant academic or professional or practice-based experience and expertise, except for staff supervising doctoral degrees having a doctoral degree or equivalent research experience. (4) Teachers who teach specialised components of a course of study, such as experienced practitioners and teachers undergoing training, who may not fully meet the standard for knowledge, skills and qualifications or experience required for teaching of supervision (3.2.3) have their teaching guided and overseen by staff who meet the standard.</td>
<td>A section 24 A be inserted in Part 4 of the Learning and Teaching Policy (Attachment 2) setting out the qualifications of teaching staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5</td>
<td>5.3 Monitoring, Review and Improvement</td>
<td>1. All accredited courses of study are subject to periodic (at least every seven years) comprehensive reviews that are overseen by peak academic governance processes and include external referencing or other benchmarking activities. 2. A comprehensive review includes the design and content of each course of study, the expected learning outcomes, the methods for assessment of those outcomes, the extent of</td>
<td>Clause 6 of Section 11, Collegial Governance of the Learning and Teaching Policy (Attachment 2) be reviewed to give guidelines on the scope of reviews of accredited reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No</td>
<td>students’ achievement of learning outcomes, and also takes account of emerging developments in the field of education, modes of delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5.4 Deliver with Other Parties | 1. Work-integrated learning, placements, other community-based learning and collaborative research training arrangements are quality assured, including assurance of the quality of supervision of student experiences.  
2. When a course of study, any parts of a course of study, or research training are delivered through arrangements with another party(ies), whether in Australia or overseas, the registered higher education provider remains accountable for the course of study and verifies continuing compliance of the course of study with the standards in the Higher Education Standards Framework that relate to the specific arrangement. |
| Also 5.2 Academic and Research Integrity (4) | 1. The Student Placement Policy (Attachment 3) be reviewed and expanded to cover provisions for agreements in the case of student project agreements with outside organisations, including industry, professional and community partners, other with other educational institutions. Such provisions should also placements for HDR students.  
2. The Guidelines on Inter-Institutional Agreements be replaced by a Collaborative Education and Research Training Agreements Policy (provisional title) (Attachment 1). |
| Also 6.1 Corporate Governance (3)(c) | |
| Also 7.3 Information Management (1) (j) | |

**CONSULTATION**

This memo has been circulated to the UE Research Training Committee (12 July) and the University Executive (20 July).

Policy amendments and proposals will be presented as follows:

1. **Learning and Teaching Policy**
   - Undergraduate Studies Committee/Graduate Studies Committee – 1 August
   - UE Education – 7 August
   - Academic Standards and Policy Committee – 8 August
   - University Executive – 10 August
   - Academic Board – 29 August

2. **Student Placement and Project Policy**
   - Undergraduate Studies Committee/Graduate Studies Committee – 1 August
   - UE Research Education Committee – 2 August
   - UE Education – 7 August
   - Academic Standards and Policy Committee – 8 August
   - University Executive – 31 August
   - Academic Board – 10 October
Non-Confidential

3. Collaborative Education and Research Training Agreements Policy (provisional title)
Undergraduate Studies Committee/Graduate Studies Committee – 1 August
UE Research Education Committee – 2 August
UE Education – 7 August
Academic Standards and Policy Committee – 8 August
University Executive – 31 August
Academic Board – 10 October

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 - Amendments to the Learning and Teaching Policy
Attachment 2 - Guidelines for Inter-Institutional Agreements (1997) (to be rescinded)
LEARNING AND TEACHING POLICY 2015

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

Dated: 2 December 2015

Last amended: [insert date]

Signature: [insert signature]

Position: Chair, Academic Board
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PART 1 PRELIMINARY

1 Name of policy

This is the Learning and Teaching 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) describes the nature of education at the University;
(b) sets out the manner in which curricula are structured;
(c) provides for the effective management of learning and teaching; and
(d) establishes quality assurance processes for learning and teaching.

5 Application

Except to the extent that a contrary intention is expressed this policy applies to the learning and teaching of coursework award courses.

6 Definitions

(1) In this policy:

academic unit means a faculty, board of studies, school, centre or interdisciplinary committee of the University.
**assessment** means the process of measuring the performance of students (as in examinations, assignments and other assessable work) that enables students to monitor their progress and contributes to their academic results in a unit of study.

**Associate Dean - Education** means:
- the Associate Dean of a faculty or University school with responsibility for education at the relevant level; or
- the deputy chairperson of a board of studies; or
- a person appointed by the Dean to have responsibility within the faculty for education at the relevant level. This position may have any of a number of different titles, including Associate Dean -Education, Associate Dean -Teaching or Learning, Associate Dean -Undergraduate Students, Associate Dean -Postgraduate Coursework or equivalent. The responsibilities of the Associate Dean -Education specified in this policy may be shared between more than one Associate Dean position.

**Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF)** means the national framework for recognition and endorsement of education qualifications.

**award course** means a course approved by the Academic Board and endorsed by the Senate, on the recommendation of the Academic Board, that leads to the conferral of a degree or the award of a diploma or certificate.

**award course resolutions** means the resolutions setting out the requirements for the award approved by the Academic Board and tabled at a meeting of the Senate.

**Bachelor degree** has the meaning given the **Coursework Policy 2014**, which at the date of this policy is:

- an undergraduate degree that:
  - achieves at least the outcome specified for level seven of the AQF;
  - is a program of liberal, professional or specialist learning and education; and
  - builds on prior secondary or tertiary study.

The University offers two types of Bachelor degrees:
- Liberal Studies bachelor Degrees; and
- Professional or Specialist Bachelor Degrees

**Note:** See clause 83A of the **Coursework Policy 2014**.
**Bachelor of Advanced Studies** has the meaning given in the *Coursework Policy 2014*, which at the date of this policy is:

the Bachelor degree available as a combined degree with all Liberal Studies Bachelor degrees and specified Specialist or Professional Bachelor degrees, as set out in the applicable award course resolutions. The Bachelor of Advanced Studies is a Liberal Studies Bachelor Degree.

**capstone experience** has the meaning given in the *Coursework Policy 2014*, which at the date of this policy is:

a unit of study that provides students with an opportunity to draw together the learning that has taken place during the course, synthesise it with their own learning and experience, and draw conclusions that form the basis for further investigation and intellectual and professional growth.

**Note** See clause 18.

**combined degree course** means a combination of two degree programs structured to enable students to count a specified number of units of study towards the requirements for both award courses, resulting in a lower volume of learning than if the two degrees were taken separately. See also double degree course.

**Note**: See clause 18.

**core** means a set of units of study that develops required knowledge and skills for an award course.

**course** means a planned and structured sequence of learning and teaching primarily aimed at the acquisition of knowledge, skills and understanding.

**coursework award course** means a course approved by the Academic Board and endorsed by the Senate 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, and graduate certificates, graduate diplomas and those Masters degrees that comprise less than 66% research are coursework award courses.

**curriculum** means the flexible and coherent presentation of the academic content in a unit or program in a series of learning experiences and assessments.

**Note**: See clauses 15 - 17.
Dean means:

• in relation to a faculty, the Dean of the relevant faculty.
• in relation to a University school, the Head of School and Dean of the relevant University school.

See: University of Sydney (Governance of Faculties and University Schools) Rule 2016

double degrees course means a course in which a student completes two AQF qualifications under one set of award course resolutions with no cross-crediting of units of study between the qualifications. A single testamur or separate testamurs may be issued.

faculty means a faculty, University school or appropriate board of studies and in this policy refers to the faculty, faculties or University schools responsible for the relevant award course.

See: University of Sydney (Governance of Faculties and University Schools) Rule 2016

faculty office means the professional staff led by a faculty manager or faculty general manager that support learning and teaching within a faculty.

graduate qualities means the qualities demonstrated by all graduates of award courses on completion of the requirements of the award course. Part 2 of this policy details the qualities of graduates of undergraduate award courses.

Group of Eight (Go8) means the coalition of eight research-intensive Universities, comprising The University of Melbourne, The Australian National University, The University of Sydney, The University of Queensland, The University of Western Australia, The University of Adelaide, Monash University and UNSW Australia.

Note: See https://go8.edu.au/

Head of School means the head of a school within a faculty with responsibility for approving arrangements for teaching and appointment of casual staff within the school. This role may be fulfilled by a position with another title (e.g. Head of Discipline or the chair of a board of studies or interdisciplinary committee.)

honours units means advanced units of study at 4000-level specified as requirements to qualify for an award with honours as set out in clause 95 of the Coursework Policy 2014.
LMS means learning management system, which is the online learning system used by the University to host unit of study websites.

learning outcomes means statements of what students know, understand and are able to do on completion of a unit of study, a major, program, award course, or other curriculum component.

Liberal Studies Bachelor Degree has the meaning given in the Coursework Policy 2014, which at the date of this policy is:

- a program of study at Bachelor level of three years duration (or part-time equivalent) that provides students with a broad multi-disciplinary education that develops disciplinary expertise and graduate qualities.

major means a defined sequence of units of study taken by a student, which develops depth of expertise in a field of study.

Note: See clause 18.

minor means a defined sequence of units of study taken by a student, which develops expertise in a field of study.

Note: See clause 18.

mode of delivery means the manner by which courses and units of study are presented to students, and includes:

- face to face classes;
- fully online learning;
- blends of face to face and online learning; and
- on or off campus delivery, including off shore delivery.

open learning environment has the meaning given in the Coursework Policy 2014, which at the date of this policy is:

- a shared pool of units of study which are:
  - of zero, two or six credit points value;
  - approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies; and
  - available to all students according to the award course resolutions applicable to the award course in which they are enrolled.

postgraduate award course means an award course leading to the award of a Graduate Certificate, Graduate Diploma, Masters degree or a Doctorate. Normally a postgraduate award course requires the prior completion of a relevant undergraduate degree or diploma.
**program**

means a combination of units of study that develops expertise in a multi-disciplinary domain or professional or specialist field and includes at least one recognised major.

**Note:** See clause 18.

**Program Director**

means the person responsible, at a program, major or degree level, for managing the curriculum and providing co-ordination and advice to staff and students.

**Professional or Specialist Bachelor Degree**

has the meaning given in the *Coursework Policy 2014*, which at the date of this policy is:

a degree that develops disciplinary or professional expertise for a specific profession or career specialisation and graduate qualities.

**shared pool**

means the list of majors, minors and units of study (including units in the open learning environment or Sydney Research Seminars) that are available to students enrolled in all Liberal Studies Bachelor degrees (including combined degrees with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies).

**specialisation**

means the disciplinary or professional expertise developed for a profession or career in a Professional or Specialist Bachelor Degree or postgraduate degree.

**stream**

means a version of a degree that can be conceptualised as a separate degree for admission purposes but that is linked to a set of other streams of the degree through shared nomenclature, shared course components and shared rules. In degree nomenclature, streams may be indicated in parentheses following the name of the main degree.

**student**

means a person who is currently admitted to candidature in an award course of the University and, where relevant, an exchange student or non-award student.

**Sydney Research Seminars**

means units of study involving a cross-disciplinary group of students and staff in exploration of an interdisciplinary issue, challenge or problem approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.

**supervisor**

means the member of the academic staff who is appointed to supervise a dissertation, treatise or long essay component of a coursework award program or an undergraduate honours program.

**teacher**

means a member of the academic staff involved in any of teaching, unit of study coordination or assessment.

**teaching session**

means, as appropriate, a semester or a summer or winter session.
third party learning technologies means web-based and mobile applications which are not managed through a contract between the University and technology suppliers.

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

undergraduate degree means an undergraduate award course at Bachelor level that achieves at a minimum the learning outcome specified for Level seven of the AQF.

unit of study means the smallest stand-alone component of an award course that is recordable on a student's transcript. Units of study have an integer credit point value, normally six credit points except where approved by the Academic Board.

Note: See clause 18.

unit of study coordinator means the academic staff member with overall responsibility for the planning and delivery of a unit of study.

PART 2 THE NATURE OF EDUCATION AT THE UNIVERSITY

7 Graduate qualities and learning outcomes

(1) All undergraduate award courses must be designed to develop and assess the acquisition of the graduate qualities that the University has agreed are necessary to contribute effectively to contemporary society. These are achieved through a structured program, including learning outcomes of specific relevance to the particular award or discipline.

(2) Graduate qualities consist of:

(a) depth of disciplinary expertise;
(b) broader skills:
   (i) critical thinking and problem solving;
   (ii) oral and written communication;
   (iii) information and digital literacy; and
   (iv) inventiveness;
(c) cultural competence;
(d) interdisciplinary effectiveness;
(e) an integrated professional, ethical and personal identity; and
(f) influence.

(3) These qualities should be embedded in the curriculum in a way that enables students to:

(a) excel at applying and continuing to develop disciplinary expertise;
(b) learn and respond effectively and creatively to novel problems;
(c) work productively, collaboratively and openly in diverse groups and across cultural boundaries;
(d) work effectively in interdisciplinary (including inter-professional) settings;
(e) build broader perspectives, innovative vision, and more contextualised and systemic forms of understanding;
(f) build integrity, confidence and personal resilience, and the capacities to manage challenges and uncertainty; and
(g) be effective in exercising professional and social responsibility and making a positive contribution to society.

(4) The graduate qualities adopted by the University for undergraduates, and their purposes, are set out in the following table (Table 1):

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate qualities</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depth of disciplinary expertise.</td>
<td>To excel at applying and continuing to develop disciplinary expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader skills:</td>
<td>To increase the impact of expertise, and to learn and respond effectively and creatively to novel problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Critical thinking and problem solving;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication (oral and written);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information/ digital literacy;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inventiveness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural competence.</td>
<td>To work productively, collaboratively and openly in diverse groups and across cultural boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary effectiveness.</td>
<td>To work effectively in interdisciplinary (including inter-professional) settings and to build broader perspective, innovative vision, and more contextualised and systemic forms of understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An integrated professional, ethical and personal identity.</td>
<td>To build integrity, confidence and personal resilience, and the capacities to manage challenges and uncertainty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence.</td>
<td>To be effective in exercising professional and social responsibility and making a positive contribution to society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See also Good Practice Guidelines for the Development of Students Academic and Professional Communication Skills and Implementation Guidelines

8 Educational excellence

(1) All award courses must be designed towards the achievement of excellence in outcomes, experience and environment.
(2) Educational programs and the management of learning and teaching must be designed and managed to ensure excellence in:

(a) educational outcomes: at the conclusion of their educational experience, students will demonstrate the graduate qualities to a high standard;

(b) educational experience, as shown through:
   (i) the impact of teachers and their capacity to engage students productively in the teaching and learning process; and
   (ii) students' mastery of the meta-cognitive skills that form the basis for self-directed learning;

and

(c) educational environment, consisting of the physical learning spaces, virtual learning environment, and support, which:
   (i) facilitates excellent outcomes and experience;
   (ii) fosters innovation; and
   (iii) seeks continuous improvement through systematic monitoring.

(3) To ensure excellent outcomes, faculties must design processes in which:

(a) curricula provide continuous and well-co-ordinated sequences of learning experiences leading to well defined learning outcomes, involving expert guidance through well designed learning activities;

(b) students:
   (i) are actively engaged in learning;
   (ii) are challenged, guided and supported to reach a high standard of learning; and
   (iii) become increasingly aware of, and responsible for, their learning;

and

(c) students and staff demonstrate a commitment to working together to achieve excellence in educational experience and outcomes.

(4) Learning environments must be accessible to students with disabilities, allow appropriate flexibility and use technology to minimise barriers to learning caused by time constraints, timetables and other artificial rigidities.

9 Engaged enquiry

(1) Learning programs must be designed to:

(a) enable students to acquire and apply knowledge and skills through engaged enquiry;

(b) challenge students with novel problems; and

(c) enable students to demonstrate increasing awareness of, and responsibility for, their learning.

(2) Engaged enquiry is a design principle which is used to develop curricula, create learning experiences, and review courses and units of study.
Engaged enquiry unites learning through the thinking and discovery processes used in research with experiential development of skills and knowledge through application.

Research-enriched enquiry involves the formulation and critical testing of hypotheses on the basis of evidence and prior knowledge.

Engagement arises from the further development of skills and knowledge through application in work, community and interdisciplinary settings.

Research-enriched enquiry and engagement together form a core principle against which learning programs must be assessed.

10 Academic integrity

(1) Academic honesty by staff and students is an underlying ethos of all education.

(2) Policy and procedures relating to academic honesty in coursework are set out in the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 and the Academic Honesty Procedures 2016.

11 Collegial governance

(1) The purpose of collegial governance is to provide a vehicle for:
   (a) continuous improvement and innovation;
   (b) an effective framework to achieve educational excellence; and
   (c) the achievement of graduate qualities and learning outcomes to a high standard by each student.

(2) All award course programs must be overseen by a course committee or standing committee of the relevant faculty or board of studies.

   Note: A standing committee may have oversight of more than one award course, or of a category of award courses: for example, all undergraduate awards or all postgraduate coursework awards.

(3) All committees with responsibility for oversight of award course programs must include:
   (a) representatives of the academic disciplines responsible for teaching;
   (b) representatives of students enrolled in the award course program; and
   (c) the relevant Associate Dean - Education.

(4) Committees responsible for award courses may:
   (a) make recommendations to the faculty or Head of School and Dean on:
       (i) learning outcomes;
       (ii) curricula;
       (iii) units of study;
       (iv) assessment;
       (v) educational excellence;
       (vi) academic integrity; and
(vii) program review;

and

(b) take such decisions on these and other matters related to learning and teaching within award courses as delegated by the faculty,

provided that the faculty retains oversight and responsibility for the outcomes, quality and review of award courses.

(5) Faculties, or their relevant standing committees, may also establish such other program committees (including, if appropriate, unit of study committees) as are necessary for ensuring excellence in outcomes, experience and environment. Program committees must include:

(a) representatives of teachers within the program; and

(b) students enrolled in the program.

(6) Faculties, or their relevant standing committees, must ensure that award courses receive a comprehensive review including external referencing or other benchmarking at least every seven years and must forward a report of the review to the Academic Board.

(7) Award course review committees must include:

(a) representatives of the academic disciplines responsible for teaching in the award course;

(b) students enrolled in, or recently graduated from the award course; and

(c) relevant stakeholders from professions or industry, as determined by the committee responsible for oversight of the award course.

(8) The faculty and award course committees are responsible for obtaining approval of units of study, programs and award courses consistently with Part 4.

(9) Learning programs must be developed and managed through a collegial process which must:

(a) be evidence based (using academic expertise, research, benchmarking, and, where appropriate, market appraisal); and

(b) build on consultation with stakeholders listed in subclause 11(7).

Note: See clause 23 for specific authorities, roles and responsibilities for the management of learning and teaching.

PART 3 CURRICULUM STRUCTURE

12 Statement of intent

This part:

(a) prescribes the structure of the curriculum for award courses and units of study; and

(b) articulates the components of award courses and the broad structure of undergraduate, postgraduate and combined coursework awards.
13 Learning outcomes

(1) Learning outcomes articulate the specific achievements in skill, knowledge and application necessary to demonstrate graduate qualities in a particular discipline. They must be aligned with graduate qualities and must be assessed as part of the curriculum.

(2) Learning outcomes should be specified for award courses and for each of their components, including as relevant units of study, majors, programs and specialisations.

(3) Learning outcomes specified for the components of an award course should be aligned with each other and with the learning outcomes of the award course.

14 Award courses

(1) An award course must enable students to demonstrate graduate qualities through defined learning outcomes.

(2) Titles for awards in the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) must be consistent with the AQF Issuance Policy.

(3) The title of an award course must include:

   (a) the qualification type; and
   
   Note: See section 1.3 of the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014 and section 1.03 of the University of Sydney (Higher Degree by Research) Rule 2011.

   (b) the discipline.

(4) The title of an award course may include one or more optional components, such as a stream.

(5) Award courses must follow an orderly and flexible program of learning experiences in a curriculum designed and approved consistently with this policy.

(6) Award courses must have defined outcomes which:

   (a) specify the relevant graduate qualities;
   
   (b) specify the learning outcomes that must be achieved to demonstrate those graduate qualities for a particular discipline; and
   
   (c) demonstrate achievement, at a minimum, of the learning outcomes specified for the qualifications type and level in the AQF.

(7) Award courses must follow a curriculum which:

   (a) takes a student-centred approach to the achievement and assessment of learning outcomes in a coherent fashion;
   
   (b) is regularly reviewed (at least every seven years) by faculties consistently with this policy, in the light of student outcomes and the student experience, the growth of knowledge, changes in the learning environment and stakeholder input; and
   
   Note: See clause 11.

   (c) incorporates the components of the curriculum framework set out in clauses 15 - 20.
15 Curricula generally

(1) Curricula must enable students to achieve the graduate qualities and learning outcomes of an award course or component of an award course. A curriculum sets out, in a progressive and cumulative manner:
   (a) specified knowledge and skills, expressed as learning outcomes;
   (b) the learning experiences and inquiry processes by which they are acquired;
   (c) how they are applied; and
   (d) an orderly and methodical assessment process through which they are demonstrated to a high standard.

(2) Curricula should be designed to enable a combination of disciplinary depth and breadth of learning appropriate to the aims of the award course.
   (a) Disciplinary depth enables students to achieve command and understanding of a discipline area and can be achieved through focussed study in a program, major, through the completion of components, or through the completion of a stream.
   (b) Disciplinary breadth enables students to contextualise their learning in the context of related studies and other disciplines, apply it to new contexts and augment it according to their learning needs and interests. Disciplinary breadth is achieved through electives, minors, additional majors, studies in other disciplines, interdisciplinary projects and the open learning environment.

(3) A curriculum framework is a broad structure for the constituent educational experiences offered by each degree. It comprises components that are essential for every student to reach an agreed standard, and enrichment opportunities that enable students to extend learning according to individual needs and interests, but are not required or relevant for every student.

16 Curriculum framework for undergraduate education

(1) The curriculum framework for new and revised undergraduate awards must include the following components:
   (a) a program, major, stream or specialisation in at least one field of study;
   (b) a structured approach to the development of knowledge and skills;
   (c) collaborative and group-based learning activities and assessments;
   (d) interdisciplinary and inter-professional learning experiences;
   (e) authentic problems and assessments;
   (f) an open learning environment for the extension of knowledge and skills; and
   (g) project-based learning.

(2) If an undergraduate degree is offered exclusively as part of combined or double degree courses, the components may be in either award course and need not be in both individually.

(3) The following table (Table 2) sets out the graduate qualities associated with each of these components.
**Note:** The curricula for award courses developed prior to 1 January 2016 must include these components when reviewed in line with clause 11(6)

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Graduate qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A major or specialisation in at least one field of study</td>
<td>• Depth of disciplinary expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A structured approach to the development of knowledge and skills</td>
<td>• Depth of disciplinary expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrated identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative and group-based learning activities and assessments</td>
<td>• Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrated identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary and inter-professional learning experiences</td>
<td>• Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interdisciplinary effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic problems and assessments</td>
<td>• Depth of disciplinary expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interdisciplinary effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrated identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An open learning environment for extension of knowledge and skills</td>
<td>• Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interdisciplinary effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrated identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-based learning</td>
<td>• Depth of disciplinary expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrated identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 17 Curriculum framework for postgraduate coursework education

1. The curriculum framework for postgraduate coursework awards must include:
   a. advanced specialisation in a field of knowledge;
(b) research skills;
(c) a structured approach to the development of knowledge and skills;
(d) a capstone experience in research, scholarship or professional project.

(2) The curriculum framework for postgraduate coursework units may include one or more of the following:
(a) a major;
(b) a minor;
(c) interdisciplinary study;
(d) exchange and work based projects;
(e) professional or industry experience;
(f) authentic problems and assessments;
(g) elective units; and
(h) project-based learning.

(3) The following table (Table 3) sets out the graduate qualities associated with each of the above components of a coursework postgraduate award course.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Graduate qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specialisation in a discipline area</td>
<td>• Depth of disciplinary expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A capstone experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary study</td>
<td>• Depth of disciplinary expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrated identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange and work based projects</td>
<td>• Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary and inter-professional</td>
<td>• Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning experiences</td>
<td>• Interdisciplinary effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional or industry experience</td>
<td>• Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural competence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
### Component: Graduate qualities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Graduate qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic problems and assessments</td>
<td>- Depth of disciplinary expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Interdisciplinary effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Integrated identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>- Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-based learning</td>
<td>- Depth of disciplinary expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Broader skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Integrated identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** See Part 17 of the [Coursework Policy 2014](#) for the requirements for different postgraduate award types.

### 18 Components of award courses

**Note:** See Clause 26(2) for commencement dates of sub clauses 18(1) - (8) inclusive.

1. **Streams:**
   - (a) can be conceptualised as separate pathways within an award course;
   - (b) are versions of a degree that are separated for admission purposes but are linked to other streams of the degree through shared nomenclature, shared course components and shared rules;
   - (c) consist of a combination of related units of study which are structured to provide the student with a depth of specialist knowledge of a discipline or field;
   - (d) are identified by the name of the stream of the award in parentheses after the name of the award course of which they are a stream;
   - (e) are recorded on the student's transcript;
   - (f) apply to 1000-, 2000-, 3000- and, where applicable, 4000-level units, as specified in the award course resolutions; and
   - (g) are not restricted to a specific number of credit points.

2. **Programs:**
   - (a) are a combination of units of study that develop expertise in a multidisciplinary domain or a professional or specialist field and include a recognised major in a field of study;
   - (b) must have intellectual and educational coherence and specified learning outcomes as required in clause 13; and
   - (c) in undergraduate degrees, comprise:
     - (i) a minimum of 12 and a maximum of 24 credit points at 1000-level;
(ii) a minimum of 12 and a maximum of 24 credit points at 2000-level;
(iii) a minimum of 18 and a maximum of 24 credit points at 3000-level units of study;

Note: Three year programs (available in degrees of 144 credit points) must not, when combined with the requirements of the degree core, require more than 84 credit points (72+12).

(iv) in degrees and combined degrees requiring 192 credit points, up to 48 credit points at 4000 level;

Note: Four year programs (available in degrees of 192 credit points) must not, when combined with the requirements of the degree core, require more than 132 credit points (120+12).

(v) an embedded major;
(vi) at least 12 credit points of the degree core, if a degree core is specified for the degree; and

(d) are recorded on the student’s transcript.

(3) Majors:
(a) comprise a defined sequence of units taken by a student that develop depth of expertise in a field of study;
(b) must have intellectual and educational coherence and specified learning outcomes as required in clause 13;
(c) in undergraduate degrees, must require exactly 48 credit points; as specified in this sub clause;
(d) in undergraduate degrees, must include:
   (i) exactly 12 credit points at 1000-level units of study;
   (ii) a minimum of 12 and a maximum of 18 credit points at 2000-level;
   and
   (iii) a minimum of 18 and a maximum of 24 credit points at 3000-level (or, higher for degrees requiring more than 144 credit points);
(e) in undergraduate degrees, must include at the 3000-level:
   (i) 1 x 6 credit point unit involving completion of a project requiring the integration and application of disciplinary knowledge and skills; and
   (ii) 1 x 6 credit point unit requiring the application of disciplinary skills and knowledge in an interdisciplinary context; and
(f) are recorded on the student transcript.

Note: the requirements of sub clauses (3)(e)(i) and (3)(e)(ii) may both be met through a single unit. Where a student takes two majors, and a single unit or units of study exists such that the requirement for (3)(e)(i) or (3)(e)(ii) can be met in both majors, that or those units may be used in fulfilment of requirement 3(e)(i) or 3(e)(ii) in both majors, provided that all other requirements in 18(3) are met for each major.
(4) Minors:
   (a) comprise a defined sequence of units of study taken by a student that
devlops expertise in a field of study;
   (b) in undergraduate degrees, comprise units to the value of exactly 36 credit
points including:
      (i) exactly 12 credit points at 1000-level;
      (ii) a minimum of 12 and a maximum of 18 credit points at 2000-level;
      (iii) a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 12 credit points at 3000-level;
   and
   (c) are recorded on the student’s transcript.

(5) A degree core:
   (a) is a set of units of study that develops required knowledge and skills for the
degree and which is required to be completed by all students within an
award course or a stream or specialisation within an award course;
   (b) in Liberal Studies Degrees, comprises no more than 24 credit points at
1000- or 2000-level.

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

Note: See Coursework Policy 2014

(7) Combined degrees and double degrees must meet the learning outcomes of
both component award courses.
   (a) All Liberal Studies and specified Specialist or Professional Bachelor Degrees
may be combined with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies as set out in the
applicable award course resolutions.

(8) Award courses may achieve depth and breadth of learning by the specification of
core units and elective units.
   (a) Units of study may be specified as core units if the faculty determines them
to be essential to achieve the learning outcomes of the award course,
stream, program, major, minor or specialisation. Core units must be
completed by all students enrolled in the award course or relevant
curriculum component or specialisation.
   (b) Elective units are units chosen by students in order to extend their degree
requirements according to their need or interests and contribute to graduate
qualities. Electives are chosen from a list defined by the faculty and
approved by the Academic Board.

(9) Units of study
   (a) Units of study:
      (i) follow a programmed set of coherent learning experiences and
assessments that lead progressively to the achievement of the
learning outcomes for the unit; and
      (ii) must be completed over one or two teaching sessions.
(b) Faculties must define learning outcomes for each unit of study which are aligned with those of the award courses in which the unit of study is offered and those of other components of award courses of which it is a part.

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

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

(e) Units of study must be identified by an eight character alpha-numeric code, of which the first four are letters identifying the relevant school, department or discipline and the final four are integers identifying the unit of study and the level at which it is offered.

(f) The integers in the unit of study alpha-numeric code must commence with a number which indicates the level, in the generic form ****1xxx (for 1000-level units), ****2xxx (for 2000-level units) and so on.

(g) 1000-level units of study have learning outcomes of a foundational or introductory nature and are designed for students in the first year of a bachelor degree.

(h) 2000-level units of study have learning outcomes which assume prior foundational or introductory study and are designed for students who have completed the first year of a bachelor degree.

(i) 3000-level units of study have learning outcomes designed for students in the third year of a bachelor degree. In 144 credit point bachelor degrees, such units should enable students to demonstrate learning outcomes at a level expected for those completing a bachelor degree at AQF level 7.

(j) 4000-level units of study have learning outcomes at the advanced or honours level and are designed for students who have already achieved learning outcomes for a 144 credit point pass-level bachelor degree or who are completing the final year of a 192 credit point bachelor degree.

(k) 5000-, 6000- and higher level units of study have learning outcomes designed for postgraduate award courses.

(10) **Credit points and student workload**

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

(b) The full time credit point load for undergraduate and postgraduate coursework award courses is 24 credit points per semester, or 12 credit points for summer session and six credit points for the winter session. A full time credit point load for a year is 48 credit points equating to a student workload of 1350 -1800 hours per year including class time, private study, assessment and assessment preparation.

(c) The normal credit point load for a unit of study is six credit points, except where otherwise approved by the Academic Board.

(d) The credit point load for a unit of study in the open learning environment must be zero, two or six credit points.
(e) Units of study shared across different award courses and between different faculties must have the same credit point value in every course.

(f) Where units of study are core units in more than one award course or shared individually or as part of a major or minor in the shared pool, faculties must design units of study to meet the learning needs of students in all award courses and components for which the unit is a core unit.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(11) On academic grounds, a faculty may propose to the Undergraduate or Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board units of study with zero, one or two credit points.

(12) **Teaching sessions**

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

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

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

(13) University semester dates, and dates for summer and winter sessions and teaching blocks must be approved by the Academic Board.

19 **Assessment framework**

(1) Assessment is the means by which students demonstrate graduate qualities and learning outcomes in a unit of study and in an award course.

(2) Learning outcomes for units of study must be assessed either within the unit of study or within an assessment framework for the award course or a component of an award course.

(3) The assessment framework of award courses and units of study must promote student learning and engaged enquiry, and be designed to ensure that key
milestones in the achievement of learning outcomes are met to a standard sufficient to allow progression.

(4) Faculties must design the assessment framework of an award course to ensure that all students who successfully complete the award course demonstrate the graduate qualities and specified learning outcomes for the award.

(5) Unit of study co-ordinators must design the assessment framework of a unit of study to ensure that all students who successfully complete the unit of study demonstrate the graduate qualities and learning outcomes of the unit of study and are assessed to the same standard.

(6) The University’s policy and procedures on assessment are set out in Part 14 of the Coursework Policy 2014 and in the Assessment Procedures 2011.

20 Academic integrity in the design of curricula

(1) Learning experiences, programs and curricula must be designed to educate students early in the first year about academic integrity, appropriate acknowledgement, academic honesty and avoiding plagiarism.

   (a) This education must include an online module endorsed by the Office of Educational Integrity and should also include tutorials work and scaffolding writing tasks as appropriate.

(2) The assessment framework of award courses and the assessment matrix within each unit of study must be designed and reviewed each time the unit is offered to ensure academic integrity.

(3) Faculties must manage the risk to academic integrity within the assessment framework for each unit of study consistently with the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 and associated procedures.

Note: See clause 12 of the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015.

20A Third party learning technologies

(1) All use of third party learning technologies must be consistent with relevant University policies, including in particular:

   (a) Policy on the Use of University Information Communications Technology Resources;

   (b) Privacy Policy 2013; and

   (c) University Recordkeeping Policy.

(2) Staff members and academic units:

   (a) are responsible for identifying and managing any risks associated with third party learning technologies which they introduce and use in association with their teaching; and

   (b) must register the use of such technologies with the office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).

(3) Third party learning technologies must not be used for assessment purposes without the permission of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).
(4) Where a third party learning technology is introduced by the University, the University must:
   (a) develop and communicate an appropriate strategy for support of the technology; and
   (b) establish and implement appropriate mechanisms for:
      (i) retrieving and storing records of student activity generated by the technology; and
      (ii) trialling and evaluating the use of the technology.

(5) Where a third party learning technology is introduced by a staff member or academic unit, the person or unit introducing it must:
   (a) develop and communicate an appropriate strategy for support of the technology; and
   (b) establish and implement appropriate mechanisms for:
      (i) retrieving and storing records of student activity generated by the technology; and
      (ii) trialling and evaluating the use of the technology.

PART 4 MANAGEMENT OF LEARNING AND TEACHING

21 Statement of intent

The purpose of this part of the policy is to set out the framework, and specific responsibilities, for the management and evaluation of learning and teaching at unit of study, degree and University level. This includes academic governance authorities, roles and responsibilities, and quality assurance processes.

22 Rescinded

23 Roles and responsibilities in managing learning and teaching

(1) Delegations of authority for the management of learning and teaching are set out in:
   (a) University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Academic Functions) Rule 2016; and
   (b) University of Sydney (Delegations of Authority – Administrative Functions) Rule 2016.

(2) The Academic Board
   (a) subject to endorsement by Senate, approves the award course level curriculum which is developed, implemented and monitored by the faculty;
   (b) approves requirements and other elements of award courses as set out in the Coursework Policy 2014, award course resolutions and tables of units of study, including:
      (i) determining the type of degree;
Note: types are: for bachelor degrees - liberal studies or specialist or professional; for masters degrees - advanced learning by coursework, professional by coursework, or research.

(ii) the inclusion of degree core, programs, majors and minors in award course requirements;
(iii) the inclusion of mandatory units, and barrier assessments;
(iv) the table of units of study for an award course;
(v) the curriculum of streams within an award course;

(c) approves faculty resolutions;
(d) approves admission requirements and pre-requisites for award courses;
(e) approves, on the recommendation of the relevant faculty or Board of Interdisciplinary Studies:
   (i) addition and deletion of award courses, streams, programs, majors, minors; and
   (ii) changes to the degree core;
(f) approves the list of majors, minors and units of study available in the shared pool for Liberal Studies degrees and the Bachelor of Advanced Studies, on the recommendation of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies;
(g) approves changes to the mode of delivery of a course or unit of study;
(h) determines deadlines for submitting proposals for new, amended and deleted award courses;
(i) determines teaching periods and commencement and conclusion dates of the academic year and, if appropriate, variations from standard teaching sessions requested by faculties;
(j) is responsible for:
   (i) aligning the range of the University’s academic programs so that all graduates demonstrate graduate qualities set out in Part 2 to a high standard;
   (ii) reviewing education programs within faculties in a seven year cycle;
   (iii) monitoring program outcomes and reports of review committees and accrediting bodies to promote educational excellence as set out in Part 2;
   (iv) monitoring processes within faculties to support the academic integrity of the University’s programs and assessment;
   (v) monitoring breaches of academic integrity, reviewing processes to minimise or eliminate them and taking appropriate action;
   (vi) considering and, if appropriate, approving the name and abbreviation used for each award course; and
   (vii) developing and maintaining quality and educational excellence as set out in Part 5.

(3) **The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)** is responsible for strategic leadership of educational excellence and educational innovation throughout the University.

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education):
(a) develops and maintains institutional systems and strategy to achieve excellence in outcomes, experience and environment. This includes curriculum frameworks, online learning, and the student experience; and
(b) develops and maintains quality and educational excellence as set out in Part 5.

(4) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) is responsible for the institutional systems and processes that support educational excellence. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) develops and maintains institutional systems and strategy in order to achieve excellence in admission, student recruitment, and administration processes.

(5) The University Executive Curriculum and Course Planning Committee:
(a) reviews the business case for new course proposals from faculties; and
(b) advises the University Executive and its relevant committees in their deliberations over whether to endorse a proposed course or change for consideration by the Academic Board.

(6) The Board of Interdisciplinary Studies approves:
(a) units of study under a faculty’s direction which are included in the shared pool of units of study available across all Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees;
(b) units of study that are not under a faculty’s direction;
(c) the inclusion of units of study that are not under a faculty’s direction in the shared pool of units of study available across all Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees;
(d) units of study in the open learning environment, Sydney Research Seminars, and interdisciplinary units of study offered to students in any degree.

(7) Faculties
(a) Faculties, and their committees, are responsible for standards, assessment and quality throughout the faculty. Faculties:
   (i) establish a standing committee or committees with responsibility for excellence in outcomes and experience in award courses;
   (ii) consider and, if appropriate, approve curriculum for all units of study, minors, and majors and programs in an award course;
   (iii) approve learning outcomes for units of study, majors and programs;
   (iv) approve assessment for units of study and other curriculum components as appropriate;
   (v) approve pre-requisites and co-requisites for units of study and honours components;
   (vi) determine the curriculum and learning outcomes for streams for recommendation to the Academic Board;
   (vii) determine integration between units of study to meet the learning outcomes of majors, programs, streams or award courses and to achieve graduate qualities;
   (viii) determine faculty resolutions relating to award courses of the faculty;
   (ix) develop and maintain alignment of curricula and the quality of learning and teaching to achieve high standards in award course outcomes;
(x) where appropriate, monitor alignment with standards set by professional and accrediting bodies;

(xi) advise the Academic Board of any changes to degree level curricula. This includes creation, variation and deletion of courses and changes to tables of units of study;

Note: Course proposal and amendment requirements can be found on the [Academic Board website](#).

(xii) ratify assessment results;

(xiii) monitor and maintain standards in the quality of assessment practices and academic integrity;

Note: See the Coursework Policy 2014, the Assessment Procedures 2011 and the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015.

(xiv) review and act on educational quality data each semester as set out in Part 5;

(xv) monitor breaches of academic integrity within the faculty;

(xvi) review the assessment framework of units of study and other curriculum components to eliminate or minimise the possibility of such breaches;

(xvii) report breaches of academic integrity to the Academic Board as required by the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015; and

(xviii) monitor the framework for the management of learning and teaching within the faculty and the processes for ensuring educational excellence in all programs as set out in Part 5.

Note: See clause 11. Responsibilities for standards and operational matters in connection with programs may be undertaken by relevant committees.

(8) Deans

(a) Deans have overarching responsibility for standards, quality, strategic leadership and resource allocation to achieve educational excellence within faculties. Deans:

(i) exercise strategic oversight of faculties and their committees, the Associate Dean - Education and Heads of School to develop and maintain alignment with faculty strategy and operations;

(ii) consistently with the Coursework Policy 2014, set operational parameters for teaching and curricula, including teaching workloads, staff profile, fees and student numbers;

(iii) make appropriate arrangements for quality assurance of teaching and learning within the faculty as set out in Part 4 and Part 5;

(iv) direct the appropriate allocation of resources for educational excellence;

(v) direct that student representatives be elected or appointed as members of education, undergraduate, postgraduate studies committees and program committees;
(vi) direct faculty or school offices to keep current and available relevant documentation relating to the faculty's academic programs, including documentation for units of study;

(vii) appoint an Educational Integrity Co-ordinator and, if appropriate, additional nominated academics to act as decision makers in relation to alleged breaches of academic integrity in line with the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015; and

(viii) consider and, if appropriate, approve requests by unit of study co-ordinators to opt out of the recording of lectures in University-managed lecture theatres, or delegate this authority to a Head of School.

(9) **Associate Deans - Education**

(a) Associate Deans - Education lead and co-ordinate strategies for educational excellence, improvement and innovation across the faculty and, on behalf of the Dean, monitor the effectiveness of processes for achieving graduate outcomes through engaged enquiry. Associate Deans – Education:

(i) co-ordinate teaching across the faculty to deliver excellent educational outcomes and experience;

(ii) review and act on data on educational quality;

(iii) monitor and direct alignment of educational standards and quality in the faculty with University policy and strategy;

(iv) implement collegial governance in the creation and review of educational programs within the faculty; and

**Note:** See clause 11.

(v) support quality of teaching and learning across the faculty as set out in Part 5.

(10) **Supervisors**

(a) Supervisors provide leadership, guidance and mentorship to students undertaking research projects, and provide academic advice to students on reporting of research findings. Supervisors:

(i) support the student in the research project, including providing timely feedback and advice;

(ii) monitor progress within the context of the overall research project;

(iii) develop in the student the necessary skills to complete the project; and

(iv) educate students about the University's policies on research integrity, data management, ethical research practice, intellectual property, relevant health and safety procedures and other relevant matters.

(11) **Heads of School**

(a) Heads of School lead strategies and allocate resources for educational excellence within the school. Heads of School:

(i) assign teaching duties, unit of study co-ordinator tasks, and program committee membership to staff in the school as specified in Section 24A;
(ii) review reports and data on educational quality in consultation with unit of study co-ordinators and program committees;

(iii) act in relation to staff performance and effective allocation of quality resources; and

(iv) if requested to do so by the Dean, consider and, if appropriate, approve requests by unit of study co-ordinators to opt out of the recording of lectures in University-managed lecture theatres.

(v) appoint a unit of study co-ordinator for each unit of study for which the school is responsible;

(vi) make appropriate alternative arrangements if a unit of study co-ordinator is or will be absent; and

(vii) appoint a new unit of study co-ordinator when a current unit of study co-ordinator leaves.

Note: In faculties without a school structure, the roles and responsibilities of a Head of School may be taken by the Associate Dean – Education.

(viii)

(12) **Unit of study co-ordinators**

(a) Each unit of study must have a named unit of study co-ordinator, appointed by the relevant Head of School.

(b) The Unit of study co-ordinator:

(i) is appointed for the whole of a teaching period during which a unit of study is being provided;

(ii) should inform the relevant Head of School of any intended or foreseeable absence, at least four weeks in advance;

(iii) develop, implement and monitor unit of study curricula, learning activities and assessment, subject to approval by the faculty;

(iv) align learning outcomes between a unit of study and an award course, and implement, at the unit study level, strategies and policies for educational excellence;

(v) review unit of study curriculum design, including learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities and assessment, and, where appropriate, align with program learning goals and graduate qualities;

(vi) document and communicate the unit of study curriculum as a unit of study outline in the LMS, and make a unit description, including pre-requisites, co-requisites and assessment, available for inclusion in the faculty handbook;

(vii) review assessment tasks and standards in relation to policy and report to the faculty and the program committee;

(viii) review the academic integrity of each assessment task and the assessment matrix of the unit of study each time it is offered to eliminate or minimise the risk of breaches of academic integrity;

(ix) design the assessment framework for the unit of study to ensure the academic integrity of each assessment in the unit as set out in the *Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015*. 
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(x) report incidents of potential academic dishonesty or plagiarism in line with university policy;

(xi) gather, review and act on data on educational quality, in consultation with the unit of study team and the Head of School;

(xii) administer surveys of educational experience and provide reports to students and the faculty on the quality of the student experience as set out in Part 5;

(xiii) make recommendations to the faculty, or a relevant committee of the faculty, about changes to learning outcomes, curriculum, or assessment for a unit of study; and

(xiv) manage access to lecture recordings and, where necessary, submit applications to opt out of recordings in University-managed lecture spaces to the Dean or Dean’s nominee.

(13) **Individual teachers**

(a) Educational excellence exists when teachers engage students in their learning. To this end, individual teachers:

(i) support and lead student learning of the curriculum, as specified and to the agreed standards;

(ii) prepare the educational content of units of study;

(iii) design and prepare assessment tasks as specified in the curriculum, and consistently with relevant policy;

(iv) monitor and act to support academic standards and academic integrity; and

(v) where there is more than one teacher in a unit, participate as part of the unit of study team to support the unit of study co-ordinator in his or her role and responsibilities.

(14) **Students**

(a) An essential component of educational excellence is that students gain increasing understanding of, and take responsibility for, their learning. To this end, students must:

(i) be familiar with the degree resolutions, relevant policies and other requirements for the course as set out in the faculty handbook, unit of study outline and other published guidelines; and

(ii) satisfy attendance and assessment requirements.

(b) In addition, students should participate in any evaluations of their experience, so that educational excellence is monitored and improved.

### 24 Documentation and communication

(1) This part of the policy sets out appropriate standards for:

(a) communicating with students and staff;

(b) managing the development of units of study, curricula and award courses; and

(c) institutional record keeping.
(2) Unit of study co-ordinators, together with the faculty, must provide a unit of study website on the LMS which contains, at a minimum:
   (a) the unit of study outline;
   (b) relevant curriculum resources; and
   (c) any other material specified in the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016.

   Note: See clause 11 of those procedures.

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

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

(5) Each faculty must publish an annual handbook, containing the minimum information specified in the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016.

   Note: See clause 9 of those procedures.

(6) The Academic Board may make award course resolutions, which must contain at least the minimum information specified in the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016.

   Note: See clause 8 of those procedures.

(7) Subject to Academic Board approval, faculties may make resolutions applying to all degrees within a certain category awarded by the faculty.

(8) Upon each student’s graduation the University will provide each of the following documents, which will provide the information required by the Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016:

   (a) a transcript;
   (b) a certificate of graduate status; and
   (c) a testamur.

   Note: See clause 12 of those procedures.

(9) ____________________________

24A Qualifications of teachers, co-ordinators and supervisors

(1) Heads of school must appoint unit of study co-ordinators and teachers who have appropriate knowledge, skills and qualifications, including:

   (a) up to date knowledge of a relevant field or discipline, which is informed by any of:

      (i) ongoing research;
      (ii) scholarship; or
      (iii) contemporary professional practice; and
(b) relevant skills in learning, teaching and assessment.

(2) Individuals teaching, co-ordinating or supervising units of study in award courses below AQF Level 10 must have:

(a) a relevant qualification at least one AQF level higher than the course being taught, co-ordinated or supervised;

(b) equivalent academic attainment; or

(c) equivalent professional experience; or

(d) be undergoing appropriate training in higher education teaching.

(3) Individuals appointed on the basis of subclauses 24A(2)(a) to (c) may also co-ordinate units of study in award courses below AQF Level 10. Individuals appointed on the basis of subclauses 24A(2)(d) must not be appointed to co-ordinate units of study.

(4) Individuals teaching, co-ordinating or supervising units of study in an award course at AQF Level 10 must have:

(a) a relevant qualification at AQF Level 10;

(b) equivalent academic attainment; or

(c) equivalent professional experience.

(5) If individuals are appointed on the basis of equivalent academic merit or professional experience under subclauses 24A(2) or 24A(3):

(a) the academic attainment or professional experience must be documented and approved in writing by the head of school;

Note: Records of approval must be retained and stored consistently with the requirements of the University Recordkeeping Policy and the Privacy Policy 2013.

And

(b) if an individual is appointed under subclause 24A(2), their work must be overseen or supervised by an appropriate University staff member who possesses the relevant AQF qualification; or

(c) if an individual is appointed under subclause 24A(3), their work must be guided or co-ordinated by an appropriate University staff member who possesses an AQF Level 10 qualification.

PART 5 QUALITY ASSURANCE

25 Quality assurance processes

(1) Quality assurance ensures that learning outcomes at the required standards are demonstrated by students in appropriate tasks and assures that, for each learning activity, a quality learning environment exists. Quality assurance processes must be:

(a) standards driven;

(b) evidence based; and

(c) institutionally aligned.
(2) Quality is measured in terms of excellence in:
(a) educational outcomes;
(b) educational experience;
(c) educational environment.

Note: See Part 2.

(3) Excellence in educational outcomes is measured through systematic assessment which ensures that students achieve course learning outcomes at a high standard, and through the assessment of graduate qualities.
(a) Faculties and their Associate Deans - Education must arrange for assessments to be subject to peer feedback and periodic benchmarking.

(4) Excellence in educational experience is measured through students’ reports of their experience. Feedback should be formal and informal and captured at unit of study, major, program or degree level. University, national and international surveys should be used to collect formal feedback.
(a) Unit of study co-ordinators and Associate Deans - Education must administer surveys of educational experience each time a unit of study is offered.
(b) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) must implement surveys of students’ experience of their learning at a University-wide level at least annually.

(5) Excellence in educational environment is measured through students’ responses to University, national and international surveys, and targeted ad hoc assessments of learning spaces.
(a) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) must implement surveys of educational environment at a University-wide level at least annually.

(6) At unit of study level
(a) Standards for educational outcomes must be determined by the faculty with reference to the discipline.
   (i) These standards must be easily visible at faculty level, generated through scrutiny of results data, and align with awards.
   (ii) The unit of study co-ordinator must assess whether educational outcomes are meeting agreed standards, including those for academic integrity.

(b) Standards for educational experience include the student experience of learning and teaching, information about which is obtained through relevant student surveys and peer observation of teaching where appropriate.
   (i) The unit of study co-ordinator must provide annual reports on students’ experience in a unit of study and feedback from surveys to students and the faculty.

(c) Educational environment is measured in the provision of formal, informal and virtual learning spaces. Physical learning spaces are measured against:
   (i) accepted learning space standards; and
   (ii) student and teacher evaluations, including the effective use of existing resources for teaching units of study.

(7) At the curriculum level
(a) Educational outcomes must:
   (i) contribute to student qualifications;
   (ii) meet accreditation requirements; and
   (iii) be aligned with institutional, industry, professional and community expectations.

(b) Standards and outcomes must be determined by the faculty and managed by the faculty or its relevant committee.
   (i) Student survey results must be used to set standards and targets.
   (ii) Benchmarking and aligning with standards across the faculty, and other comparable institutions, and with professional disciplinary and industry expectations, must be used to measure excellence.

(c) Educational experience is provided through a thematically coherent program. Evaluation methods include student surveys, benchmarking reports, reports from accrediting bodies, and Go8 Standards Verification reports.
   (i) The Associate Dean - Education must provide annual reports on students' educational experience to the faculty.
   (ii) Faculties must provide copies of formal benchmarking reports to the Academic Board.
   (iii) Deans must provide copies of accreditation reports from external organisations to the Academic Board on receipt.
   (iv) The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education) must provide Go8 Standards Verification reports to the Academic Board on receipt.

(d) The quality of the educational environment is measured by the provision of formal and informal learning spaces, where students belong to a community of scholars within discipline and degree programs. Physical learning spaces are measured against:
   (i) accepted learning space standards; and
   (ii) student and teacher evaluations, including the effective use of existing resources.

(8) At the University level

(a) Educational outcomes prepare the student for learning, life and work experiences, including success in accessing further study opportunities, rewarding career paths, and contribution to the community.

(b) Educational experience is acquired through engagement and enquiry which challenges students with novel problems and issues at every stage of the educational process.

(c) Educational environment is measured in terms of the provision of physical spaces and equipment, and virtual learning environments. The environment should support working together to achieve excellence.

(d) The University must evaluate the quality of outcomes, experience and environment using methods which include:
   (i) using study survey results to set targets and benchmarks at faculty and University level;
(ii) accreditation reports;
(iii) meeting Group of Eight (Go8), AQF, Higher Education Standards, and professional regulatory body requirements; and
(iv) Academic Board and UE faculty reviews.

(e) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) must monitor evaluations of the standards of educational experience and education environments and provide reports to the University Executive and the Academic Board.

(f) The Academic Board must monitor educational excellence and, where appropriate, provide advice to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), the Vice-Chancellor and the Senate.

(g) The Academic Board and the UE must provide reports of faculty reviews to the Senate.

26 Rescissions, replacements and transitional provisions

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

(a) Academic Board Resolutions: Creation, variation and deletion of award courses and units of study which commenced on 1 January 2001
(b) Academic Board Resolutions: The Management and Evaluation of Coursework Teaching which commenced on 1 June 2001
(c) Academic Board Policy on Consultation with Students which commenced in 2008
(d) Academic Board Resolutions: Generic Attributes of Graduates of the University of Sydney which commenced in 1997
(e) Distance, Alternative and Flexible Modes of Delivery in Postgraduate Courses Policy
(f) Flexible Student-Centred Learning in the University of Sydney Policy which commenced in 1999
(g) Improved Learning and Teaching Through Collaboration, Benchmarking and Alliances Policy which commenced in 2005
(h) Principles for First Year Orientation and Transition Policy which commenced in 2001
(i) Quality Assurance and Learning Management Systems Policy which commenced in 2005
(j) Research-Enhanced Learning and Teaching Policy which commenced in 2007
(k) Written and Oral Communication Skills of Students Policy which commenced in 2002
(l) Parallel Teaching of Postgraduate and Undergraduate Students Policy which commenced in 2004

(2) Sub clauses 18(1)-(8) apply to all undergraduate degrees approved or reviewed after 25 July 2016.
(3) For staff employed prior to 1 January 2018, Section 24A Subclause 2(a)(ii) and (2)b(i) take effect on by 31 December 2018.
## SCHEDULE ONE

### Roles and responsibilities for curriculum (standards) and operational aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibility: Curriculum (standards)</th>
<th>Responsibility: Operational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Be familiar with legislative and other requirements of the course as set out in the faculty handbook, unit of study outline, and other published guidelines.</td>
<td>Participate in evaluations of their experience, to ensure that educational excellence is achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfy attendance and assessment requirements.</td>
<td>Encouraged to participate in the development and review of courses and units of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual teachers</td>
<td>Support and lead student learning of the curriculum as specified, and to the agreed standard.</td>
<td>Participate as part of the unit of study team (if appropriate) to support the roles and responsibilities of the unit of study co-ordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design and prepare assessment tasks as specified in the curriculum and in accordance with the standards in the relevant policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor and implement academic standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educate students on academic integrity and report any breaches of academic integrity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Responsibility: Curriculum (standards)</td>
<td>Responsibility: Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Unit of study co-ordinators | Review the design of the curriculum of the unit of study, including learning outcomes, learning and teaching activities, and assessment, to ensure ongoing alignment against program learning goals and graduate qualities.  
Document and communicate the unit of study curriculum as a unit of study outline in the LMS, and ensure its availability in the faculty handbook.  
Review assessment tasks and standards in relation to policy and report to the faculty and program committee.  
Review the academic integrity of each assessment task and the assessment matrix of the unit to eliminate or minimise the possibility of breaches of academic integrity. Unit of study co-ordinators must ensure that assessment framework in the unit of study is designed to ensure the academic integrity of each assessment in the unit as set out in the *Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015*.  
Act on breaches of academic integrity within a unit of study, and review the assessment framework each time the unit of study is offered to eliminate or minimise the possibility of such breaches.  
Recommend student assessment tasks to the faculty and program committee.  
In consultation with the unit of study team and the Head of School, gather, review and act on data on educational quality. | Lead and co-ordinate the unit of study team to deliver quality teaching and assessment, including reviewing, communicating and acting on data on educational quality in the unit of study. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibility: Curriculum (standards)</th>
<th>Responsibility: Operational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Provide leadership, guidance and mentorship to students undertaking research projects.</td>
<td>Support the student in the research project, including providing timely feedback and advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide academic advice to students on the reporting of research findings in a dissertation, treatise or long essay.</td>
<td>Monitor progress within the context of the overall research plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educate students on, and monitor the project for compliance with, the University's policies on research integrity, data management, ethical research practice, intellectual property, relevant health and safety procedures and other relevant matters.</td>
<td>Provide the student with the necessary skills to complete the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of school</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appoint a unit of study co-ordinator for each unit of study within the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of school</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assign teaching duties, unit of study co-ordinator tasks, and program committee membership to staff in the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In consultation with the heads of schools, unit of study co-ordinators and program committees, review reports and data on educational quality, and act in relation to staff performance and effective allocation of quality resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Responsibility: Curriculum (standards)</td>
<td>Responsibility: Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean - Education</td>
<td>Lead and co-ordinate strategies for educational excellence, improvement and innovation across the faculty.</td>
<td>Co-ordinate teaching across the faculty to deliver excellence in educational outcomes and experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On behalf of the Dean establish effective processes for achieving graduate outcomes through engaged enquiry.</td>
<td>Review and act on data on educational quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Align educational standards and quality within the faculty with the University policy and strategy.</td>
<td>Establish and implement collegial governance, as set out in Clause 11, in the creation and review of educational programs within the faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support quality of learning and teaching across the faculty as set out in Part 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have strategic oversight of faculties, the Associate Dean - Education and heads of school and heads of schools to ensure alignment with faculty strategy and operations (resources).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review and act on data relating to educational quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consistently with the <em>Coursework Policy 2014</em>, set operational parameters for teaching and curriculum (e.g. teaching workloads, staff profile, fees, student numbers.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make arrangements for quality assurance of teaching and learning within the faculty as set out in Part 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include, where appropriate, student representatives on standard governance committees and provide them with same information as other committee members to enable effective participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure that faculty offices maintain and update all documentation for policy and procedures relating to the faculty's academic programs, including documentation for units of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Responsibility: Curriculum (standards)</td>
<td>Responsibility: Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>Plan and implement reviews of degree curriculum design, including degree learning outcomes, degree learning experiences, and degree level assessment. This will establish ongoing internal alignment and mapping coverage in relation to program goals, coherence, relevance and strategic fit.</td>
<td>Monitor the framework for the management of learning and teaching within the faculty and the processes for ensuring educational excellence in all programs. May devolve their responsibilities for standards and operational matters to degree, major and program committees and to degree co-ordinators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advise the Academic Board of any changes to degree level curricula. This may include creation, variation or deletion of courses and changes to tables of units of study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ratify assessment results with degrees and monitor and act to ensure quality of standards and quality of assessment practices. (See the Coursework Policy 2014 and the Assessment Procedures 2011).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and act on data on educational quality and ensure educational excellence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrench academic integrity within the assessment framework of each award course at each stage of the program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor breaches of academic integrity within the faculty, review the assessment framework to eliminate or minimise the possibility of such breaches, and report breaches of academic integrity each year to the Academic Board as set out in the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Responsibility: Curriculum (standards)</td>
<td>Responsibility: Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Vice-Chancellor</td>
<td>Establish and support institutional systems and strategy to deliver the educational mission in order</td>
<td>Establish and support institutional systems and strategy to deliver the educational mission in relation to admission, recruitment, and administration processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>to achieve excellence in outcomes, experience and environment (e.g. infrastructure, IT, curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frameworks, student experience).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deliver quality assurance measures as set out in Part 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Vice-Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Through faculties, the Academic Board and the University Executive (UE) Education Committee, review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and act on:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• reports of program committees, including curriculum review and assessment standards;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• data on educational quality; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• academic integrity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Guidelines for Inter-institutional Agreements

Approved by: Vice-Chancellor on 8 July 1997
Contact Officer Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic and International)

Introduction

The national and international profile of the University of Sydney is enhanced by the active participation of its staff and the visibility of its students in activities arising from cooperative cross-institutional Agreements with a range of relevant institutions both within and outside Australia. The challenge to the University is to ensure that academic cooperation is facilitated through provision of sound administrative support and that overly burdensome procedures are avoided.

Co-operative arrangements may vary in formality from formal Agreements, such as Memoranda of Understanding that are negotiated at institutional levels and signed by the CEOs of the institutions concerned to informal Agreements that result from the initiative of individual staff and relate to the conduct of particular activities or events.

While some co-operative arrangement can and will exist at an informal level, this will not apply in cases where award programs of the University of Sydney are involved. In such cases, the University's reputation and the interests of its students must be safeguarded. This will typically be achieved through the Academic Board which has the responsibility of ensuring the academic integrity of the University's programs of instruction and the quality of their modes of delivery.

Where an inter-institutional Agreement involves an award course of the University of Sydney, matters relating to Academic Board requirements for admission, assessment and curriculum requirements for the program, the methods proposed for moderation and quality assurance as well the agreement of the relevant faculty, college or other university groups will need to be addressed prior to the finalisation of the Agreement.

Scope of these guidelines

In developing guidelines for Agreements, it is not intended to impose any changes to the informal inter-institutional co-operation that occurs at the level of individual staff or groups of staff. Monitoring of these informal arrangements should occur as appropriate at departmental or faculty levels.

The guidelines proposed in this discussion paper relate to inter-institutional Agreements and are intended to apply where inter-institutional co-operation is the subject of formal documentation including Memoranda of Understanding or similar signed by one or more officers of the University of Sydney. The institutions involved in these links with the University of Sydney will commonly but not necessarily be located overseas and may involve a range of academic activities, including the delivery of programs that provide students with advanced standing to programs of this University, the delivery of programs of the University, staff and/or student exchanges.

These guidelines do not apply to inter-institutional Agreements outside the international arena, such as those concerned with the clinical placements of UG students of the University of Sydney.
A pro forma designed to assist in the process of setting up an Agreement is available. The pro forma should be used whenever a University-to-University Memorandum of Understanding or a Student Exchange Agreement is proposed.

A second pro forma (See B2 below) will be prepared following discussion of these guidelines and feedback by relevant groups, including the International Reference Group.

Guidelines

All Agreements will be for a nominated time period, commonly 3 to 5 years, after which time an Agreement will lapse unless renewed.

A. Formal inter-institutional Agreements for research cooperation and/or for staff and/or student exchanges

A1 Agreements of this nature may be entered into to support the activities of departments, faculties, Colleges or the University as a whole and typically take the form of Memoranda of Understanding to operate for a nominated period.

A2 Before their conclusion, any Agreement involving the proposed exchange of students will be referred to the International Office for advice concerning relevant matters such as visa requirements and other formalities.

A3 Such Agreements may be of various types:

(i) inter-departmental Agreements, initiated by the relevant Head(s) of Department of the University of Sydney, endorsed by the Dean(s), with the signatory on behalf of the University of Sydney being the relevant College Pro-Vice-Chancellor(s);

(ii) inter-faculty Agreements, initiated and endorsed by the Dean(s), with the signatory on behalf of the University of Sydney being the relevant College Pro-Vice-Chancellor(s);

(iii) inter-institutional Agreements, endorsed by the relevant College Pro-Vice-Chancellor(s), in which case the appropriate signatory for the University of Sydney is the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International & Development).

A4 Notwithstanding item A3 above, where the signatory of the proposed partner institution is to be its Vice-Chancellor/President/Rector/Chief Executive, the proposed Agreement will be forwarded prior to finalisation to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International & Development) to determine whether, from the University's position, the Vice-Chancellor's signature is appropriate, and if so, will forward the document to the Vice-Chancellor.

A5 Notwithstanding item A3 above, where the partner is a Department or Division of a foreign Government, the proposed Agreement will prior to finalisation be forwarded to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International & Development) to determine whether from the University's position, the Vice-Chancellor's signature is appropriate, and if so, will forward the document to the Vice-Chancellor.

A6 A copy of each Agreement signed in this category will be forwarded to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International and Development) for central records and data base entry.
B. Agreements that involve the offering, in whole or part, of any existing award program of the University within Australia or overseas

B1. The Vice-Chancellor and Principal will be the signatory on behalf of the University of Sydney to an Agreement through which any degree, diploma or certificate program of the University is to be offered either in whole or part, in association with or by a partner institution in Australia or overseas.

B2. A Supporting Memorandum will be prepared by the proposing group and will provide brief comment on the partner institution under the following headings:
   € academic standing and, where appropriate, financial stability;
   € arrangements for the physical and pastoral care of the students involved;
   € arrangements for the collection, disbursement and refund of tuition fees (if any) to be paid by those students;
   € arrangements for student record keeping;
   € resource implications (both human and financial) of the Agreement;
   € where relevant, provisions made to protect the University’s intellectual property;
   € where relevant, the arrangements to address any offshore legal and financial requirements, such as provisions for withholding tax.

A pro forma with checklist will be provided to facilitate this process.

B3. Where an Agreement involves the offering of units of study under arrangements that vary significantly from their normal modes of offering, the relevant Dean(s) and Head(s) of Department will certify that the new arrangements are appropriate.

B4. After endorsement by the relevant Dean(s) and College Pro-Vice-Chancellor(s), the proposed Agreement with the Supporting Memorandum should be forwarded to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International and Development) who will refer it to the Vice-Chancellor.

B5. A copy of any such Agreement under this category will be recorded in the central data base through the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International & Development).

C. Agreements to accept prior studies at another institution for credit or exemption towards a Degree, Diploma or Certificate of the University for international students

C1. It is acknowledged that the granting of credit for prior studies at another institution whether within Australia or overseas is governed by the Resolutions of Senate relating to particular degrees and is typically handled according to the general policies of Academic Board.

C2. Under normal circumstances, the granting of credit would not normally entail the setting up of a formal Agreement. In some cases, however, for offshore legal purposes or to enhance international student recruitment, a formal Agreement will be deemed desirable by an academic unit. Such an Agreement should specify the extent of the credit and the circumstances under which it would be granted and recognise that admission may be subject to quota restriction.

C3. The signatory for such Agreements is the relevant College Pro-Vice-Chancellor(s) after endorsement by the Dean(s).

C4. When signing such Agreements, the College Pro-Vice-Chancellors would generally satisfy themselves that:
   € the proposed partner institution is of good academic standing and reputation;
   € its students will be properly prepared for their proposed programs of study in Australia; and
   € relevant legal and financial requirements have been addressed.
C5 A copy of any such Agreement under this category will be forwarded to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International and Development) for central records and to be included in relevant marketing material.

D. Use of the University coat-of-arms

Where an Agreement has been set up in accord with the relevant guidelines and signed by the appropriate University officers, the Vice-Chancellor or nominee may approve the limited use of the University coat-of-arms or other devices for circumscribed purposes by the other institutional party to the Agreement.

These guidelines have been developed in consultation with the International Reference Group, the Senior Executive Staff and the Vice-Chancellor's Advisory Committee and come into effect from 7 August 1997.

The guidelines will be reviewed on a regular basis.
ELECTION CANDIDATES’ CONDUCT PROCEDURES 2017

Issued by: Secretary to Senate

Dated:

Last amended:

Signature:
Name: Mr David Pacey

1 Purpose and application

(1) These procedures are to give effect to the electoral provisions of the University of Sydney (Governance of Faculties and University Schools) Rule 2016 (“the GOFUS Rule”) and the University of Sydney (Academic Board) Rule 2017 (“the Academic Board Rule”).

(2) These procedures should be read in conjunction with the Election Procedures 2017.

(3) These procedures apply, in addition to the Code of Conduct – Staff and Affiliates and Code of Conduct for Students, to all staff and students involved in the conduct of:

(a) elections held under the GOFUS Rule or the Academic Board Rule; and

(b) election campaigns.

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 GOFUS Rule, the Academic Board Rule, as appropriate, or the Election Procedures 2017.

Note: See section 1.4 of the GOFUS Rule, section 1.4 of the Academic Board Rule, and clause 3 of the Election Procedures 2017.
(2) In these procedures:

**campaign materials** means all electronic and non-electronic materials used for the promotion of a candidate including web pages, emails, social media posts, brochures and flyers.

**campaigning** means carrying out an activity that identifies a person as a candidate for an election.

**candidate** means a person who has nominated for election, and whose nomination has been accepted.

**supporter** means a person assisting a candidate in an election campaign.

4 Principles

(1) The relevant Returning Officer must provide a copy of these procedures and the *Election Procedures 2017* to all candidates as soon as possible after receipt of their nomination.

(2) Staff and students involved in campaigning for elections must not engage in dishonest or misleading practices during the course of the campaign.

(3) All information provided to the Returning Officer, orally or in writing, must be true, accurate and not misleading.

   (a) If required by the Returning Officer, information must be verified by such means as the Returning Officer may stipulate.

(4) Campaign materials must not contain images or languages, or promote behaviour, that:

   (a) breaches any legislative or regulatory requirement;

   (b) breaches any University Rule, policy or procedures; or

   (c) in the reasonable opinion of the Returning Officer, is offensive.

   **Note:** See Code of Conduct – Staff and Affiliates, the Code of Conduct for Students, and Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Policy 2015.

(5) Each candidate is responsible for the actions of their supporters during the campaign.

54 Campaigning

(1) Each candidate must inform their supporters:

   (a) about the requirements of these procedures; and

   (b) the necessity to observe these requirements at all times.

(2) During the course of the election, candidates and their supporters must conduct themselves in a manner that:

   (a) does not compromise the fairness and integrity of the election process, including the conduct of a secret ballot; and
(b) does not prejudice the good name of the University.

56 Canvassing votes

(1) Candidates and their supporters may approach potential voters to ask for their vote.

(2) Candidates and their supporters must not:

(a) harass, intimidate or coerce potential voters to vote for or against a particular candidate; or

(b) use any means, including bribery or threats or similar means, to induce a potential voter to vote for or against a particular candidate.

Note: See Code of Conduct – Staff and Affiliates, the Code of Conduct for Students, and Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Policy 2015.

76 Voting

(1) No person may:

(a) log in online with another person’s ID or password; or

(b) use another person’s ID and password to vote online on an electronic device.

Note: See Clause 5(q) of the Policy on the use of University Information and Communication Technology Resources (ICT Resources).

(2) No person may

(a) provide another person with their passwords; or

(b) allow another person to vote on their behalf.

Note: See clause 11a of the Information Security Policy.

87 Breach of these procedures

Breach of the requirements of this document may constitute misconduct or serious misconduct, and the University may take disciplinary action against any person who does so.
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RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee note the 2016 Consolidated Summary of the Student Experience and Graduate Outcomes report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As part of the 2016-2020 Strategic Plan the University is committed to offering an educational experience of the highest quality. We intend to achieve this through two key strategies: a transformation of undergraduate education at the University of Sydney; and a transformation of the learning experience.

In order to assess progress towards the 2016-2020 Strategic Plan goals of offering an educational experience of the highest quality, we monitor students' satisfaction with their learning experience and track graduate employment and further study outcomes, using a standard suite of surveys.

The Quality and Analytics Group has produced a new report to summarise findings from the full suite of surveys, the 2016 Consolidated Summary of the Student Experience and Graduate Outcomes report.

The executive summary and key recommendations are included below. The complete report is attached.
Non-Confidential

REPORT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The University target for KPI-E2 (SES) was achieved in 2016, with seven faculties achieving their target.
- While we failed to achieve university targets on KPI-E1 and KPI-E3, substantial improvement was made at the university level, with several faculties achieving or just falling short of their targets.
- The University has performed relatively poorly in comparison to Australian and/or Go8 benchmarks for undergraduates in the areas of student support, learning resources, overall experience, good teaching, and percentage in further full-time study. Good teaching and learner engagement measures are low nationally. However, a positive indicator for the University is the employability of its undergraduate cohort.
- The University's postgraduate coursework students have a relatively poor experience, particularly our international students, and student support is an issue. Good teaching is low nationally. On a more upbeat note, results have consistently improved across all areas in the past two to three years.
- Coursework students are critical of the structure of their programs, many aspects of assessment and feedback, aspects of face-to-face teaching, and of the level of concern demonstrated by teachers for student learning.
- Feedback on the learning environment suggests improvement is needed socially and cross-culturally, both through the provision of more and better physical teaching and learning spaces, student spaces and common areas, and through efforts to promote broader and more open connection among students. Students also express some dissatisfaction with class sizes.
- In 2015 and 2016, a number of Sydney-specific items that relate to Graduate Qualities identified in the University's 2016-2020 Strategic Plan were introduced to the SES. Not surprisingly, item results indicate that the University has some strategic development work to do in these areas, as most of the Sydney-specific items are at or below 50% satisfaction. These results underline the importance of ensuring that the graduate qualities are effectively embedded in the new curriculum.
- Regarding the HDR experience, quality of supervision is ahead of the Australian and Go8 average, while performance is relatively poor in respect to infrastructure, thesis examination, and support for international students. Intellectual climate is perceived poorly nationally.
- The University of Sydney is well ahead of the Australian and Go8 average for full-time employment rate of bachelor-degree graduates. Coursework postgraduates fair slightly better than average, and research postgraduates slightly worse.
- Graduate outcomes are generally better at 12 months post-completion than at 4 months, however this does not appear to be the case for research postgraduates, who generally take longer to secure full-time employment.
- According to the new Student Perception of Overqualification scale, University of Sydney graduates (at all levels) are less likely to feel overqualified in their current full-time employment compared to the Australian and Go8 average.
- Given performance over 2014-2016, the University will need to ensure that it meets its annual Education KPI targets if it is to achieve its aspirations for an outstanding educational experience by 2020.
REPORT KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Faculties and schools should ensure that they systematically monitor and address a number of the identified issues as part of their regular learning and teaching review and improvement processes and through strategic projects underway, including projects on curriculum redevelopment, assessment and LMS renewal. In particular, this work should address:
   - Program organization and coherence;
   - Embedding of graduate qualities;
   - Assessment of graduate qualities;
   - A more coherent and targeted approach to assessment and feedback, in general; and
   - Quality of online learning materials.

2. Faculties should explicitly address the concerns identified by students in their survey feedback as they take advantage of current mechanisms to support educational quality improvement and innovation, including:
   - Compact funding agreements with the Education portfolio;
   - Strategic Education Grants;
   - Support for embedded initiatives from the Portfolio’s spoke teams in Educational Innovation, Academic Enrichment, and Industry and Community Engagement; and
   - A range of professional learning programs and opportunities (including peer observation and review, the flipped professional model offered by the Educational Innovation team, the Semester 2, 2017 First Year Coordinators program).

3. Faculty strategic plans (some of which are under current development) should set out a coherent set of aims and initiatives to address student experience issues pertinent to their local context (summarized in Section 2.2); these plans should also serve to frame the annually updated Faculty Action Plans for learning and teaching to be submitted as part of the Faculty-Education portfolio compact funding process noted in Recommendation 2. The proposed suite of actions for improving students learning experiences set out in 2016 by the Education Portfolio may serve as a stimulus (see Attachment 1).

4. Faculties should engage schools in developing strategies to address issues in particular study areas (summarized in Section 2.2), in both coursework and HDR degrees.

5. More effective use should be made of student feedback on unit of study and course experiences at all levels of the University and efforts to inform students of actions taken by different parts of the University in response to this feedback should be increased at all levels as well. A plan for student communications should be developed by the Education portfolio for consideration by the UE Education and UE Research Education Committees.

6. The University should address its poor performance in the area of Student Support as a matter of urgency, especially in the areas of academic and career advising. The DVC Registrar and DVC Education should be asked to prepare a joint plan for consideration by the UE Education, UE Research Education, and Student Life Committees.

7. The University should address the poor experience of international postgraduate coursework students. An issues paper should be developed by the Education portfolio for consideration by the UE Education Committee.

8. The University should address the HDR student experience of thesis examination. An issues paper should be developed by the Education portfolio for consideration by the UE Research Education Committee.

ATTACHMENT

- 2016 Consolidated Summary of the Student Experience and Graduate Outcomes
Consolidated Summary of the Student Experience and Graduate Outcomes

2016 Performance

Prepared by Quality and Analytics Group, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) Portfolio

1. INTRODUCTION

The 2016-2020 Strategic Plan commits the University to offering an educational experience of the highest quality. We intend to achieve this through two key strategies: a transformation of undergraduate education at the University of Sydney; and a transformation of the learning experience. In order to assess progress, we have committed to monitoring students' satisfaction with their learning experience and tracking graduate employment and further study outcomes, using a standard suite of surveys.

A set of three Education Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) focused on students' learning experiences was introduced at the University of Sydney in 2015. In response to the current Strategic Plan a further three KPIs have been added in 2017. These additional KPIs focus on graduate outcomes, student retention, and demand for the new undergraduate curriculum. Only the KPIs related to the student experience and graduate outcomes are presented here. Table 1 indicates the baselines and University-wide targets approved by Senate March 2017 for these four Education KPIs, defined below.

- **KPI-E1: Student Satisfaction - Unit of Study Survey (USS)** is the mean score across all core items of the USS. The annual improvement target is 7.5% of the difference between the perfect scale score of 5 and prior year outcome.

- **KPI-E2: Student Satisfaction - Student Experience Survey (SES)** is the mean of scale scores for Skills Development, Learner Engagement and Teaching Quality on the national SES. The annual improvement target is 5% of the difference between the perfect scale score of 100 and prior year outcome.

- **KPI-E3: Higher Degree Research (HDR) Experience** is the average of all items measuring Overall Satisfaction, Intellectual Climate, Skills and Supervision on the Student Research Experience Questionnaire (SREQ) in even years, and on the Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (PREQ) in odd years. The annual improvement target is a biennial improvement of 9.75% of the difference between the perfect scale score of 5 and outcomes two years prior.

- **KPI-E4: Employment/Further Study – Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS)** is the percentage of graduating cohort in full-time employment or full-time further study 4 months post-completion. The target is to be in the top decile of Australian universities by 2020.

---

1 We will also monitor retention, demand for the new undergraduates curriculum, HDR completions, the teaching experience, uptake of a range of professional learning opportunities by staff, uptake of experiential learning opportunities by students, and assess acquisition of the graduate qualities.
Table 1. Survey-related Education Strategy KPIs: Baselines and Targets to 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2017</th>
<th>Target 2018</th>
<th>Target 2019</th>
<th>Target 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPI-E1: Student Satisfaction – Unit of Study Survey (USS)</td>
<td>4.03 (2016)</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI-E2: Student Satisfaction – Student Experience Survey (SES)</td>
<td>73.76 (2016)</td>
<td>75.07</td>
<td>76.32</td>
<td>77.50</td>
<td>78.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI-E3(a): HDR Experience – Sydney Research Experience Questionnaire (SREQ)</td>
<td>4.01 (2016)</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI-E4: Employment/ Further Study – Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS)</td>
<td>=6th</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these indicators, other scales collected as part of the GOS and the Student Barometers yield important benchmarking information. Also, since 2015 we have conducted the internal Sydney Graduate Trajectories Survey (SGTS) to assess graduate outcomes 12 months post-completion, to complement the GOS which is conducted approximately 4 months post-completion. An overview of the full suite of student surveys is available at [https://intranet.sydney.edu.au/teaching-support/quality-analytics/surveys.html](https://intranet.sydney.edu.au/teaching-support/quality-analytics/surveys.html).

The report is organized as follows.

Section 2 provides an executive summary of the results overall, as well as some key recommendations for the University for addressing the substantial challenges that face us in achieving the outstanding educational experience to which we aspire.

Section 3 presents high-level information about student experience and graduate outcomes performance across the University against our own internal KPIs, and against Australian and Group of Eight (Go8) benchmarks where available.

Section 4 presents information by themes (teacher approaches relevant to learning, the learning environment, graduate qualities, and graduate outcomes) using relevant items from across the full survey suite.

Section 5 presents performance on survey scales across the University for 2014-2016, broken down by Faculty and study level.

The attachments supplement the data presented in Sections 2-5. Attachment 1 contains a summary of potential strategies for improving students’ learning experiences. Attachment 2 presents a further breakdown of the data presented in Section 3 by the 20 national Quality Indicators of Learning and Teaching (QILT) study area categories. These tables should allow faculties and schools to benchmark specific scales on the SES, CEQ, PREQ and GOS.
2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 Executive summary

- The University target for KPI-E2 (SES) was achieved in 2016, with seven faculties achieving their target.

- While we failed to achieve university targets on KPI-E1 and KPI-E3, substantial improvement was made at the university level, with several faculties achieving or just falling short of their targets.

- The University has performed relatively poorly in comparison to Australian and/or Go8 benchmarks for undergraduates in the areas of student support, learning resources, overall experience, good teaching, and percentage in further full-time study. Good teaching and learner engagement measures are low nationally. However, a positive indicator for the University is the employability of its undergraduate cohort.

- The University's postgraduate coursework students have a relatively poor experience, particularly our international students, and student support is an issue. Good teaching is low nationally. On a more upbeat note, results have consistently improved across all areas in the past two to three years.

- Coursework students are critical of the structure of their programs, many aspects of assessment and feedback, aspects of face-to-face teaching, and of the level of concern demonstrated by teachers for student learning.

- Feedback on the learning environment suggests improvement is needed socially and cross-culturally, both through the provision of more and better physical teaching and learning spaces, student spaces and common areas, and through efforts to promote broader and more open connection among students. Students also express some dissatisfaction with class sizes.

- In 2015 and 2016, a number of Sydney-specific items that relate to Graduate Qualities identified in the University's 2016-2020 Strategic Plan were introduced to the SES. Not surprisingly, item results indicate that the University has some strategic development work to do in these areas, as most of the Sydney-specific items are at or below 50% satisfaction. These results underline the importance of ensuring that the graduate qualities are effectively embedded in the new curriculum.

- Regarding the HDR experience, quality of supervision is ahead of the Australian and Go8 average, while performance is relatively poor in respect to infrastructure, thesis examination, and support for international students. Intellectual climate is perceived poorly nationally.

- The University of Sydney is well ahead of the Australian and Go8 average for full-time employment rate of bachelor-degree graduates. Coursework postgraduates fair slightly better than average, and research postgraduates slightly worse.

- Graduate outcomes are generally better at 12 months post-completion than at 4 months, however this does not appear to be the case for research postgraduates, who generally take longer to secure full-time employment.

- According to the new Student Perception of Overqualification scale, University of Sydney graduates (at all levels) are less likely to feel overqualified in their current full-time employment compared to the Australian and Go8 average.

- Given performance over 2014-2016, the University will need to ensure that it meets its annual Education KPI targets if it is to achieve its aspirations for an outstanding educational experience by 2020.
2.2 Benchmarking summary

- **UNDERGRADUATE BENCHMARKING**
  - **Highlights for Sydney:**
    - % graduates in full-time employment
    - Relatively positive experience in particular study areas: Psychology (CEQ); Law and paralegal studies (CEQ), Nursing (SES); Teacher education (SES + CEQ); Creative arts (SES); Dentistry (CEQ); Social work (CEQ)
  - **Areas of concern for Sydney:**
    - Overall experience (SES + CEQ)
    - Student support (SES + SB + CEQ)
    - Learning resources (CEQ)
    - Learning overall (ISB/SB)
    - Relatively poor experience in particular study areas: Science and mathematics (SES); Computing and information systems (SES); Engineering (SES); Pharmacy (SES); Rehabilitation (SES + CEQ); Humanities, culture and social sciences (SES); Social work (SES); Communications (SES); Agriculture and environmental studies (CEQ); Health services and support (CEQ)
  - **Areas of concern for the sector as a whole:**
    - Learner engagement (SES)
    - Good teaching (CEQ)

- **POSTGRADUATE COURSEWORK BENCHMARKING**
  - **Highlights for Sydney:**
    - Relatively positive experience in particular study areas: Health services and support (CEQ); Teacher education (CEQ); Business and management (CEQ); Humanities, culture and social science (CEQ); Communications (CEQ)
  - **Areas of concern for Sydney:**
    - Learning overall (ISB), for international students
    - Support overall (ISB), for international students
    - Relatively poor % graduates in full-time employment in particular study areas: Engineering; Psychology
    - Relatively poor experience in particular study areas: Pharmacy (CEQ); Rehabilitation (CEQ)
  - **Areas of concern for the sector as a whole:**
    - Good teaching (CEQ)
HDR BENCHMARKING

- Highlights for Sydney:
  - Supervision
  - Relatively positive experience in particular study areas: Engineering; Medicine
  - Relatively positive % graduates in full-time employment in particular study areas: Humanities, culture and social sciences

- Areas of concern for Sydney:
  - Infrastructure
  - Thesis examination
  - Support overall (ISB), for international students
  - Relatively poor % graduates in full-time employment in particular study areas: Psychology
  - Relatively poor experience in particular study areas: Architecture and built environment; Dentistry; Veterinary science; Law and paralegal studies

- Areas of concern for the sector as a whole:
  - Intellectual climate

2.3 Issues underlying the student experience results

A thematic analysis of items, using benchmarking data where available suggest the following are particular issues contributing to our relatively poor coursework student experience.

- Teaching:
  - program design
  - concern and understanding for students
  - quality of lectures and explanations
  - engagement in active learning and motivating teaching
  - clarity of assessment expectations and marking criteria
  - feedback that guides learning and helps students improve future performance
  - (HDR) guidance on literature searching

- Learning environment:
  - quality of a range of spaces used by students – teaching and learning spaces, student spaces, common areas
  - quality of online learning materials
  - active facilitation of interaction among students
  - class sizes
  - a sense of belonging to the University community

- Graduate qualities development:
  - information and digital literacy
  - inventiveness and the ability to respond creatively to novel problems
  - cultural competence
  - interdisciplinary effectiveness
  - ability to respond constructively to challenge
  - ability to contribute positively to the community
  - ability to exercise leadership and influence when required
2.4 Key recommendations

1. Faculties and schools should ensure that they systematically monitor and address a number of the identified issues as part of their regular learning and teaching review and improvement processes and through strategic projects underway, including projects on curriculum redevelopment, assessment and LMS renewal. In particular, this work should address:
   ▪ Program organization and coherence;
   ▪ Embedding of graduate qualities;
   ▪ Assessment of graduate qualities;
   ▪ A more coherent and targeted approach to assessment and feedback, in general; and
   ▪ Quality of online learning materials.

2. Faculties should explicitly address the concerns identified by students in their survey feedback as they take advantage of current mechanisms to support educational quality improvement and innovation, including:
   ▪ Compact funding agreements with the Education portfolio;
   ▪ Strategic Education Grants;
   ▪ Support for embedded initiatives from the Portfolio’s spoke teams in Educational Innovation, Academic Enrichment, and Industry and Community Engagement; and
   ▪ A range of professional learning programs and opportunities (including peer observation and review, the flipped professional model offered by the Educational Innovation team, the Semester 2, 2017 First Year Coordinators program).

3. Faculty strategic plans (some of which are under current development) should set out a coherent set of aims and initiatives to address student experience issues pertinent to their local context (summarized in Section 2.2); these plans should also serve to frame the annually updated Faculty Action Plans for learning and teaching to be submitted as part of the Faculty-Education portfolio compact funding process noted in Recommendation 2. The proposed suite of actions for improving students learning experiences set out in 2016 by the Education Portfolio may serve as a stimulus (see Attachment 1).

4. Faculties should engage schools in developing strategies to address issues in particular study areas (summarized in Section 2.2), in both coursework and HDR degrees.

5. More effective use should be made of student feedback on unit of study and course experiences at all levels of the University and efforts to inform students of actions taken by different parts of the University in response to this feedback should be increased at all levels as well. A plan for student communications should be developed by the Education portfolio for consideration by the UE Education and UE Research Education Committees.

6. The University should address its poor performance in the area of Student Support as a matter of urgency, especially in the areas of academic and career advising. The DVC Registrar and DVC Education should be asked to prepare a joint plan for consideration by the UE Education, UE Research Education, and Student Life Committees.

7. The University’s International Student Experience Taskforce should be asked to include student experience survey results for international students, especially those in postgraduate coursework programs, as part of its forthcoming deliberations. A more detailed report on international student survey data should be prepared by the Education portfolio for consideration by the Taskforce.

8. The University should address the HDR student experience of thesis examination. An issues paper should be developed by the Education portfolio for consideration by the UE Research Education Committee.
3. PERFORMANCE ON STUDENTS' LEARNING EXPERIENCES AND GRADUATE OUTCOMES 2016

Section 3 presents 2016 Education KPI performance against the 2016 targets, which used 2015 survey results as a baseline, with the exception of the biennial SREQ which used 2014 survey results as a baseline. The GOS was run for the first time in 2016, so there was no 2016 target set for KPI-E4.

3.1 2016 Performance against internal KPI targets

Table 3.1. 2016 KPIs: targets and performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>KPI-E1: USS</th>
<th>KPI-E2: SES</th>
<th>KPI-E3: SREQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.79 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.94 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.14 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.10 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.83 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.00 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Information Tech.</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.01 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.94 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.08 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.98 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.00 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.85 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.94 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.27 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.18 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.92 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.03 No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.

^ 2016 Agriculture and Veterinary Science students are included in Science results following transition to School of Life and Environmental Sciences.

As the table indicates, our performance on KPI-E2 was positive across the University and in a number of faculties, reflecting a more positive evaluation of the degree-level experience of coursework students. While we failed to achieve the university target on KPI-E1 and KPI-E3, it should be noted that significant improvement was made at the university level, with several faculties achieving or just falling short of their targets. Engineering and Information Technology and Law were the only two faculties to achieve all three of their KPI targets in 2016, while Business, Dentistry, and SCA achieved both of their targets for coursework indicators (KPI-E1 and KPI-E2). These data reinforce the challenge and urgency of the task ahead: to improve the quality of students' learning experiences as we transform the undergraduate curriculum and students' learning experiences.
### 3.2 Overall performance relative to national benchmarks

With respect to the sector nationally, our performance is generally below average. In Table 3.2 we summarise the scale scores and overall experience indicators for each of the national survey instruments. Note that SES benchmarking data is not available for coursework postgraduates, as they are an optional cohort for this survey. The GOS was introduced in 2016, so data is not available for 2014-2015.

Table 3.2. Scale scores and overall experience trend data for University of Sydney, with 2016 benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDERGRADUATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Experience Survey (SES)</td>
<td>Skills Development</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learner Engagement</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Quality</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Support</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Resources</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall experience</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ)</td>
<td>Good Teaching</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generic Skills</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Qualities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS)</td>
<td>% in full-time employment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% in full-time study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad Attrib: Adaptive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad Attrib: Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad Attrib: Foundation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern'l Student Barometer/Student Barometer (ISB/SB)</td>
<td>Learning overall</td>
<td>88/-</td>
<td>84/85</td>
<td>84/83</td>
<td>87/87</td>
<td>87/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support overall</td>
<td>89/-</td>
<td>86/84</td>
<td>86/81</td>
<td>89/88</td>
<td>89/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COURSEWORK POSTGRADUATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Experience Survey (SES)</td>
<td>Skills Development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learner Engagement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Quality</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Resources</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall experience</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ)</td>
<td>Good Teaching</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generic Skills</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Qualities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS)</td>
<td>% in full-time employment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% in full-time study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad Attrib: Adaptive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad Attrib: Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad Attrib: Foundation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern'l Student Barometer/Student Barometer (ISB/SB)</td>
<td>Learning overall</td>
<td>84/-</td>
<td>84/84</td>
<td>82/83</td>
<td>86/85</td>
<td>85/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support overall</td>
<td>86/-</td>
<td>85/86</td>
<td>86/88</td>
<td>89/88</td>
<td>89/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESEARCH POSTGRADUATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (PREQ)</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual Climate</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill Development</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thesis Examination</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goals and Expectations</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall satisfaction</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS)</td>
<td>% in full-time employment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% in full-time study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad Attrib: Adaptive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad Attrib: Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad Attrib: Foundation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern'l Student Barometer/Student Barometer (ISB/SB)</td>
<td>Learning overall</td>
<td>90/-</td>
<td>89/89</td>
<td>92/90</td>
<td>90/90</td>
<td>90/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support overall</td>
<td>88/-</td>
<td>85/89</td>
<td>85/85</td>
<td>89/86</td>
<td>90/86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As the table indicates, there is substantial opportunity for improvement in these indicators, particularly the undergraduate student experience as the University of Sydney is below the national average on many indicators (including Support, Learning Resources and Overall Experience on the national SES).

Encouragingly there has been improvement in regards to overall satisfaction and generic skills of recent graduates, with both these measures now closer in line with the Australian and Go8 average.

There has also been encouraging improvement in the experience of coursework postgraduates, with improvement on most SES and CEQ measures over recent years. While SES benchmarks are not available for the SES, we are broadly in line with the Australian and Go8 average on all CEQ scales.

Performance on HDR indicators is mixed, with quality of supervision ahead of the Australian and Go8 average, and performance relatively poor in respect to intellectual climate, infrastructure and thesis examination. Support for international HDR students is also a concern.

The University’s performance in the area of Student Support is a particular concern. University of Sydney students assign low ratings to the availability and helpfulness of both academic advice (less than 60% satisfaction on the SES since 2014) and career advice (less than 40% satisfaction on the SES since 2014). Although the focus of this report is on the quality of students’ learning experiences and outcomes, it is clearly important that the University address students’ concerns about student support as a matter of urgency.

Attachment 2 contains a breakdown of the results summarised in Table 3.2 for the 20 study areas used to present data to prospective students on the Quality Indicators of Learning and Teachers (QILT) website; see https://www.qilt.edu.au. The website allows prospective students to compare institutional results by choosing one of these 20 study area categories.
4. RESULTS BY THEME

We now present the data at item level, clustered in a way that focuses on:

- Students’ judgments of teacher approaches that are relevant to learning (Table 4.1);
- Students’ assessments of the environment for learning (Table 4.2);
- Students’ employment outcomes as graduates (Table 4.3); and
- Students’ perceptions of their development of graduate qualities (Table 4.4).

Table 4.1 Students’ perceptions of teacher approaches relevant to learning 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-Scale: item</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Go8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Study well-structured and focused</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Study relevant to education as a whole</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USS-2: The work has been intellectually rewarding</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Learning Overall</td>
<td>84/85</td>
<td>87/86</td>
<td>87/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Program content</td>
<td>88/89</td>
<td>90/90</td>
<td>90/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Program organization</td>
<td>81/75</td>
<td>86/80</td>
<td>86/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Teachers engaged you actively in learning</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Teachers demonstrated concern for student learning</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Teachers stimulated you intellectually</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Teachers seemed helpful and approachable</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Quality of teaching</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USS-1: Overall I was satisfied with the quality of teaching by the teacher(s)</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GTS: The teaching staff of this course motivated me to do my best work</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GTS: My lecturers were extremely good at explaining things</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GTS: The teaching staff worked hard to make their subjects interesting</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GTS: The staff made a real effort to understand difficulties I might have</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Expert lecturers</td>
<td>92/94</td>
<td>93/95</td>
<td>93/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Academics’ English</td>
<td>91/91</td>
<td>91/92</td>
<td>91/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Good teachers</td>
<td>85/85</td>
<td>88/88</td>
<td>88/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Quality lectures</td>
<td>84/85</td>
<td>88/87</td>
<td>88/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Teachers provided clear explanations on coursework and assessment</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Teachers set assessment tasks that challenge you to learn</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USS-5: The assessment tasks challenged me to learn</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Marking criteria</td>
<td>78/72</td>
<td>84/76</td>
<td>84/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Assessment</td>
<td>85/84</td>
<td>88/87</td>
<td>88/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEEDBACK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-TQ: Teachers commented on your work in ways that help you learn</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USS-6: I have been guided by helpful feedback on my learning</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GTS: The staff put a lot of time into commenting on my work</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GTS: The teaching staff gave me helpful feedback on how I was going</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB-Performance feedback</td>
<td>78/72</td>
<td>85/77</td>
<td>84/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESEARCH POSTGRADUATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREG-SU: Supervision was available when I needed it</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREG-SU: My supervisor/s made a real effort to understand difficulties I faced</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREG-SU: My supervisor/s provided additional information relevant to my topic</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREG-SU: I was given good guidance in topic selection and refinement</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREG-SU: My supervisor/s provided helpful feedback on my progress</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREG-SU: I received good guidance in my literature search</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SES results include undergraduates only, as other institutions do not include postgraduates. USS, CEQ and ISB/SB results include both undergraduates and coursework postgraduates. PREG results include research postgraduates only.

N/A: Not applicable, as the USS is an internal survey conducted only at Sydney.

TBA: To be announced, item level benchmarks for QILT surveys were not available at the time of this report.

With respect to students’ perceptions of teachers’ approaches summarised in Table 4.1, the only item where University of Sydney students rated their experience more positively than students nationally was for ‘Teachers stimulated you intellectually’. Students are positive, in other words, about the capacity of teachers to engage them intellectually, but this positive response is arguably more muted than is desirable.
for a leading research-intensive university. Moreover, students' responses are at their least positive when they are reflecting more directly on the impact of their teachers on their learning. They are critical of the structure of their programs, many aspects of assessment and feedback, and of the level of concern demonstrated by teachers for student learning. Relative to the benchmark groups, they are especially critical of marking criteria and feedback on students' performance.

Table 4.2 Students' perceptions of the learning environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-Scale: Item</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Go8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEARNING SPACES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LR: Quality of teaching spaces</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LR: Quality of student spaces and common areas</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LR: Quality of laboratory or studio equipment</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB: Physical library</td>
<td>87/86</td>
<td>88/88</td>
<td>88/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB: Laboratories</td>
<td>88/86</td>
<td>90/92</td>
<td>90/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB: Learning spaces</td>
<td>84/80</td>
<td>90/87</td>
<td>89/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEARNING RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USS-4: I have had good access to valuable learning resources</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LR: Quality of online learning materials</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LR: Quality of assigned books, notes and resources</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LR: Quality of library resources and facilities</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB: Online library</td>
<td>93/94</td>
<td>91/93</td>
<td>93/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERACTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LE: Had a sense of belonging to your university</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LE: Interacted with students outside study requirements</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LE: Interacted with students who are very different from you</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LE: Been given opportunities to interact with local students</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB: Class sizes</td>
<td>82/85</td>
<td>90/91</td>
<td>87/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECHNOLOGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LR: Quality of computing/IT resources</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB: Virtual learning</td>
<td>91/85</td>
<td>92/89</td>
<td>92/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB/SB: Technology</td>
<td>91/89</td>
<td>91/89</td>
<td>90/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESEARCH POSTGRADUATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-IC: The department provided opportunities for social contact with other postgrads</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-IC: I was integrated into the department’s community postgraduate students</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-IC: The dep’t provided opportunities to be involved in the broader research culture</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-IC: A good seminar program for postgraduate students was provided</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-IC: The research ambience in the department or faculty stimulated my work</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-TE: The thesis examination process was fair</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-TE: I was satisfied with the thesis examination process</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-GE: I developed an understanding of the standard of work expected</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-GE: I understood the required standard for the thesis</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-GE: I understood the requirements of the thesis examination</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SES results include undergraduates only, as other institutions do not include postgraduates. USS, CEQ and ISB/SB results include both undergraduates and coursework postgraduates. PREQ results include research postgraduates only.

N/A: Not applicable, as the USS is an internal survey conducted only at Sydney

TBA: To be announced, item level benchmarks for QILT surveys were not available at the time of this report.

Table 4.2 summarises students’ views of the learning environment and demonstrates that we still have some challenges in developing the physical and virtual learning environment to the standard that students expect. The data also suggest we need to do more to enrich the environment socially and cross-culturally, both through the provision of more and better student spaces and common areas, and through efforts to promote broader and more open connection among students and to the University community more broadly. A number of HDR students also see the intellectual climate in less than positive terms.

The strategic plan prioritises a learning environment that supports collaborative and active learning and the development of flexible, collaborative, connected, informal spaces. For HDR students, it seeks to enrich...
the environment in ways that will broaden students’ perspectives and skills and create an intellectual community within and across faculties.

Table 4.3 Students’ perceptions of their development of graduate qualities 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-Scale: Item</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Go8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPTH OF DISCIPLINARY EXPERTISE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-SD: Developed knowledge of field studying</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BROADER SKILLS: CRITICAL THINKING AND PROBLEM SOLVING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-SD: Developed critical and analytical thinking</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-SD: Developed ability to solve complex problems</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USS-3: I have developed relevant critical and analytical thinking skills</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GSS: The course sharpened my analytic skills</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GSS: The course developed my problem solving skills</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GSS: As a result of my course, I feel confident about tackling unfamiliar problems</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BROADER SKILLS: COMMUNICATION (ORAL AND WRITTEN)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-SD: Developed written communication skills</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-SD: Developed spoken communication skills</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GSS: The course improved my skills in written communication skills</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BROADER SKILLS: INFORMATION/DIGITAL LITERACY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-Syd: Ability to work effectively with digital and online tools and information</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BROADER SKILLS: INVENTIVENESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-Syd: Ability to respond creatively to novel problems</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL COMPETENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-Syd: Ability to work effectively with people from cultures other than your own</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERDISCIPLINARY EFFECTIVENESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-Syd: Ability to work effectively with others studying in a different field(s)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTEGRATED IDENTITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-Syd: Capacity to respond constructively to challenge</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFLUENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-Syd: Ability to contribute positively to the community</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-Syd: Ability to exercise leadership and influence when required</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-SD: Developed ability to work effectively with others</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LE: Worked with other students as part of your study</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LE: Participated in discussions online or face-to-face</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GSS: The course helped me develop my ability to work as a team member</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-SD: Developed confidence to learn independently</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-LE: Felt prepared for your study</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ-GSS: My course helped me to develop the ability to plan my own work</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work-related</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES-SD: Developed work-related knowledge and skills</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESEARCH POSTGRADUATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-SD: My research further developed my problem-solving skills</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-SD: I learned to develop my ideas and present them in my written work</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-SD: My research sharpened my analytical skills</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-SD: Doing my research helped me to develop my ability to plan my own work</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREQ-SD: As a result of my research, I feel confident about tackling unfamiliar problems</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SES results include undergraduates only, as other institutions do not include postgraduates. Sydney Graduate Qualities items (Syd) on the SES are additional Sydney-specific items. USS, CEQ and ISB/SB results include both undergraduates and coursework postgraduates. PREQ results include research postgraduates only.

N/A: Not applicable, as the USS is an internal survey conducted only at Sydney.

TBA: To be announced, item level benchmarks for QILT surveys were not available at the time of this report.
Table 4.3 summarises students’ perceptions of their development of broad capabilities. The data indicate that University of Sydney students see their capabilities as well developed as other students on average, both while they are students and also 4-6 months post-completion. Relative to other students, Sydney students feel less well prepared for the study they are doing now, and they see themselves as less well prepared for any work that may follow.

In 2015 and 2016, a number of Sydney-specific items that relate to Graduate Qualities identified in the University’s 2016-2020 Strategic Plan were introduced to the SES (identified in Table 4.3 as SES-Syd). Item results confirm the expected need to embed the development of these qualities more thoroughly in the curriculum as most of the Sydney-specific items are at or below 50% satisfaction. These items will be helpful in assessing student perceptions of the success of this embedding work.

Table 4.4. Students’ outcomes as graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator/measure</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Go8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDERGRADUATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS: % of those available in full-time employment (4 months post-completion)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS: % of cohort in full-time further study (4 months post-completion)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS: Student Perception of Overqualification scale (of those in full-time employment)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGTS: % of those available in full-time employment (12 months post-completion)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGTS: % of cohort in full-time further study (12 months post-completion)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COURSEWORK POSTGRADUATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS: % of those available in full-time employment (4 months post-completion)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS: % of cohort in full-time further study (4 months post-completion)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS: Student Perception of Overqualification scale (of those in full-time employment)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGTS: % of those available in full-time employment (12 months post-completion)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGTS: % of cohort in full-time further study (12 months post-completion)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESEARCH POSTGRADUATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS: % of those available in full-time employment (4 months post-completion)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS: % of cohort in full-time further study (4 months post-completion)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOS: Student Perception of Overqualification scale (of those in full-time employment)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGTS: % of those available in full-time employment (12 months post-completion)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGTS: % of cohort in full-time further study (12 months post-completion)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The GOS is a snapshot of graduate outcomes 4-6 months after award completion, and the SGTS is 12 months after award completion.

N/A: Not applicable as the SGTS is an internal survey conducted only at Sydney.

Table 4.4 summarises the data on graduate employment outcomes. The introduction of the Graduate Outcomes Survey in 2016 and its revised methodology (to better reflect Australian Bureau of Statistics definitions of full-time employment) has seen an increase in the percentage of bachelor-level graduates in full-time employment 4 months post-completion, compared to previous years (64% in 2015 as measured by the now superseded Australian Graduate Survey). The University of Sydney is well ahead of the Australian and Go8 average for bachelor-degree graduates on this new measure. Coursework postgraduates fare slightly better than average, and research postgraduates slightly worse.

Graduate outcomes are generally better at 12 months post-completion than at 4 months, however this does not appear to be the case for research postgraduates, who generally take longer to secure full-time employment.

According to the new Student Perception of Overqualification scale, University of Sydney graduates (at all levels) are less likely to feel overqualified in their current full-time employment compared to the Australian and Go8 average.
5. FACULTY PERFORMANCE ON SCALES OVER TIME

Section 5 presents performance on survey scales across the University for 2014-2016, broken down by Faculty and study level. These tables should be helpful for faculties as they determine areas on which to focus their improvement efforts.

Table 5.1 Undergraduate performance on SES scales 2014-2016 by Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES: Undergraduates</th>
<th>Skills Development</th>
<th>Learner Engagement</th>
<th>Teaching Quality</th>
<th>Student Support</th>
<th>Learning Resources</th>
<th>Overall Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Environment</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>.^</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, D&amp;P</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Science</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Social Work</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; IT</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80^</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. College of the Arts</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. Conserv. of Music</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>.^</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ 2016 Agriculture and Veterinary Science students are included in Science results following transition to School of Life and Environmental Sciences.
* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table 5.2 Coursework postgraduate performance on SES scales 2015-2016 by Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES: Coursework PGs</th>
<th>Skills Development</th>
<th>Learner Engagement</th>
<th>Teaching Quality</th>
<th>Student Support</th>
<th>Learning Resources</th>
<th>Overall Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Environment</td>
<td>98*</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66*</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>96*</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, D&amp;P</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Science</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Social Work</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; IT</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>87*</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>76*</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. Conserv. of Music</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>72*</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>75*</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>90*</td>
<td>36*</td>
<td>92*</td>
<td>38*</td>
<td>92*</td>
<td>92*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ 2016 Agriculture and Veterinary Science students are included in Science results following transition to School of Life and Environmental Sciences.
* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table 5.3 Undergraduate performance on CEQ scales 2014-2016 by Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQ: Undergraduates</th>
<th>Good Teaching</th>
<th>Generic Skills</th>
<th>Graduate Qualities</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Environment</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40*</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, D&amp;P</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Science</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Social Work</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; IT</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. College of the Arts</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. Conserv. of Music</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Graduate Qualities scale of the CEQ was run for the first time in 2016.
* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table 5.4 Coursework postgraduate performance on CEQ scales 2014-2016 by Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQ: Coursework PGs</th>
<th>Good Teaching</th>
<th>Generic Skills</th>
<th>Graduate Qualities</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Environment</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, D&amp;P</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Science</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>74*</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Social Work</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; IT</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. College of the Arts</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>73*</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. Conserv. of Music</td>
<td>79*</td>
<td>68*</td>
<td>90*</td>
<td>65*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>67*</td>
<td>77*</td>
<td>86*</td>
<td>79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Graduate Qualities scale of the CEQ was run for the first time in 2016.

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table 5.5 Research postgraduate performance on PREQ scales 2014-2016 by Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Intellectual Climate</th>
<th>Skill Development</th>
<th>Thesis Examination</th>
<th>Goals &amp; Expectations</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Environment</td>
<td>77*</td>
<td>88*</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>93*</td>
<td>74*</td>
<td>89*</td>
<td>78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, D&amp;P</td>
<td>67*</td>
<td>92*</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>77*</td>
<td>69*</td>
<td>67*</td>
<td>60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Science</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>85*</td>
<td>81*</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>89*</td>
<td>91*</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>94*</td>
<td>57*</td>
<td>67*</td>
<td>78*</td>
<td>64*</td>
<td>83*</td>
<td>77*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Social Work</td>
<td>76*</td>
<td>87*</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>75*</td>
<td>64*</td>
<td>69*</td>
<td>72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; IT</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67*</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>40*</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56*</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>95*</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>79*</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>74*</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78*</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>77*</td>
<td>69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. College of the Arts</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62*</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. Conserv. of Music</td>
<td>73*</td>
<td>83*</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>62*</td>
<td>67*</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>92*</td>
<td>85*</td>
<td>72*</td>
<td>71*</td>
<td>59*</td>
<td>67*</td>
<td>64*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
### Table 5.6 Performance on GOS scales 2016 by Faculty and study level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOS Faculty</th>
<th>% in full-time employment</th>
<th>% in full-time study</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Adaptive</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Collaboration</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly Agriculture &amp; Environment</td>
<td>89* 75* 0*</td>
<td>67* 100*</td>
<td>75* 100*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, D&amp;P</td>
<td>75 83 40*</td>
<td>84 81 86*</td>
<td>80 74 86*</td>
<td>75 84 100*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Science</td>
<td>64 77 75</td>
<td>82 79 92</td>
<td>71 69 66</td>
<td>80 80 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>71 64 80*</td>
<td>81 88 100*</td>
<td>74 85 86*</td>
<td>87 88 100*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>58* 84 -**</td>
<td>9* 0* 17*</td>
<td>94* 77 100*</td>
<td>100* 87 100*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Social Work</td>
<td>82 80 57*</td>
<td>86 84 83*</td>
<td>86 80 75*</td>
<td>88 86 85*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; IT</td>
<td>76 70 74</td>
<td>80 83 89</td>
<td>78 85 78</td>
<td>91 85 94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>73 85 92</td>
<td>84 77 86</td>
<td>90 73 70</td>
<td>90 82 86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>88 88 100*</td>
<td>78 79 100*</td>
<td>61 46 57*</td>
<td>92 79 100*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>97 87 81</td>
<td>73 82 88</td>
<td>79 61 77</td>
<td>81 83 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>93 91 -**</td>
<td>94 81 -**</td>
<td>90 67 -**</td>
<td>97 83 -**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>92 78 88*</td>
<td>87 68* 94*</td>
<td>93 63* 82*</td>
<td>98 89* 94*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>62 68 69</td>
<td>83 78 84</td>
<td>76 75 68</td>
<td>87 88 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. College of the Arts</td>
<td>48 71* 71*</td>
<td>80 100* 94*</td>
<td>71 88* 71*</td>
<td>74 78* 93*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. Conserv. of Music</td>
<td>58 29* 88*</td>
<td>84 67* 89*</td>
<td>80 67 42*</td>
<td>71 78* 89*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>79 100* 67*</td>
<td>87 50* 77*</td>
<td>81 83* 64*</td>
<td>88 67* 77*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>74 78 77</td>
<td>83 81 89</td>
<td>79 70 71</td>
<td>86 84 92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: UG = Undergraduates; PGCW = Coursework postgraduates; HDR = Research postgraduates.

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.

** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISB: International Students</th>
<th>Undergraduates</th>
<th>Coursework Postgraduates</th>
<th>Research Postgraduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Learning Overall</td>
<td>Support Overall</td>
<td>Learning Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Environment</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>77*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, D&amp;P</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Science</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Social Work</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; IT</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. College of the Arts</td>
<td>92*</td>
<td>75*</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syd. Conserv. of Music</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>100*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table 5.8 Performance on SB 2015-2016 by Faculty and study level

| SB: Domestic Students | Undergraduates | | Coursework Postgraduates | | Research Postgraduates | |
|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Faculty              | Learning Overall | Support Overall | Learning Overall | Support Overall | Learning Overall | Support Overall |
| Agriculture & Environment | 89   | 76   | 89   | 76   | .** | .** | .** | .** |
| Architecture, D&P    | 81   | 83   | 88   | 80   | 80  | 70  | 79  | 90  |
| Arts & Social Science | 86   | 83   | 82   | 77   | 88  | 85  | 84  | 82  |
| Business School      | 79   | 78   | 81   | 80   | 79  | 81  | 85  | 90  |
| Dentistry            | 88   | 91   | 89   | 90   | 64  | 76  | 77  | 97  |
| Education & Social Work | 85   | 84   | 87   | 84   | 85  | .** | 93  | 90  |
| Engineering & IT     | 79   | 77   | 86   | 83   | 80  | 76  | 91  | 85  |
| Health Sciences      | 89   | 90   | 84   | 86   | 84  | 76  | 85  | 83  |
| Law                  | 80   | 90   | 68   | 71   | 84  | 84  | 83  | 85  |
| Medicine             | 74   | 80   | 82   | 79   | 88  | 86  | 89  | 90  |
| Nursing              | 84   | 89   | 84   | 87   | 88  | 84  | 83  | 94  |
| Pharmacy             | 84   | 76   | 85   | 89   | 74  | 90  | 90  | 83  |
| Science              | 88   | 86   | 84   | 78   | 86  | 86  | 79  | 90  |
| Syd. College of the Arts | 84   | 75   | 93   | 83   | .** | .** | .** | .** |
| Syd. Conserv. of Music | 92   | 91   | 90   | 79   | .** | .** | .** | .** |
| Veterinary Science   | 86   | 82   | 87   | 85   | 85* | 79  | 83* | 77  |
| University of Sydney | 85   | 83   | 84   | 81   | 84  | 83  | 86  | 88  |

Note: The University took part in the Student Barometer (for Domestic students) for the first time in 2015.
* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
ATTACHMENT 1. Strategies for improving students’ educational experience

1. **Embed the new graduate qualities and the new curriculum framework:**
   - Ensure course coherence and alignment with learning outcomes (including graduate qualities) at the level of degree, program, major, utilising curriculum mapping software where appropriate
   - Develop/contribute to new learning experiences and units to ensure embedding of curriculum framework, including interdisciplinary experiences, opportunities for research, entrepreneurship, industry and community engagement, mobility experiences, and the Open Learning Environment

2. **Provide more interactive learning experiences:**
   - Design active and collaborative learning experiences including wider use of pre-class preparation
   - Encourage development and effective use of eLearning resources e.g. in-class polling, video, animation, visualisation, simulation
   - Design learning experiences that make effective use of available learning technologies, including the suite of enterprise tools (e.g., LMS, Echo 360, Kaltura, Pebblepad, etc)
   - Shift content delivery online and maximise interactivity in face-to-face classes
   - Develop and trial use of new technologies and teaching strategies, recognising that it can take time to ‘tune’ new approaches

3. **Provide richer peer engagement:**
   - Encourage cohort-building activities at course, program, major, and unit of study levels
   - Establish peer support and mentoring/leadership programs to facilitate interactions across year levels, and where possible embed these activities into units of study e.g. project-based units, interdisciplinary units
   - Explicitly encourage student involvement in co-curricular activities
   - Design activities that encourage peer discussion, inquiry, analysis, and problem solving
   - Shift content delivery online and maximise peer-to-peer and teacher interaction in-class
   - Design interesting in-class discussions and collaborative activities
   - Support out-of-class interaction between students (and staff) with effective discussion boards and other peer communication tools

4. **Assessment and feedback:**
   - Where appropriate, use early diagnostic assessments of pre-requisite knowledge and skills, and provide opportunities for further development as needed
   - Review assessment to ensure integrity, challenge, promotion of learning, and alignment with unit of study/course learning outcomes
   - Develop use of online marking tools and rubrics, peer- and self-assessment
   - Ensure ample formative feedback opportunities, including via automated feedback on quizzes and writing tasks,
• Use low stakes assessments to encourage preparation before class

• Use learning analytics tools to gain insights into student progress, and provide personalised learning support

• Avoid over-assessment and provide feedback on drafts of larger tasks

• Where possible, use authentic assessments that emphasise the application of skills and knowledge in meaningful, contextualised situations

• Engage in benchmarking of assessment and student learning outcomes, including through the Go8 Quality Verification System

5. Utilise information, feedback and analysis effectively

• Ensure that each unit of study coordinator has access to information on the composition of students in their class, including the distribution of qualifying awards (Australian or international), course enrolments, intended majors (where available), and completion of relevant units of study.

• Access learning analytics reports within LMS unit of study sites as a means of understanding students’ responses to learning activities, learning resources, and assessment tasks

• Use learning analytics approaches and tools to undertake personalised learning support

• Complement systematic University-level approaches to monitoring the university experience with fast, local feedback mechanisms, such as: in-class polling, staff-student liaison committees; formative assessment results; and regular informal meetings with students

• Give students confidence that their feedback is effective by reporting back to them (e.g. using the Closing The Loop process) on the impact of their feedback

• Read, discuss, respond and act on the rich qualitative feedback students provide

6. Integrative experiences:

• Ensure that the final year of every major, program or stream offers experiences – preferably in required (core) units – that challenge students to integrate what they have learnt in the course, stream, program or major (e.g. through project work, research, entrepreneurship opportunities, applied problem solving, clinical work, internships, placements, work experience)

• Where appropriate, provide opportunities for students to experience the workplace settings, activities and challenges for which the course serves as preparation

• Engage with relevant industry and community groups to ensure (a) exposure of students to industry and community needs (e.g. through guest lectures, field trips) and (b) support the development of experiential course components (e.g. industry and community-based projects and internships)

7. Promote peer review and professional development among staff:

• Encourage peer review of educational design, including assessment and resources, and of in-class and online teaching

• Set faculty-level targets for participation in professional development activities and work with DVC Education portfolio to monitor participation and its effectiveness

• Work with the DVC Education portfolio to ensure that professional development activities are targeted effectively and offered in ways that meet academic staff needs, including through local delivery where appropriate and feasible
• Use and contribute to the review and improvement of professional development activities for sessional staff, including tutors

• Make effective use of the AP&D process and mentoring to support the development of skills and leadership for all staff involved in teaching and learning

• Ensure sustained focus on quality improvement for all units of study, but especially those with Unit of Study Survey outcomes in the lower quartile

8. **Recognise excellence and innovation in Teaching and Learning:**

• Develop faculty processes to identify, recognise and celebrate excellence and innovation in teaching, including through nomination for national and new University awards

• Apply education criteria for appointment, confirmation, professional development and promotion, systematically and rigorously
ATTACHMENT 2. Performance by study area relative to national benchmarks

Results on the national Quality Indicators of Learning and Teachers (QILT) suite of surveys (the SES, GOS and CEQ) are made publically available on the QILT website (https://www.qilt.edu.au). They allow prospective students to compare institutional results by choosing one of 20 study area categories. Tables A2.1 to A2.7 present results on the QILT suite of surveys broken down by these 20 study areas, benchmarked against the national Go8 average. PREQ results are also presented, although they are not currently made available via the QILT website.

Table A2.1 Undergraduate performance on 2016 SES scales by study area, with 2016 benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Skills Development</th>
<th>Learner Engagement</th>
<th>Teaching Quality</th>
<th>Student Support</th>
<th>Learning Resources</th>
<th>Overall Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sydney Australia</td>
<td>Sydney Australia</td>
<td>Sydney Australia</td>
<td>Sydney Australia</td>
<td>Sydney Australia</td>
<td>Sydney Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and mathematics</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing and info. systems</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; built enviro.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; enviro. studies</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services and support</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary science</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and management</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities, culture &amp; social sci.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and paralegal studies</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative arts</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A2.2 Undergraduate performance on 2016 CEQ scales by study area, with 2016 benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQ: Undergraduates</th>
<th>Good Teaching</th>
<th>Generic Skills</th>
<th>Graduate Qualities</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Go8</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and math.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing and info.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; built enviro.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; enviro. studies</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services and support</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary science</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and management</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities, culture &amp; social sci.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and paralegal studies</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative arts</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A2.3 Coursework postgraduate performance on 2016 CEQ scales by study area, with 2016 benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQ: Coursework Postgrads</th>
<th>Good Teaching</th>
<th>Graduate Qualities</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Go8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and mathematics</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing and info. systems</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; built enviro.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; enviro. studies</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services and support</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary science</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and management</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities, culture &amp; social sci.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and paralegal studies</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative arts</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A.2.4 Research postgraduate performance on 2016 PREQ scales by study area, with 2016 benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science and mathematics</td>
<td>80 79 77</td>
<td>61 65 69</td>
<td>97 95 95</td>
<td>80 81 84</td>
<td>71 78 79</td>
<td>92 93 93</td>
<td>86 86 88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing and info. systems</td>
<td>100* 82 93</td>
<td>63* 67 84</td>
<td>88* 93 96</td>
<td>88* 80 87</td>
<td>63* 82 84</td>
<td>100* 92 100</td>
<td>100* 85 96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>81 81 79</td>
<td>67 66 65</td>
<td>96 94 93</td>
<td>83 85 86</td>
<td>88 82 80</td>
<td>90 91 89</td>
<td>83 86 86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; built enviro.</td>
<td>100* 74 78</td>
<td>60* 64 74</td>
<td>100* 96 97</td>
<td>60* 75 81</td>
<td>40* 77 74</td>
<td>83* 91 88</td>
<td>60* 83 84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; enviro. studies</td>
<td>100* 78 81</td>
<td>78* 56 63</td>
<td>100* 94 93</td>
<td>89* 77 80</td>
<td>78* 72 77</td>
<td>100* 92 94</td>
<td>100* 86 86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services and support</td>
<td>86 81 79</td>
<td>62 61 64</td>
<td>90 94 91</td>
<td>73 73 71</td>
<td>68 77 77</td>
<td>86 90 90</td>
<td>82 85 82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>85 80 83</td>
<td>66 67 67</td>
<td>95 96 96</td>
<td>80 81 81</td>
<td>78 80 79</td>
<td>95 93 94</td>
<td>86 87 87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>-** 86 100*</td>
<td>-** 55 54*</td>
<td>-** 93 100*</td>
<td>-** 67 77*</td>
<td>-** 74 69*</td>
<td>-** 97 100*</td>
<td>-** 85 92*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>82* 84 86</td>
<td>65* 67 69</td>
<td>100* 95 95</td>
<td>76* 73 76</td>
<td>71* 75 64</td>
<td>88* 95 95</td>
<td>82* 81 83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>67* 82* 81*</td>
<td>17* 47* 44*</td>
<td>83* 94* 94*</td>
<td>83* 88* 88*</td>
<td>33* 59* 56*</td>
<td>83* 94* 94*</td>
<td>67* 88* 88*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary science</td>
<td>72* 70 69</td>
<td>44* 58 56</td>
<td>89* 94 92</td>
<td>67* 70 69</td>
<td>72* 82 79</td>
<td>78* 88 87</td>
<td>83* 86 82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>100* 96 94*</td>
<td>55* 61 61*</td>
<td>100* 100 100*</td>
<td>55* 63 61*</td>
<td>100* 86 94*</td>
<td>91* 96 94*</td>
<td>100* 100 100*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education</td>
<td>100* 86 85</td>
<td>63* 57 57</td>
<td>94* 92 91</td>
<td>67* 67 57</td>
<td>79* 80 82</td>
<td>95* 92 91</td>
<td>89* 86 88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and management</td>
<td>100* 86 87</td>
<td>67* 63 66</td>
<td>100* 93 93</td>
<td>80* 80 81</td>
<td>80* 80 80</td>
<td>100* 91 90</td>
<td>93* 86 86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities, culture &amp; social sci.</td>
<td>86 81 80</td>
<td>62 56 57</td>
<td>95 94 94</td>
<td>60 67 62</td>
<td>60 76 77</td>
<td>97 90 89</td>
<td>83 85 82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>-** 72* 50*</td>
<td>-** 61* 33*</td>
<td>-** 89* 83*</td>
<td>-** 72* 50*</td>
<td>-** 61* 33*</td>
<td>-** 94* 100*</td>
<td>-** 78* 67*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>83 81 81</td>
<td>57 50 54</td>
<td>96 93 93</td>
<td>74 77 78</td>
<td>74 77 78</td>
<td>83 88 87</td>
<td>87 84 84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and paralegal studies</td>
<td>70* 83 79</td>
<td>40* 53 56</td>
<td>90* 95 92</td>
<td>50* 63 59</td>
<td>80* 77 74</td>
<td>80* 90 85</td>
<td>80* 86 82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative arts</td>
<td>93 82 84</td>
<td>64 55 55</td>
<td>95 96 93</td>
<td>55 59 53</td>
<td>66 71 65</td>
<td>86 86 86</td>
<td>89 84 81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>-** 78 83</td>
<td>-** 38 50</td>
<td>-** 93 92</td>
<td>-** 57 71</td>
<td>-** 72 71</td>
<td>-** 89 92</td>
<td>-** 78 83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>86 81 81</td>
<td>62 61 64</td>
<td>95 94 94</td>
<td>72 76 76</td>
<td>73 78 78</td>
<td>91 91 91</td>
<td>86 85 86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table A2.5 Undergraduate performance on 2016 GOS scales by study area, with 2016 benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>% in full-time employment</th>
<th>% in full-time study</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Adaptive</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Collaboration</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science and mathematics</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing and info. systems</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; built enviro.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; enviro. studies</td>
<td>76*</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services and support</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>58*</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary science</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and management</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities, culture &amp; social sci.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and paralegal studies</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative arts</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>63*</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.

** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Table A2.6 Coursework postgraduate performance on 2016 GOS scales by study area, with 2016 benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>% in full-time employment</th>
<th>% in full-time study</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Adaptive</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Collaboration</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science and mathematics</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing and info. systems</td>
<td>94*</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; built enviro.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; enviro. studies</td>
<td>69*</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services and support</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary science</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and management</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities, culture &amp; social sci.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and paralegal studies</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative arts</td>
<td>75*</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.

** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
### Table A2.7: Research postgraduate performance on 2016 GOS scales by study area, with 2016 benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>% in full-time employment</th>
<th>% in full-time study</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Adaptive</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Collaboration</th>
<th>Grad. Attributes: Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science and mathematics</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing and info. systems</td>
<td>75*</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; built enviro.</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; enviro. studies</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services and support</td>
<td>92*</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>88*</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82*</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary science</td>
<td>73*</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education</td>
<td>62*</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and management</td>
<td>80*</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities, culture &amp; social sci.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and paralegal studies</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative arts</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65*</td>
<td>.**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures for faculties with less than 20 responses should be interpreted with caution.
** Figures for faculties with less than 5 responses have been suppressed.
Non-Confidential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Professor Donna Waters (Dean, Sydney Nursing School)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer/Approver</td>
<td>Professor Donna Waters (Dean, Sydney Nursing School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper title</td>
<td>Nursing: 2018 Academic Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To seek the Academic Board's approval of the 2018 Academic Calendar for Sydney Nursing School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

That the Academic Board approve the 2018 Academic Calendar for Sydney Nursing School, as presented.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This proposal seeks the approval by the Academic Board of the 2018 Academic Calendar for Sydney Nursing School. The calendar reflects the relevant components of each program by year, and specifies teaching periods, clinical placement as required by the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Accreditation Council, and important university dates. It was developed in consultation with Faculty staff and approved by the Faculty Board on 7 August 2018.
MEMORANDUM

To: Chair of Academic Board
A/Professor Anthony Masters

From: Professor Donna Waters

cc: Executive Officer to Academic Board
Mr Mathew Charet

Date: 8 August 2017

Subject: The Faculty of Nursing & Midwifery 2018 Academic Calendar

I am writing to provide the Faculty of Nursing & Midwifery Academic Calendar for 2018 to be presented to the Academic Board on 22 August 2018 for approval.

This calendar reflects the relevant components of each program by year, and specifies teaching periods, clinical placement as required by the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Accreditation Council, and important university dates.

This calendar was compiled in consultation with Faculty staff and approved by the Faculty Board on 7 August 2018. Students, the SRC and SUPRA have also been consulted regarding this calendar.

Warm Regards

[Signature]

Professor Donna Waters
Dean
Sydney Nursing School
## Academic Board

29 August 2017

### 2018 Nursing Calendar

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wk 1</td>
<td>Wk 2</td>
<td>Wk 3</td>
<td>Wk 4</td>
<td>Wk 5</td>
<td>Wk 6</td>
<td>Wk 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wk 8</td>
<td>Wk 9</td>
<td>Wk 10</td>
<td>Wk 11</td>
<td>Wk 12</td>
<td>Wk 13</td>
<td>Wk 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wk 15</td>
<td>Wk 16</td>
<td>Wk 17</td>
<td>Wk 18</td>
<td>Wk 19</td>
<td>Wk 20</td>
<td>Wk 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructional:**

- Teaching
- Clinical
- Exam
- Study
- Exam
- Teaching
- Exam
- Study
- Exam

**Vacation Week:**

- Week 15
- Week 16
- Week 17

**Academic Calendar 2018:**

- The University agrees to three University Australia Common Vacation Weeks each year.

**Important Dates:**

- 29 August 2017: Academic Board
- Other dates for instruction and vacation weeks are as follows:
  - Week 1: Wk 1
  - Week 2: Wk 2
  - Week 3: Wk 3
  - Week 4: Wk 4
  - Week 5: Wk 5
  - Week 6: Wk 6
  - Week 7: Wk 7
  - Week 8: Wk 8
  - Week 9: Wk 9
  - Week 10: Wk 10
  - Week 11: Wk 11
  - Week 12: Wk 12
  - Week 13: Wk 13
  - Week 14: Wk 14
  - Week 15: Wk 15
  - Week 16: Wk 16
  - Week 17: Wk 17
  - Week 18: Wk 18
  - Week 19: Wk 19
  - Week 20: Wk 20
  - Week 21: Wk 21

**Important Reminders:**

- All students are required to participate in all scheduled academic activities.
- Failure to attend scheduled classes may result in academic disciplinary action.
- Regular attendance and participation are essential for academic success.

**Contact Information:**

- For any inquiries, please contact the Academic Affairs Office at info@university.edu.au.