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13. OTHER BUSINESS
Minutes of a meeting of Academic Senate held on 8 July 2011 at 9.30am in the Senate Room, Level 3, Lincoln Building.

Present: Professor J Fitness (in the Chair)  Professor P Radan
Dr W Bradford  Professor J Sachs
Professor John Croucher  Dr J Tent
Mr Andrew Dahdal  Professor B Thompson
Mr Dr J De Meyrick  Professor G Town
A/Professor S George  A/Professor D Verity
Professor J Greeley  Professor G Whiteford
Professor J Hedberg  Professor R Widing
Dr W McDonald  Dr R Yager

In Attendance: Mr A Burrell
A/Professor K Dadd
Ms S Kelly
Ms R Myton
Professor J Sheen
Ms K Shorrock
Ms K Smart
Ms E Whiteford

1. APOLOGIES / WELCOME

Academic Senate noted that apologies were received from:
Dr M Arrow, Ms M Brodie, Professor M Gabbott, Professor N Mansfield,
Professor M Mollering, A/Professor S Page, Professor J Piper, Professor S
Schwartz, Professor J Simons, A/Professor I Solomonides, Professor S
Thurgate, Ms C Trotman, and Dr X Zhou.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Resolution 11/158

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 June 2011
http://senate.mq.edu.au/MQUonly/minutes/2011/Minutes_0611.pdf be
signed as a true and correct record, subject to the following amendment to
item 5.1:
last sentence in the 2nd paragraph to read: “The University has severe
penalties for such misconduct, but these penalties need to be better
communicated to students and staff.”

3. IDENTIFICATION OF ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

The following items were starred for discussion:
6.1 Consideration of Examination Results, Mid-Year 2011
6.5 List of Prizewinners (tabled document with late nominations)
6.6 Approval for the Communication of Results
4. **ADOPTION OF UNSTARRED ITEMS**

**Resolution 11/159**

That the items not starred for discussion be noted and, where appropriate, be adopted as recommended.

(The adopted items are recorded in these minutes according to the sequence of the agenda.)

5. **CONSIDERATION OF CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS**

5.1 **HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH APPEALS COMMITTEE**

Academic Senate approved as recommended the decision of the HDRAC related to one of the Higher Degree Research appeals.

**Resolution 11/160**

That the view of Professor William Thompson be accepted and that the candidate be advised of the outcome of the appeal that the thesis not be allowed for re-examination.

6. **2011 MID-YEAR UNIT RESULTS**

6.1 **Consideration of Examination Results, Mid-Year 2011**

Academic Senate considered the reports submitted by the Faculties with their Mid-Year 2011 examination results. The reports can be viewed online:


The following observations were made by the Executive Deans and the Faculty representatives:

**Faculty of Human Sciences**

Professor Greeley briefed Academic Senate on the Faculty’s examination procedures and highlighted a few anomalies in grade distribution. Among them:

- High fail rate in PSY 122
- Large class sizes which present a challenge for examiners re deadlines and raise issues of security. The Faculty is considering reducing the number of invigilated examinations and developing alternative assessment tasks.

Among other issues raised in the report were concerns related to use of casual and external markers and issues with SIBT moderation.
Professor Greeley reported about moderation practices and her Faculty’s activities to support students at risk. She also reported how the removal of the PC grade affected grading in the Faculty.

Faculty of Science
In her presentation A/Professor Dadd reported about the examination process in the Faculty of Science. She noted that the Faculty handled the absence of PCs very well. A/Professor Dadd brought the Senate’s attention to the questionable practice of appointing a casual staff as convenor in charge of unit’s examination.

Action: The Chair of Academic Senate will make a formal enquiry to the Executive Dean of the Faculty of Science in relation to casual convenors in charge, and missed deadlines for results reporting.

Faculty of Business and Economics
Professor Jeffrey Sheen reported on behalf of his Faculty about the examination results in individual departments. He noted that there were no major changes to the overall distribution of grades.

Among points raised in Professor Sheen’s report was poor attendance in classes. Academic Senate noted that a problem with student attendance seems to be common not just across the Macquarie Faculties, but also in other universities. The overall comments indicated that there is a need to engage with this issue.

Faculty of Arts
Professor Radan reported that there were no major discrepancies in the Faculty’s examination results in comparison with previous years. There was also no major impact on the examination process caused by the deletion of the PC grade. He reported about the increase of requests for special consideration and how the Faculty is trying to handle this situation.

The Chair thanked all Faculties for their reports. She made a general observation about changes in the examination process, e.g. introduction of three examination sessions and additional Saturday session and welcomed the fact that termination of the PC grade appears to have had no major impact on grading.

Resolution 11/161
That the examination reports of the Faculties be noted and published.

6.2 Candidates who have now Satisfied Requirements for Undergraduate Degrees/Diplomas/Certificates (D99/47-04)

The candidates who have now satisfied requirements for the undergraduate degrees, diplomas and certificates were presented for the consideration of Academic Senate.

6.3 Undergraduate Candidates who may Qualify once I/F Grades are Resolved/Amended (D99/47-04)

The undergraduate candidates who may qualify once I/F grades are resolved were presented for the consideration of Academic Senate.

6.4 Candidates who have now Satisfied Requirements for Postgraduate Coursework Certificates/Diplomas/Degrees (A91/57-07)
The candidates who have now satisfied requirements for the postgraduate coursework certificates, diplomas and degrees were presented for the consideration of Academic Senate.

**Resolution 11/162**

*That the candidates in the reports under items 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4 have satisfied requirements for the awards stated.*

**6.5 List of Prizewinners**

(02/2032)

Academic Senate resolved as recommended the list of prizewinners submitted for its consideration at the meeting.

**Resolution 11/163**

*That prizes be awarded to the students nominated for the prize awards.*

**6.6 Approval for the Communication of Results**

Academic Senate considered the communication of results.

**Resolution 11/164**

*That the schedule of results, as amended, be approved as the official record and that the Academic Registrar be authorised to convey these results to students.*

**7. OTHER RESULTS FOR NOTING**

Academic Senate noted the following results:

**7.1 OUA Term 3, 2010**

(03/993-04)


**7.2 OUA Term 4, 2010**

(03/993-04)


**7.3 Macquarie City Campus Study Period 3, 2010**

(A91/40-03)

http://senate.mq.edu.au/MQUonly/agenda/2011/0711/MQC3_2010FBE.pdf

**7.4 Summer Course 2011**

(A98/572)


**7.5 Vacation 2011**

8. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

8.1 Academic Standards and Quality Committee
Report of Meeting of 28 June 2011

The following items were approved as recommended:

1. **2009 Academic Program**
   1.1 Undergraduate
   1.1.1 Amendment to pre-2010 programs (07/1050-02)
   **Resolution 11/165**
   That Academic Senate approves the proposed changes to the coherent studies and study patterns for pre-2010 programs offered by the Department of Marketing and Management (Attachment 1 – http://senate.mq.edu.au/MQUonly/agenda/2011/0711/Attach_1.pdf).

2. **2011 Academic Program**
   2.1 Postgraduate
   2.1.1 Postgraduate Certificate in Ancient History through OUA (08/562)
   **Resolution 11/166**
   That Academic Senate approves the revised program template for the Postgraduate Certificate in Ancient History through OUA (Attachment 2 – http://senate.mq.edu.au/MQUonly/agenda/2011/0711/Attach_2.pdf) with effect from 1 January 2011.

2.2 Undergraduate
   **Resolution 11/167**
   i) That AHST360 be deemed a 300 level unit for the purposes of allowing students who have transferred into a 2010 program to qualify for graduation with a major in Ancient History.
   ii) That for the purpose of 'back mapping' programs for students who have transferred to a program under the new curriculum, any unit in a specified unit prefix range which has been completed at a higher level should be permitted to count towards the requirements of a lower level unit prefix range.

2.2.1 Macquarie University Foundation Program (10/1539)
   **Resolution 11/168**
   i) That Academic Senate approves the introduction of the FPTP021 Tertiary Skills Workshop with effect from 27 June 2011.
   ii) That Academic Senate approves a Pass/Fail grading for the unit FPTP021 Tertiary Skills Workshop.

3. **2012 Academic Program**
   3.1 Postgraduate Curriculum Renewal
   3.1.1 Exit Awards (10/1938-10/1942, 04/694, 05/1818)
   **Resolution 11/169**
   That Academic Senate approves that the awards listed in the report (p.3 of http://senate.mq.edu.au/MQUonly/agenda/2011/0711/ASQC_0711.pdf) be identified as exit awards.

3.1.2 Review of PICT Program Structures (07/75, 07/76, 10/1954, 05/1537-02, 05/1536-02, 05/1535-02, 05/1534-02, 04/1617-02, 05/1533, 06/991, 11/459)
   **Resolution 11/170**
   That all PICT program structures as listed in the report (p.3 of http://senate.mq.edu.au/MQUonly/agenda/2011/0711/ASQC_0711.pdf) be approved for renewal for 2012 only. All PICT programs will need to go
through the renewal process for 2012, which will allow:
  a. the University to formulate a policy on Recognition for Prior Learning;
  b. further consultation and collaboration with the Department of Computing regarding the Computer Forensics programs.

3.1.3 Awards to be Discontinued

Resolution 11/171
That Academic Senate approves the discontinuance of the awards listed in the report (p.4 of http://senate.mq.edu.au/MQUonly/agenda/2011/0711/ASQC_0711.pdf) with effect from 31 December 2011:

3.1.4 New units from 2012

Resolution 11/172
That Academic Senate approves the introduction of the units listed in the report (pp.4-5 of http://senate.mq.edu.au/MQUonly/agenda/2011/0711/ASQC_0711.pdf) with effect from 1 January 2012.

3.1.5 Units to be Deleted from 2012

Resolution 11/173
That Academic Senate approves the deletion of the units listed in the report (pp.5-8 of http://senate.mq.edu.au/MQUonly/agenda/2011/0711/ASQC_0711.pdf) with effect from 31 December 2011.

3.1.6 Units to be Deleted from 2013

Resolution 11/174
That Academic Senate approves the deletion of the units listed in the report (pp.8-9 of http://senate.mq.edu.au/MQUonly/agenda/2011/0711/ASQC_0711.pdf) with effect from 31 December 2012.

3.1.7 Units to be recoded/deleted

Resolution 11/175
That Academic Senate approves
  i) the retention on the 2012 Schedule of Postgraduate Units of the 800- and 900-level units listed in the report (p.9 of http://senate.mq.edu.au/MQUonly/agenda/2011/0711/ASQC_0711.pdf);
  ii) the deletion of the 800 and 900-level units listed above with effect from 31 December 2012.

Resolution 11/176
That Academic Senate approves
  i) That the units list in the report (p.10 of http://senate.mq.edu.au/MQUonly/agenda/2011/0711/ASQC_0711.pdf) be recoded from 1 January 2012;
  ii) That the 2011 units listed above be deleted with effect from 31 December 2012.

3.2 Undergraduate

3.2.1 Units to be deleted

Resolution 11/177
That Academic Senate approves the deletion of the units ACCG201 Organisational Planning and Control and ACCG325 Financial Accounting Theory and Practice with effect from 31 December 2011.
3.2.2 2012 Schedule of Programs

Resolution 11/178

That Academic Senate approves the revised templates for the following programs with effect from 1 January 2012:


3.2.3 2012 Schedule of Majors

Resolution 11/179

That Academic Senate approves the revised templates for the following majors with effect from 1 January 2012:


4. Policy Matters

4.1 Postgraduate

4.1.1 Naming convention for named awards and generic awards with specialisations

Resolution 11/180

That Academic Senate approves the following format for the naming of awards in the postgraduate coursework rules:

Master of X
Postgraduate Diploma of X
Postgraduate Certificate of X

4.1.2 Format of testamur and academic transcript

Resolution 11/181

That Academic Senate approves the following format of the postgraduate testamur with effect from 1 January 2012:

Master of X in
Name of specialisation X
Name of specialisation Y
(note: the word “Specialisation” is not to appear on the testamur)

Postgraduate Diploma of X in
Name of specialisation X
Name of specialisation Y
(note: the word “Specialisation” is not to appear on the testamur)

Postgraduate Certificate of X in
Name of specialisation X
Name of specialisation Y
(note: the word “Specialisation” is not to appear on the testamur)
4.2 Undergraduate

4.2.1 Definition of People and Planet Units

Resolution 11/182 (09/853)

That Academic Senate approves:

i. that submissions for the confirmation of a unit’s designation as a People or Planet unit be submitted by no later than 30 June 2012 for implementation in 2014. Submissions for units not currently designated as People or Planet units are to be submitted by 30 June 2012;

ii. that no further units be approved as People or Planet units until after the review of People and Planet units has taken place;

iii. the expanded criteria for the determination of People and Planet units, as follows:

Criteria:

1) Every department should have the opportunity to offer either a People or Planet unit.

2) If a unit is a required unit in a program, it cannot count as a People or Planet unit.

3) People units should enable students to develop cultural or social literacy while Planet units should enable students to develop scientific literacy.

4) People and Planet units must be distinguishable and be able to demonstrate the following three particular graduate capabilities: Effective Communication; Engaged and Ethical Local and Global citizens; Socially and Environmentally Active and Responsible.

5) At least one assessment task worth at least 20% should be clearly aligned to the graduate capabilities and the unit’s People or Planet status.

4.2.2 Recognition of units completed prior to 2010 as People and Planet units

Resolution 11/183 (08/115)

That Academic Senate approves that a student seeking exemption from a People or Planet unit on the basis of having completed a unit no longer offered, which is NCSCW with a current unit, will need to submit a case for consideration by the Individual Cases Committee (until 31 July 2011) or the relevant Faculty Committee from 1 August 2011.

4.2.3 People and Planet units – recognition for student requesting double majors

Resolution 11/184 (09/853)

That Academic Senate confirms the following principle in relation to the determination of People and Planet units:

i) a required unit in a second (non-qualifying) major may also count towards the People and Planet requirements in a degree

ii) if the departmental ownership of a unit changes after a student has completed the unit, a student should not be disadvantaged in relation to satisfying People or Planet requirements.

5. 2012 Schedule of Postgraduate Programs

Resolution 11/185 (11/991)

6. Terms of Reference of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee
   (A87/116-04)

Resolution 11/186
That Academic Senate approves the following Terms of Reference of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee:

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) of Academic Senate is responsible for overseeing the quality and standards of the University’s undergraduate and postgraduate academic coursework programs. It does this by:

1. ensuring compliance with the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF);
2. identifying, developing and monitoring policy to ensure academic quality of all coursework programs;
3. advising the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Provost) and Academic Senate on issues relating to the development and implementation of new programs;
4. recommending for Senate approval of new programs and revised academic coursework programs;
5. auditing and reviewing programs on a regular basis in accordance with the approved review framework;
6. receiving reports from Faculties relating to the deliberations of the Faculty Standards and Quality Committees (FSQC);
7. monitoring the Faculty based process for consideration of individual student cases. Providing advice to Faculties and to the Academic Program Section (APS) to assist in the consideration of complex individual student cases. Determining student appeals against Faculty decisions made under the Deeming provision and the Saving clause of the Rules.

8.2 Higher Degree Research Committee
   (03/449-02)
   Report of Meeting of 1 July 2011

The following items were resolved as recommended:

Resolution 11/187
That the students included in the report (http://senate.mq.edu.au/MQUonly/agenda/2011/0711/HDRC_0711.pdf) have satisfied the requirements for the awards stated.

8.3 Coursework Studies Committee
   Report of Meeting of 27 June 2011

The following items were resolved as recommended:

(1) Undergraduate: Saving Clause

(1.1) GAO, Yun

Resolution 11/188
That the Saving Clause be invoked to enable Miss Gao to satisfy degree requirements in the Bachelor of Commerce – Professional Accounting without having completed BBA102 Principles of Management, provided all other requirements have been met.
Resolution 11/189

That the Saving Clause be invoked to enable Mr Wang to satisfy degree requirements in the Bachelor of Commerce – Professional Accounting without having completed BBA102 Principles of Management, provided all other requirements have been met.

Resolution 11/190

That the Saving Clause be invoked to enable Mr Lagaida Prabowo to satisfy degree requirements in the Bachelor of Applied Finance with the Bachelor of Commerce – Professional Accounting without having completed MKTG101 Marketing Fundamentals and BBA102 Principles of Management, provided all other requirements have been met.

9. MEMBERSHIP

9.1 Student Member of the Discipline Committee

Academic Senate noted the recording of its flying minutes of 23 June 2011 as follows:

Resolution 11/191

That Ms Emily Macloud is appointed as a student member of the Discipline Committee for the term of her membership on Academic Senate, i.e. until 21 May 2012.

9.2 Membership of the Grading Appeals Committee

Resolution 11/192

That the revised membership of the Grading Appeals Committee be approved for 2011 and 2012 as attached (p.31 of http://senate.mq.edu.au/MQUonly/agenda/2011/0711/AGENDAALL_0711.pdf).

9.3 Appointment of Student Members to Academic Senate Committees

Resolution 11/193

(1) That Academic Senate appoints Mr Tom Hambrett as a student member to the Academic Appeals Committee for a term of office concluding on 21 May 2012;

(2) That Academic Senate appoints Mr Sam Bradshaw as a student member to the Grading Appeals Committee and the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee for a term of office concluding on 21 May 2012.

10. OTHER BUSINESS

There being no further business the meeting was declared closed at 10:30am.

Professor J Fitness
Chair
1. **2012 Academic Program**

1.1 **Postgraduate Curriculum Renewal** (File No.09/1252-02)

The Committee noted the following advice from Associate Professor Coutts, on behalf of the ASQC Postgraduate Sub-Committee, regarding the postgraduate curriculum renewal process in relation to the outcomes of the unit renewal process and consideration of the viable size of programs:

1.1.1 **Outcomes of the Unit Renewal Process**

Approximately 1500 units have been considered by the Postgraduate Sub-Committee since November 2010. The unit renewal process is now close to completion. Associate Professor Coutts summarised the following key outcomes of the unit renewal process:

i) No postgraduate unit from 2012 will be NCCW with an undergraduate unit;

ii) All postgraduate units will be four credit points or its multiples from 2013;

iii) All postgraduate units will have prerequisites from 2012.

The Committee commended the Postgraduate Sub-Committee for all its work in the unit renewal process and acknowledged the involvement of many across the University in facilitating significant quality changes.

1.1.2 **Viable Size of Programs**

Associate Professor Coutts reported that the Sub-Committee had observed that while it was not the remit of the sub-committee it was not uncommon for Faculties to submit proposals for the retention and renewal of programs with relatively small numbers of enrolled students without considering the associated impacts for the University.

**RECOMMENDED**

*That Academic Senate undertakes further discussion and consideration on this issue.*

1.1.3 **Awards to be discontinued**

The Faculty of Arts has proposed the discontinuance of the following awards with effect from 31 December 2011:

*Postgraduate Certificate in Creative Writing (File No. 02/925)*

*Master of Arts with Master of International Relations (File No. 02/1146)*

The Faculty of Human Sciences has proposed the discontinuance of the following award:

*Master of Translating and Interpreting with Master of Applied Linguistics (TESOL) (File No. 06/1465)*

(This award is to be renewed with a new award name of Master of Translating and Interpreting with the degree of Master of Applied Linguistics – see 1.1.4 New Awards from 2012 below)
The Faculty of Science has proposed the discontinuance of the following award:

**Master of Consulting (File No. 06/1488)**
(This award is to be renewed with a new award name of Master of IT Consulting – see 1.1.4 New Awards from 2012 below)

**RECOMMENDED**

That Academic Senate approves the discontinuance of the following awards with effect from 31 December 2011:
- Postgraduate Certificate in Creative Writing
- Master of Arts with Master of International Relations
- Master of Translating and Interpreting with Master of Applied Linguistics (TESOL)
- Master of Consulting

1.1.4 **New Awards from 2012**

The Faculty of Human Sciences has proposed the introduction of the following new award:
**Master of Translating and Interpreting with Master of Applied Linguistics (MTransInterMAppLing) (File No. 11/1124)**

The Faculty of Science has proposed the introduction of the following new award:
**Master of Information Technology Consulting (MITCons) (File No. 11/1122)**

**RECOMMENDED**

That Academic Senate recommends to Council the introduction of the awards listed below with effect from 1 January 2012:
- Master of Translating and Interpreting with Master of Applied Linguistics (MTransInterMAppLing) (File No. 11/1124)
- Master of Information Technology Consulting (MITCons) (File No. 11/1122)

1.1.5 **New Exit Awards from 2012**

The Faculty of Human Sciences has proposed the introduction of a new exit award, Postgraduate Diploma of Communication Disorders. This exit award will only be available to students currently enrolled in the Master of Communication Disorders program which is being discontinued at the end of 2011:
**Postgraduate Diploma of Communication Disorders (PGDipCommDis) (File No. 11/1123)**

The Faculty of Science has proposed the introduction of the following new exit award for students enrolled in the Master of Biotechnology program:
**Postgraduate Diploma of Biotechnology (PGDipBiotech) (File No. 03/784)**

**RECOMMENDED**

That Academic Senate recommends to Council the introduction of the following exit awards with effect from 1 January 2012:
- Postgraduate Diploma of Communication Disorders (PGDipCommDis) (File No. 11/1123)
- Postgraduate Diploma of Biotechnology (PGDipBiotech) (File No. 03/784)

1.1.6 **Retention and Renewal of Named Awards**

**RECOMMENDED**

That Academic Senate approves the retention and renewal of the awards listed below with effect from 1 January 2012:
- Master of Laboratory Quality Analysis and Management (File No. 05/1530)
- Postgraduate Diploma of Laboratory Quality Analysis and Management (File No. 05/1531)
- Postgraduate Certificate of Laboratory Quality Analysis and Management (File No. 05/1532)
1.1.7 Programs of Study to be discontinued

The Faculties of Arts, Human Sciences and Science have proposed the discontinuance of the programs of study with effect from 31 December 2011 as follows:

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves the discontinuance of the following programs of study with effect from 31 December 2011:

- Postgraduate Certificate in Creative Writing (CREA06P)
- Master of Translating and Interpreting with Master of Applied Linguistics (TESOL) (TRAN30P)
- Master of Consulting (INFT68P)

1.1.8 Specialisation Change of Name (File Nos A89/263-02; A98/296)

The Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Human Sciences, has requested that the specialisation,Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages, which is offered within the Master of Applied Linguistics and the Postgraduate Diploma of Applied Linguistics, be renamed TESOL.

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves the specialisation ‘Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages’, offered within the Master of Applied Linguistics and the Postgraduate Diploma of Applied Linguistics, be renamed ‘TESOL’, with effect from 1 January 2012.

1.1.9 New units from 2012 (File No. 11/452)

The Faculties of Arts, Human Sciences and Science have proposed the introduction of the following units from 1 January 2012:

Faculty of Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CWPG820</td>
<td>Writing for Emerging Readers (6-12 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INED801</td>
<td>History of Indigenous Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INED802</td>
<td>Contemporary Issues in Indigenous Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INED803</td>
<td>Politics, Power and Indigenous Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INED804</td>
<td>Global Indigenous Education Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INED820</td>
<td>Research Methods in Indigenous Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW898</td>
<td>International Commercial Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL801</td>
<td>Brain, Self and World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL825</td>
<td>Special Topics in Agency and Cognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL863</td>
<td>Advanced Topics in Philosophy and Cognitive Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICT840</td>
<td>Cybercrime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICT842</td>
<td>Protecting Society: Public Policing/Private Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICT844</td>
<td>Advanced Intelligence Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICT845</td>
<td>Intelligence Product and Decision Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICT846</td>
<td>Competitive Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICT920</td>
<td>Asian Economic Security Threats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty of Human Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAMP801</td>
<td>MAMed Medical Elective 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMP802</td>
<td>MAMed Medical Elective 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMP803</td>
<td>MAMed Medical Elective 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMP804</td>
<td>MAMed Medical Elective 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMP805</td>
<td>MAMed Medical Elective 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAMP806   MAMed Medical Elective 6
SPH823     Practicum II
SPH824     Complex Communication Needs and AAC
SPH825     Neuroanatomy and Physiology for Speech Pathologists
SPH826     Aural Rehabilitation
SPH827     Clinical Linguistic Analysis
TRAN874    Professional Practice in Translation and Interpreting
TRAN880    Discourse and Text Analysis for Translators and Interpreters
TRAN883    Research in Reflective T&I Practice

Faculty of Science
ITEC902 Research and Development Project

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves the introduction of the units listed above with effect from 1 January 2012.

1.1.10 Units to be Deleted from 2012

The Faculties of Arts, Business and Economics, Human Sciences and Science have proposed the deletion of the following units from 2012:

Faculty of Arts
IRPG854 Conflict in the Pacific
LIT844 Children’s Literature Dissertation

Faculty of Business and Economics
ACCG833 Professional Qualifying Program – CPA
ACCG834 Professional Qualifying Program – CA

Faculty of Human Science
LING920 First Language Acquisition
SPH807 Neurosciences for Speech Pathology

Faculty of Science
BIOL905 Introduction to Coral Reefs
CHIR889 Research Preparation - Chiropractic
CHIR890 Selected Coursework - Chiropractic
ENVE810 GIS Skills in Habitat and Wildlife Management
ENVE818 Selected Coursework - Environmental Science
ENVE878 Advanced Soils
GSE813 Semi-Arid Land Management
ITEC814 Special Topic in Information Technology
ITEC815 Special Topic in Information Technology
ITEC816 Special Topic in Information Technology
ITEC817 Special Topic in Information Technology

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves the deletion of the units listed above with effect from 31 December 2011.
1.2 Undergraduate

1.2.1 New Awards from 2012

The Faculty of Business and Economics has proposed the introduction of the following degree: Honours degree of Bachelor of Marketing and Media (BMktgMedia (Hons)) (File No. 10/1962)

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate recommends to Council the introduction of the Honours degree of Bachelor of Marketing and Media (BMktgMedia (Hons)) with effect from 1 January 2012.

1.2.2 New Units from 2012

The Faculty of Arts has proposed the introduction of the following unit from 1 January 2012:

LAW551 Professional and Community Engagement

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves the introduction of LAW551 Professional and Community Engagement with effect from 1 January 2012, subject to clarification of the NCCW and prerequisite issues as identified by the Undergraduate Sub-Committee.

1.2.3 Proposals for Participation Units

The Committee noted that the Undergraduate Sub-Committee had agreed to refer the following issue to the PACE Advisory Committee for advice back to ASQC and Academic Senate:

What is the minimum amount of contact required between a student and a partner organisation in order for a unit to satisfy the experiential learning requirements of the Participation Criteria?

The Faculties of Arts, Business and Economics and Science have proposed that the following units be added to the Schedule of Participation Units for 2012:

**Faculty of Arts**
- LAW 488 Access to Justice
- LAW 551 Professional and Community Engagement
  *(subject to the provision of the information identified above)*
- MAS 350 Media Internship
- MMCS321 Arts Practicum

**Faculty of Business and Economics**
- BBA 360 Business Project

**Faculty of Science**
- CBMS308 Chemical Analysis II
- ENGG400 Industry Experience

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves the addition of the above units to the Schedule of Participation Units for 2012, LAW 551 being subject to the provision of the following information from the PACE Advisory Committee:

“What is the minimum amount of contact required between a student and a partner organisation in order for a unit to satisfy the experiential learning requirements of the Participation Criteria?”
1.2.4  2012 Schedule of Programs

Bachelor of Community Management
In order to facilitate the enrolment of students in the Bachelor of Community Management program the creation of a new unit, BCM 310 Social Marketing and Sustainability, has been proposed. The Committee noted that this unit is a copy of MKTG309 Social Marketing and Sustainability. These two units will be NCCW with each other and BCM 310 will have a different prerequisite to MKTG309.

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves the creation of the unit BCM 310 Social Marketing and Sustainability in order to facilitate the enrolment of students in the Bachelor of Community Management program.

1.2.5  2012 Schedule of Majors

Interactivity and Games (ITG01)
The Committee was advised that the Faculty of Arts had queried the ownership in 2012 of the major Interactivity and Games. The major was originally jointly proposed by the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Science, to be owned by the Faculty of Science as a qualifying major for the degree of Bachelor of Arts. Following discussion between the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Science, it has been agreed that the Faculty of Arts should be the ‘owner’ of the Interactivity and Games major.

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves that the Interactivity and Games major be deemed to be owned by the Faculty of Arts.

1.2.6  Revised Definition of People and Planet Units

Academic Senate at its meeting on 8 July 2011 approved revised criteria for the determination of People and Planet units. The Committee discussed further minor revisions proposed by the Undergraduate Sub-Committee.

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves the revised statement for the determination of People and Planet units (Attachment 1 http://senate.mq.edu.au/MQUonly/agenda/2011/0811/Attach_1.pdf).

1.2.7  OUA Schedule of Undergraduate Units (File No. 03/993-04)

The Faculty of Arts has advised that the Capstone unit designation for CLT340 Genre Writing is incorrect. The unit CLT370 Advanced Research in Cultural Studies is the Capstone unit in the Critical Studies major within the BA offered through OUA. The Committee reviewed the OUA Schedule of Undergraduate Units and noted that four units proposed by the Faculty of Arts for offering in 2012, ANT151, ANT202, PLT310, PLT350, PLT390, have not yet been through the appropriate approval processes.

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves:
(1)  The 2012 OUA Schedule of Undergraduate Units (Attachment 2 http://senate.mq.edu.au/MQUonly/agenda/2011/0811/Attach_2.pdf)
(2)  The rescinding of the Capstone unit designation for CLT340 Genre Writing.
1.2.8 Exchange Units (File No. 11/452)

The Committee reviewed the list of Exchange Units owned by the Faculty of Business and Economics and agreed to recommend that they be designated as Commerce/Economics units. It is hoped that the number of undergraduate qualifications that will need to be processed manually will be reduced by adding the Commerce/Economics designation to these units.

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves that the Exchange Units owned by the Faculty of Business and Economics be designated as Commerce/Economics units (Attachment 3 http://senate.mq.edu.au/MQUonly/agenda/2011/0811/Attach_3.pdf).

1.2.9 Prerequisites for Summer School Units (File No. 11/452)

The Committee received advice that a request had been submitted seeking to amend the prerequisites for two units to be offered in the 2012 Summer School program. The prerequisites would be different from those listed for the 2011 semester-based offerings of the units. The Committee believes that the listing of different prerequisites for different study periods is not academically appropriate and causes confusion among students.

RECOMMENDED
(1) That Academic Senate endorses the principle that for 2012 and all future Summer School teaching periods the prerequisites listed against the unit in the Schedule of Units apply across all teaching periods/offering, including Summer School.
(2) That the question of which particular year’s Schedule of Units should apply to units offered in the Summer School (i.e. the Schedule of the year “prior” or the Schedule for the “coming” year) be referred to the Summer Session Implementation Steering Committee for resolution.

1.2.10 Transition Arrangements at the End of 2012

The Committee noted that at the end of 2012 all undergraduate bachelor degree students will be required to move into programs under the new curriculum. To ensure the smooth transition of students the Committee agreed that a Working Party be established to consider principles that should apply to the resolution of any issues and problems which may arise in relation to transferring students enrolled in pre-2010 programs of study. This Working Party should also be charged with recommending

i. a strategy for communicating with students about the transition arrangements; and
ii. the appropriate format and membership of a “troubleshooting group” to deal with any unforeseen problems relating to transition as they arise.

It is proposed that the Working Party comprise:

- Dean of Students (Chair)
- Mr Bradley Windon, Coursework Studies Section
- Mr Jonathan Wiley, Academic Program Section
- Ms Francoise Ware, Academic Program Section
- Ms Suzanne Kelly, Student Systems and Business Solutions
- Nominee from PR and Marketing
- Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching, Faculty of Arts (or nominee)
- Associate Professor Pamela Coutts, Faculty of Human Sciences
RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves the establishment of a Working Party to determine principles for resolving issues and problems surrounding the transfer of pre-2010 students into new curriculum programs.

2. 2013 Academic Program

2.1 Postgraduate

2.1.1 Units to be Deleted from 2013 (File Nos. 10/1526; 11/453)

The Faculties of Human Sciences and Science have proposed the deletion of the following units from 2013:

**Faculty of Human Sciences**
- LING896  Practicum
- LING930 Research Methods for Communication Disorders Part A
- LING931 Special Project Communication Disorders Part A
- LING965 Dissertation I
- LING966 Dissertation II
- LING932 Special Project Communication Disorders Part B
- LING940 Research Methods for Communication Disorders Part B
- SLP813 Project in Speech and Language Processing I
- SLP806 Practicum II
- SPH811 Aural Rehabilitation
- SPH815 Professional Practice III
- SPH816 Professional Practice IV
- SPH818 Clinical Linguistic Analysis
- SPH819 Speech Pathology III: Alternative and Augmentative Communication and Severe Communication Impairment

**Faculty of Science**
- GSE880 Learner Managed Learning for Environmental Education Part B

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves the deletion of the units listed above with effect from 31 December 2012.

2.1.2 New Unit Proposals for 2013 (File No. 11/453)

The Committee has agreed that proposals for the introduction of new units in 2013 will be required to be submitted in paper format rather than using the unit online system. The online system requires major redevelopment work which cannot be completed in time to meet the Committee’s deadline for submission of new unit proposals. The new unit proposal form will be redesigned to capture the strengths of the unit online system as well as retaining the key information elements of the previous paper-based form.

FOR NOTING

3. 2012 Schedule of Postgraduate Programs

3.1. Program Structures Approved for 2012 Only

3.1.1 Master of Environmental Law (File No. 02/488)
Master of International Environmental Law (File No. 03/122)
The Committee noted advice from the Postgraduate Sub-Committee which reiterated its position that there is considerable conceptual overlap between the two named awards listed above. The Postgraduate Sub-Committee had recommended that the Faculty of Arts reconsider either:

i) a specialisation of International Environmental Law within the degree of Master of Environmental Law; or

ii) if retaining the two named degrees, structuring the programs of study to satisfy the 50% rule of distinctiveness. If the Faculty chooses to retain the two named degrees, in order to progress the programs for 2012, the Committee will accept program structures for the Master of Environmental Law and Master of International Environmental Law with at least 3 distinct units pending a guarantee of an additional distinct unit for 2013.

After some discussion the Committee agreed that in order to allow a proper consideration of the above recommendations, the current proposed structures for the Master of Environmental Law and the Master of International Environmental Law will be approved for renewal for 2012 only. The Faculty of Arts will be required to submit revised program structures for 2013 by no later than 30 September 2011.

**RECOMMENDED**

That Academic Senate approves the program structures of the Master of Environmental Law and Master of International Environmental Law for 2012 only.

### 3.1.2 Master of Recording Arts (File No. 04/1611)

**RECOMMENDED**

That Academic Senate approves the program structure of the Master of Recording Arts for 2012 only, which will allow the University to formulate a policy on Recognition for Prior Learning.

### 3.2 Program Structures

The Committee reviewed the complete 2012 Schedule of Postgraduate Programs.

**RECOMMENDED**


### 3.3 Double Award Principles

The Committee noted that the Faculty of Science had requested that the credit point requirement for the double degree award of Master of Biotechnology with Master of Commerce be 64 credit points. A memorandum from Associate Professor Paul Haynes which outlined justification for the credit point requirement of 64 was tabled at the meeting.

The Postgraduate Sub-Committee’s position on this issue, as recorded in the following extract (Item 7.4) from the minutes of the 14 July 2011 meeting, was also noted:

"The subcommittee reiterated its previous recommendation that the double should be 72 credit points (the length of the longer award plus 50%). The committee noted that although the Master of Commerce contains 600 level graduate units the award has been constructed as a 48 credit point award taken over 1.5 years, and that all 48 credit points are required to satisfy the requirements of the award. Consequently, the two single awards are 48 credit point awards and the double award:
- should be a total of 72 cps (the length of the longer award plus 50%)
- in awards with 600 level units the loss of units by combining the awards should be..."
shared at all levels proportionately. So in this case the award should only contain 12 credit points at 600 level.”

After a lengthy discussion on this issue, the Committee RECOMMENDED

That Academic Senate approves the following principles for double awards:

1. For postgraduate programs with 32cp of 800 level or above, a double masters program must include a minimum of 24 credit points at 800 level or above from that component single degree.

2. For postgraduate programs with 48cp of 800 level or above, a double masters program must include a minimum of 32 credit points at 800 level or above from that component single degree.

3. The total number of credit points in a double degree program must be a multiple of 16cps.

4. Two 48 credit point single degrees consisting of 800 level or above units can only be combined to form a double degree if they are in cognate areas.

5. There must be savings from both degrees and if any degree is comprised of required and elective units the saving must come from the elective units.

4. Retention and Renewal of Graduate Diplomas and Graduate Certificates

As part of the undergraduate curriculum renewal project the ASQC Undergraduate Subcommittee has reviewed all existing Graduate Diplomas and Graduate Certificates. The Sub-Committee considered proposals for retention and renewal of existing awards, proposals for new awards, proposals for discontinuance of existing awards, proposals for majors and reviewed proposed program structures for awards which had previously been approved for introduction in 2012. In reviewing the proposals put forward by faculties, the Sub-Committee applied the principles determined by the ASQC Working Party on Graduate Diplomas and Certificates which have been approved by Academic Senate.

In light of the revised nomenclature for Postgraduate Diploma and Postgraduate Certificate Awards which was approved by Academic Senate at its 8 July 2011 meeting, the Committee RECOMMENDED

That Academic Senate approves:

1. That the award of Graduate Certificate be identified in the Rules as a “Graduate Certificate of XXX” and the award of Graduate Diploma be identified in the Rules as “Graduate Diploma of XXX”. Where a Graduate Diploma or Graduate Certificate contains majors, these will be referred to as “major in YYY”. This change of nomenclature is to be effective for all Graduate Certificate and Graduate Diploma programs from 1 January 2012. Awards under the pre-2012 Rules will continue to be known as “Graduate Certificate in XXX” and “Graduate Diploma in XXX”.

2. The following award abbreviations:
   - Graduate Certificate of Arts (GCertArts)
   - Graduate Diploma of Arts (GDipArts)
   - Graduate Certificate of Science (GCertSc)
   - Graduate Diploma of Science (GDipSc)
4.1 Retention and Renewal of Named Awards

The Faculties of Human Sciences and Science have proposed the retention and renewal of the following named awards:

Graduate Diploma of Education (File No. A90/252)
Graduate Diploma of Psychology (File No. A92-322)
Graduate Certificate of Biotechnology (File No. 03/1140)
Graduate Certificate of Information Technology (File No. 04/151)
Graduate Diploma of Information Technology (File No. 03/1393)

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves the retention and renewal of the awards listed above with effect from 1 January 2012.

4.2 New Awards from 2012

The Faculties of Business and Economics, Human Sciences and Science have proposed the introduction of the following new awards:

Graduate Certificate of Commerce (exit award only) (File No. 11/1098)
Graduate Diploma of Early Childhood Teaching (File No. 11/1096)
Graduate Diploma of Advanced Studies in Early Childhood (File No. 11/1097)
Graduate Certificate of Geoscience (File No. 10/1966)
Graduate Certificate of Chiropractic Science (File No. 11/1099)

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate recommends to Council that the introduction of the following awards be approved with effect from 1 January 2012:

- Graduate Certificate of Commerce (exit award only)
- Graduate Diploma of Early Childhood Teaching
- Graduate Diploma of Advanced Studies in Early Childhood
- Graduate Certificate of Geoscience
- Graduate Certificate of Chiropractic Science

4.3 Confirmation of New Awards previously approved for introduction

The awards listed below were approved for introduction before the principles for the review of the Graduate Certificate and Graduate Diplomas had been developed. These awards have been reviewed using the principles approved by Academic Senate.

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate confirms the introduction of the awards listed above with effect from 1 January 2012:

- Graduate Diploma of Advanced Psychology (File No. 11/640)
- Graduate Certificate of Speech and Communication (exit award only) (File No. 11/789)
- Graduate Diploma of Speech and Communication (File No. 11/788)
- Graduate Diploma of Geoscience (File No. 10/1965)
- Graduate Diploma of Chiropractic Science (File No. 09/1747)

4.4 Graduate Certificate of Arts – New Majors (File No. 11/409)

The Faculty of Arts has proposed the introduction of the majors in the Graduate Certificate of Arts as follows:
RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves the introduction of the following majors for the Graduate Certificate of Arts with effect from 1 January 2012:

- Coptic Studies
- Creative Writing
- Egyptology

4.5 Graduate Diploma of Arts – New Majors (File No. 11/411)

The Faculty of Arts has proposed the introduction of the majors in the Graduate Diploma of Arts as follows:

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves the introduction of the following majors for the Graduate Diploma of Arts with effect from 1 January 2012:

- Anthropology
- Coptic Studies
- Egyptology
- Philosophy
- Women's Studies, Gender and Sexuality

4.6 Graduate Certificate of Science – New Majors (File No. 11/410)

The Faculty of Science has proposed the introduction of the majors in the Graduate Certificate of Science as follows:

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves the introduction of the following majors for the Graduate Certificate of Science with effect from 1 January 2012:

- Statistics
- Palaeobiology

4.7 Graduate Diploma of Science – New Majors (File No. 11/412)

The Faculty of Science has proposed the introduction of the majors in the Graduate Diploma of Science as follows:

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves the introduction of the following majors for the Graduate Diploma of Science with effect from 1 January 2012:

- Climate Science
- Geographical Information Systems

4.8 Awards to be Discontinued

4.8.1 The following awards have never been formally discontinued, although the associated program of study has been discontinued.

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves that the awards listed below be discontinued with effect from 31 December 2011:

- Graduate Certificate in Critical and Cultural Studies (File No. 05/122)
- Graduate Certificate in Introductory Japanese Teaching (File No. A99/768)
- Graduate Certificate in Japanese Corporate Training (File No. A98/953)
- Graduate Diploma in Chinese (File No. A93/641)
4.8.2 The following awards are being replaced with majors within the Graduate Certificate of Arts, Graduate Diploma of Arts, Graduate Certificate of Science and Graduate Diploma of Science:

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves that the awards listed below be discontinued with effect from 31 December 2011:

- Graduate Diploma in Anthropology (File No. A99/299)
- Graduate Diploma in Philosophy (File No. D00/599)
- Graduate Diploma in Women’s Studies (File No. D00/599)
- Graduate Certificate in Statistics (File No. 05/1135)
- Graduate Diploma in Climate Science (File No. 10/1527)
- Graduate Diploma in Geographic Information Science (File No. 98/188)

4.8.3 The Faculties of Arts, Business and Economics and Human Sciences have proposed the discontinuance of the following awards:

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves that the awards listed below be discontinued with effect from 31 December 2011:

- Graduate Diploma in Japanese (File No. A93/645)
- Graduate Certificate in Business (File No. 05/1447)
- Graduate Certificate in Marketing (File No. 05/1448)
- Graduate Certificate in Information Systems and Technology (File No. 1449)
- Graduate Diploma in Early Childhood (File No. A96/280)

4.8.4 A number of Graduate Certificate and Graduate Diploma awards are to be replaced with a new named award of either “Graduate Diploma of xxx” or Graduate Certificate of xxx from 1 January 2012. As a consequence of this recommended change to nomenclature, it is necessary for the following awards to be discontinued:

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves that the awards listed below be discontinued with effect from 31 December 2011:

- Graduate Certificate in Biotechnology (File No. 03/1140)
- Graduate Diploma in Education (File No. A90/252)
- Graduate Certificate in Information Technology (File No.04/151)
- Graduate Diploma in Information Technology (File No.03/1393)
- Graduate Diploma in Psychology (File No. A92-322)
4.9 Programs of study to be discontinued
The Faculties of Arts, Business and Economics, Human Sciences and Science have proposed the discontinuance of the following programs of study:

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves that the programs of study listed below be discontinued with effect from 31 December 2011:

- Graduate Diploma in Anthropology (ANTH05)
- Graduate Diploma in Philosophy (PHLS05)
- Graduate Diploma in Women’s Studies (WMST01)
- Graduate Certificate in Statistics (STAT02)
- Graduate Diploma in Climate Science (ATMS05)
- Graduate Diploma in Geographic Information Science (GISC05)
- Graduate Diploma in Japanese (JPNS10)
- Graduate Certificate in Business (BUSN40)
- Graduate Certificate in Marketing (MKTG20)
- Graduate Certificate in Information Systems and Technology (INFT12)
- Graduate Diploma in Early Childhood (ECHS05, ECHS06, ECHS07)

4.10 Awards to be rescinded
The following awards were recommended for approval by ASQC to Academic Senate and subsequently approved by the University Council. Since the approval for the introduction of these awards, Academic Senate has approved a set of criteria to be applied in relation to the introduction of ‘named’ Graduate programs. These awards do not satisfy that criteria and are being replaced by a major within the Graduate Certificate of Arts, Graduate Diploma of Arts or the Graduate Certificate of Science:

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate recommends to Council that the approval for the introduction of the awards listed below be rescinded:

- Graduate Certificate in Coptic Studies (File No. 10/1958)
- Graduate Diploma in Coptic Studies (File No. 10/1959)
- Graduate Certificate in Egyptology (File No. 10/1960)
- Graduate Diploma in Egyptology (File No. 10/1961)
- Graduate Certificate in Palaeobiology (File No. 11/197)

4.11 Schedule of Graduate Diplomas and Graduate Certificates
The Committee reviewed the program templates for Graduate Diplomas and Graduate Certificates proposed for offering in 2012.

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves the Schedule of Graduate Diplomas and Graduate Certificates (Attachment 5 http://senate.mq.edu.au/MQUonly/agenda/2011/0811/Attach_5.pdf).

5. Schedule of Programs for the Certificate in Ancient Languages, Certificate in Languages, Diploma in Ancient Languages, Diploma in Languages (File Nos. 02/1813; D00/841; 02/1814; A99/503)

5.1 Programs of study to be discontinued
The Department of International Studies has advised that the offering of units in Macedonian will cease at the end of the 2011 academic year.

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves the discontinuance of the following programs of study with effect from 31 December 2011:
5.2 Schedule of Programs

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves the Schedule of Programs for the Certificate in Ancient Languages, Certificate in Languages, Diploma in Ancient Languages and the Diploma in Languages with effect from 1 January 2012 (Attachment 6 http://senate.mq.edu.au/MQUonly/agenda/2011/0811/Attach_6.pdf).

6 Amendments to the Handbook Database, Course Finder and Admin Manager

6.1 Graduate Programs in Course Finder
The Committee noted that while Graduate Certificates and Graduate Diplomas are deemed to be ‘postgraduate’ programs by UAC, the University regards them as ‘undergraduate’ programs. It was agreed that a separate ‘tab’ should be developed in Course Finder, the Handbook Database and Admin Manager so that these programs can be placed in the correct hierarchical location in these databases (i.e. separate from both Undergraduate and Postgraduate programs).

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves that appropriate development work be undertaken in Course Finder, the Handbook Database and Admin Manager so that the entries for the Graduate Diploma and Graduate Certificate programs can be placed in the correct hierarchical location in these databases.

6.2 Inconsistency in Admission Requirements shown in Handbook of Undergraduate Studies and Course Finder
The noted advice from the Undergraduate Sub-Committee regarding discrepancies between the admission requirements shown in the 2011 Handbook of Undergraduate Studies and Course Finder for Graduate Certificates and Graduate Diplomas.

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves that the admission requirements shown in the Handbook of Undergraduate Studies for Graduate Certificates and Graduate Diplomas also be used in Course Finder.

6.3 Admission Requirements for International Students
The Committee’s attention to a database that maintains a set of admission requirements that apply to international students but are not reflected in Course Finder. The current review process involves faculties being requested to confirm the consistency of the differentiated admission requirements for international students in relation to the requirements that apply to local students.

RECOMMENDED
That Academic Senate approves that appropriate development work be undertaken in Handbook, Admin Manager and Course Finder, to enable the inclusion of admission requirements that are applicable to international students.

J Fitness
CHAIR
A meeting of the Higher Degree Research Committee was held on Friday 29 July 2011.

A. MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

The Acting Chair of Higher Degree Research Committee, Professor Nick Mansfield provided an update to members on the Master+PhD degree matter and its current development. Both the Department of Innovation, Industry, Science (DIISR) and Research and the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) would like to discuss this matter further with the University. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research), Dean of Higher Degree Research and Director of Higher Degree Research Office will be meeting with the DIISR and DEEWR in August to discuss the matter further.

Professor Mansfield also briefed members on last Central Commencement Program for HDR candidates. The feedbacks from HDR candidates are positive, 98% candidates indicate that the program is valuable and helpful.

Associate Professor Robyn Dowling in the meeting extended an invitation to supervisors to enrol earlier in the supervision enhancement program for second semester.

Dr Ren Yi updated members on the current commencement and completion data. In comparison with last year same period, the commencement number is down and completion number is maintained. However, the numbers of candidates who are under examination and undertaking corrections are higher in comparison to last year. Dr Yi also provided an update on the current implementation of the new OOT policy.

Dr Ren Yi and Ms Louise Fleck (Director, RO) updated the committee on the new research skill training program Epiium. The program will be available for newly commenced HDR students and ECR researchers through HDRO and RO. The Committee welcomes the new initiative.

Professor Ernest Jordan reported on his last trip to Europe in June and the upcoming China Scholarship Council trip in October. Professor Jordan also briefed members on the current restructuring of International Research Program team. The team will have broader responsibilities and will report to the Vice President Strategy.

B. MATTERS FOR RECOMMENDATION

(1) COMPLETION OF REQUIREMENTS

Bhatia, Bhunu

Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Melanie Beresford
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Peter Petocz
Thesis submitted for examination: 02 March 2011
Thesis title: Social capital in rural Bangladesh: A critique from the gender perspective
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

Davies, Peter John

Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Mark Taylor
Associate Supervisor: Dr Nicole Graham
Adjunct Supervisor: I. Wright
Thesis submitted for examination: 21 April 2011
Thesis title: Managing urban water resources in Sydney – Integrating science with the role of local government policy, planning and implementation
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy
DOLAI, SIBASISH  FOS  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Associate Professor Mark Molloy
Associate Supervisor:  Dr Fei Liu
Thesis submitted for examination:  13 April 2011
Thesis title:  Quantitative proteomics using chemical probes
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

HOU, YU  FOHS  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Associate Professor Ilija Casule
Associate Supervisor:  Dr Zhongwei Song
Thesis submitted for examination:  25 March 2011
Thesis title:  Nominalisation in the translation of literary prose from Chinese into English
(Based on the three English version of Hong Lou Meng)
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

ISLAM, MOHAMMAD TOWHIDUL  FOA  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Dr Shawkat Alam
Associate Supervisor:  Professor Rafiqul Islam
Thesis submitted for examination:  19 April 2011
Thesis title:  Trips agreement of the WTO: Implications and challenges for Bangladesh
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

MAMO, BRIONY LOUISE  FOS  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Associate Professor Glenn Brock
Associate Supervisor:  Dr James Valentine
Adjunct Supervisor:  D. Dominey Howes
Thesis submitted for examination:  09 March 2011
Thesis title:  Applications of Holocene Benthic Foraminifera: Biodiversity and biotopes from the southern Great Barrier Reef and identification of extreme events in SW Pacific
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

ROBERTS, MATTHEW DAMIEN  FOS  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Associate Professor Dominic Verity
Associate Supervisor:  Associate Professor Anthony Sloane
Thesis submitted for examination:  18 March 2011
Thesis title:  Compiled generics for functional programming languages
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

SAID, RESSA  FOS  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Professor Jason Twamley
Associate Supervisor:  Associate Professor Daniel Terno, Dr Alberto Carlini
Thesis submitted for examination:  11 February 2011
Thesis title:  Quantum information processing tasks and applications in Diamond
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

SHADDICK, KIM  FOS  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Associate Professor Luciano Beheregaray
Associate Supervisor:  Professor David Briscoe
Thesis submitted for examination:  06 April 2011
Thesis title:  Phylogeography, conservation genetics and stocking management of two Australian catadromous fish: Estuary perch Macquaria colonorum and Australian bass M. novemaculeata
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy
STRUPPERT, ANIKA FOA PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Qin Guo
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Manjula Waniganayake
Thesis submitted for examination: 30 April 2011
Thesis title: Developing intercultural awareness and sensitivity through digital game play. Three case studies with the simulation RealLives 2010 in Australian, American and Swiss Middle Schools
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

RECOMMENDED
That the students included in the report have satisfied the requirements for the awards stated.

Dr Ren Yi
Director, Higher Degree Research Office
At its meetings on 15 June and 27 July 2011 the SLTC discussed a draft of the assessment policy and procedure.

The overall comments made during discussion on 15 June 2011 showed that the policy needed to undergo further editing. The Committee discussed the view that the draft policy had become a little too proscriptive and over-detailed; by seeking to bound certain assessment activities (such as examinations and tests) as a proportion of the overall assessment load of a unit. Some members suggested that the working group should shift its attention from the assessment regimes that exist within particular units to those that apply across entire programs.

The committee discussed a proposal to delete a clause stating that “20% of the total assessment of the unit as non-invigilated assessment/examinations”. Questions were also raised in regard to how unit convenors were to determine if two assessments could be regarded as being of different types under the policy. In particular, the committee discussed the key factors which might apply in distinguishing non-invigilated / invigilated assessments, tests / exams and different forms of essay based assignment.

Representatives of the working group reported that their intention in setting these bounds was to encourage unit convenors to apply more than one type of assessment and to be more thoughtful about the types of assessment they used to assess each learning outcome or graduate capability. They also noted that this was still a draft document and that they were intending to continue their work on improving the policy at a meeting to be held on the 7th of July.

The Committee also suggested that the policy’s implementation would be substantially aided by the provision of a carefully selected suite of case studies based upon existing best practice within each faculty. It was of the view that these would provide unit convenors and department heads with more effective guidance on the issue of appropriate assessment mix.

The working group was asked to review the draft policy at its meeting of the 7th of July, to make specific amendments suggested by the Committee and to submit an updated and improved version to the July meeting of the SLTC.

At the meeting on 27 July 2011, the SLTC continued the discussion of the Assessment Policy and Procedure and made following observations regarding the latest draft tabled by the working party:

The definition of examination in the Examination Policy still needs to be aligned with the new definition given in the proposed Assessment Policy.

There are some issues related to the assessment, e.g. negotiation of assignment deadlines with students, which will be resolved in the Unit Guide policy (currently under review).

On the matter of assessment types, the Committee noted that some academics would prefer to invigilate the conduct of all assessment components. On the other hand, it was also observed that all students should be given the opportunity to engage fully with a scholarly
and truly reflective approach to their work. Given the importance of this latter imperative, the Committee accepted that the assessment policy would have to place some limits on the use of invigilated assessment.

It was noted that during its development the proposed policy had undergone an extensive consultation process, which had encompassing fact-finding visits to 13 departments and detailed written submissions from 4 others.

The Committee also discussed mechanisms for ensuring compliance with the proposed policy. Its view was that the processes for post factum compliance checking, at Departmental and Faculty examination meetings, were strong but that there was still need to strengthen compliance processes both before and during each semester. It was pointed out that systems and procedures (collectively codenamed Marquis) currently under development to support the formulation and publication of unit guide would be of great assistance to the process of pre-semester compliance checking. It was also mentioned that many departments have implemented processes (such as meetings with student representatives) to facilitate intra-semester teaching quality feedback from students. It was the Committee’s view that these could also be used as a context for monitoring compliance with the assessment policy.

The Committee reaffirmed the principle that Faculties, through their FSQCs, and ASQC would be jointly responsible for monitoring and reporting upon compliance to the proposed policy.

Based on the results of its discussions, the SLTC gave its approval for the Assessment Policy, Procedure and Assessment Good practice guideline as attached (Attachments A, B and C) be referred on for further. This was granted on the proviso that the committee reserves its right to review and monitor the implementation of the policy. The policy is now referred for consultation to the office of the General Counsel and the Vice-Chancellor and next step after that will be the University policy Reference Group and finally Academic Senate.

It is expected that the final version of the policy will be presented to Academic Senate for approval at its October meeting. In the meantime, the attached draft policy is included here for discussion purposes only.

A/Professor Dominic Verity
Chair, SLTC

Attachment A: Assessment Policy
Attachment B: Assessment Procedure
Attachment C: Assessment – Good Practice Guideline
Attachment D: Assessment and Feedback Policy Review Report
**POLICY**

**Assessment Policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>To articulate the principles that underpin the Macquarie University approach to assessment of student learning and feedback. These principles guide the procedures to be used in the conduct and management of assessment and feedback practices in all coursework units.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Overview | Assessment of student learning performance and feedback on progress are pivotal and important processes in University learning and teaching. Assessment tasks communicate to students what must be learned and are vehicles by which the University assures itself, and society, of its graduates’ capabilities.  
The design of assessment tasks, feedback processes and grading strategies are to be efficient, effective and ethical, as well as imbued with educational integrity and equity and grounded in research-based evidence regarding effective practice.  
Research is a core element of University practice. Assessment can enhance the nexus between learning and research through providing students with opportunities to:  
- experience critical exposure to the research of academic teachers and graduate, higher degree students  
- engage in research inspired learning and develop the capacity to conceptualise and conduct research  
- provide an opportunity to understand and evaluate the contribution of research to knowledge in their field of study. |

**Principles of Quality Assessment**  
This Policy is based on the following evidenced-based principles:  
- Curriculum Alignment  
- Standards-based Grading  
- Student Engagement  
- Scholarly and Evidence Based Practice  
- Social Inclusion and Diversity  
- Quality and Timely Feedback  
- Quality Enhancement  
- Quality Assurance

**DEFINITIONS**  
**Assessment Task:** illustrative task or performance opportunity that closely targets defined learning outcomes, allowing students to demonstrate their learning and capabilities.  
**Examination:** a time-limited assessment task conducted under invigilation. For example, tests, practical assessments, in-unit quizzes.
A final examination is held within a specified examination period that is defined by the University.

**Invigilation:** to supervise students attempting an examination to ensure its proper and efficient conduct, and to prevent cheating.

**Moderation:** a quality review and assurance process which supports the examination setting and marking activities. It involves using other academics and qualified staff to confirm that the examination tasks and marking are valid and reliable. Essentially, it is a checking process.

### Scope

This Policy applies to all coursework units offered by or on behalf of Macquarie University.

It will be relevant to all academic leaders and managers of learning and teaching, all teaching staff, including sessional teachers, and all coursework students.

The Policy also provides information for external stakeholders, such as professional accrediting bodies, workplace supervisors and employers of graduates.

### Policy

All assessment design and practice will adhere to the stated evidence-based principles of quality assessment.

Standards based assessment will be used.

There will be no pre-determined or ideal distribution of grades across a student cohort (i.e., norm referencing).

**COMPLETION OF A UNIT**

Academic Senate will:

- confirm the criteria to be used to determine whether a student has satisfactorily completed a coursework unit
- approve the final grades for all coursework units.

**QUALITY ASSURANCE AND MANAGEMENT OF ASSESSMENT**

The faculties, through the Executive Deans, and the University, through Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC), will:

- ensure the quality assurance of assessment practice
- ensure that all assessment tasks undergo regular cycles of moderation.

The Unit Convenor will institute a process to ensure alignment between teaching strategies, expected learning outcomes and assessment requirements by all staff with a responsibility for unit assessment.

**UNIT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS**

Each unit will:

- have at least three assessment tasks
- require more than one type of assessment
- include feedback on an early task (assessed or other) within the first third of the study period
- have no single assessment task worth more than 60% of the total assessment of the unit
- not include a total examination component of more than 80% of the total assessment of the unit

Group assessment prepared and presented as a single entity where the contributions of individual students cannot be identified are to be:
- graded on a pass/fail basis, and
- limited to 30% of the total assessment.

For the assessment tasks there will be a description in the Unit Guide of:
- the assessment requirements (such as length of written tasks or examination duration), their relative weightings and due dates
- the process for extensions
- penalties for late submission
- resubmission options
- the criteria and standards for grading against which individual assessment tasks will be judged
- the submission method for each assessment task
- how each assessment task aligns with the unit Learning Outcomes
- how the assessment tasks align with Macquarie University’s Graduate Capabilities
- the type and timing of feedback that will be provided
- how the workload for the assessment requirements is calculated based on the amount of time required to master both the assessment mode and the content
- the ways in which judgments of individual assessment tasks will be combined to give an overall unit grade.

CHANGES TO UNIT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS
All changes to unit assessment tasks requested after the unit has commenced will require approval by the Head of Department.

FINAL GRADES
The Unit Convenor will be responsible for determining and reporting the final unit grades.

RETENTION OF RECORDS
All items submitted or completed by a student for the purpose of assessment or evaluation will be retained at least until the end of the grade appeal period (six months), unless returned to the student.

At the end of the retention period, the items will be destroyed or returned to students.

EXCEPTIONS
Exceptions to this Policy will only be granted when supported by sound pedagogical reasons.

Any exception to this Policy will require the approval of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee.

COMPLIANCE AND BREACHES
The University will manage breaches of this Policy, and any associated procedures, by applying:
- the appropriate processes of the relevant industrial instrument to staff breaches
- disciplinary procedures applicable to student misconduct to student breaches.

The University will treat seriously, and monitor, pursue and address, any breaches. Cases of serious, deliberate, and/or criminal breach may result in disciplinary action, may be referred to external authorities and may result in civil or criminal proceedings.
## PROCEDURE

### Assessment Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>To detail the actions and responsibilities required for the efficient and ethical management of the assessment process at Macquarie University.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Procedure | This procedure requires actions by the following:  
- Academic Senate  
- Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC)  
- Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching  
- Executive Dean / Dean  
- Faculty Student Administration Manager  
- Head of Department  
- Student  
- Unit Convenor |

**Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching**  
1. **QUALITY ASSURANCE**  
   Put quality assurance processes in place to ensure that new and continuing staff are familiar with the Assessment Policy, its related procedures and guidelines, and all future updates.  
   
   Ensure new staff are routinely inducted into institutional assessment expectations.  
   
   **Assessment Literacy**  
   Provide all stakeholders with opportunities to develop a level of assessment literacy.  

**Executive Dean/Dean**  
2. **ELIGIBILITY FOR CONTINUATION IN A UNIT**  
   Determine whether a student is eligible to continue in a unit. A student not considered eligible will be excluded from the unit and this will result in the student being awarded a Fail grade (F) for the unit.  

**Unit Convenor**  
3. **ASSESSMENT DESIGN**  
   Ensure assessment tasks include authentic challenges and connect learning and learning outcomes.  
   
   Where appropriate, incorporate an external supervisor’s evaluation of a student’s learning in the grading process (e.g. for Participation units).  
   
   4. **GROUP ASSESSMENT**  
   Where there is group assessment, prepare students to ensure they possess the skills necessary to complete the tasks successfully.  
   
   5. **RESUBMISSION**  
   Detail the resubmission options in the Unit Guide. Note that if resubmission is available, it is only permissible after the original assessment task has been graded and returned to students.  
   
   6. **CHANGE TO UNIT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS DURING A UNIT OFFERING**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Academic Senate</strong></th>
<th><strong>2 August 2011</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 10.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If recommending a change to the assessment requirements after a unit has commenced, consider the implications of the recommended change on both the students and staff members involved. Make the recommendation to the Head of Department or delegated authority. Upon approval notify students in writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student</strong></th>
<th><strong>7. ACADEMIC HONESTY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comply with the Academic Honesty Policy, noting particularly the need to ensure that all the assessment tasks you submit are your original work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student</strong></th>
<th><strong>8. FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be an active participant in the feedback process, act upon the advice given and provide evidence of having done so.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student</strong></th>
<th><strong>9. RETENTION OF RECORDS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep a copy of all assignment items you lodge for assessment, regardless of whether or not they will be graded. Ensure the copies are kept until the final unit grade has been officially released or until the finalisation of any appeals process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student</strong></th>
<th><strong>10. INCLUSIVE PRACTICE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where applicable, submit a request for reasonable adjustment, with the necessary supporting documentation, to Campus Wellbeing as soon as practicable after enrolment in the unit. Any such reasonable adjustments must be negotiated between the Disability Support Unit and the Unit Convenor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student</strong></th>
<th><strong>11. ELIGIBILITY FOR CONTINUATION IN A UNIT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attend required classes and submit required assessment tasks. Note that the Executive Dean has the authority to refuse you permission to continue in the unit. If you are not considered eligible to continue, you will be excluded from the unit and this will result in you being awarded a Fail grade (F) for the unit. Where there is a final examination, this will result in you not being permitted to sit this examination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Head of Department</strong></th>
<th><strong>12. CONSIDER REQUESTS FOR A CHANGE TO UNIT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS DURING A UNIT OFFERING</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consider requests for a change to unit assessment requirements. In exceptional circumstances, and where they maintain the relationship between the assessment methods and the expected learning outcomes, approve the request. In giving approval for the change, be satisfied that students are not disadvantaged by either the change or the timing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Academic Standards and Quality Committee</strong></th>
<th><strong>13. CONSIDER AN EXCEPTION TO THE ASSESSMENT POLICY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consider a request for an exception to unit assessment requirements and, where the request is based on sound pedagogical rationale and if appropriate, provide approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Academic Senate</strong></th>
<th><strong>14. APPROVE FINAL GRADES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consider and approve final unit grades for each coursework student.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 15. RECORDS MANAGEMENT

Ensure there is a system to record receipt and track the submission of assessment tasks.

## 16. RESULTS MANAGEMENT

Ensure a record of the results for each assessment task is retained until the end of any appeal period (six months).

## 17. RETENTION OF RECORDS

Maintain a system to allow uncollected assessment tasks to be returned to the student or retained for the mandated period (six months).

Comply with any officially authorised request for assessment records (eg by subpoena, for a student discipline case, for a grade appeal, through a Government Information (Public Access) request, or from an audit request).

## 18. DISPOSAL OF RECORDS

At the end of the mandated retention period, arrange for the secure and final disposal of assessment records.
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### Related Policies, Procedures, Guidelines, Forms or Templates
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- Disability Action Plan
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- Grade Appeal [Policy](#)
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- Records Management Policy [Rules](#)
- Special Consideration [Policy / Procedure](#)
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### Resources

- Assessment and Feedback
- [Guide to Implementation of Assessment Policies and Procedures](#)

### Keywords

Assessment, Unit Guide, Assignment
### Purpose

The following guidelines are provided to support best practice in assessment.

### Guideline

#### THE UNIVERSITY

The University, through the Vice-Chancellor and the Academic Senate, encourages assessment and feedback practices that are:

- explicit, fair, transparent, inclusive and consistent across the institution
- well managed and moderated at faculty level
- supported by resources that provide all staff with access to information and opportunities to increase their assessment literacy and their capability in the practice of assessment and feedback
- underpinned by a shared and explicit understanding of what is entailed in academic integrity in assessment and consistent application of the procedures and consequences of academic dishonesty
- supported by consistently applied policies and procedures to inform and manage requirements for students with disabilities and/or special consideration, in the case of illness and misadventure
- supported by appeal mechanisms that are widely publicised and consistently applied.

#### DEPARTMENTS AND FACULTIES

Staff in faculties and departments should develop an environment where:

- assessment and feedback principles, values and procedures are adhered to
- assessment and feedback information, resources and procedures are available and publicised for both students and staff so that all are aware of their role in the assessment and learning processes
- there is a shared understanding of standards and expectations in regard to assessment of learning
- national and international standards occurs with relevant professional and academic discipline organisations and other relevant stakeholders
- assessment tasks are aligned with curriculum aims and objectives and the authentic intentions of the degree program
- a diverse range of assessment tasks are incorporated into each degree program in order to provide opportunities for students to acquire and further develop the espoused Macquarie University Graduate Capabilities
- assessment task design and requirements are monitored in terms of authenticity and workload
- students receive formative assessments and feedback and gain adequate information in a timely fashion in order to learn from past activities and become effective in self assessment
- there is a consistent approach is adopted towards developing students’ understanding of integrity in academic practice
- there is a consistent interpretation of incidents of academic misconduct and a consistent application of the procedures and consequences for academic honesty
- grading criteria and standards are applied accurately, fairly and consistently
- examinations are managed according to the accepted policy and procedures
- accurate records of student performances are kept and maintained for the mandated period
- all examination papers, scripts, records and academic judgments are stored and managed efficiently and securely and kept for the mandated period
- only the student number is disclosed in any public reporting of results (not the student identity) except where the student has given consent or through graduation.

**STAFF**
Staff of the University should ensure they are familiar with the implications of the Assessment Policy and related documents, including:
- mechanisms and procedures to facilitate the implementation of the Assessment Policy
- sound connections with related professional and accrediting bodies and employer groups to establish a clear and shared understanding of the standards of achievement implied in graduates’ credentials they receive from the University.

**ACADEMIC STAFF**
Academic staff should develop a learning environment which encourages students to:
- be focused on learning rather than merely the achievement of grades
- make the effort to be informed of the rules and requirements for progression in their degree program
- be aware of, and abide by, the assessment policies including academic honesty and the consequences for acts of dishonesty that include cheating, collusion, plagiarism and fraud
- seek assistance from the department, faculty and/or institution if they so require it
- behave ethically and responsibly in their conduct of assessment tasks
- use assessment to engage in critical self evaluation in terms of their progress towards the espoused learning expectations
- submit work on time that is their own except when shared ownership is part of the task
- provide notification as soon as possible if difficulties arise with timing, online access, availability of resources or other requirements of the task
- provide notification as soon as possible if difficulties arise in terms of substantial absences and submission of a Special Consideration application with the appropriate medical and/or other certificates
- utilise the mechanisms for appeal if the need arises.

Academic staff should:
- be familiar with University and faculty requirements for best practice in assessment design, communication, grading and feedback
- ensure that all assessment design and practice is congruent with the objectives of the related unit of study and degree program and will facilitate the development of Macquarie University Graduate Capabilities
- communicate assessment expectations clearly and in a timely fashion to students to enable them to be well informed and gain access to required resources
- assess assumptions of students’ entering knowledge, skills and capabilities, including their access to technology and skills to use it
- ensure students are familiar with the requirements for academic integrity in the discipline
- review and give timely and useful detailed feedback on work submitted
- keep and maintain adequate paper-based or electronic records of student achievement for the mandated period
- ensure records and reports on student learning are based only on relevant evidence
- maintain confidentiality regarding student results, disclosing them only to those with a legitimate right of access
- critically review assessment activities in order to anticipate any negative
unintended consequences
• evaluate their own performance as an assessor against the principles, values and practices outlined in this guideline and seek peer feedback
• seek external expert moderation of assessment design and grading practices to gain feedback on the academic and disciplinary standards they entail
• ensure any potential or actual conflict of interest in relation to assessment is resolved in line with the Staff Code of Conduct.

STUDENTS
Students are a pivotal part of the learning process. They need to understand the systems, rules and expectations for academic honesty in all matters to do with assessment products and performances.

Students should:
• be informed about all aspects of assessment policy and practices in each unit of study including criteria, standards and procedures to be met and penalties for breaches
• experience the consistent application of policies, procedures and penalties
• experience the timely return of results with feedback to enable improved performance
• receive information that allows them to calibrate their own performance against the expected performance standards
• review their examination scripts and other forms of summative assessment (except in the case of reuse) for the duration of the mandated script retention period
• have access to their student file and other documents related to their assessment
• be informed of the mechanisms for appeal
• where necessary and with the necessary evidence, use the University’s appeal policy and procedures to appeal against an academic decision.

Students should ensure they:
• are aware that the major objective of assessment is to aid learning rather than the achievement of grades
• are informed of the rules and requirements for progression in the degree program, ensuring that they are fully aware of the advice implications of discontinuation or withdrawal from a unit of study
• are aware of, and abide by, the assessment policies including academic honesty and the consequences for acts of dishonesty that include cheating, collusion, plagiarism and fraud
• are aware of the means for seeking assistance in the department, faculty and institution
• act ethically and responsibly in their behaviour and conduct of assessment tasks and avoid any action that would unfairly disadvantage or advantage another student
• use assessment to engage in critical self evaluation in terms of their progress towards the espoused learning expectations
• submit work on time, ensuring that it is their own except when shared ownership is part of the task
• notify staff as soon as possible if difficulties arise with timing, online access, availability of resources or other requirements of the task
• notify staff as soon as possible if difficulties arise in terms of substantial absences and submit an application for Special Consideration with the appropriate medical and/or other certificates
• are aware of mechanisms for appeal.

PROFESSIONAL AND ACCREDITING ASSOCIATIONS AND EMPLOYER
External stakeholders are important to consider in the learning and assessment process and should:
• have access to information that will provide a clear explanation of the procedure and standards used to assess students capabilities
• have their opinion respected in University contexts related to discussion of desirable graduate capabilities
• be included in peer to peer negotiations with related University academic areas in any process used to identify desirable graduate capabilities and in articulating the standards against which student performances are judged
• have an assurance of the accuracy, consistency and representativeness regarding student achievement contained in documentation produced by the University and released to them by students and graduates
• experience some measure of mutual benefit when they provide opportunities for students to work in their organisations in order to learn.

These external stakeholders should:
• recognise and respect the pedagogical dimension of disciplinary expertise held by academic staff, namely how a particular subject area is learned
• contribute to the University process for developing shared comprehensive and validated conceptions of desirable graduate capabilities and how they are recognised in the workplace, profession and/or community
• provide opportunities for students to carry out some part of their University study program in real world contexts as learners, not just observers or unpaid workers
• provide meaningful feedback to assist students to improve their performance when they are placed and assessed in their respective organisations.
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Summary of Recommendations
The Assessment and Feedback Working Party present the following recommendations for consideration by Senate’s Learning and Teaching Committee.

Policy
1. Early low risk diagnostic may need to be replaced in the policy as there is confusion as to what this actually means. - Nature and intention of low risk to be clarified, including marking considerations.
   a. Replace early low risk diagnostic with a requirement that feedback is provided on an early task (assessed or other) undertaken within the first third of the study period to support student learning.; outline responsibilities of all stakeholders.
2. Clarify the meaning of moderation.
3. Remind Deans they can delegate (e.g., approval of changes to assessment).
   a. Change the approval responsibility to include Associate Deans.
4. Revise the policy, procedure and guidelines (i.e., code of practice) to ensure compliance with the policy framework including use of plain language, punctuation and consistency across all policies (e.g., cross reference assessment policy with exam policy).
   a. Review all documents to ensure policy and procedures are separate (currently some blurring of boundaries).
   b. Glossary of terms to be relaunched and linked within the policy.
5. Include in the assessment policy cross-referencing to other relevant policies
   a. the Records Policy in relation to the retention of assessments,
   b. the Grade Appeal Policy regarding resubmission guidelines,
   c. the Exam Policy.
6. Course work units based on a research project may be assessed on a single thesis submission, but early and ongoing feedback must be provided.

Policy implementation support
7. Ongoing website development, specifically
   a) Publish resources on feedback e.g., “Feed Forward loop (Hounsell, et al, 2008);
   b) Publish moderation resources on the website, inclusive of definitions, examples of moderation.
   c) Upload resources on diverse assessment tasks.
8. Ongoing and proactive professional learning support with foci
   a) LTC to be proactive in supporting the ongoing development of standards within departments. This would include personal contact with each head of department with the offer of a departmental workshop.
   b) Continue to offer, as needed, workshops and support on standards development (through the LTC).

Develop a strategy for the dissemination of existing discipline based standards resources.
Assessment and Feedback Policy Review Report

This report outlines the methodology used by the Assessment Working Party to undertake a review of the assessment policy and the key findings and recommendations that came as a result of the review process.

Introduction
The implementation of a new assessment policy at Macquarie University represented a significant cultural shift in assessment practice. To assess the impact and sustainability of its implementation, a review was scheduled by the Assessment Working Party Committee to identify what was working, what was not working, what changes (if any) were needed and whether additional resources were required to facilitate policy implementation. At the same time, the university introduced a new policy framework. The framework indicated that reviews were required, but not the specifics of the review process.

The literature (Althaus, Bridgman and Davis, 2007) provides many examples of generic approaches to undertaking a policy review, however, it lacks detailed information on methodology and process, and is particularly limited on examples directly relevant to the higher education sector. As Hatwell and Jensen (2008) state, “[i]t is arguable that university policy is a different creature from public policy and that the process of developing it differs significantly from the development of public policy” (p1). Hence, in undertaking a review of the assessment policy it became necessary to develop a process responsive to the needs of the higher education sector, and more specifically to the contextual parameters of the university. Consequently the Assessment Working Party Committee developed a four phase process for policy review and used the review of the assessment policy as the opportunity to trial the approach with the understanding it would provide the model for future learning and teaching policy reviews.

Methodology
A new four phase process was developed by the Working Party to review the assessment policy (see below). These steps were followed and this report represents one of the final stages in Step 4 of the review process (Kosman and Harvey, 2010).

---

1. Process Development
   - Select and use relevant and appropriate governance structures.
   - Adopt a distributed leadership approach.
   - Identify and develop leadership capacity.
   - Ensure multi-disciplinary, multi-level collaboration.
   - Collaboratively develop targeted review questions.

2. Data Collection
   - Develop a sampling plan.
   - Identify alternative methods (e.g., surveys) for obtaining feedback.
   - Identify methods for recording feedback.

3. Data Analysis and Interpretation
   - Select appropriate and available technology for data management and analysis.
   - Review data to identify main themes and issues.
   - Determine relevance of additional feedback to the review.
   - Disseminate a summary of the key themes and issues to the university community (feedback loop).

4. Recommendations and Approval
   - Workshop findings to develop recommendations for policy amendment.
   - Submit recommendations through appropriate governance structures for approval.
   - Adopt recommendations.
   - Implement communication strategy.
   - Receive feedback on revised policy for consideration at the next review.

---
Data Collection and Analysis

The Working Party agreed we were aiming to receive constructive feedback, presented in a form that would direct the review of the policy. This principle helped in developing the first four targeted review questions, namely:

1. What aspects of the Assessment Policy work for you?
2. What isn’t working?
3. What changes would you make?
4. What else needs to be covered?

A fifth question of “What changes have you made in your units to implement the policy?” was developed to measure impact of policy on practice and the questions concluded with “What other supports do you require to fully implement the policy?” to allow us to gather feedback on what additional resourcing was needed to support the policy in practice.

All departments across the university were invited to participate in the review. This would involve two members of the Working Party attending a department meeting to gather feedback on the assessment policy using the review questions. A total of 13 departments were involved and an additional 6 textual responses were received from other departments and individual staff.

During departmental meetings, one member of the Working Party facilitated departmental discussion, based on the review questions, while the other Working Party member recorded responses by taking “field” notes (Berg, 2004). Field notes were typed up and sent back to the departments for a validity check (Kirk and Miller, 1986).

At the end of the data collection phase a rich body of data was ready for analysis. This was a successful outcome for the review process, in contrast to the previously acknowledged minimal feedback normally achieved. Data was then uploaded to NVivo, a qualitative research software tool designed for text analysis. This “interactive-hermeneutic text analysis software” (Krippendorff, 2004, p. 15) was selected as it provided the power to manage large data sets. Initially the data was analysed by response to questions to reveal the main themes emerging, using a content analysis (Krippendorff and Bock, 2009) method.

Feedback and Recommendations

Feedback collected is discussed below with a set of recommendations for each of the major themes/issues raised during the review process. Some of the recommendations address multiple themes and this should ensure implementation can occur in a streamlined and timely manner.

Question 1: What aspects of the policy work for you?

The policy was generally considered to be an enormous improvement on previous practice. Standards-based assessment including the introduction of rubrics was most strongly endorsed. Positive feedback was also received in the areas of the policy providing an affirmation of practice; alignment; consistency, transferability and equity; an exam limit; a moderation process; encouraged reflective practice, peer assessment and a variety of assessment and more.

Five issues that have polarised the community, in that both positive and negative feedback was received about each of them, are:

1. Early diagnostic assessment;
2. Exam limit / weighting;
3. Flexibility afforded by the policy;
4. Moderation process;
5. Three assessment tasks.

Recommendations

See recommendations for Question 2 which address some the issues listed above.
Academic workload is affected by a set of issues, not just assessment-related, however the requirement for the early diagnostic task and feedback, has resulted in a sense of no longer having the relative down time that used to be available early in the semester. Formative assessment and feedback has created more work e.g. students now asking for feedback from exams and students do not always understand that they have received feedback or do not collect their assignments for written feedback.

Early diagnostic has attracted mixed feelings and mixed understandings of what is required for sequenced units. The intention to provide early diagnostic prior to Census date (cut off for students to withdraw without penalty) may be idealistic as the assessment and feedback would be required by Week 4 – too early for many units. Early diagnostic may be of importance to the First Year Experience project including the timing, feedback and relationship with the more substantial assessments later in the unit.

Early ‘low risk’ tasks are also of concern as many express a preference for more substantial assignments for advanced units comprised of students that an academic may have taught previously or in the pre-requisite unit. Uncertainty as to whether to mark the low risk tasks: pros and cons may need outlining.

The timing for exam preparation may be too early in the timetable to facilitate assessment for learning.

Weighting (% limit) of exams received mixed responses with some disciplines using the exam to address plagiarism, others concerned regarding the workload implications of the other 40%. The policy was based on global good pedagogical practice, although the 60% limit was decided at MQ. This limit is considered appropriate even though a small number of concerns were expressed.

Concerns with communication of standards include uncertainty as to how to set standards in the first place, how to work with rubrics, may depress the standards, too much workload to add to unit outlines. Departments exhibited reticence to ask for assistance during the review. Concerns were expressed with limited flexibility for timing and processing of changes. Early diagnostic task is creating a lack of flexibility in timing – softening the requirements for the early diagnostic may reduce this issue.

Moderation needs clarification, as varying interpretations exist. Different understandings of roles and responsibilities require clarification. Timing and ‘clumping’ of assignments has led to pressure on students and increasing requests for extensions. Flexibility with the early diagnostic may reduce this issue.

**Recommendations**

1. Publish feedback resources on the website.
2. Early low risk diagnostic to be clarified and more flexibility to be built into the policy requirements e.g. essential for introductory units, but may be phased out through more advanced units; phrase “diagnostic” may need to be replaced, or deleted, in the policy as there is confusion as to what this actually means.
3. Replace “diagnostic” with the requirement for feedback to be provided on an early task (assessed or other) undertaken within the first third of the study period to support student learning. Resources developed and published on the website to expand on what this means: e.g., “Feed forward loop” (Hounsell et al, 2008); outline responsibilities of all stakeholders.
4. Nature and intention of low risk to be clarified, including marking considerations.
5. LTC to be proactive in supporting the ongoing development of standards within departments. This would include Marina Harvey personally contacting each head of department with the offer of a departmental workshop.
6. Remind Deans they can delegate (e.g., approval of changes to assessment).
7. Clarification of the meaning of moderation.
8. Publish moderation resources on the website.
9. Review documents to ensure policy and procedures are separate (currently some blurring of boundaries).
10. Glossary of terms to be relaunched and linked within the policy.

Question 3: What changes would you make?
Many of the issues raised in response to the question “what changes would you make” also appeared in response to question 2 “what isn’t working”. Additional themes emerged: diversity of assessment tasks and what this means; inconsistency across related policies, procedures and guidelines; responsibility for making changes or exceptions to the policy; and, the retention of assessments.

Recommendations
1. Course work units based on research project may be assessed on a single thesis submission, but must provide early and ongoing feedback.
2. Upload resources on diverse assessment tasks onto the LTC website.
3. Revise the policy, procedure and guidelines (i.e. code of practice) to ensure compliance with the policy framework including use of plain language, punctuation and consistency across all policies (e.g. cross reference assessment policy with exam policy).
4. Change the approval responsibility to include Associate Deans.
5. Include in the assessment policy a reference to the records policy in relation to the retention of assessments.

Question 4: What else needs to be covered?
The overall response to this question was low with only 3 departments raising issues. Two themes to emerge that had not previously appeared were: a request for more resources on moderation and policy implementation and the matter of assessment resubmission guidelines.

Recommendations
1. Make more resources available on the web e.g. on moderation, policy implementation.
2. Include in the assessment policy a reference to the Grade Appeal Policy regarding resubmission guidelines.

Question 5: What changes have you made in your units to implement the policy?
Departments provided examples of how they had implemented the new assessment policy. Examples included remedial workshops; the early diagnostic task; aligning practice with policy; unit review processes established; changes to unit outlines; diversity of assessment, assessment timelines, resourcing and changes to feedback.

Recommendations
N/A

Question 6: What other supports do you require to fully implement the policy?
The overall response to this question was low and some of the recommendations raised in questions 2 and 3 were again mentioned. The matter of developing and working with standards based assessment was raised.

Recommendations
1. Continue to offer, as needed, workshops and support on standards development.
2. Develop a strategy for the dissemination of existing discipline based standards resources.
Other comments
During the policy review process it became evident that there was a general lack of understanding of the assessment policy. A number of departments also expressed concern at the roll out of the policy and their associated limited understanding. One action may be to develop a framework within which all the available procedures, resources and information may be placed to support ease of dissemination and access.

Graduate Capability Mapping was another key issue raised by most departments. It was acknowledged that this will be supported in time with the enactment of Marquis.

This policy review highlighted to the Working Party that change requires considerable resources, expertise, time and planning for effective implementation.
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MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY

UNDERGRADUATE AND POSTGRADUATE STUDENTS QUALIFIED FOR AN AWARD

The list of undergraduates and postgraduates candidates qualified for an award will be circulated to the members of Academic Senate.

RECOMMENDED
That the candidates in the report have satisfied requirements for the awards stated.

Andrew Burrell
ACTING ACADEMIC REGISTRAR
Nominations for a Vice-Chancellor’s Commendation for Master coursework candidates are listed below. To be eligible for a Vice-Chancellor’s Commendation a Master coursework graduand must have a GPA of 4.0, no more than 25% satisfactory/fail type credit points allowed, and at least 75% of the requirements of the award credit points must have been completed at Macquarie University.

**Faculty of Arts**
- BALLINA GARCIA, Santiago: Master of International Security Studies
- DOMINGUEZ PALMA, Lidia Aidee: Master of International Relations
- EDGILL, Duncan Peter: Master of International Security Studies
- GARABEDIAN, Taveet: Master of International Relations
- GEHWOLF, Cordula: Master of International Relations
- KHAN, Muhammad Arshad: Master of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism
- POULSEN, Agnethe Louise Nording: Master of Arts in History (Coursework)
- RITCHIE, Natalie Anne: Master of Arts in Egyptology (Coursework)
- DE WILT, Sarah: Master of Arts in English Literature (Coursework)

**Faculty of Business and Economics**
- AKANAY, Aylin: Master of Commerce in Marketing
- BERENDES, Jan-Philip: Master of International Business with Master of International Relations
- CAHYADI, Rus Ferdianto: Master of Commerce in Information Systems and Technology
- CHEN, Jing: Master of Actuarial Practice
- DIPOCE, Laura Anne: Master of Applied Finance
- GIBBON, Nadine Marie: Master of Commerce in Business
- GORDON, Dougal Ruaridh: Master of Commerce in Business
- LI, Jingwen: Master of Accounting (CPA Extension)
- MCCARTHY, Vanja: Master of Commerce in Business
- STACK, Tatiana: Master of Commercial Law
- SUN, Cheng: Master of Actuarial Practice
- SYKES, Jonathan Alastair: Master of Commerce in Business
- WACHTEL, Sophie Rose: Master of Commerce in Business
- WENGENMAYER, Roland: Master of Commerce in Accounting & Finance
- YU, Chen: Master of Accounting (CPA Extension)

**Faculty of Human Sciences**
- EDWARDS, Emily Claire: Master of Applied Linguistics (TESOL)
- GRAY, Allison: Master of Applied Linguistics (TESOL)
- KAPLAN, Leanne Natalie: Master of Clinical Neuropsychology
- MOORE, Danielle Maree: Master of Clinical Neuropsychology
- NIRTA, Lauren Rae: Master of Applied Linguistics (TESP)
- TROOP, John Edward: Master of Applied Linguistics (TESP)

**Faculty of Science**
- BANKS, Rebecca Elizabeth: Master of Museum Studies
- HUYNH, Thi My Dung: Master of Biotechnology
- JOSSERMOZ, Thierry Michel Guy: Master of Information Technology in Web Technologies
- VARKEY, Deepa Ruth: Master of Biotechnology
- VELLA, Nicole Grace Francine: Master of Environmental Studies
RECOMMENDED

That the Vice-Chancellor’s Commendation be awarded to the 38 Masters coursework graduands listed above.

(2) NOMINATIONS FOR BACHELOR DEGREE CANDIDATES

Nominations for a Vice-Chancellor’s Commendation for outstanding academic achievement at the undergraduate level are listed herein. To be eligible for this award, an undergraduate student must have a GPA of 4.0 in at least 40 credit points completed at Macquarie University.

Faculty of Business and Economics

JAGARNATH, Vidushi Bachelor of Applied Finance
PATerson, Helen Louise Bachelor of Commerce - Accounting with Bachelor of Laws
SOORKEA, Chetan Bachelor of Applied Finance
YANG, Huini Bachelor of Commerce - Accounting
ZHANG, Linxi Bachelor of Commerce - Accounting

Faculty of Science

IRVING, Eleanor Ines Miranda Bachelor of Advanced Science
TRALAGGAN, Peter John Bachelor of Science

RECOMMENDED

That the Vice-Chancellor’s Commendation be awarded to the 7 Bachelor graduands listed above.

Andrew Burrell
ACTING ACADEMIC REGISTRAR
MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY

APPOINTMENT TO THE HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH APPEALS COMMITTEE

According to the Terms of Reference for the Higher Degree Research Appeals Committee, there are two categories of membership for this committee:

a. Chair appointed by the Academic Senate

b. One member and an alternate appointed by the Academic Senate from each Faculty on the advice of the Executive Dean of the Faculty.

On 5 March 2010, Academic Senate appointed the Faculty members of this Committee for the term of office 3 years.

Dr Kristina Everett was appointed as a member on behalf of the Faculty of Arts. Regrettably, Dr Everett will be leaving her employment at Macquarie University. As such, the membership position is vacant for the Faculty of Arts.

The Chair of the HDRAC, on behalf of the Committee, thanked Dr Everett for her contributions to the Committee and asked Academic Senate to appoint Dr Everett’s replacement.

The Executive Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Professor Simons, is nominating Dr Alison Holland from the Department of Modern History to fill the above vacancy.

RECOMMENDED
That Dr Alison Holland from the Faculty of Arts be appointed as a member of the HDRAC for a remaining term of office of Dr Everett, i.e. until 4 March 2013.