ACADEMIC SENATE

A meeting of the Academic Senate will be held at 9.30 am on Tuesday 15 December 2015, in the Senate Room, Lincoln Building C8A, Level 3.

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

Members are requested to notify the Chair of Academic Senate, Professor Dominic Verity, of any additional items which they wish to have starred, and the reason for seeking discussion of those items.

Members who are unable to attend the meeting are requested to send their apologies to Zoe Williams, Head of Governance Services (phone +61 2 9850 4322 or e-mail senate@mq.edu.au).
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ITEM 3  MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING
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For approval.

Recommendation:
That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 November 2015 be signed as a true and correct record.
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1. APOLOGIES / WELCOME / ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY

The Chair opened the meeting and acknowledged the traditional custodians of the land.
The Chair welcomed members and attendees to the meeting and noted that this was the first Academic
Senate meeting for Professor Simon Handley, Executive Dean of the Faculty of Human Sciences and noted
that Professor Charles Areni was attending for Professor Norma Harrison from the Graduate School of
Management.

The Chair noted that apologies had been received from Dr Wylie Bradford, Professor Alex Frino, Ms Anna
Glen, Mr Jeremey Gunter, Professor Norma Harrison, Ms Jinji Kong, A/Professor Estela Valverde and Ms
Julia Yang.

Nicholas McGuigan arrived at 9.35am.

The Chair shared with members news of the unexpected passing last Tuesday of Ms Amanda Phelps,
University Committee Secretary. The Chair noted the contribution that Ms Phelps had made to the
management of the University academic governing committees over the past two and a half years and the
impact that her passing had had on him personally and also the broader University community.

2. ARRANGEMENT OF AGENDA

2.1 Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest

The Chair requested that Senate members declare any conflict of interest.

No conflicts were recorded.

2.2 Adoption of Unstarred Items

Members noted the need for starring of items 4.2 and 8.3.

Resolution 15/100

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

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Resolution 15/101

That the minutes of the Academic Senate meeting held on 6 October 2015 be signed as a true and correct
record.

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

4.1 Academic Senate items requiring action

The outstanding action items were noted.

4.2 Master by Research (MRes) Appeals

The DVC (Research) Chair of Higher Degrees Research Committee provided an oral report on the MRes
appeals process. The report noted that on the 27th of October two Flying Minutes were circulated to
members of HDRC for approval. These were:

- Proposed Moderation Panel for (SN40966208) Members were asked to consider the proposed
  moderation panel for the MRes for SN40966208.
- Final Results as Recommended by the Moderation Panel for SN40973484 and SN42497981

Approval for these two recommendations was not obtained via the Flying Minute process due to:

- A large number of the members of HDRC participating in the annual delegation to the CSC fair in
  China and therefore unable to access their Gmail account;
- Concern from some members that they neither had the time or information necessary to make an
  informed and considered decision.

An extraordinary meeting of HDRC was held on Tuesday the 3rd of November for the sole purpose of
coming to a decision regarding the two recommendations. At that meeting HDRC resolved:
• to approve the appointment of the following internal moderators to review the original MRes examiner’s reports and candidate thesis, and to propose a final mark for SN40966208:
  o Professor Simon George (Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences)
  o Associate Professor Grant Hose (Department of Biological Sciences)
• to ratify the results recommended by the moderation panel as the final MRes results for candidates SN42497981 and SN40973484.

In both cases, HDRC noted that these extraordinary processes do not form a precedent for future cases. The HDRC also noted that more appropriate processes for handling the MRes result appeals cases are needed. In closing, the DVC (Research) noted that that the members of the HDRAC and PESC will participate in a facilitated workshop to come to an agreed understanding on the most appropriate way to manage MRes appeals.

4.3 Implementation Progress Report – 2014 Governance Workshop
Academic Senate noted the Implementation Progress Report.

4.4 Recommendations to University Council
The extract minutes of the University Council meeting held 8 October 2015 were noted.

5. ORAL REPORT FROM THE CHAIR
The Chair advised that he had been on a research trip for the past three weeks.

The Chair provided an updated on the Senate sponsored external review of the MRes Program. The Chair advised that an external chair had been identified to lead the review, and that discussions were currently underway with the Vice-Chancellor, Chair of Senate, Deputy Vice-Chancellor Research, and the Higher Degree Research Office to frame the Terms of Reference. The Terms of Reference will return to Senate for approval early next year.

6. VICE-CHANCELLOR ORAL UPDATE
Further to the report provided by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) on the MRes appeals and the report from the Chair, the Vice-Chancellor advised that discussions were progressing with a suitably qualified external candidate to Chair the review of the MRes.

The Vice-Chancellor congratulated the winners of the 2015 Research Excellence Awards, the ceremony for which he had attended on 4 November.

The Vice-Chancellor informed members the 2016 Budget would be presented to the Finance and Facilities Committee for submission to University Council on 3 December. The Vice-Chancellor spoke to the new approach to budget-setting and the direct connection between work outputs and resource allocation. Members were advised that the Vice-Chancellor had reviewed every budget account in the University with cost centre heads to identify how resources were being deployed and potential inefficiencies. The Vice-Chancellor provided context to the budget environment, resulting from changes to international and domestic markets and deferred capital maintenance, and predicted that 2016 will be a challenging year. Notwithstanding these challenges, where possible the University Executive has made every effort to protect the University’s teaching, learning and research mission and to ensure that the student experience is not impacted or diminished. The Vice-Chancellor assured members that capital works such as the refurbishment of the Science Building E7A and proposed refurbishment of the Arts Building W6A would continue, as would the planning for the new Law School Building.

In closing, the Vice-Chancellor referred to the Question on Notice from the October meeting of Academic Senate and advised members the University had determined to retain the Chiropractic program. The Executive Dean of Science and Engineering and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) are now working through the necessary arrangements to secure the program at Macquarie.

The Chair thanked the Vice-Chancellor for his update and welcomed questions.

4
7. QUESTION TIME

The Chair reminded members of the trial introduction of Question Time and invited members to ask any questions of the Vice-Chancellor and the Chair.

A Faculty-elected member referred to the Vice-Chancellor’s comments regarding international and domestic markets and asked whether the University had an agreed understanding of the ideal balance of international and domestic cohorts and of the overall question of the ideal size of the student body. The Vice-Chancellor referred to the strategic objective to align the nature and size of the University and noted that there was still work to be done in this area. The Vice-Chancellor referred to changes to Commonwealth Government funding and the need for all institutions to have diversified revenue streams as challenges influencing strategy in this area. The Vice-Chancellor spoke to the revenue sources for Macquarie and identified areas for potential growth and development, some of which speak to the size and nature of the University. Like many other Australian institutions this is a work in progress for Macquarie and Senate will be kept informed of developments.

A Faculty-elected member raised the closure of the Learning and Teaching Centre (LTC) and enquired what impact this would have on Faculties. The Vice-Chancellor spoke to the need for a re-organisation of the LTC to ensure that the appropriate resources are available to support the academic mission and the Learning and Teaching Plan. The Vice-Chancellor shared his view that the ownership of planning and delivery of support for learning and teaching needs to be within those areas responsible for learning and teaching; the Faculties. Members were advised that a central unit would remain to support technology platforms and that a change proposal would be released for comment in the near future.

8. STRATEGY AND POLICY

8.1 University Rankings

The Vice-Chancellor spoke to the following points relating to the increasingly competitive international market and performance in University rankings:

- there are presently 14 key ranking systems for Universities internationally;
- institutions which had actively pursued participation in the rankings had resulted in improved performance, as evidenced by the way in experience of the MGSM;
- Singapore, Hong Kong, Korea, Taiwan and SAR had concentrated efforts to improve performance in rankings and this had resulted in several institutions from these countries excelling in international rankings; and
- coherent data collection and accessibility and active engagement with those agencies collating performance metrics are keys to success.

Members were advised of strategic project driven by the Vice-Chancellor’s Office to engage with the relevant agencies and streamline and systematise data collection. Initially, the University will appoint a consultant with specialised knowledge and experience in this field and members were assured that this project would have little impact on those with the learning, teaching and research responsibilities.

8.2 Review of Assessment Policy – Principles of Assessment

Professor Sherman Young, Chair of the Assessment Policy Working Party, provided an overview of the broad consultation which had that has taken place in the development of the Assessment Policy and spoke to the development of Principles of Assessment presented for endorsement.

The Executive Dean of Medicine and Health Sciences cautioned against an overly prescriptive framework and articulated the need for a policy which empowers academics to engage in rigorous teaching and develop assessment regimes that suit different disciplines. The Chair of the Working Party acknowledged this point.

There was broad discussion on the need to provide coursework students with feedback prior to census date and how this might be given. It was agreed that the term feedback required further clarification for both academic staff and students.

The Pro-Vice Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) thanked the staff involved in the Assessment Policy Working Party.

Resolution 15/102

Academic Senate resolved to endorse the Policy Statement – Principles of Assessment.
The Deputy Chair of Academic Senate spoke to the draft Policy and Procedure and members raised several concerns with the draft policy including:

- whether the top ranking students in professional programs would qualify;
- if more than one candidate from a department could be nominated;
- the administrative burden of the nomination process;
- whether the decision would be based on student academic result data alone; and
- why postgraduate coursework students were not eligible.

The Chair advised members that the draft Policy was an interim approach to guide decision making for the current year only, was based on current practice and accommodated the range of coursework and research awards involved. The Chair agreed to the suggestion to that students enrolled in post-graduate coursework programs at AQF Level 9 would also be eligible for the University Medal. The Chair also advised members of the need for a holistic review of the award of prizes, including the Vice-Chancellor’s Commendations and University Medals and a new framework for awards, including eligibility criteria, validation and processes for the award of prizes be established.

There was agreement on the need for a new streamlined framework and that the University Medal Policy and Procedure be approved only for the current round.

*Professor Ian Solomindes left the room at 10.51am and returned at 10.53am.*

*Mr Nick McGuigan left the room at 10.55 returned at 11am.*

**Resolution 15/103**

Academic Senate resolved to approve the University Medal Policy and Guidelines with immediate effect, subject to agreed changes to the eligibility criteria, and to remain in effect until the end of Session 3 2015.

9. **QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Members are provided an opportunity to submit Questions on Notice to the Chair two days in advance of the meeting.

No questions received.

10. **GENERAL BUSINESS**

10.1 **Academic Integrity Workshop Agenda**

The agenda for the Academic Integrity Workshops, being held on Thursday 19 and Friday 20 November was noted.

10.2 **Higher Education Standards**

The paper outlining the University’s approach to the Higher Education Standards was discussed.

**Resolution 15/104**

Academic Senate note the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015 and associated documentation, set out in Appendix A.

**Resolution 15/105**

Academic Senate note that it has been recommended to the Executive Group that the remit of the existing TEQSA Steering Group be extended to include oversight of analysis of changes required to meet compliance with the new standards framework and a plan to ensure compliance by 1 January 2017.

**Resolution 15/106**

Academic Senate receive a further analysis of the impact of the new standards framework and regular updates on progress towards compliance by 1 January 2017.

10.3 **MGSM Academic Board – Terms of Reference and Membership**

The membership of the MGSM Academic Board was noted.

**Resolution 15/107**
10.4 University Medal Committee – Terms of Reference

**Resolution 15/108**
Academic Senate resolved to approve the University Medal Committee Terms of Reference.

11. **ITEMS FOR APPROVAL FROM ASQC AND SLTC**

11.1 Academic Senate noted that ASQC has recommended, in principle, four new Postgraduate Awards to commence in 2017 from the Faculty of Business and Economics.

**Resolution 15/109**
Academic Senate resolve, as recommended by the ASQC, to approve in principle the academic case for the Master of Management and Business for introduction in 2017.

**Resolution 15/110**
Academic Senate resolve to approve in principle, as recommended by the ASQC, the academic case for the Master of Management and Leadership for introduction in 2017.

**Resolution 15/111**
Academic Senate resolve to approve in principle, as recommended by the ASQC, the academic case for the Master of Management and Leadership Extension for introduction in 2017.

**Resolution 15/112**
Academic Senate resolve to approve in principle, as recommended by the ASQC, the academic case for the Master of Management and Leadership Extension for introduction in 2017.

11.2 Amendment to the RPL Schedule of Minimum Requirements

**Resolution 15/113**
Academic Senate resolve to approve, as recommended by the ASQC, the addition of Schedule C Sub- Undergraduate Award Programs to the RPL Schedule of Minimum Requirements.

11.3 Exit GPAs for MUIC Diploma Programs

**Resolution 15/114**
Academic Senate resolve to approve, as recommended by the ASQC, that GPA exit requirements be removed for MUIC Diploma students who have passed eight Diploma units and who are articulating to the 2nd year of an undergraduate degree, with the following exceptions:

i. Actuarial Studies (5.75/7);

ii. Applied Finance (5.0/7); or

iii. BA-Media (5.0/7).

11.4 Updated Principles of Shared Teaching

**Resolution 15/115**
Academic Senate resolve to approve, as recommended by ASQC, the revised Principles of Shared Teaching, with effect from 1 January 2017.

11.5 Student Disability Support Policy and Procedure (SLTC)

At its meeting of 25 August 2015, Academic Senate approved the Disability Policy which clarifies reasonable adjustments for accommodating students with a disability. Since that time, the Office of General Counsel has provided additional feedback on the Policy and the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee has considered and recommended an associated Procedure and Schedules for approval.

Faculty- elected members noted concerns around the disclosure of disabilities to individual academics, the
impact this had on the delivery of reasonable adjustments and the pressure that this places on the Disability Officers. Faculty-elected members also noted concerns around the management of confidential information.

The Director of Campus Wellbeing confirmed that the only individual allowed to disclose a student’s disability to an academic staff member, or provide consent for this to be disclosed by a third party, is the student himself or herself and that presently only 50% of students registered with the disability service have provided that consent.

The Director of Campus Wellbeing outlined the body of work being undertaken on inherent requirements and an institutional Privacy Policy both of which will align with the Disability Policy. The content in the draft Disability Policy relating to disclosure has been provided by the Office of the General Counsel in preparation for the Inherent Requirements policy which is being drafted. Ideally the three policies would be presented for approval and implementation at the same time, however there is a pressing need to have the Disability Policy approved while work continues with the Legal Office on the issues relating to Inherent Requirements.

Members were advised that the flowchart attached to the procedure was consistent with the new Policy Framework and incorporated the principles of universal design. All flowcharts be published on Policy Central are readable PDF files and can be read in as alternative text.

The Director of Campus Wellbeing advised members that endorsement from Risk and Assurance who have oversight of the University’s Privacy Management Policy would be sought prior to publication. The Chair moved that the amendments to the Disability Policy, associated Procedure and Schedules be approved in principal, with any later amendments being presented to the Academic Senate Standing Committee for approval.

Action: The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar) provide an update to the 15 December Academic Senate meeting on the development of Inherent Requirements.

**Resolution 15/116**

*Academic Senate resolves to approve the amendments to the Student Disability Support Policy.*

**Resolution 15/117**

*Academic Senate resolves to approve the; Student Disability Support Procedure; Schedule 1: Disability Service Practitioner; Schedule 2: Health Practitioner’s Report; Guideline: Developing Individual Educational Access Plans; and the Decision Flowchart.*

**Resolution 15/118**

*Academic Senate ratify the approval of the Attendance and Study Load Policy for Students enrolled in Programs delivered by MUIC.*

**Resolution 15/119**

*Academic Senate ratify the approval of the Progression Policy for Students enrolled in Programs delivered by MUIC and their associated Procedures.*

**Resolution 15/120**

*Academic Senate ratify the approval of the amendments to the Assessment Policy and Procedure, Final Examinations Policy and Procedure, and Grade Appeal Policy and Procedure.*

12. **REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

12.1 Academic Standards and Quality Committee

Matters arising requiring action by Senate were considered at items 11.1, 11.2, 11.3 and 11.4 of this Agenda. Academic Senate noted the report of the 20 October 2015 meeting of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee.

12.2 Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

Matters arising requiring action by Senate were considered at items 11.5 and 11.6 of this Agenda.
Academic Senate noted the report of the 12 October 2015 meeting of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee.

13. REPORTS FROM FACULTY BOARDS
   13.1 Faculty of Business and Economics
       The report of the Faculty of Business and Economics Faculty Board meeting of 6 October was noted.
   
   13.2 Faculty of Human Sciences
       The report of the Faculty of Human Sciences Faculty Board meeting of 6 October was noted.

14. OTHER BUSINESS
    There was no other business raised by members.

15. CONSIDERATION OF CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS
   15.1 University Discipline Committee
       The minutes of the University Discipline Committees held on 7 October 2015 were tabled and noted.

17. NEXT MEETING
    The next meeting of Academic Senate will be held on 15 December 2015.

    Agenda Items are due by Tuesday, 1 December 2015.

    There being no further business the meeting closed at 11:24am.
ITEM 4.1 ACADEMIC SENATE ITEMS REQUIRING ACTION

For discussion.
## ITEM 4.1: ACADEMIC SENATE ITEMS REQUIRING ACTION AS AT 9 DECEMBER 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/07/13</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>That the University develops a policy regarding posthumous awards. Responsible Officer, Chair Academic Senate. Related Resolution 13/215</td>
<td>To be commenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/04/14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>That Academic Senate establishes a working party to review its membership structure and report its findings and recommendations to a subsequent Academic Senate meeting.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 18/07/14       | 9.12        | The following action items were referred as a result of the issues raised by the Session 1 2014 Examination Reports from the Executive Deans:  
• Issues of lack of student engagement and attendance at lectures to be referred to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee.  
• Refer consideration of a consistent University approach to the late submission of assignments to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee.  
• Review of first session of the implementation of the new Disruption to Studies Policy to be referred to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee.  
• The managing of expectations for non ATAR entry English language requirements referred to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee.  
• The use of grade distributions in the University’s assessment practices to be referred for further clarification to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee.  
• Post Session 1 examination results analysis referred to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee for consideration. A report on its findings to be provided to Academic Senate and Faculties for action.  
• Senate Learning and Teaching Committee to consider examination reports and to identify possible policy responses to issues identified.  
• The Deputy Registrar to provide a statistical report on the application of the Withdrawal Without Academic Penalty rule and to provide an update on the progress of the process review. | In progress. Referred to SLTC (9 November) and ASQC Ratification of Result Working Group |
<p>| 7/10/14        | 4.2         | The Academic Senate to establish a Working Group to recommend criteria for the award of the University Medal and be provided criteria for members to consider before the end of 2014. | In progress. See Item 8.3 |
| 3/3/15         | 8           | The Chair of Academic Senate to discuss ongoing Warawara representation on Academic Senate with the Executive Dean of Faculty of Arts. Academic Senate discussed and noted the question on notice. The Chair confirmed that he would respond directly to the authors of the letter. | In progress |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/06/15</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>The Senate Learning and Teaching Committee to discuss and consider the recommendations of the Disruption to Studies Working Group and to provide a progress update to the 25 August 2015 meeting of Academic Senate.</td>
<td>Completed – see item 11.6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/06/15</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>That Academic Senate refers relevant issues addressed within the ICAC report to QEC or ASQC.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/06/15</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>That Academic Senate establish a working party (including a student member) to develop a set of principles to govern the rescission of degrees in future cases and to work with the General Counsel to develop amendments to the relevant academic rules to clearly articulate University Council’s powers to rescind awarded degrees.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/06/15</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Comments on the Student Academic Code of Conduct to be forwarded to the General Counsel.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/06/15</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>That the Terms of Reference for SLTC, ASQC and QEC are amended in line with the suggestions of the Senate members and provided for further consideration and approval by Senate at a future meeting.</td>
<td>SLTC and ASQC finalised and approved 4 August 2015 Senate Standing Committee. In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/8/15</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Governance Services and Human Resources to consider and appropriate training package for members of Senate and its committees.</td>
<td>To be commenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/10/15</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>The Chair of Academic Senate to work with the Vice-Chancellor to identify a suitable individual to Chair this external review and to establish a process to frame a terms of reference and identify further members for this review panel.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/10/15</td>
<td>QoN</td>
<td>The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) to clarify the University’s position in regard to the teach out of those Chiropractic students enrolled in the 2016 intake. In particular, he will provide information as to whether qualified students from that intake will be guaranteed entry into, and teach out in, the Masters of Chiropractic program.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2015</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar) provide an update to the 15 December Academic Senate meeting on the development of Inherent Requirements.</td>
<td>Completed – oral update to be provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM 5 REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

For noting.
Assessment Policy

At its last meeting, Senate endorsed the Policy Statement - *Principles of Assessment*. The working group and SLTC are now finalising the Schedules to accompany the Policy. The Schedules include:

- Schedule 1: Grading Requirements
- Schedule 2: Unit Assessment Requirements
- Schedule 3: HDR Assessment Requirements
- Schedule 4: Final Examination Requirements
- Schedule 5: Moderation Requirements

SLTC discussed Schedules 1, 4 and 5 at its special meeting on 24th November and these have been circulated to the Faculty Boards for information. The working party is finalising Schedule 2, and the Higher Degree Research Office is currently preparing Schedule 3 for comment by Higher Degree Research Committee and the wider University community.

In acknowledgement of the fact that assessment practices should, and do, vary across Faculties, it is not intended for the University to develop a central procedure to guide the implementation of the Assessment Policy. Instead, Faculty Boards will be given autonomy and flexibility to develop, publish and implement procedures tailored to the way the Faculty conducts its assessment regime. It is hoped that through this process Faculties will own, and be genuinely committed to satisfying, the requirements of the University’s assessment policy.

Faculty Boards will be asked to address a range of procedural matters, including but not limited to:

- The process by which it will implement and foster standards based assessment
- The process by which it will consider assessment at a program, rather than unit level.
- The checks and balances to ensure assessments are fair, transparent and equitable.
- The measures by which the Faculty will promote academic integrity in assessment design.
- The manner in which moderation will be conducted at all stages of the assessment lifecycle.

The proposed procedures will be approved by the Faculty Board and forwarded to SLTC, which will verify that all procedural issues raised by the Policy have been addressed and to ensure a baseline level of inter-Faculty consistency.

The suite of Schedules will be discussed at a Senate meeting in early 2016.

Academic Integrity Workshops

On 19-20th November, Academic Senate hosted a two-day academic integrity workshop which was co-facilitated by academic integrity experts and international research leaders:

- Dr Tracey Bretag, former Chair and Founding Member of the Asia-Pacific Forum on Educational Integrity and President of the Executive Board of the International Centre for Academic Integrity; and

- Dr Teddi Fishman, the Director of the International Centre for Academic Integrity (ICAI), based at Clemson University in the United States.

The purpose of the workshops was to provide a forum to encourage staff and students to think about how we might embed a renewed culture of personal integrity and ethical good practice throughout Macquarie’s undergraduate and postgraduate coursework programs. The workshops canvassed the following topics:

- Creating a campus culture of personal integrity and ethical good practice,
- Policy responses to the challenge of fostering academic integrity as a community value,
• Educating & engaging students in academic integrity matters,
• Supporting staff in developing responses to academic integrity challenges.

The workshops were well attended, by about 70 staff over the two days, and proved to be very enjoyable and successful. The recommendations arising out of the workshops will be documented in a report titled “A Framework for Action”. This report will be considered and endorsed by Academic Senate and University Council in early 2016.

Recommendations that may be included in the Framework include: drafting and implementing an Academic Integrity Policy to articulate shared values and principles; appointing Academic Integrity Advisers in each department; making academic integrity a standing item at existing Faculty/University level academic board meetings; revising staff induction and on-boarding processes; and creating a visual campaign on campus to promote and raise awareness of the importance of integrity both at university and beyond the campus.

This Framework is being designed to provide a solid foundation for ensuring that academic integrity remains a strategic priority for 2016 and beyond.

Finally, a special thank you to colleagues and students who participated in the workshops at such a busy time of the year – your support and assistance was greatly appreciated.

Chairs of Academic Boards Conference

The Chairs of Academic Boards conference was held on 11-13 November at James Cook University, Cairns campus. Once again, this conference was an excellent opportunity to discuss challenges, and be re-assured that all universities are grappling with similar issues. The sessions focused on how to identify and manage academic risks; the quality assurance questions raised by the NSW Independent Commission Against Corruption’s investigation into University’s relationships with international agents; and the ongoing issues in relation to ensuring and promoting academic integrity.

I’m pleased to report that the Chair of The University of Sydney’s Academic Board, Associate Professor Peter McCallum, and Deputy Chair of University of Newcastle’s Academic Senate, Associate Professor Liz Milward, submitted a grant application to the OLT on behalf of all Chairs of Academic Boards to fund an independent academic integrity project.

If successful, Macquarie and other participating institutions have agreed to provide a small monetary contribution to support the project. The project aims to ‘tackle the challenges that universities face in ensuring academic integrity in the digital age from the perspective of institution-wide and sector-wide strategies. It seeks to understand the effectiveness of institution-wide strategies for different types of universities and to build models for institution-wide and sector-wide engagement. Key to this is understanding the role of academics in establishing shared, collegially derived standards, the role of students in shaping and changing culture, the effectiveness of educational approaches and remediation strategies, and good practice for policy formulation, implementation and ongoing review.’

The OLT will consider grant applications next year and I will keep you informed of progress.

Update: Student engagement in decision-making and governance

The OLT project on student engagement in decision-making and governance, which is headed by Professor Sally Varnham, former Chair of the Academic Board at UTS, continues to develop momentum. Most recently it hosted a very successful workshop to collect experiences from across participating institutions. I have been appointed as a reference group member on this project, and have been working with Professor Varnham to identify ways in which Macquarie can contribute to this effort. We are currently investigating the feasibility of hosting a sub-project here to examine the impact on engagement of more effective communication of student representative roles. This would include studying measures to better articulate the nature and responsibility of such roles, to
support existing representatives in network and community building, and to better communicate the benefits of governance participation to students and the broader university.

I have also met with the student representatives on Senate to discuss how we might advance implementation of some of the student-focussed recommendations from the 2014 Governance Workshops. As the next step, it has been agreed that we will be bringing proposals forward, to the February 2016 meeting of Senate, to extend student terms of office to 2 years, aligning them with corresponding roles on the Student Advisory Board, and to build the profile and responsibilities of these roles.

**University Medal – Call for Nominations**

In November Academic Senate approved the University Medal Policy and Procedure for the current round of applications. As agreed, there will be a major review of all prizes and awards in early 2016 to produce a more streamlined framework. Faculty Boards and Heads of Department have now been asked to consider nominations for the 2015 University Medal. The University Medal Committee will consider nominations in February, and medals will be awarded at graduation ceremonies in April 2016.
ITEM 8.1 INDIGENOUS STRATEGY GREEN PAPER

For discussion.

Recommendation:
That Academic Senate:
   i. consider the Indigenous Strategy Green Paper;
   ii. provide constructive feedback to the Office of Indigenous Strategy on the academic related components; and
   iii. support and encourage debate of and engagement with of the Green Paper across the University.
ITEM 8.1  INDIGENOUS STRATEGY GREEN PAPER

Issue
This Green Paper is the first step towards building capacity for Indigenous excellence at Macquarie University. Higher education access and participation is an issue of significant ongoing concern for Indigenous people. This Green Paper is intended to open a collaborative dialogue regarding a whole of University approach to Indigenous Strategy at Macquarie University.

Consultation Process
The Indigenous Strategy Green Paper has been through an extensive consultation process. The first draft of the Indigenous Strategy Green Paper was circulated in August 2015 to select members of the University for consultation and feedback including:

- Patyegarang Indigenous Strategic Committee (please refer to Attachment A for membership);
- The Executive Group;
- NTEU; and
- Indigenous community groups, internal and external to the University.

The Green Paper has been updated to reflect all feedback and comments received. In November 2015, the Green Paper was endorsed by the Executive Group. Following an extensive consultation phase in the following months, a White Paper will be drafted in early 2016 to set out the specific activities and targets to achieve the goals proposed in the Green Paper.

Recommendation
That Senate:
- Consider the proposals of the Indigenous Strategy Green Paper;
- Provide constructive feedback to the Office of Indigenous Strategy on the academic related components; and
- Support and encourage debate and engagement of the Green Paper across the University.

Operational Impact
The Indigenous Strategy Green Paper proposes a whole of University partnership that supports and promotes Indigenous inclusion, access and participation. All University staff are asked to consider the Green Paper, how the proposed strategies can integrate with current programs / portfolio, and how the Office of Indigenous Strategy can work in partnership with each faculty / department / office to implement these strategies.

Outcome to be communicated to
Academic staff within Macquarie University.

Submitted by
Associate Professor Shane Hearn, Director Office of Indigenous Strategy

For enquiries contact
Alex Swain, Project Officer, Office of Indigenous Strategy
Alex.swain@mq.edu.au
(02) 9850 6794
### Membership of the Patyegarang Indigenous Strategic Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Wylie Bradford</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer, Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Chatterton</td>
<td>Acting Marketing Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Lindie Clark</td>
<td>Academic and Program Director, PACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Leanne Denby</td>
<td>Director, Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor Jenny Donald</td>
<td>Associate Dean Learning and Teaching, Faculty of Science and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Nicole Gower</td>
<td>Director, Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Melanie Harris</td>
<td>Director of the Vice-Chancellor's Office and Chief of Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Laura Heron</td>
<td>Project Officer, Learning, Teaching and Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor Judi Homewood</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Margaret Hudson</td>
<td>Director, Corporate Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Brian Hurd</td>
<td>Manager, Scholarships / Prizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Nick Mansfield</td>
<td>Dean, Higher Degree Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Peter McCarthy</td>
<td>Director, Government Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Craig Oliver</td>
<td>Director, Campus Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Darren Peters</td>
<td>Director, Campus Wellbeing and Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Yi Ren</td>
<td>Director, Research Training and International Research Training Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor Ian Solomonides</td>
<td>Director Learning and Teaching Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Jonathan Wylie</td>
<td>Deputy Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Sherman Young</td>
<td>Pro Vice-Chancellor, Learning, Teaching and Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Patrick McNeil</td>
<td>Executive Dean, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Dominic Verity</td>
<td>Chair, Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor Shane Hearn (Chair)</td>
<td>Director, Office of Indigenous Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Alex Swain (Secretariat)</td>
<td>Project Officer, Office of Indigenous Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM 8.2  ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE: PROGRESS REPORT ON WORKSHOPS AND PRIORITIES FOR 2016

For discussion.

Recommendation:
That Academic Senate:

i. consider the progress report on recommendations from the Academic Governance Workshops;

ii. consider the proposed project priority areas for 2016; and

iii. identify other project areas that Academic Senate should engage with in 2016.
ITEM 8.2  ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE WORKSHOP RECOMMENDATIONS: PROGRESS REPORT & ACADEMIC PRIORITIES FOR 2016

**Issue**
At the end of each year, Academic Senate is required to review progress on ongoing projects, and plan for future projects and priorities. This will ultimately form a schedule of work for 2016.

**Recommendations**
Academic Senate is asked to:

(a) Consider the attached progress report on recommendations from the Academic Governance Workshops;
(b) Consider project priority areas for 2016; and
(c) Identify other project areas that Academic Senate should engage with in 2016.

**Operational Impact**

- Governance Services
- Chairs of Academic Senate Committees

**Submitted by**
Professor Dominic Verity, Chair of Academic Senate, dominic.verity@mq.edu.au

*For enquiries contact*
Ainslee Harvey, Academic Senate Project Officer, ainslee.harvey@mq.edu.au (x 6346)
1. Academic Governance Beyond Learning and Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Transfer the Quality Enhancement Committee, making it a governance committee reporting to Academic Senate</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Senate approved terms of Reference for QEC in June 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The next step in the re-establishment of the committee is for the Chair of Senate and DVCA to evaluate and revise the University's quality enhancement framework and to establish new operating procedures both for the conduct of academic organisational reviews (of Departments and Faculties) and for the identification and reporting of academic risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Establish a formal Research Committee of Academic Senate</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Senate considered a proposal to establish a joint Research and Research Training Committee at its meetings in August &amp; October 2015. Discussions to continue in accordance with consultation plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Complete the Senate review of Higher Degree Research Committee (HDRC). Transfer any operational management responsibilities and merge Program and Examinations Subcommittee into HDRC.</td>
<td>In progress (see above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Senate is also considering proposal to establish a Thesis Examination Sub Committee of the Research and Research Training Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Establish a working party to consider the transition of HDR Examination to Faculties</td>
<td>For consideration by the expert Research &amp; Research Training Committee in 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. Managing and Planning the Business of Senate

| (a) Introduce a Senate Steering Committee to organise and prioritise its agenda, monitor its subcommittee process, and approve routine academic governance matters | Completed  
Terms of Reference for the Academic Senate Standing Committee approved by Academic Senate in April 2015. Six meetings were scheduled for 2015. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) Revise the policy review and approval process, to ensure early and well-briefed engagement with Senate while delegating great responsibility to subcommittees</td>
<td>Completed in accordance with the Policy Framework Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (c) Complete the development of a comprehensive academic risk register. Make risk assessment and prioritisation an explicit responsibility of all subcommittees. | Terms of Reference for all Senate subcommittees were reviewed to ensure they included a responsibility to: contribute to the development and maintenance of those aspects of the University’s academic risk register that relate to area of responsibility.  
Discussions are ongoing with between Chair of Academic Senate and Head of Risk and Compliance regarding the development of an academic risk register. |
| (d) Establish a working party to identify the responsibilities of Senate that can be authorised to Faculty Boards and develop a timeline for that transfer. | Priority for 2016 |

## 3. Committee Processes

<p>| (a) Establish a formal set of principles to govern all subcommittees of Senate, from which all Terms for Reference are derived | Completed and published on Senate website: <a href="http://www.mq.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/51286/213770.pdf">http://www.mq.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/51286/213770.pdf</a> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Student engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Develop a PACE unit, or module, focussed on supporting and rewarding student academic governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea to be progressed in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Adopt the title “student fellow” for student members, its subcommittee and the student advisory board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be introduced for 2016-17 student representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Formally recognise the contribution of student fellows on their transcripts and in letters of reference from Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition on transcripts to be discussed with Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar). Chair of Senate to provide letters of reference at conclusion of term in May 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Pair each student fellow with a mentor from the Committee on which they serve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed. Mentors and students representatives meet regularly with the Chair of Academic Senate to discuss items on Senate agenda and any other issues of concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Establish a VC's award for student governance contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Academic Senate to discuss with Vice-Chancellor &amp; Deputy Vice-Chancellor Students &amp; Registrar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Establish a budget to compensate students who engage in commissioned governance work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea to be progressed in 2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Communication and consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>Establish a series of Vice-Chancellor and Chair of Academic Senate staff/student academic governance forums</th>
<th>Idea to be progressed in 2016.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Develop common guidelines to encompass all academic governance consultation processes.</td>
<td>Idea to be progressed in 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Develop a formal communication plan for Senate and its subcommittee</td>
<td>Communication Plan developed by Head of Governance Services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Redesign the Senate website to focus on hot topics</td>
<td>Priority for 2016 following completion of web transformation project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>Introduce a searchable database of Senate and Faculty Board resolutions</td>
<td>Idea to be progressed in 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>Provide support for the communication needs of student and staff representatives – to facilitate better two-way communication</td>
<td>Idea to be progressed in 2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Miscellany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>Establish a working party to develop a mechanism for ensuring that Heads of Department are better represented in the academic governance process</th>
<th>Idea to be progressed in 2016. In the meantime, include Heads of Department on circulation list for Chair’s Report on Teche Blog.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Pursue the review of the ex-officio / elected / professional staff balance on Senate.</td>
<td>Priority for 2016. Chair of Senate to discuss with Vice-Chancellor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Organise for Faculty elected members to meet between meetings and bring forward matters to populate a business without notice section of the agenda.</td>
<td>The Chair of Academic Senate has facilitated lunchtime meetings with Faculty elected members during 2015.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposed Project Priority Areas for 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research and Research Training Committee</td>
<td>Consultation phase completed in 2015, concluding in Academic Senate resolution to establish a single governance committee for Research and Research Training. Further work on Terms of Reference, Membership and establishment of this committee scheduled for 1st quarter 2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Review of Membership of Academic Senate          | Issues for consideration:  
  - Membership terms of student members  
  - Ex-officio membership  
  - Indigenous representation  
| Assessment Policy                                | Commenced by SLTC. Project Sponsors: Chair of Academic Senate & Pro-Vice Chancellor (Learning and Teaching)                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Student Progression                              | Commenced by SLTC  
  Project Sponsors: Chair of Academic Senate & Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students & Registrar)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Integrity</th>
<th>Framework for Action to be presented to Senate and University Council in February 2016. Working group / project sponsors to be determined.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Discipline</td>
<td>Implementation of new Student Discipline Procedure scheduled for start of session 1 2016. ASQC to determine appropriate mechanisms for monitoring consistency of implementation across Faculties and annual reporting schedule and pro forma reports by start of session 1 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Freedom</td>
<td>Commenced by Academic Senate. Working party to present a draft Academic Freedom statement and associated recommendations to Senate in April 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Appeals</td>
<td>Draft Appeals Policy completed, associated procedure and grounds for appeal documents under consultation with key stakeholders. Circulation for comment by Faculty Boards planned for January and February 2016. Presentation of policy and procedures to Senate scheduled for April 2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM 8.3 APPROVAL TO PROCEED: STUDENT EXPERIENCE SURVEYING

For approval.

Recommendation:
That Academic Senate resolve to endorse the development of the Student Experience Surveying Policy, Schedule and Procedure to proceed.
ITEM 8.3 STUDENT EXPERIENCE SURVEYING: DISCUSSION PAPER

Issues
A Student Experience Surveying Policy, Schedule and Procedure is being developed to optimise university surveying enabling effective evaluation of the student experience whilst minimising survey demands on individual students. The Policy and Procedure will outline governance, administration and management of ‘enterprise’ and ‘learner’ surveys1 as per an agreed Schedule.

Discussion
University Executive and the Student Experience Sub-Committee of Council both endorsed the establishment of a cross-representative working party to develop a Schedule detailing the timing, mode and application of all surveys across the student life-cycle, together with associated Policy and Procedure.

The Working Party presented an initial report to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee in March 2015. That report clearly identified compounding issues with over-surveying and inefficiencies such as losses caused through invalid returns. Moreover, there was evidence of units of study not being surveyed in a systematic way with some units repeatedly surveyed whilst others had not been surveyed for several years. The Teaching Evaluations for Development Service (TEDS) also noted that the Learner Evaluations of Teaching (LET) surveys were being over ordered, with some teachers requesting as many as 10 evaluations in a single survey period. The Group noted that efficiencies could be gained through (for example) sample rather than census surveying in units with more than 100 students, resulting in up to a 75% saving in surveys required. These findings were noted by the Executive with endorsement to progress a student experience of surveying Policy, Procedure and Schedule.

A draft Policy and Schedule were presented to the October 2015 SLTC. Following discussion, actions were to progress:
1. A Discussion Paper for Academic Senate consideration; and
2. A revised Policy, Procedure and Schedule drafted and returned to SLTC for further consideration.

Revisions to the documents will incorporate feedback from SLTC members including: reframing the purpose to align with improving student service and engagement strategies; providing suggestions for alternative / complimentary survey methods (e.g. sample versus census); outlining approval processes for surveys not listed in the Schedule; reducing the number of LET surveys; and, creating a category of ‘user group surveys’ (iLearn, Web-user etc.) to augment the proposed ‘enterprise’ (SES, CEQ, ISB etc.) and ‘learner’ (LEU, LET etc.) categories in the schedule.

It was also suggested that the schedule should include other surveys such as KickStart and GLP and that the procedure should also advise on other feedback mechanisms that do not require formal permissions.

Recommendation:
For noting by Academic Senate on 15 December 2015 in advance of the Policy, Procedure and Schedule that will be presented to Senate Learning and Teaching Committee on 1 February 2016 seeking endorsement ahead of consideration by the Academic Senate on 16 February 2016.

Prepared by:
The Office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor Learning and Teaching in collaboration with Offices under the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar) and the Division of Strategic Planning and Information.

Contact:
Laura Heron x 1089 for more information.

---

1 Enterprise surveys: those that secure feedback from students about their experience with information provided, enrolment and admission, orientation and progression, facilities and infrastructure, general and support services, activities and events are within the scope of this policy.

Learner surveys: those that secure feedback from students regarding the content, delivery and teaching of programs of study, and their constituent units, are also within the scope of this policy.
Student Experience Surveying Policy

1 PURPOSE

To optimise university surveying to enable effective evaluation of the student experience whilst minimising survey demands on individual students.

2 BACKGROUND

Evaluation of the student experience is an expectation of the Australian Government and has been listed in the Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF). Seeking feedback gives agency and voice to students and helps to inform staff at all levels in their decision-making.

Surveys may be used to collect information about student expectations, needs and their experiences of educational and non-educational programs and services. Surveys such as questionnaires and focus groups, for example, are commonly used evaluation methods by governments and universities.

A more streamlined and centralised life-cycle approach to survey administration has been adopted by the University to manage the scheduling and timing of surveys, and to help maintain the highest levels of data integrity and reliability. In addition, it is intended to reduce the number of surveys of students by the University about the student experience, whilst not precluding surveys to address specific local needs (see Procedure).

3 SCOPE

Enterprise surveys, such as those that secure feedback from students about their experience with learning, information provided, enrolment and admission, orientation and progression, facilities and infrastructure, general and support services, activities and events for the purpose of quality enhancement are within the scope of this policy.

Learner surveys that secure feedback from students regarding the content, delivery and teaching of programs of study, and their constituent units, are also within the scope of this policy.

For a list of University Enterprise and Learner survey activities, please refer to the Schedule. The Procedure details alternative survey, sampling and evaluative practices not in scope of this Policy.

This Policy applies to all staff and students at all campuses and locations of the University.

4 DEFINITIONS

Commonly defined terms are located in the University Glossary.

‘Enterprise’ surveys refer to surveys that focus on mandated surveys such as those forming the Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching (QILT) [http://www.qilt.edu.au/] under the
Department of Education and Training, other externally benchmarked surveys, and internal University surveys specific to faculties, departments and offices for enhancing the quality of learning and teaching, employability and student experience.

Learner surveys refer to surveys that focus on curriculum or teaching, typically provided through the Office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor Learning and Teaching in the portfolio of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic [https://staff.mq.edu.au/teaching/evaluation/].

5 POLICY STATEMENT

The evaluation of the student experience is important because it informs quality enhancement and strategic decision-making, aids institutional benchmarking, and provides agency to students. It can include measures to evaluate institutional, academic program, teaching, administration, amenity and support aspects of the student experience.

Mandatory Australian Government student experience measures and those with National and/or International benchmarking capability will be prioritized over other measures.

Student experience surveys will be, where possible, minimized to only those required to inform the experience at the various stages of the student lifecycle (refer to the Schedule).

Student experience surveys will be, where possible, developed, conducted, evaluated and reported in accordance with best practice principles (refer to the Procedure).

Only surveys approved by the University nominee(s) as outlined by the Policy and listed in the Schedule may be administered. Authorisation for student experience surveys is by nominated member(s) of the University Executive (refer to the Procedure).

6 RELEVANT LEGISLATION

Higher Education Support Act 2003 (HESA)
Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011 (TEQSA)

7 KEY RELATED DOCUMENTS

Student Experience Surveying Procedure
Student Experience Surveying Schedule
Human Research Ethics Policy
Quality Enhancement Policy and Guidelines
Academic Survey Evaluation of Teaching Procedures
Unit Guide Policy and Procedures
Enterprise Agreement

8 NOTES

<table>
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<th>Contact Officer</th>
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</tr>
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<td>Amendment History</td>
</tr>
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</table>

### REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLISHING TO POLICY CENTRAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category [select ONE only]</th>
<th>Governance (including Legal; Risk, Compliance and Insurance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audience [select ALL that apply]</td>
<td>Academic staff, Professional staff, Researchers &amp; HDR Candidates, Students, Visitors to Macquarie, Other – specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Experience Surveying Procedure

1 PURPOSE

To define the processes for management, application, analysis and reporting of Student Experience Surveys in accordance with the Student Experience Surveying Policy and Schedule.

2 SCOPE

This Procedure applies to all staff and students at all campuses and locations of the University.

3 DEFINITIONS

Commonly defined terms are located in the University Glossary. The following definitions apply for the purpose of this Policy:

**Enterprise** surveys refer to surveys that focus on mandated surveys such as those forming the Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching (QILT) [http://www.qilt.edu.au/] under the Department of Education and Training, other externally benchmarked surveys, and internal University surveys specific to faculties, departments and offices for enhancing the quality of learning and teaching, employability and student experience.

**Learner** surveys that secure feedback from students regarding the content, delivery and teaching of programs of study, and their constituent units. For example, those typically provided through Office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor Learning and Teaching in the portfolio of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic [https://staff.mq.edu.au/teaching/evaluation]

4 RESPONSIBILITIES AND REQUIRED ACTIONS

**STAFF**

It is an expectation that all Macquarie University staff will comply with the Policy, Procedure and Schedule by actively pursuing opportunities to optimize and streamline university conducted or facilitated surveying of student experience.

In cases where staff wish to conduct alternative surveys for the purpose of evaluation of quality assurance of a program/service, that fall outside this schedule, Staff are responsible for seeking procedural advice (and approval) from Faculty Associate-Deans Learning and Teaching or Office Directors (in the first instance), and from the Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Students and Registrar, if the enquiry cannot be addressed at Faculty or Office level.

**MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE**

Led by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Students and Registrar, the Chief Operating Officer and Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic share the following responsibilities:
− Review metrics generated across student experience surveying to inform planning and resource allocation in the interest of improving the student experience;

− Consider collaborative approaches to issues relating to student experience;

− Benchmark university outcomes and metrics against national and international universities; and

− Provide reports to the Executive Group, Senate, Council and the Student Advisory Board on outcomes of interventions and strategies to enhance the overall student experience.

The Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Students and Registrar will oversee adherence to the Policy, Procedure and Schedule, respond to related enquiries and consider requests for exceptions to the Procedure and Schedule in consultation with the Office’s of the Chief Operating Officer and Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic.

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER
The portfolio of the Chief Operating Officer is responsible for conducting, facilitating and reporting on ‘Enterprise’ surveys such as those forming the Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching (QILT) [http://www.qilt.edu.au/] under the Department of Education and Training, the new internal Macquarie University graduate destination survey, and other externally benchmarked surveys.

The portfolio is also responsible for providing advice to Staff on alternative approaches to student experience surveying such as sampling and collaborative approach to reduce survey fatigue among students – see the Schedule for more information.

DEPUTY VICE-CHANCELLOR ACADEMIC
The portfolio of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic is responsible for designing, conducting, facilitating and reporting on Learner surveys that focus on curriculum or teaching, typically provided through the Office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor Learning and Teaching.

The portfolio is also responsible for providing advice to Staff on alternative approaches to student experience surveying such as embedding and interpretation of learning analytics – see the Schedule for more information.

5 RELEVANT LEGISLATION
Higher Education Support Act 2003 (HESA)
Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011 (TEQSA)

6 KEY RELATED DOCUMENTS
Student Experience Surveying Policy
Student Experience Surveying Schedule
Human Research Ethics Policy
Quality Enhancement Policy and Guidelines
Academic Survey Evaluation of Teaching Procedures
Unit Guide Policy and Procedures
### 7 NOTES

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Contact Officer</td>
<td><em>Deputy Vice Chancellor Students &amp; Registrar (DVC-S&amp;R)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Implementation Officer</td>
<td><em>Executive Officer, DVC-S&amp;R</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7.3 | Approval Authority / Authorities | *Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic)*  
*Deputy Vice Chancellor Students & Registrar (DVC-S&R)*  
*Chief Operating Officer*  
*Chair, Senate* |
| 7.4 | Date Approved |   |
| 7.5 | Date of Commencement |   |
| 7.6 | Date for Review | *The standard review period is 3 years. Indicate a shorter review period if required.* |
| 7.7 | Documents Superseded by this Procedure | *List any policy documents or previous authority superseded by this procedure.* |
| 7.8 | Amendment History | *The Policy Unit will complete this section as required.* |

Please complete the following:

**REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLISHING TO POLICY CENTRAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category [select ONE only]</th>
<th>Governance (including Legal; Risk, Compliance and Insurance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Audience [select ALL that apply] | Academic staff  
Professional staff  
Researchers & HDR Candidates  
Students  
Visitors to Macquarie  
Other – specify |
# Student Experience Surveying Schedule

## 1 PURPOSE

To outline the annual schedule of approved student experience surveys, and their administration, associated with the Student Experience Surveying Policy and Procedure.

## 2 SCHEDULE

### 2.1 Enterprise surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>What it measures</th>
<th>Scale basis</th>
<th>Benchmarking</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Experience Survey (SES)</td>
<td>Student experience</td>
<td>Five scales &amp; two index items: Skills Development, Learner Engagement,</td>
<td>National (all 40 universities in Australia participate in this federal Govt</td>
<td>Administered August – September</td>
<td>Central (Strategic Planning and Information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Resources, Teaching Quality, Student Support, &amp; Overall Quality of</td>
<td>survey)</td>
<td>Reported December (MQ data) &amp; March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Index, Quality of Entire Educational Experience Index</td>
<td>(National data)</td>
<td>(National data)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report to: Executive Group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Student Barometer (ISB)</td>
<td>International student satisfaction</td>
<td>Decision Making, Application, Arrival Satisfaction, Learning Satisfaction,</td>
<td>International (n=180)</td>
<td>Administered: April - June</td>
<td>Macquarie International (MI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(from Nov 2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Living Satisfaction, Support Satisfaction, Careers Support</td>
<td>National (n=34)</td>
<td>Reported: October – December</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report to: Executive Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Outcome Survey (GOS)</td>
<td>Graduate employment, outcome and further studies</td>
<td>Full-time &amp; Part-time employment</td>
<td>National (all 40 universities in Australia participate in this federal Govt</td>
<td>Administered twice in a year</td>
<td>Central (Strategic Planning and Information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(from Nov 2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time &amp; part-time study</td>
<td>survey)</td>
<td>a. April – June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Oct - Dec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reported December (MQ data) &amp; March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(National data)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report to: Executive Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (PREQ)</td>
<td>Satisfaction of higher degree graduates</td>
<td>Satisfaction on: Supervision, Intellectual Climate, Skill Development,</td>
<td>National (all 40 universities in Australia participate in this federal Govt</td>
<td>Administered twice in a year</td>
<td>Central (Strategic Planning and Information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure, Thesis Examination, Goals &amp; Expectations, Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>survey)</td>
<td>a. April – June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macquarie University Student Experience Questionnaire – HDR (MUSEQ-R)</td>
<td>Higher Degree research student satisfaction</td>
<td>Satisfaction on: Supervision, Intellectual Climate, Skill Development,</td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Oct - Dec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure, Goals &amp; expectations, Overall satisfaction with the quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reported December (MQ data) &amp; March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of my higher degree research experience, with University services &amp; facilities,</td>
<td></td>
<td>(National data)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>quality of my supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report to: Executive Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macquarie University Graduate Destination Survey</td>
<td>Graduate employment outcome and further studies close to one year after the course</td>
<td>This questionnaire is under construction to start from 2016 following up 2015 graduates to comply with the QS employability ranking data request.</td>
<td>Internal – trends over time</td>
<td>Administered September-October</td>
<td>Central (Strategic Planning and Information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reported: February</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report to: Executive Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule is being prepared – twice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or three times a year, 11 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>after completion of a course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.2 Learner surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>What it measures</th>
<th>Scale basis</th>
<th>Benchmarking</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner Experience of Unit (LEU)</td>
<td>Obtain student feedback on specific Unit of study</td>
<td>12 core scale items on: Learning outcomes, standards and criteria; Feedback; Teaching sessions and learning activities; Information and organisation; Intellectual challenge; Workload; Graduate capabilities Up to ten optional scale items (five chosen by Department, five by Unit Convenor) Open-ended items (three scale-related, three overall)</td>
<td>Core items and scales derived from CEQ scales; Internal historical norms</td>
<td>Administered towards end of each teaching session Report to: SLTC &amp; ASQC</td>
<td>Department, Unit Convenor (Data held by Office PVC L&amp;T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Experience of People/Planet Unit (LPL)</td>
<td>Obtain student feedback on People/Planet Unit of study</td>
<td>12 core LEU scale items (as above) 6 LEU open-ended items (as above) Up to five optional scale items chosen by Unit Convenor 5 People/Planet scale items 2 People/Planet open-ended items</td>
<td>LEU core items and scales derived from CEQ scales; Internal historical norms (under development for People/Planet items)</td>
<td>Administered towards end of each teaching session Report to: SLTC &amp; ASQC</td>
<td>Department, Unit Convenor (Data held by Office PVC L&amp;T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Experience of PACE Unit (PACE)</td>
<td>Obtain student feedback on PACE Unit of study</td>
<td>6 core LEU scale items on: Learning outcomes, standards and criteria; Feedback; Workload; Intellectual challenge 2 LEU scale-related open-ended items 5 scale items relating to Graduate Capabilities 4 scale items specific to PACE learning 3 open-ended items specific to PACE</td>
<td>LEU core items and scales derived from CEQ scales; Internal historical norms (under development for PACE items)</td>
<td>Administered towards end of each teaching session or following placement Report to: PVC L&amp;T.</td>
<td>Department, Unit Convenor (Data held by Office PVC L&amp;T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Experience of Unit Early Feedback Survey (EFS)</td>
<td>Obtain student feedback on early experience in Unit of study</td>
<td>6 open-ended items focusing on early experience of unit</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Recommend for administration in Week 2-3 of teaching session Report to: Program Convenors</td>
<td>Unit Convenors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Experience of Teaching (LET)</td>
<td>Obtain student feedback on individual teaching</td>
<td>6 core scale items based on CEQ Good Teaching Scale 6 scale-related open-ended items Up to 6 optional scale items chosen by teacher 3 standard open-ended overall items</td>
<td>Core items based on CEQ GTS; internal historical norms.</td>
<td>Usually administered towards end of each teaching session Report to PVC L&amp;T.</td>
<td>Individual teacher (Data held by Office PVC L&amp;T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Supervisor Survey (ISS)</td>
<td>Obtain student feedback on individual PG supervision</td>
<td>6 open-ended items focusing on supervision experience</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>As requested by staff (but no more than twice annually).</td>
<td>Individual supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner, Project, and trial surveys (capstone, clinical, sessional staff)</td>
<td>Obtain student feedback on programs, specific, curriculum</td>
<td>Devised in consultation with stakeholders</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>As appropriate for purpose determined in consultation with the PVC L&amp;T.</td>
<td>As appropriate for purpose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Report to:</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner Experience of Unit (LEU)</td>
<td>Executive Group</td>
<td>Department, Unit Convenor (Data held by Office PVC L&amp;T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Experience of People/Planet Unit (LPL)</td>
<td>Executive Group</td>
<td>Department, Unit Convenor (Data held by Office PVC L&amp;T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Experience of PACE Unit (PACE)</td>
<td>Executive Group</td>
<td>Department, Unit Convenor (Data held by Office PVC L&amp;T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Experience of Unit Early Feedback Survey (EFS)</td>
<td>Executive Group</td>
<td>Unit Convenors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Experience of Teaching (LET)</td>
<td>Executive Group</td>
<td>Individual teacher (Data held by Office PVC L&amp;T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Supervisor Survey (ISS)</td>
<td>Executive Group</td>
<td>Individual supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Performance Evaluation: Report to: DVC S&R (SERM)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kickstart, GLP</th>
<th>innovation, capstone and clinical units, sessional staff teaching</th>
<th>Report to: PVC L&amp;T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User Group surveys (iLearn, Web, MUSE)</td>
<td>Obtain student feedback on level of service / user-ability</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1 Contact Officer</th>
<th>Deputy Vice Chancellor Students &amp; Registrar (DVC-S&amp;R)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Implementation Officer</td>
<td>Executive Officer, DVC-S&amp;R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.3 Approval Authority / Authorities | Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic)  
Deputy Vice Chancellor Students & Registrar (DVC-S&R)  
Chief Operating Officer  
Chair, Senate |
| 3.4 Date Approved | TBD |
| 3.5 Date of Commencement | 2015 |
| 3.6 Date for Review | 2018 |
| 3.7 Documents Superseded by this Schedule | TBD |
| 3.8 Amendment History | The Policy Unit will complete this section as required. |
| 3.9 Policy Authorisation | Name and link to the associated policy or other document from which this Schedule obtains its authority |

### REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLISHING TO POLICY CENTRAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Governance (including Legal; Risk, Compliance and Insurance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Audience | Academic staff  
Professional staff  
Researchers & HDR Candidates  
Students  
Visitors to Macquarie  
Other – specify |
ITEM 10.1  ACADEMIC FREEDOM WORKING GROUP: PROGRESS REPORT

For discussion.

Recommendation:
That Academic Senate:

i. consider Macquarie’s current statement on Academic Freedom, last approved October 2006; and

ii. consider the provided exemplars and provide feedback to the Academic Freedom Working Group.
ITEM 10.1 PROGRESS REPORT: ACADEMIC FREEDOM WORKING GROUP

Issue

Under the Academic Senate Rules, Academic Senate is responsible for advising University Council and the Vice-Chancellor on ‘measures to safeguard the academic freedom of the University.’

Academic Senate last endorsed its Statement on Academic Freedom in October 2006. This statement is attached for reference. It details Senate’s position on the:

"right and duty of academic staff to exercise professional judgment in engaging in teaching and research, and to disseminate the results of that research, without undue interference from governments, the University's administration, the media, private corporations and other organisations".

Given the changing nature of the academic environment and regulation of the tertiary sector, a working group has been formed to review and rewrite this statement. Furthermore, the working group is also charged with considering more contemporary approaches to academic freedom, and determining how the underlying principles could be integrated into practice within the university community.

At its first meeting, the working group acknowledged that the University’s current statement is focused on defining the limits of academic freedom, and not the protection of academic freedom. It also observed that it had been constructed at a time at which the University had been engaged in a infamous dispute with a specific staff member and that this had influenced the framing of the statement.

The working group recognised the importance for any revised principles/policy/statement to be owned and understood by the whole University community, including management and governance committees. It also needs to be consistent with the University’s strategic direction as articulated in A Framing of Futures.

The working group has considered a number of approaches to academic freedom at other institutions and has identified two exemplar statements, to form the foundation on which Macquarie might redefine its approach. These statements are attached for reference:

1. The University of Melbourne – Academic Freedom of Expression Policy
2. Academic Freedom Statement of the First Global Colloquium of University Presidents

Academic Senate will be re-engaging more effectively with this issue over the next 6 months, and will be examining ways to give Academic Freedom matters a more central place in its ongoing deliberations.

Recommendations from the Academic Freedom Working Group will be forwarded to Senate for consideration in April 2016.

Recommendations

Academic Senate is asked to:

2. Consider the attached exemplars and provide feedback to the working group.

Academic Freedom Working Group

- Professor Jacqueline Phillips, Deputy Chair of Academic Senate (Chair)
- Professor Dominic Verity, Chair of Academic Senate
- Professor Richie Howitt, Director, Macquarie-Ryde Futures Partnership
- Associate Professor David Coutts, Academic Senate representative, Faculty of Science & Engineering
- Professor Simon George, Academic Senate representative, Faculty of Science & Engineering
- Professor Linda Cupples, Academic Senate representative, Faculty of Human Sciences
• Cathy Rytmeister, Academic Senate Non-Faculty representative
• Dr Kate Fullagar, Academic Senate representative, Faculty of Arts
• Dr Paul Formosa, Faculty of Arts

Submitted by
Professor Jacqueline Phillips, Deputy Chair of Academic Senate, Jacqueline.phillips@mq.edu.au

For enquiries contact
Ainslee Harvey, Academic Senate Project Officer, Ainslee.harvey@mq.edu.au (x6346)
SENATE STATEMENT ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The University's value as an institution of learning depends upon its ability and its determination to challenge, revise and renew accepted ideas, its encouragement of vigorous debate, and its support for the development and testing of theories. For the University to fulfill this role, its academic staff must have the right and duty to exercise their own professional judgment in engaging in teaching and research, and to disseminate the results of that research, without undue interference from governments, the University's administration, the media, private corporations and other organisations.

Academic freedom includes the right and duty of staff to:

- Carry out research and disseminate and publish the results in a timely way.
- Play a significant role in determining the curriculum and the standards and methods of teaching.
- Read broadly and without fear of being judged on what they read.

Researchers and teachers at Macquarie University are bound by high academic standards, including a commitment to intellectual honesty, rigour in the construction of arguments, and the appropriate use of evidence. The maintenance of these standards is especially important when staff comment in public forums outside the university, including the media. Academics are not in the privileged position of being able to say whatever occurs to them on any matter whatsoever, nor are they entitled to inflict gratuitous damage on others, but when they act with high professional standards, researchers and teachers should be free to challenge the most fundamental values and beliefs of society in the spirit of open inquiry.

Students and staff should be able, however, to expect that their right to hold values of their own choosing will be respected even when those values are being questioned. Academic freedom carries associated responsibilities to exercise professional care and competence in the conduct of teaching and research, to subject academic work to the critical scrutiny of others, to consider the impact that one's work may have on others, and not to impinge on the ability of others to engage freely in teaching and learning, research, and academic debate.

Academic freedom is fundamental to the academic work of the University itself. It is also emblematic of the values that the University stands for and strives to cultivate in the wider society. Teachers and researchers can only fulfill their obligation to society in a context of academic freedom. More than this, however, since the University stands for, promotes and defends the right and need of all people to have access to open debate, academic freedom is the enactment of the University's commitment to society.

NOTE

*This is a statement about Academic Senate's views concerning academic freedom. It is not designed to be a policy document, and it should be read in conjunction with other documents, such as the Enterprise Agreement and the University's media policy.*

Endorsed by Academic Senate
10 October 2006
Academic Freedom of Expression Policy (MPF1224)

RELEVANT LEGISLATION

Statute 4.1 – Academic Board

SCOPE

This policy applies across the University.

POLICY

1. Right to academic freedom of expression

1.1 A core value of the University of Melbourne is to preserve, defend and promote the traditional principles of academic freedom in the conduct of its affairs, so that all scholars at the University are free to engage in critical enquiry, scholarly endeavour and public discourse without fear or favour.

1.2 Accordingly, the University supports the right of all scholars at the University to search for truth and to hold and express diverse opinions. It recognises that scholarly debate should be robust and uninhibited. It recognises also that scholars are entitled to express their ideas and opinions even when doing so may cause offence. These principles apply to all activities in which scholars express their views both inside and outside the University.

1.3 The liberty to speak freely extends to making statements on political matters, including policies affecting higher education, and to criticism of the University and its actions.

1.4 Scholars at the University should expect to be able to exercise academic freedom of expression and not be disadvantaged or subject to less favourable treatment by the University for doing so.

2. Responsibilities of scholars in exercising academic freedom of expression

2.1 Like all rights, the right to academic freedom of expression carries responsibilities. Scholars may hold their own views and speak freely on all topics, even outside their expertise, and even identifying themselves as members of the University. However, if they speak in public on topics outside their expertise, they should consider whether it is reasonable in the circumstances to link their comments to their association with the University.

2.2 Academic freedom of expression is subject to the following principles:

• All discourse must be undertaken reasonably and in good faith.
• All discourse should accord with principles of academic and research ethics, where applicable. For example, reasons should be given for an argument so that those who wish to respond have a basis to do so and speakers may need to state affiliations (including speciality), sources, funding and potential conflicts of interest. The University recognises that these principles may vary according to the context in which the discourse occurs.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER

The President, Academic Board is responsible for the development, compliance monitoring and review of this policy and any associated procedures and guidelines.
IMPLEMENTATION OFFICER

The Academic Secretary is responsible for the promulgation and implementation of this policy in accordance with the scope outlined above. Enquiries about interpretation of this policy should be directed to the Implementation Officer.

REVIEW

This policy is to be reviewed by 30 June 2015.

VERSION HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Approved By</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>President Academic Board (authorised by Academic Board)</td>
<td>08 October 2012</td>
<td>08 October 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first annual Global Colloquium of University Presidents met at Columbia University on January 18 and 19, 2005. Envisioned as a series of annual events growing into an international network of research universities, the inaugural meeting gathered more than 40 university leaders and professors. In response to the United Nations Secretary-General’s request for greater involvement of the global academic community in exploring international public policy concerns, five New York-area universities launched the Colloquium. This year, the presidents of 15 universities discussed academic freedom in higher education while their expert representatives met to consider the pressing issue of international cooperation on migration.

In the introduction to this year’s opening session, Columbia University President, Lee C. Bollinger, welcomed his counterparts from major research universities throughout Europe, Asia, Africa, South America, and Australia, and emphasized the critical importance of increased collaboration among universities. “In these days of rapid globalization and a more interconnected world,” remarked Bollinger, “we have a tremendous responsibility to lend our collective scholarship and expertise toward the resolution of challenges worldwide.” The Global Colloquium of University Presidents will facilitate a collaborative network of university leaders and academics that will regularly gather to consider some of the most significant issues facing the global community. Each year, university presidents will meet to focus on issues of direct importance to the academic community, while their expert faculty members discuss key global policy challenges — chosen for their importance to the Secretary-General. Hosting responsibilities for the Colloquium will rotate among the five sponsoring universities: Columbia University, New York University, Princeton University, University of Pennsylvania, and Yale University. The inaugural Colloquium was made possible through the generous support of the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation.

The Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, chaired the plenary discussion of both topics, and also addressed the attendees at an opening dinner. Mr. Annan’s remarks focused on his hopes for the Colloquium and on the results of two of his recent reform reports (described below).

Secretary-General Annan began by noting that, “One of the first speeches I gave on taking office as Secretary-General was to a distinguished group of university presidents from around the world. From the outset, I was convinced that universities would be tremendously important partners of the United Nations. And so it has been. As educators, as repositories and creators of knowledge, as people deeply involved in helping the world address the issues of our times, your role has been vital. This colloquium is yet another example of the productive ties we have developed over the years, and I hope it will become a tradition.”

The Secretary-General then remarked that we are “at the start of a year that has the potential to bring fundamental change not only to the United Nations, but also to the way the world handles the challenges and threats we face. Member States have decided to hold a summit in September to review the progress we have made in implementing the Millennium Declaration1 which, as you know was adopted five years ago at the Millennium Summit. It is my hope that leaders will use the months between now and then for serious discussions, and arrive in September ready for bold decisions about our common future.”

In his own recommendations to the forthcoming summit, Mr. Annan will draw on two landmark reports, the High Level Panel Report on Threats, Challenges and Change, entitled “A More

1 Endorsed by all 191 UN Member States, the Declaration sets international goals across a wide spectrum of global issues, ranging from peace and security through development and poverty eradication to UN reform
Secure World,” and the Millennium Project Report. Mr. Annan embraced the work of the High Level Panel in achieving a definition of terrorism. He was particularly hopeful that this definition would ultimately be accepted by the global community because it was articulated by a consensus of experts from all regions of the world.

Noting the interconnectedness of threats in today’s world, Mr. Annan stressed that governments can no longer afford to ignore the plight of citizens of other nations. He expressed his hope that the Security Council would continue to embrace the role of protecting citizens when their governments were unable or unwilling to do so, and referenced the Evans-Sahnoun Commission’s finding of an emerging international norm of a “duty to protect.” He also discussed other changes that he hoped would move the international community toward a stronger collective security regime, mentioning the possibility of reforming the Security Council to better reflect the global situation of the world today.

Turning to the Millennium Project Report, Mr. Annan emphasized the link between security and development and welcomed the Report’s inclusion of “ideas to help those who have fallen behind.” Responding to a question regarding the breadth of the agenda expressed by the reports, the Secretary-General stressed his belief that the goals of the reports are achievable. He stated that he would issue a report in March that outlines priorities for working towards the Millennium Development Goals, noting in particular the pressing need to double the current level of development assistance, from $50 billion to $100 billion.

Mr. Annan particularly welcomed the participation of the academic community in assisting the United Nations in its work, stressing that, “There is ample scope in the year ahead for university leaders such as you to contribute to this process. I hope you will do what you do best: challenge your students, your faculty, and the wider communities in which you operate, to engage and work together for the greater good of humankind.”

The Secretary-General concluded his remarks with a brief discussion of his trip to Asia in the aftermath of the tsunami. He shared his deep admiration for the way the victims of the disaster, at both local and governmental levels, have come together to rebuild their communities, specifically citing the summit of Asian governments in Jakarta and subsequent fundraising efforts. Emphasizing the fact that “it is the poorest who are hardest hit,” Mr. Annan also emphasized the need for the global community’s assistance.

The Colloquium focused on two topics: international migration, a key element of globalization, and academic freedom, a crucial foundation of university research and teaching. The participants met in parallel sessions to discuss the two issues before reconvening in plenary, with the Secretary-General as chair.

The full record of the symposium, including this report and the background papers prepared by each of the participants, is available at: http://www.columbia.edu/~md2221/global_colloquium.htm

The two sessions prepared the following two statements designed to highlight the conclusions of their deliberations. They have invited other university presidents and other experts in migration to join them in endorsing the statements.
I.

The Context of Academic Freedom

The Purposes of Universities

The international community recognizes the important role played in society by universities and other institutions of higher learning and research. Indeed, all states are expected to provide higher education in fulfillment of Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and Article 13, paragraph 2(c), of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966).

Modern societies now entrust universities with greater responsibilities than ever before. Universities are charged with preserving the knowledge of the past and transmitting it to the next generation; educating tomorrow’s citizens, professionals, and leaders; and fostering the discovery of new knowledge that may either strengthen or challenge established ideas and norms -- all with the aim of deepening human understanding and bettering the human condition. They also function as engines of economic development, foster technological and scientific innovation, stimulate creativity in the arts and literature, and address urgent global problems such as poverty, disease, ethno-political conflict, and environmental degradation.

The Principles of Universities

At the International Conference convened by UNESCO in 1950, in Nice, the Universities of the World articulated three interdependent principles for which every university should stand:

- The right to pursue knowledge for its own sake and to follow wherever the search for truth may lead.
- The tolerance of divergent opinion and freedom from political interference.
- The obligation as social institutions to promote, through teaching and research, the principles of freedom and justice, of human dignity and solidarity, and to develop mutually material and moral aid on an international level.

These principles reflect the central role that university-based research and education play in the cultural, social, political and economic development of societies. They apply regardless of whether universities are state-funded, state-regulated, or private institutions.
II.
The Meaning of Academic Freedom

The Foundations of Academic Freedom

The principles upon which universities, and the academic activities they embody, stand are widely recognized. These principles are morally, legally, and politically grounded in the values that define the role of scholars in all academic disciplines (including the humanities, the natural, biological, and social sciences, the arts, engineering, law, medicine, etc.) as professionals and the universities in which they work, study, and teach as important social institutions that enable, support, and protect scholars’ professional activities.

The activities of preserving, pursuing, disseminating, and creating knowledge and understanding require societies to respect the autonomy of universities, of the scholars who research and teach in them, and of the students who come to them to prepare for lives as knowledgeable citizens and capable leaders. The autonomy of universities is the guarantor of academic freedom in the performance of scholars’ professional duties.

Academic freedom is therefore distinct from -- and not a mere extension of -- the freedoms of thought, conscience, opinion, expression, assembly, and association promised to all human beings under Articles 18, 19, and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international covenants.

The Definition of Academic Freedom

At its simplest, academic freedom may be defined as the freedom to conduct research, teach, speak, and publish, subject to the norms and standards of scholarly inquiry, without interference or penalty, wherever the search for truth and understanding may lead.

The Importance of Academic Freedom

The value of academic freedom is closely linked to the fundamental purposes and mission of the modern university. The expanding role that universities are playing in the Information Age only increases its significance. The emergence of a world-wide knowledge economy, the unparalleled transnational flow of information and ideas, and the growing number of young democracies, all make necessary the continued re-examination and articulation of the nature and importance of academic freedom. Indeed, across the globe, the defense of academic freedom remains at the heart of ongoing political and economic battles over the role and autonomy of universities.

Academic freedom benefits society in two fundamental ways. It benefits society directly, and usually immediately, through the impacts and benefits of applied knowledge, the training of skilled professionals, and the education of future leaders and citizens. It benefits society indirectly and usually over longer periods of time, through the creation, preservation, and transmission of knowledge and understanding for its own sake, irrespective of immediate applications.
Thus, academic freedom has both intrinsic and practical value. Above all, by facilitating critical thinking and open discourse, academic freedom provides the foundation for the continued intellectual and social value of the university as a place of unfettered debate and the free exchange of ideas. It thereby enables universities to produce citizens equipped to thrive in and sustain free and open societies.

III. The Practice of Academic Freedom

Academic freedom applies to the activities of faculty and students that are closely related to or impact upon the educational, scholarly, and research purposes of universities. Academic freedom is not applicable to every activity, and without accountability it can be barren and unproductive. The “freedom” in “academic freedom” is qualified or bounded by what can reasonably be counted as “academic.” In practice, this means that universities are best able to gauge the parameters of academic freedom and therefore must be responsible for a considerable degree of self-regulation. All of the relevant individual actors, governance bodies, and constituencies within the university must use their freedom not only to advance the university’s goals of education, research, and service, but also to contribute positively to an environment of academic freedom, defending its privileges and fulfilling its obligations.

Like other professional privileges, academic freedom confers both rights and responsibilities on universities, individual scholars, and students:

- **The Rights of Scholars and Students**
  Academic freedom is fundamental to the central values and purposes of universities, which must in turn protect freedom of inquiry and speech, without which neither faculty nor students can flourish or achieve the ends that academic freedom is designed to serve. Scholars and students must be able to study, learn, speak, teach, research, and publish, without fear of intimidation or reprisal, free from political interference, in an environment of tolerance for and engagement with divergent opinions. The teacher is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing his or her subject, and when speaking or writing outside the classroom as an individual, the teacher must be free from institutional censorship or discipline.

- **The Responsibilities of Scholars**
  Academic freedom carries with it a concomitant responsibility of scholars to resist corrupting influences on their research and teaching, to transcend partisanship and prejudice, and to foster intellectually vigorous and open discussion within the classroom, adhering to the highest norms and standards of scholarly inquiry and teaching. In their academic duties, faculty are responsible to further the learning of students and should avoid statements and actions that may inhibit students’ freedom of inquiry and expression, thereby compromising the university’s most fundamental values.
• **The Rights of Universities**

Academic freedom requires the institutional autonomy of universities, which enables them to preserve the human record of knowledge and ideas, to advance the discovery and interpretation of new knowledge, to educate students, and to serve the larger society. This autonomy includes the right of the university to determine for itself, on academic grounds, who may teach, what may be taught, how it shall be taught, and who may be admitted to study. Likewise, this institutional autonomy should determine the framework for statutory provisions that govern or impact universities.

• **The Responsibilities of Universities**

Academic institutions bear a heavy responsibility to protect the scholars and students who work within them from improper pressures, whether political, cultural, economic, or ideological. Universities must maintain and encourage freedom of inquiry, discourse, teaching, research, and publication, and they must protect all members of the academic staff and student body against external and internal influences that might restrict the exercise of these freedoms.

**The Operational Meaning of Academic Freedom**

Though national realities inevitably shape perspectives on the meaning and practice of academic freedom, at minimum, the performance and expressions of faculty in the classroom and other educational settings must be subject solely to the professional judgment of scholarly colleagues. Freedom of expression inside and outside the classroom must be strongly defended by the university, regardless of the popularity or content of the views expressed. It is essential that each university have established guidelines and procedures that address and safeguard academic freedom. The structure of relationships, responsibilities, and accountabilities among the constituents of the institution (students, faculty, administrators, and trustees or governing council) should be of a nature that facilitates the full implementation of and respect for such guidelines and procedures.

Although academic freedom can be threatened from a variety of sources, both internal and external to the academic community, historically the most fundamental threats to academic freedom have come from the state, whose political power and disposition to regulate often stands in opposition to the university’s need for institutional autonomy.

Common practices and institutions of civil society may also threaten the integrity of academic freedom. For example, the pressures and lures of commercial initiatives and alliances, or attacks by outside groups on the freedom of the academy (particularly, but not only, in periods of national crisis), can seriously threaten the autonomy of universities and the academic freedom of their faculty and students. Universities must be free of obligation to external groups, alumni, community leaders, the media, or other elements of civil society who may object to or seek the suppression of viewpoints expressed by faculty members, students, public speakers, and others who participate in the academic and educational activities of universities.
University authorities themselves, by bending to political pressures or popular will, can also weaken the environment of academic freedom within the university, stifling student dissent or the unpopular views of controversial professors. In addition, disciplinary orthodoxy in some academic fields may pose a threat to the university’s environment of free dialogue by compelling scholars or students to conform to established lines of thought. Among the most important mechanisms for maintaining scholarly standards and protecting academic freedom are peer-review systems that determine how research is funded, conducted, and results published, but peer review systems must never be allowed to become vehicles to enforce blind adherence to dominant viewpoints or silence those perspectives that deviate from established, orthodox ideas.

It is our hope that the principles set forth in this document will help to clarify the nature of academic freedom, reaffirm its value, strengthen its practice, and resist threats to the academic freedom of scholars, students and universities around the world.
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ITEM 10.2 ACADEMIC PROGRESSION WORKING GROUP: PROGRESS REPORT

For discussion.

Recommendation:
That Academic Senate:

i. note the progress of the Academic Progression Working Group;

ii. discuss the minimum rate of progression – identification and support model; and

iii. endorse the minimum rate of progression – identification and support model.
ITEM 10.2. ACADEMIC PROGRESSION WORKING GROUP: PROGRESS REPORT

Issue

A significant number of students are excluded from further enrolment or graduation each session as a result of failing to meet certain requirements outlined in the General Coursework Rules (the Rules).

The most common reason for Exclusion is the failure to meet the minimum requirements for progression as outlined in Part 10 (3) of the Rules, which states that:

(3) A student must meet a minimum rate of progress requirement at the end of each academic year; this being:

(a) for a student enrolled in an undergraduate course who has attempted at least 36 credit points, an overall Grade Point Average (GPA) of at least 1.00 and a GPA of at least 1.00 in the academic year under consideration; and

The application of this Rule does not require any form of prior notification that a student’s performance is likely to put their enrolment in jeopardy. Furthermore, the University does not currently implement a tiered system of warnings and probationary restrictions, such as is common practice at other comparable institutions. Consequently it is not uncommon for an exclusion notice to be the first contact a student receives from the University in regard to his or her overall progression.

Despite the large number of students excluded each session, Macquarie does not currently have a policy that governs the identification of students at risk of exclusion, or an early identification support and remedial action plan to improve the student’s chances of success prior to exclusion. The current approach has a direct impact on the University’s attrition rate.

The Academic Progression working party was formed to address the issues posed by the University’s current approach. The working party has now met on three occasions to consider what opportunities and support should be provided to enable students at risk of exclusion to get back on track.

Minimum rate of progress - identification and support model

The working party has endorsed a proposal to identify and support students who fail to pass more than 50% of their study load in a study period. The model is underpinned by the notion of ‘Academic Standing’ that would indicate a student’s current position on the spectrum of academic progression. This model would replace the GPA based cut-off that is currently used as a measurement of student progression through a program of study and would meet the University’s obligations under the ESOS Act.

Academic Standing will be re-assessed at the end of each main study period (Session 1 and Session 2) and appropriate communication and intervention will follow any change in standing.

The proposed graduated support model is attached for reference.

The model is based on the classifications as detailed below:

**Good Standing**: Indicates that the student has successfully passed more than 50% of their study load in the previous study period.

**Academic Caution**: Indicates that the student has failed 50% or more of their study load in the previous period. At this point, students are sent a letter advising they are at risk of being placed on conditional enrolment in the next period if they fail more that 50% of attempted load in the current period.

If, however, the student passes more than 50% of the study load for the period of Academic Caution they will return to Good Standing.
Conditional Enrolment: Indicates that the student was at Academic Caution in the previous period and failed 50% or more of their study load in that period. At this point, the student must enrol for a reduced academic load. They are required to attend academic counselling prior to enrolling and are given advice and guidance by Campus Wellbeing. The student will be warned that failing 50% or more of their study load in the next period will result in Suspension from enrolment.

If the student passes more than 50% of the study load for the period of Conditional Enrolment they will return to Academic Caution.

Suspension: The student has failed 50% or more of the reduced study load while on Conditional Enrolment. The student will be unable to enrol in any units of study for a period of 12 months. The student will still have access to Campus Wellbeing services.

The aim is to encourage students to explore other options that may be more appropriate for them, and prevent students incurring significant costs. The University must exercise a duty of care to students who incur fees and who are not well suited to tertiary study, and not permit poorly performing students continuing to study indefinitely.

System support

Initial investigations have revealed that the University’s student administration system should be able to support the implementation of this model via changes to the configuration of study sanctions and the development of reports.

This work is being co-ordinated by the Office of Deputy Registrar, resources have and will be made available to implement process and systems changes, and a team will be deliver the implementation of the proposed model within agreed timeframes.

Next steps and timeframe

1. The working group is currently considering Rules relating to unduly long time and double fail provisions for units, which impact student progression.
2. The working group will consider a draft policy in February 2016 which articulates Macquarie’s academic progression requirements.
3. Academic Senate will determine and recommend required amendments to the General Coursework Rules for approval by University Council, in accordance with the recommendations made by the working group.

The Academic Progression Policy will be effective from Session 2, 2016. Accordingly, the first round of formal communications regarding ‘academic standing’ will be sent to students at the end of Session 2, 2016.

Academic Progression Working Group:

- Professor Dominic Verity, Chair of Academic Senate (Chair)
- Angela Stark, Physiotherapy Clinical and Student Support Manager
- Brad Windon, Executive Officer, Deputy Vice-Chancellor Students and Registrar
- Dale Griffin, Business Integration Manager, Student Systems
- James Hamilton, Head, Learning Technology and Infrastructure
- Associate Professor Jenny Donald, Associate Dean Learning and Teaching, Faculty of Science and Engineering
- Jonathan Wylie, Deputy Registrar
- Kate Roth, Associate Director Academic Programs Macquarie International
- Kathryn Whittingham, Head of Student Administration
- Lilia Draganov, Student Support Coordinator Faculty of Business & Economics
- Associate Professor Pamela Coutts, Associate Dean Quality and Standards, Faculty of Human Sciences, Chair ASQC
- Lise Barry, School of Law
- Peter Gregory, Business Analyst, Student Services
- Susan Omundsen, Student Engagement Coordinator, Faculty of Arts
- Zoe Williams, Head of Governance Services
- Dr Wylie Bradford, Academic Senate representative, Faculty of Business and Economics

Consultation Process
The following offices have been consulted prior to the submission of this paper:
- Academic Progression working group
- Office of Deputy Registrar
- Head of Governance Services
- Head Student Administration

**Recommendation**

1: That Academic Senate discuss the minimum rate of progression – identification and support model.

2: That Academic Senate endorse the minimum rate of progression – identification and support model.

**Submitted by**
Professor Dominic Verity, Chair of Academic Senate, dominic.verity@mq.edu.au

**For enquiries contact**
Ainslee Harvey, Academic Senate Project Officer, Ainslee.harvey@mq.edu.au, (x6346)
ITEM 10.3  POLICY CHANGES REQUIRED AS A RESULT OF THE
ESTABLISHMENT OF FACULTY BOARDS

For discussion.

Recommendation:
That Academic Senate resolve to approve the amendments to policies and procedures to reflect the
functions of the Faculty Boards.
ITEM 10.3 POLICY CHANGES REQUIRED AS A RESULT OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF FACULTY BOARDS

Issue
At its meeting of 18 December 2014, Academic Senate approved the Faculty Board Terms of Reference (Item 10.10, Resolution 14/215).

At its meeting of 25 August 2015, Academic Senate considered revisions to the Academic Senate Rules (Item 8.2). It was noted in the Item that:

The required amendments to University Policy and Procedure to reflect appropriate authorisations to Faculty Boards are being scoped and will be presented to Academic Senate for approval.

Those amendments are attached for consideration by members.

Consultation Process
The following offices have been consulted prior to the submission of this paper:
Chair Academic Senate; Policy Unit, Governance Services.

Recommendation
That Academic Senate resolve to approve the amendments to policies and procedures to reflect the functions of the Faculty Boards.

Operational Impact
Policy Unit, Governance Services

Outcome to be communicated to
Faculty Boards

Submitted by
Professor Dominic Verity, Chair Academic Senate

For enquiries contact
Ellen Carlson, Policy Manager  ellen.carlson@mq.edu.au  ext 4791.
## AMENDMENTS TO POLICY TO ENABLE FACULTY BOARD AUTHORISATIONS FROM ACADEMIC SENATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Admission (Coursework) Direct Entry** | Procedure | Academic Senate: DETERMINE ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS  
Approve the eligibility and selection requirements for admission to the University, including minimum English language proficiency, on the recommendation of the Executive Dean of Faculty.  
Consider and approve recommendations from Faculties - Faculty Boards pertaining to strategies for selection of candidates. |
| **Admission (Coursework) Procedure - via UAC** | Procedure | Executive DeanFaculty Board:  
DETERMINE ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS  
Prior to each admission period, and in time for relevant publications, inform the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar) of:  
- individual courses to be offered for admission  
- any particular selection criteria, application material or changes to the application process for courses on offer  
- individual course enrolment targets  
- the minimum entry rank for each course below which a candidate will not be considered for an offer.  
...  
Where a candidate’s application requires university assessment, recommend to the Head Student Administration the outcome of that selection decision. |
| **Assessment** | Procedure | Academic SenateFaculty Board  
APPROVE FINAL GRADES  
Consider and approve final unit grades for each coursework student. |
| **Coursework Unit – New Mode of Offering** | Policy | OVERVIEW  
Academic Senate is currently responsible for the approval of new, deleted and revised units. Responsibility for the approval of coursework unit offerings lies with the Executive Dean of the Faculty Board of the Faculty owning the unit, exercising delegated authority from the Academic Program Committee Academic Standards and Quality Committee.  
POLICY STATEMENT  
Academic Senate approves a coursework unit only for the mode (or modes) of offering detailed on the New Unit Proposal form.  
Formal written approval is required from the Executive DeanFaculty Board for the offering of a coursework unit in any mode other than that for which it was originally approved. The Executive DeanFaculty Board in this instance is the Board Executive Dean of the Faculty that is responsible for the teaching of the unit. If the teaching is shared across more than one faculty, each Executive DeanFaculty Board must give their approval in writing for any change in the mode of offering of a coursework unit. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Examination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Appeal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Examination Policy**

Each final examination script will be kept by the University for a minimum of six months, or longer if deemed appropriate by the relevant Executive Dean/Faculty Board. The six months starts from the end date of the relevant final examination period. Where an appeal has been lodged, the final examination script is to be kept for a minimum of six months following the outcome of the appeal.

**Grade Appeal Policy**

SYSTEMS AND DEADLINES

Executive Deans / Director MUIC will ensure that Grade Appeals are reviewed in a timely manner.

REPORT

The University's approved Grade Appeal system will have reports available for use by Executive Deans / [Faculty Boards] / Director MUIC, Heads of Department/ MUIC Program Manager [Faculty Boards] and the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC), in which de-identified data is provided on:

... Executive Deans / Faculty Boards / Director MUIC will also report to the SLTC on the operation of the Grade Appeal process within their Faculties by 1 April each year. The reports will detail issues that arose in the operation of these processes and the strategies to be implemented to address them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Appeal</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXECUTIVE DEAN, FACULTY BOARD/ DIRECTOR MUIC QUALITY ASSURANCE</strong>&lt;br&gt;Ensure no grade appeal will be reviewed by a person who was involved in the assessment process or determination of the final grade for the unit in which the grade appeal has been received.</td>
<td><strong>DETERMINE OUTCOME</strong>&lt;br&gt;Receive and consider the recommendations related to all valid grade appeals.&lt;br&gt;Determine if there are grounds for an appeal to be upheld, and if so, whether there is to be an amendment to the SNG.&lt;br&gt;Notify the Head of Department accordingly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HDR Doctoral Equivalence</th>
<th>Guideline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Provide Guidance in determining doctoral equivalence</strong>&lt;br&gt;The <strong>Executive Dean of the Faculty</strong> will assess such evidence and make a recommendation to the DVC Research as to the deeming of doctoral equivalence. The recommendation of Macquarie doctoral equivalence will be confirmed in writing by the DVC Research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HDR Supervision</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXECUTIVE DEAN</strong>&lt;br&gt;...&lt;br&gt;<strong>FACULTY COMMENCEMENT PROGRAM</strong>&lt;br&gt;Propose a Faculty Commencement Program (FCP) to Faculty Board for endorsement which:</td>
<td><strong>FACULTY BOARD</strong>&lt;br&gt;Endorse Faculty Commencement Program prior to its implementation by the Executive Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supplements the CCP&lt;br&gt;outlines Faculty and Departmental HDR expectations, and&lt;br&gt;provides information about the support services that are available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Agreements</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAFF MEMBER: DOCUMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For transnational agreements only:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• assist the International Agreements Coordinator to complete Part 1 of the Quality Assurance Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• complete Part 2 of the Quality Assurance Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• submit the Quality Assurance Assessment to the Executive Dean and Faculty Board for approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• prepare an Academic Case with the assistance of the International Agreements Coordinator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBTAIN APPROVAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain approval as follows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proposals that do not include program delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain Executive Dean and Faculty Board approval for a <em>Proposal for Establishing an International Agreement</em> which requires a Memorandum of Understanding or a Student Exchange Agreement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proposals that include program delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit an Academic Case and a <em>Proposal for Establishing an International Agreement</em> for dual degree, articulation or transnational arrangements, for approval by the:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Executive Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Faculty Standards and Quality Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Academic Standards and Quality Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Academic Senate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXECUTIVE DEAN/FACULTY BOARD</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPROVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As appropriate, consider and approve:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a Quality Assurance Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• an Academic Case</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a Proposal for Establishing an International Agreement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As appropriate, recommend a Proposal for Establishing an International Agreement to the Deputy-Vice-Chancellor (International).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM 10.4  ACADEMIC SENATE MEMBERSHIP ATTENDANCE REPORT

For noting.
ITEM 10.4 ACADEMIC SENATE MEMBERSHIP ATTENDANCE REPORT

In accordance with Standing Order 38 of the Academic Senate Standing Orders, Governance Services will monitor absences and apologies submitted by members who are unable to attend a meeting. The receipt of an apology does not imply the consent of the Senate to grant leave of absence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex-officio</td>
<td>Professor Bruce Dowton</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Dominic Verity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Jacqueline Phillips</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor John Simons</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Sakkie Pretorius</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Jim Lee</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deidre Anderson</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor David Wilkinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Sherman Young</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Lesley Hughes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Peter Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Martina Mollering</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Mark Gabbott</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Janet Greeley</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Richard Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Simon Handley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Patrick McNeil</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Barbara Messerle</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Nick Mansfield</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Alex Frino</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor Ian Solomides</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JoAnne Sparks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elected Staff Members</strong></td>
<td>Dr Kate Fullagar</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Kathryn Millard</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Peter Radan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor Estela Valverde</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Wylie Bradford</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Yvonne Breyer</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas McGuigan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Lucy Taksa</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Amanda Barnier</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Linda Cupples</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Mike Jones</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor David Coutts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Simon George</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Mariella Herberstein</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Norma Harrison</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cathy Rytmeister</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Elected Student Members** | AnnaGlen                     | ✓         | ✓          | ✓         | ✓          |            |            |
|                             | Gabrielle Hardy               | ✓         | ✓          | ✓         | ✓          |            |            |
|                             | JuliaYang                     | ✓         | ✓          | ✓         |            |            | Absent     |
|                             | Simon Populin                 | ✓         | ✓          | ✓         |            |            | Apology    |
|                             | Jeremy Gunter                 | ✓         | ✓          |            |            | Apology    | Apology    |
|                             | Jinji Kong                    | ✓         | ✓          |            |            | Apology    | Apology    |
|                             | Harry Dang                    | ✓         | ✓          |            |            | Apology    | ✓          |
|                             | Cheryl Ware                   | ✓         | ✓          |            |            |            |            |

| **Co-opted Member** | Associate Professor Pamela Coutts | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

**Recommendation:**
For noting.
ITEM 10.5 UNIVERSITY MEDAL COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC SENATE: MEMBERSHIP

For discussion.

Recommendation:
That Academic Senate nominate two members of its elected cohort to serve on the University Medal Committee of Academic Senate.
ITEM 10.5 UNIVERSITY MEDAL COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC SENATE

Issue

At its November meeting, Academic Senate approved the new Terms of Reference for the University Medals Committee. The Committee is responsible for making recommendations to Academic Senate on the award of the University Medal in accordance with the University Medal Policy and Procedure.

The membership of the committee will compromise the Chair of Academic Senate, a nominee of the Faculty Board of each Faculty, and two elected members of Academic Senate. The Terms of Reference for the University Medal Committee are attached for reference.

Academic Senate is now calling for nominations from its elected cohort to be members of this Committee. The Committee will meet in February to consider the nominations from departments, and University Medals will be awarded at the April graduation ceremonies.

It is also hoped that members of the University Medals Committee will actively contribute to the holistic review of the award of prizes scheduled to commence in 2016. This will include review of the Vice-Chancellor’s Commendations and University Medals and a new framework for awards, including eligibility criteria, validation and processes for the award of prizes be established.

Consultation Process

The following offices have been consulted prior to the submission of this paper:

- Governance Services
- Faculty Boards

Recommendation

1. That Academic Senate nominates two members of its elected cohort to serve on the University Medal Committee of Academic Senate.

Outcome to be communicated to

Governance Services

Submitted by

Professor Dominic Verity, Chair of Academic Senate

For enquiries contact

Ainslee Harvey, Academic Senate Project Officer, ainslee.harvey@mq.edu.au, 02 9850 6346
University Medal Committee

Terms of Reference

The Academic Senate University Medal Committee was established by the Academic Senate of Macquarie University and is directly responsible and accountable to Academic Senate for the exercise of its responsibilities.

This Terms of Reference sets out the objective, role and responsibilities, membership, and tenure of the Committee.

1. Objective

The Committee is to make recommendations to Academic Senate on the award of the University Medal in accordance with the University Medal Policy and Procedure.

2. Role and responsibilities

The Committee is to:

(1) Consider, examine and review all nominations received from the Faculties in accordance with the eligibility and selection criteria outlined in the University Medal Policy and Procedure;

(2) Recommend to the Academic Senate on the award of University medals in respect of the nominated candidates as required by the University Medal Procedure;

(3) Provide feedback to Faculties in respect of unsuccessful candidates;

(4) Review the University’s policies, procedures and guidelines governing the award of the University Medal and recommend any necessary amendments to Academic Senate for approval;

(5) Report annually to Academic Senate on trends in the award of medals across the University for that year, and across the previous years, including consideration of equity and diversity issues; and
(6) Consider and report on any matters referred to it by Academic Senate, from time to time, as required.

3. Membership

The membership of the Committee comprises:

a) Chair of Academic Senate (Chair)
   - *Professor Dominic Verity*

b) One (1) member nominated by the Faculty Board of each Faculty
   - *To be confirmed – Faculty of Arts*
   - *To be confirmed – Faculty of Business & Economics*
   - *To be confirmed – Faculty of Human Sciences*
   - *To be confirmed – Faculty of Medicine & Health Sciences*
   - *To be confirmed – Faculty of Science & Engineering*

c) Two (2) elected members of Academic Senate.
   - *To be confirmed*
   - *To be confirmed*

4. Tenure

(a) The term of appointment of all members shall be two (2) years, unless otherwise stated by the Chair of Academic Senate.

(b) The Chair of Academic Senate may renew any such term of appointment, in consultation with the Academic Senate Standing Committee.

5. Authorisations

The Academic Senate shall, from time to time, resolve to grant the Committee specific authorisations to discharge its delegated responsibilities. The Committee may request the granting of such authorisations as it sees fit. All such authorisations shall be documented here.
6. Rules of operation

The Committee shall conduct its business subject to the Standing Orders for Committees of Academic Senate.
ITEM 10.6 UNIVERSITY MEDAL NOMINATIONS: TIMELINE

Issue and Discussion
At its 10 November meeting, Academic Senate approved the interim University Medals Policy and Procedure and Terms of Reference for the University Medals Committee.

Faculty Boards have been asked to nominate members to sit on the University Medals Committee.

The following timeline has been established for the nomination process for University Medal recipients for 2015:

- Monday December 14th 2015: Request for University Medal Recipient Nominations sent to Faculty Boards
- Wednesday 12th February 2016: Deadline for Nominations for University Medals from Faculty Boards
- Tuesday 23rd February 2016: University Medals Committee Meeting

Recommendation
That Academic Senate note the University Medal nominations timeframe.
ITEM 11.1  RECOGNITION OF PRIOR LEARNING (RPL) SCHEDULE OF MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS: AMENDMENT TO SCHEDULE B – POSTGRADUATE AWARDS AND FHS EXCEPTION (ASQC)

Both items of business were considered and recommended for approval by Academic Senate at the Academic Standards and Quality Committee meeting held 17 November 2015 (Refer to Item 12.1).

For approval.

Recommendation:
That Academic Senate resolve to:

i. approve the amendment to the Schedule of Minimum Requirements under Schedule B – Postgraduate Awards to specify 50% of the 800 and/or 900 level units of the Award at Macquarie University.

ii. approve the exception to the RPL Schedule of Minimum Requirements to allow students who have completed one of the Macquarie masters level 9 Translating & Interpreting (T&I) awards (under which they will have completed either 40, 48 or 64 credit points of T&I units at 800 level or above), to be exempt from the requirement to study 32 credit points to gain the award Master of Advanced Conference Interpreting.
SCHEDULE OF MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS AT MACQUARIE

1 PURPOSE

To outline the minimum requirements a student must undertake at Macquarie University in order to qualify with a Macquarie University Award.

The minimum requirement amounts must be unique to the Award, having not been used towards another Award. The stated minimum requirements prescribe the maximum amounts of Credit Transfer possible through Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL).

2 SCHEDULE

SCHEDULE A – UNDERGRADUATE AWARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macquarie University Award Length</th>
<th>Minimum requirement</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 years full time</td>
<td>Student must complete a minimum of the equivalent of 50 per cent of the total credit point load of the Award at Macquarie University</td>
<td>Student must complete 24 credit points of the Award at Macquarie University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years full time</td>
<td>Student must complete a minimum of the equivalent of 1 full time year of the Award at Macquarie University</td>
<td>Student must complete 36 credit points of the Award at Macquarie University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years full time</td>
<td>Student must complete a minimum of the equivalent of 1.5 full time years of the Award at Macquarie University</td>
<td>Student must complete 48 credit points of the Award at Macquarie University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years full time</td>
<td>Student must complete a minimum of the equivalent of 2 full time years of the Award at Macquarie University</td>
<td>Student must complete 48 credit points of the Award at Macquarie University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all cases, where an undergraduate Award has a Capstone requirement, the student must complete this requirement at Macquarie University.

In all cases, the student must complete the majority of the higher level units of the Award at Macquarie University. To ensure this, Credit Transfer for units at 300 level or above will only...
be permitted up to a maximum of 6 credit points for a 3 year Bachelor degree, and up to a maximum of 12 credit points for Bachelor degrees longer than 3 years.

SCHEDULE B - POSTGRADUATE AWARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macquarie University Award Type</th>
<th>Minimum Requirement</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate</td>
<td>Student must complete a minimum of the equivalent of 50 per cent of the Award at Macquarie University</td>
<td>Student must complete 8 credit points of the Award at Macquarie University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma</td>
<td>Student must complete a minimum of the equivalent of 50 per cent of the Award at Macquarie University</td>
<td>Student must complete 16 credit points of the Award at Macquarie University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree (Coursework)</td>
<td>Student must complete a minimum of the equivalent of 50 per cent of the Award at Macquarie University</td>
<td>Masters Degrees have a minimum notional volume of learning of 64 credit points. Student must complete 32 credit points at 800 and/or 900 level of the Award at Macquarie University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree (Extended)</td>
<td>Students must complete a minimum of the equivalent of 50 per cent of the Award at Macquarie University</td>
<td>Students must complete 32 credit points at 800 and/or 900 level of the Award at Macquarie University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree (Extended) or Masters Degree of more than 2 years full time</td>
<td>Students must complete a minimum of the equivalent of 50 per cent of the Award at Macquarie University</td>
<td>Students must complete 32 credit points at 800 and/or 900 level of the Award at Macquarie University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The minimum requirements for all other coursework postgraduate Award types will be approved on a case-by-case basis and recorded in this schedule as an exception.

The minimum requirements for all double degree Award types will be approved on a case-by-case basis and recorded in this schedule as an exception.

In all cases, where a postgraduate Award has a Capstone or Professional-Practice requirement, the student must complete this requirement at Macquarie University.

In all cases, the student must complete at least 50% majority of the 800 and/or 900 level units of the Award at Macquarie University. To ensure this, the student’s minimum requirements of the Award at Macquarie University must consist of units at 800 and/or 900 level.

SCHEDULE C – SUB-UNDERGRADUATE AWARD PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macquarie University Award Type</th>
<th>Minimum Requirement</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Foundation Program</td>
<td>The full program must be completed at Macquarie University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Foundation Programs</strong></td>
<td>Student must complete a minimum of the equivalent of 50 per cent of the total credit point load of the Award at Macquarie University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diploma Programs</strong></td>
<td>Student must complete a minimum of the equivalent of 50 per cent of the total credit point load of the Award at Macquarie University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXCEPTIONS - THE FOLLOWING EXCEPTIONS HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY ACADEMIC SENATE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macquarie University</td>
<td>Application and Minimum Requirement</td>
<td>Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Management (MMgt) articulating into the Master of Business Administration (MBA) at the Macquarie Graduate School of Management (MGSM)</td>
<td>A student who enrolls in the MMgt (40 credit points) before the end of the 2014 calendar year is eligible for maximum RPL of 40 credit points towards the MBA (64 credit points). Student must complete a minimum of 24 credit points in the MBA at Macquarie University.</td>
<td>A student admitted to the MMgt who intends to articulate into the MBA is required to maintain continuous enrolment (ie be enrolled in at least one [1] unit per term) throughout the remaining duration of the program. This Exception will apply from term 1, 2015 up to and including term 2, 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma of Auslan-English Interpreting (GradDipAuslEngInt) articulating into the Master of Translation and Interpreting Studies (MTransInter)</td>
<td>A student who completes the GradDipAuslEngInt is eligible for maximum RPL of 32 credit points towards the MTransInter (48 credit points). Student must complete a minimum of 16 credit points in the MTransInter at Macquarie University.</td>
<td>This Exception is effective 1 January 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Advanced Translation and Interpreting Studies (MAdvTransInterStud) / Master of Translation and Interpreting Studies (MTransInter) / Master of Translation and Interpreting Studies with the degree of Master of Applied Linguistics and Master of Translation and Interpreting Studies with the degree of Master of International Relations</td>
<td>A student who completes the MAdvTransInterStud / MTransInter / MTransInterMAppLingTESOL / MTransInterMIntRel is eligible for maximum RPL of 4 credit points towards the MConfInt (32 credit points).</td>
<td>This Exception is effective 1 January 2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TESOL (MTransInterMAppLingTESOL) / Master of Translation and Interpreting Studies with the degree of Master of International Relations (MTransInterMIntRel) articulating into the Master of Advanced Conference Interpreting (MConfInt)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1</strong> Contact Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2</strong> Implementation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3</strong> Approval Authority / Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4</strong> Date Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.5</strong> Date of Commencement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.6</strong> Date for Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.7</strong> Documents Superseded by this Schedule</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **3.8** Amendment History | 17 November 2015 – minor amendment to Schedule B recommended by ASQC 17 November 2015.  
20 April 2015 – alignment to new Policy Framework  
3 March 2015 – Amendment to Schedule A maximums approved by Academic Senate 3 March on recommendation of ASQC 29 January 2015.  
21 Nov 2014 – Minor amendment Exceptions Conditions clarified for MMgt students, Approved Pro Dean MGSM. |
| **3.9** Policy Authorisation | Recognition of Prior Learning Policy |
ITEM 11.2  APPROVAL OF A NEW POSTGRADUATE AWARD 2017 – MASTER OF PUBLIC HEALTH (ASQC)

This item was considered and recommended for approval by Academic Senate at the Academic Standards and Quality Committee meeting held 17 November 2015 (Refer to Item 12.1).

For approval.

Recommendation: That Academic Senate resolve to approve the academic case for the new award Master of Public Health (MPH) commencing 2017, noting that the admission requirements will be simplified.
ITEM 6.1 FACULTY OF MEDICINE AND HEALTH SCIENCES:
APPROVAL OF A NEW POSTGRADUATE AWARD 2017 – MASTER OF
PUBLIC HEALTH (MPH)

Overview
The Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Department of Health Systems and Populations, is proposing the establishment of a Master of Public Health (MPH) program, commencing in 2017. An Expression of Interest (EOI) was considered at the 22 September 2015 ASQC meeting.

The Faculty Board of the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences endorsed the proposal for the new award on 2 November 2015.

The Master of Public Health (MPH) will be based on a rigorous and carefully sequenced curriculum. As a multi-disciplinary professional degree, it is anticipated that the MPH will be attractive to domestic and international students from a variety of fields. In addition, the MPH presents the potential for cross-faculty collaboration at an institutional level, as can be seen from the approach to development of the curriculum.

The Macquarie MPH has been designed on the basis of extensive worldwide research that has been conducted on what public health education should look like in the 21st century. The common core of the MPH degree will educate graduates in foundational areas of public health. The specialisation areas will provide rigorous, in-depth, skills-based education that is responsive to the interests of students, the strengths of the institution, and the needs of employers.

Consultation Process
The following people and offices have been consulted prior to the submission of this paper:

- Learning and Teaching Centre
- Consultation with people from Faculties, Departments, and/or Centres across campus regarding MPH (directly, and through a cross-Faculty Planning Day), including:
  - Faculty of Business and Economics: Department of Economics, Centre for Health Economics
  - Faculty of Arts: Department of Anthropology; Department of Sociology; School of Law; Department of Philosophy; Centre for Agency, Values and Ethics
  - Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences: Department of Clinical Medicine; Department of Health Professions; AIHI
  - Faculty of Human Sciences: Institute of Early Childhood; Department of Linguistics
  - Faculty of Science and Engineering: Department of Statistics; Department of Environmental Science
- Library
- Macquarie International
- Executive (including DVCA)
- Chair, Academic Standards and Quality Committee
- Manager, Curriculum and Planning

Recommendation
For consideration and recommendation to Academic Senate.

Submitted by: Associate Professor Sonia Allen, Head of Department, Health Systems and Populations, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences (T: 9850 2404)
The Education Services for Overseas Students (ESOS) Act 2000, and The National Code of Practice govern the delivery of courses to International students. All programs of study offered to International students studying in Australia on a student visa must have a CRICOS code and comply with these provisions. This includes the requirement that holders of an international student visa maintain full-time enrolment. Therefore, consultation with Macquarie International will be required prior to submission.

Faculty: Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences
Department: Department of Health Systems and Populations
Award Name: Master of Public Health

General

The Department of Health Systems and Populations proposes to offer a Master of Public Health degree recognising that:

a) increasing challenges to our health at both national and international scales require an ever-expanding workforce;
b) there is a need to strengthen our public health infrastructure to respond to future health threats;
c) approximately 50% of the public health workforce will reach retirement age within the next five years and as such, there is a great demand for the next generation of public health practitioners ready to meet the challenges of the 21st century;
d) The MPH degree will continue to grow in value and in enrolment during the 21st century as societies, organizations, and individuals increasingly focus on population health and health care as key concerns.

The MPH degree proposed will be based on a rigorous, structured, and carefully sequenced curriculum that reflects that the MPH degree is a professional degree requiring an education that has strong connections to applied public health practice. The Macquarie MPH will also recognise that 'global health' is public health, and as such will include both domestic and international issues, and global health perspectives and content. To this end, it will also be designed to meet expected international competencies and standards across the globe, making it attractive to international and national students, who will be able to work anywhere in the world with the Macquarie MPH qualification. The Macquarie MPH will be designed on the basis of extensive worldwide research that has been conducted on what public health education should look like in the 21st century. The common core of the MPH degree will educate graduates in foundational areas of public health. The specialisation areas will provide rigorous, in-depth, skills-based education that is responsive to the interests of students, the strengths of the institution, and the needs of employers. The proposed Macquarie MPH will be attractive to students who:

1. Wish to engage in an advanced professional degree in public health which will equip them for the modern public health workforce;
2. Are looking for a degree that will not only give them knowledge and understanding, but will also train them in skills essential to public health practice;
3. Understand the importance of public health and will value the training in leadership, teamwork and innovation that the Macquarie MPH offers;
4. Are looking for an MPH degree designed with the future of public health education and practice in mind.

| Replacement | Does the proposed award replace an existing award? | No |

## Details

### Admission Requirements

**Admission Criteria**

(Formal qualifications; GPA; Required Work Experience; Required Cognate Disciplines)

Published in Handbook, Coursefinder and UAC

Australian Bachelor degree or recognised equivalent in health; social sciences; health sciences; social work and human welfare; behavioural sciences; environmental sciences; health administration; human biological sciences; medical, forensic, food and pharmacology sciences; sport and recreation disciplines; humanities; law and justice studies; commerce; economics; education; communication and media studies; and/or rehabilitation therapies;

OR

Australian Bachelor degree or recognised equivalent with significant components in health; social sciences; health sciences; social work and human welfare; behavioural sciences; environmental sciences; health administration; human biological sciences; medical, forensic, food and pharmacology sciences; sport and recreation disciplines; humanities; law and justice studies; commerce; economics; education; communication and media studies; and/or rehabilitation therapies;

AND/OR relevant work experience in the discipline.

**Required Supporting Documents**

(e.g. Portfolio or CV)

Published in Handbook, Coursefinder and UAC

Academic transcript, CV

**Threshold Admission Criteria**

(Threshold GPA; Alternative Criteria e.g. 300 level GPA or work experience)

Non-Published data for admissions assessment only

### English Language Requirements

English language requirements are expressed as an "IELTS or IELTS equivalent" across five categories. Provide IELTS scores against the listed categories. Refer to English Language Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Program Structure

Is the award structured on Specialisations? Yes

### Specialisations

Please provide names of specialisations and indicate those which will be proposed as new specialisations

- Health Law, Ethics and Policy
- Global Health
- Environmental Health
- Health Leadership
- Research (32 cps only)

Please note that you should submit a program structure template for the award showing the general requirements for the award and any specific requirements which all students must complete regardless of specialisation chosen. You must then also complete separate proposals for any new specialisations under the award.

### Requirements

Upload Program Structure template.

Templates are available from here. Refer to Academic Senate Structure Statement: Postgraduate Coursework Programs document

### New Unit Requirements

Will new units be required for the program structure? Yes

If yes, what year will the units be introduced? 2017

### Award Type

Is this a professional named award (accredited award)? No

### Professional Accreditation

(if relevant)

Provide details of the professional body and timeframe

### Articulated/Nested Award Arrangements

(if relevant)

Does this award have Articulated/Nested Award Arrangements? Yes

Identify the suite of nested awards. For example, G CertX/G DipX/MasterX

Grad Certificate (Exit award - at 16cps)
Grad Diploma (Exit award - at 32 cps)

Identify any progression conditions (GPA requirement to articulate from the lesser to the higher
Overview and Aims of the Program

Short introduction to the program and its context, important and distinctive features, and educational aims. Refer to senate.mq.edu.au/apc/resources.html.

The Master of Public Health at Macquarie University provides students with a unique opportunity to gain valuable skills and training in the field of public health. Committed to practice, research and teaching our goal is to train and equip scholars and practitioners with the knowledge and skills needed to prevent disease, promote health, and address health related issues in our globalised world.

The program reflects the multi-disciplinary nature of public health. It is unique in its emphasis upon building essential skills for 21st century practice. The focus is upon training students in a way that is innovative, integrated and outcomes focused with content and experiences that are ‘informative’, ‘formative’ and ‘transformative’.

Students will engage with learning activities designed to meet the core competencies and practice goals expected of a graduate of a Master of Public Health in Australia and internationally. Students will be equipped to work locally, nationally or globally.

Case studies are used across the curriculum to integrate learning modules and experiences showing links between disciplines, skills and competencies in an applied way throughout the core. Experiential learning plays a key role in the core curriculum. In addition, skills based workshops will provide students with requisite skills they need to practice in the field. Such skills include leadership, innovation, teamwork, communication, advocacy, ethics applications, disaster preparedness, health resourcing, and more. At present, no other MPH in Australia is offering such comprehensive skills based training. Research skills are fundamental to public health, and are integrated across units, modules, assessment.

After completing the common core all Master of Public Health students move into an in-depth specialisation; or take electives that will give them a broader general knowledge of public health practice; or undertake a research specialisation.

Students not undertaking the research specialisation have the opportunity to complete a capstone project in which students from different specialisations/professions will work together on a major issue of public health for their capstone project, bringing together their knowledge, skills and specialisations (thus being a truly demanding and inter-professional experience). Students will engage with

1. Problem identification/community analysis/situation analysis (including population health and its contexts; Intervention systems);
2. Selection of targets and identification of target groups;
3. Selection of intervention;
4. Implementation of intervention;
5. Follow-up and evaluation.

Students undertaking the research specialisation instead undertake a year-long research project in the second year of their MPH enabling them to move into research practice or higher level post-graduate research training.

The aim of the Macquarie MPH is to meet the needs of local, national and international and target-market employers, and the demands of students for future public health practice.

The integrated approach to learning, skills training, mapping to national and international standards, sets the MQ MPH apart while maintaining the professional nature and core competencies required of the MPH degree.

Support for Learning

Describe how learners are supported in the program. This might include descriptions of induction, staff expertise or standing, pastoral and academic support, academic advising, resources etc. Refer to senate.mq.edu.au/apc/resources.html.

Macquarie University aspires to be an inclusive and supportive community of learners where all students are given the opportunity to meet their academic and personal goals. The University offers a comprehensive range of free and accessible student support services which include academic advice, counselling and psychological services, advocacy services and welfare advice, careers and employment, disability services and academic skills workshops amongst others. There is also a bulk billing medical service located on campus.

Further information can be found at www.students.mq.edu.au/support

Campus Wellbeing contact details:
Phone: +61 2 9850 7497
Email: campuswellbeing@mq.edu.au
www.students.mq.edu.au/support/health_and_wellbeing/contact_us

Program Standards and Quality

Describe the principal mechanisms by which the standards and quality of provision are maintained, assured and enhanced. Refer to senate.mq.edu.au/apc/resources.html.

The program is subject to an ongoing comprehensive process of quality review in accordance with a pre-determined schedule that complies with the Higher Education Standards Framework. The review is overseen by Macquarie University’s peak academic governance body, the Academic Senate and takes into account feedback received from students, staff and external stakeholders.
### Graduate Destinations and Employability

Describe the career opportunities for graduates of this program. Describe how students are prepared for the world of work, training and/or further study. Refer to senate.mq.edu.au/apc/resources.html.

Graduates of the Macquarie MPH are equipped to work in government, non-governmental organisations, business, public health clinical or community settings, multilateral aid organisations, or other groups concerned with health, human rights, indigenous issues, environmental health, health leadership, and/or development.

Graduates move into a variety of jobs in a variety of sectors, and may focus upon improving people's health; protecting people's health; working with information; teaching and researching; maintaining and raising standards; leadership; planning and management or a variety of such things. Examples of titles held by MPH graduates include (but are not limited to) Public Health Specialist; Head of Public Health Intelligence; Health Partnership Programme Manager; Health Promotion Campaign Manager; Epidemiologist; Health Data Analyst; Project Coordinator; Public Health Advisor; Health Protection Specialist; Public Health Screening Coordinator; Vascular Prevention Programme Coordinator; Health Improvement Practitioner; Public Health Specialist; and Lecturer in Public Health.

Other MPH graduates go on to do further research and/or study, for example continuing into doctoral studies with particular research or professional training focus.

The demand for qualified individuals is increasing, as the ageing public health workforce is retiring, and demand for public health leaders and innovators grows. The Macquarie MPH will equip graduates with knowledge and skills to move into public health practice and/or research with confidence.

### Assessment Regulations

Identify any approved dispensation from the assessment regulations that applicants are likely to need to know about or any special features of the regulations, such as accrediting body requirements. Refer to senate.mq.edu.au/apc/resources.html.

This program is subject to Macquarie University regulations, including but not limited to those specified in the Assessment Policy, Academic Honesty Policy, the Final Examination Policy and relevant University Rules. For all approved University policies, procedures, guidelines and schedules, visit: mq.edu.au/policy/

### Mapping of Program Learning Outcomes to Units

Formal qualifications, RPL (where offered). Refer to senate.mq.edu.au/apc/resources.html. Templates are available from here.

Requirements file has been uploaded. (Uploading another will replace the present one.)

To view the requirements download the file Map FOM PG A PubHea ID232-5.xlsx

### RPL

#### Recognition of Prior Learning

(If relevant)

Describe how the recognition of prior learning will be applied for admission to this program and/or for the granting of credit. Only list that information of specific relevance to this program, information of a more general nature should be provided in the Departmental RPL plan. Refer to senate.mq.edu.au/apc/resources.html.

Macquarie University may recognise prior formal, informal and non-formal learning for the purpose of granting credit towards, or admission into, a program. The recognition of these forms of learning is enabled by the University’s Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) Policy and its associated Procedures and Guidelines. For recognition of prior informal and non-formal learning, please refer to the Departmental RPL Plan, which describes the evidential requirements and approval processes for recognising prior learning for entry or credit in this program.

RPL will not be applied automatically. Students need to elect that they wish to be considered for advanced standing/RPL.

Students may elect to reverse RPL at the end of their first year if they wish to undertake the 32cp Research Project.

#### Relevant Disciplines

Relevant Disciplines indicate that a formal learning experience is completed in a related area of study, also listed as 'cognate'.

Define cognate areas (relevant discipline) of prior studies:

- Health; social sciences; health sciences; social work and human welfare; behavioural sciences; environmental sciences; health administration; human biological sciences; medical, forensic, food and pharmacology sciences; sport and recreation disciplines; humanities; law and justice studies; commerce; economics; education; communication and media studies; and/or rehabilitation therapies.

- e.g. ‘Master of Sustainable Development’ (2015)


#### Relevant Area

Relevant Areas indicate informal learning experiences, such as work or professional experience, which is completed in a related industry or position.

Define relevant areas of prior work or professional experience:

- Health; social sciences; health sciences; social work and human welfare; behavioural sciences; environmental sciences; health administration; human biological sciences; medical, forensic, food and pharmacology sciences; sport and recreation disciplines; humanities; law and justice studies; commerce; economics; education; communication and media studies; and/or rehabilitation therapies.

- e.g. ‘Master of International Communication’ (2015)

Relevant areas defined as: employment or volunteer work including advisory, advocacy, consultancy, representation, analysis, research, management in public service, community, government relations, political and social, international or professional bodies, organisations, institutes or associations.

Experience in Public diplomacy, public relations, public policy, communications policy, communications strategy, media strategy, international relations, media policy, media writing.
## RPL for Entry

Enter conditions for entry (standard program length) into the program of study based on the prior learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Cognate Bachelor (AQF7)</th>
<th>Complete Bachelor degree in any discipline</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognate Bachelor (AQF7)</th>
<th>Complete Bachelor degree in a relevant discipline</th>
<th>Additional requirements: Transcript; CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Automatic Offer GPA &gt;2.5 with no work experience GPA 2.0-2.5 if applicant has relevant work experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to Department Straight Rejection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Delegation to the Admissions Team

Please specify GPA requirements for delegation to and assessment by the Admissions Team.

Alternatively, should you wish to make all entry decisions or feel the program is complex/too difficult for delegation please specify "NO DELEGATION"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Cognate Bachelor (AQF7) + Work Experience</th>
<th>Complete Bachelor degree in any discipline and work experience in a relevant area</th>
<th>Minimum years experience: (No option selected)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Automatic Offer GPA &gt;2.5 with work experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to Department Straight Rejection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Delegation to the Admissions Team

Please specify GPA requirements for delegation to and assessment by the Admissions Team.

Alternatively, should you wish to make all entry decisions or feel the program is complex/too difficult for delegation please specify "NO DELEGATION"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Formal Learning + Work Experience</th>
<th>No studies complete including or higher than a Bachelor degree in any discipline and work experience in a relevant area</th>
<th>Minimum years experience: (No option selected)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Automatic Offer 8+ relevant documented work experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to Department Straight Rejection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## RPL for Credit Recognition
Enter conditions for reduced duration upon entry into the program of study based on the prior learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognate Diploma (AQF5)</td>
<td>Entry with a Diploma in a relevant discipline, Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognate Diploma (AQF6)</td>
<td>Entry with a Diploma in a relevant discipline, Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognate Bachelor (AQF7)</td>
<td>Complete Bachelor degree in a relevant discipline, Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Cognate Bachelor (AQF7) + Work Experience</td>
<td>Complete Bachelor degree in any discipline and work experience in a relevant area, Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognate Bachelor (AQF7) + Work Experience</strong></td>
<td>Complete Bachelor degree in any discipline and work experience in a relevant area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific RPL Applied</strong></td>
<td>Minimum years experience: (No option selected) Years to complete degree (full time study load): 1.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List units of credit/block exempted: In most instances student will be awarded up to 16cps toward the elective set for meeting general program aims of health education. However work experience needs to be assessed as in some (very limited) instances, credit may be applied to core subjects. Remaining credit points to complete degree: Minimum 48cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delegation to the Admissions Team</strong></td>
<td>Please specify GPA requirements for delegation to and assessment by the Admissions Team. Alternatively, should you wish to make all entry decisions or feel the program is complex/too difficult for delegation please specify &quot;NO DELEGATION&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Any Bachelor (AQF7)) + Cognate Honours and/or Graduate Diploma (AQF8)</td>
<td>(Assumed) Complete Bachelor degree in any discipline and Postgraduate study in a relevant discipline equal to or higher than AQF level 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific RPL Applied</strong></td>
<td>Years to complete degree (reduced full time study load): 1.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List units of credit/block exempted: In most instances student will be awarded up to 16cps toward the elective set for meeting general program aims of health education. However further study needs to be assessed as in some (very limited) instances, credit may be applied to core subjects. Remaining credit points to complete degree: Minimum of 48cp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delegation to the Admissions Team</strong></td>
<td>Please specify GPA requirements for delegation to and assessment by the Admissions Team. Alternatively, should you wish to make all entry decisions or feel the program is complex/too difficult for delegation please specify &quot;NO DELEGATION&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Automatic Offer</strong></td>
<td>Refer to Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Straight Rejection</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delegation to the Admissions Team

Please specify GPA requirements for delegation to and assessment by the Admissions Team. Alternatively, should you wish to make all entry decisions or feel the program is complex/too difficult for delegation please specify "NO DELEGATION".
Justification

Market Analysis

Explain how the proposed new award fits with the Faculty’s Learning and Teaching Plan providing specific examples. Demonstrate how this is consistent with the University’s Academic Plan. Refer to http://mq.edu.au/about/strategy/academicplan.html

Domestic Market

The Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences aims to educate students to ‘heal, learn and discover’. The Master of Public Health is a degree reflective of these values and is the first post-graduate program in the new Department of Health Systems and Populations.

The Master of Public Health contributes to the University’s Academic Plan by offering intellectually challenging learning and research opportunities that will empower diverse students to contribute to national and global concerns regarding public health. This encompasses cultural, social and environmental health and well-being.

Students will develop lifelong learning skills and knowledge of ethical practice needed as a professional and member of the global community.

Additionally, the core of the Master of Public Health program mirrors Macquarie’s Academic Plan in its commitment to teaching students the best practices for engaging local, national and international communities and in its emphasis on knowledge and skills relevant to preventing illness and improving health.

International Market (if relevant)

The Master of Public Health is an internationally recognised professional qualification.

The Macquarie MPH will reflect core competency training required across the globe equipping students with knowledge and skills that will translate internationally.

In addition, the Macquarie MPH will be particularly attractive to global students as it offers skills training in leadership, innovation, teamwork, communication, resourcing, and other practical skills necessary for stand out public health leaders and practitioners. Its integrated and innovative approach to teaching and learning will provide international students with an experience and rigorous training needed for them to be the leaders of tomorrow.

(Macquarie International has consulted with people in India, Indonesia, Bangladesh, Vietnam, PNG, Africa, Middle East and China, all who have expressed demand for such a degree).

Macquarie Advantages

If an established need is recognised for the proposed award, explain how Macquarie University provides a desirable or unique opportunity for the successful establishment of the proposed award. Determine in what way your proposal is different from similar awards offered by competitors.

The Macquarie MPH forms part of a broader health enterprise being established via the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences. As such, study at Macquarie will enable students to be part of something that is truly visionary, and is unique in its kind.

While there are many Master of Public Health Programs across Australia, and it is surprising to find a University that does not have one, the Macquarie MPH will be the first of its kind in Australia to offer an innovative and integrated curriculum, allowing students to make connections and develop skills necessary for public health practice in the 21st century. It is also being developed in a way that will meet international competencies and accreditation requirements, which will give our students the added advantage of being confident that their qualification should be recognised globally as being a rigorous and professional public health degree.
### Competitive Offerings

Provide a summary of similar awards offered by Australian and international institutions which could be considered as competition for the proposed award.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>Competitive Offering</th>
<th>Additional information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Western Sydney</td>
<td>Master of Public Health</td>
<td>CORE UNITS – A Global Perspective on Social Determinants of Health Public Health, Policy and Society Introduction to Epidemiology Introduction to Biostatistics 2 years – 16 subjects – 4 core Units; 11 electives; 1 capstone – see <a href="http://logincms.uws.edu">http://logincms.uws.edu</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>Master of Public Health</td>
<td>Standard core subjects (x5); specialisations differ in areas of expertise to Macquarie; offer extended professional practice; no integrated approach to curriculum; no skills training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Queensland</td>
<td>Master of Public Health</td>
<td>Core: 5 subjects (10 units) • Introduction to Environmental Health • Introduction to Epidemiology • Health Systems • Social Perspectives in Population Health • Introduction to Biostatistics Electives: 7 subjects (total 1 units) (from specialisation 12-16 subjects in total 200 point program (2years) = FIVE core subjects and TEN elective subjects and the Capstone Selective POPH90227 Public Health in Practice OR FIVE core subjects, NINE elective subjects and either a Research Project or Professional P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Master of Public Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estimated Student Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Total EFTSU</th>
<th>1st Year of offering</th>
<th>2nd Year of offering</th>
<th>3rd Year of offering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low EFTSU for which award would be run</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of international students expected to enrol in this award: 15
Number of domestic students expected to enrol in this award: 15

### Consultation

**Stakeholder Consultation**

Before the proposal is considered by ASQC, faculties need to have consulted widely with relevant stakeholders and indicate the outcome(s) achieved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultees</th>
<th>Date of consultation</th>
<th>Method of consultation and outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center for Health Economy</td>
<td>27/07/2015 ongoing</td>
<td>Meeting, discussion of MPH, Center for Health Economy wishes to contribute to curriculum development, planning and delivery. Further involvement in MPH Planning day 22/09/2015; ongoing work together on development. Present at meeting was Paul Beggs, Professor Saintilin, Goldstine Taylor and Siciliano. Discussed contribution to core, as well as development of specialisations for program. Environmental science Further involvement in MPH Planning Day - 18/09/2015; Exc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Environmental Science</td>
<td>27/07/2015 - ongoing</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss MPH, ideas about linking with undergraduate health programs as a pathway into MPH; involvement in MPH Planning Workshop; ideas and input concerning integrated curriculum development and cross-faculty collaborations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Sciences; Ross Mackenzie; Melissa Johnson</td>
<td>July 2015 - ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teaching Arrangements: Availability of teaching and support staff

There will be 1x Level D, 2x Level B academics within the department of Health Systems and Populations when the program commences. There will be a project officer working with the department on a full time basis to assist. Many of the specialisation units will continue to be taught across the University by current MQ University staff.

Future staff planning has been accounted for in business case.
Please contact the relevant staff members with:

1. The name and unit code for this unit
2. The link to this webform (http://senate.mq.edu.au/apc/webforms_prog/)

They should already have an account to access the system, but if not, they can contact the Curriculum and Planning team for assistance in creating one (email: curriculum@mq.edu.au).

You can proceed to any other part of this webform, but should only submit for approval when these sections have been completed.

### Library Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Librarian: Mary Simons, Jeremy Cullis</th>
<th>Date: 23/10/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Summary Impact Information

- **Resources:** Major issues: No major issues are identified. One key database (Global Health) will be added to the Library’s wish list. Core textbooks will be purchased: Start-up costs: USD12,032.00 (textbooks and one database: Global Health)
- **ongoing annual costs:** USD10,520.00 (Database renewal)

### Learning and Teaching Centre Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Developer: Panos Vlachopoulos</th>
<th>Date: 21.10.2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Summary Impact Information

- **Resources:** Learning and Teaching support and resources are available for the proposed award through the Faculty liaison Educational Developers and Designers. The Faculty is also supported for tutor induction, training and support in online teaching. Appropriate advice on assessment approaches including moderation and feedback is available. Customized support for the program specific technologies (e.g. an e-portfolio tool, web-conferencing, social media) can also be arranged.
- Summary Impact Information: A comprehensive list of resources and guides are available to all academic staff in the program. These resources can be accessed on the university website: http://staff.mq.edu.au/teaching/
- **services / staffing:** Support staff are able to offer support for program design and development of units, learning design (including resource development), review, implementation and evaluation.

### International

All new awards offered to International Students must comply with the ESOS Act (2000), the National Code of Practice, and have a CRICOS Code. The following provisions are mandatory for CRICOS registration:

- Providers may only offer courses to International students on a full-time basis (Part C.S.7.1)
- International students may take no more than 25 per cent of their course online or by distance education (Part C.S.9)
- International students must be enrolled in at least one face-to-face subject in each compulsory teaching period (Part C.S.9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Time Mode</th>
<th>Will international students be able to undertake the award in full time mode?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Mode</td>
<td>Will students be able to study the proposed award in internal mode for at least 75% each semester?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2 commencements</td>
<td>If the student commences in S2 will the duration of the program of study be extended due to subject unavailability? (e.g., are the core subjects available both S1 and S2 each year?)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Certification

The below section needs to be filled in by a Macquarie International representative prior to submission to your Head of Department.
Please contact the International Compliance Manager (ext 7359; email mi.compliance@mq.edu.au) with the name of this proposal. You can proceed to any other part of this webform, but should only submit for approval when the below sections have been completed.

Please note that CRICOS registration will be obtained after the award is approved at Academic Senate.

Name of MI representative: Helen McConachie  Date: 22/10/2015

Comments
This degree meets the ESOS requirements for international students to be able to choose it as a program of study.

Other

Student Liability Category
Both
Provide a case for CSP category nominations. Cases will be considered by the University.

Arrangements with Other Providers
Other provider arrangements may include partnerships with other institutions, higher education providers, or entities.

Does the program have arrangements with other providers? No

External Benchmarks
State the names (with links) of any external benchmarks that have been applied in the design of this program. Refer to senate.mq.edu.au/apc/resources.html.

AUSTRALIA:
2. Royal Australian College of Physicians, requirements for doctors wishing to enter the advanced fellowship training in public health to become fellows of the college. (Entry to program requires an MPH that meets certain criteria) - See https://members.racp.edu.au/page/racp-faculties/australasian-faculty-of-public-health-medicine; and http://www.racp.edu.au/trainees/advanced-training/apply-to-start-advanced-training.

EUROPE:
1. Agency for Public Health Education Accreditation (APHEA - Europe) Core Competencies for European MPH. (NB APHEA was founded by a consortium composed of the following organisations: Association of Schools of Public Health in the European Region (ASPHER); European Public Health Association (EUPHA); EuroHealthNet; European Public Health Alliance (EUPHA); and the European Health Management Association (EHMA). Using a European benchmark was seen as important as we wish to attract international students who may work globally (including in Europe and beyond). The APEA is particularly concerned with
   • Ensuring greater academic RECOGNITION on the global stage.
   • Promoting TRANSFERABILITY of public health education & training.
   • Increasing EMPLOYABILITY of public health graduates.
   • Attesting the QUALITY of Public Health Workforce training.

UNITED STATES
1. Extensive research, consultation and planning over the past five years has taken place in the United States regarding what public health education should include into the future. The proposed program has been benchmarked against content and pedagogical approach recommended by the Association of Schools and Programs in Public Health (ASPPH) for Master of Public Health degrees in the 21st century. See for further information ‘Framing the Future Report - An MPH for the 21st Century’ (2014), at http://www.aspph.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/MPH1.pdf. Again, the program we have designed has been developed to be closely aligned with accreditation requirements for Master of Public Health degrees offered in the United States to ensure that our students are receiving a comprehensive and global education that will meet global public health needs.

Approvals

Name: Sonia Allan  Ext: 2404  Email: sonia.allan@mq.edu.au  Date: Fri - 4/9/15  Director
Comment: For Faculty Board Approval 07 September 2015; submission to ASQC for 22 September 2015.

Name: Linda Barton  Ext: 5555  Email: linda.barton@mq.edu.au  Date: Mon - 7/9/15  Faculty Board
Comment: Faculty Board met on 7 September 2015 and approved this EOI.

Name: Sonia Allan  Ext: 2404  Email: sonia.allan@mq.edu.au  Date: Fri - 23/10/15  Director
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Supported by the Faculty Board of the Faculty of Medicine and Health Services and recommended for approval by ASQC at a meeting held 2 November 2015
Postgraduate Award Template

AWARD NAME: Master of Public Health

General requirements:
- Minimum number of credit points
- Minimum number of credit points at 600 level: 0
- Minimum number of credit points at 800 level or above: 64
- Completion of other specific minimum requirements as set out below

Specific minimum requirements: Completion of 32 cps of core units and completion of a specialisation (32 cps)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Unit Code</th>
<th>Unit Title</th>
<th>Credit Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>HSYP (new)</td>
<td>Foundations of Public Health</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>HSYP (new)</td>
<td>Quantitative and Qualitative Methods</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>HSYP (new)</td>
<td>Determinants of Health</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>HSYP (new)</td>
<td>Health Law, Governance and Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>HSYP (new)</td>
<td>Disease Prevention and Health Promotion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>HSYP (new)</td>
<td>Understanding Health Systems</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>HSYP (new)</td>
<td>Leadership, Innovation &amp; Teamwork</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AND

Required
- Specialisation: 32
  - Health Law, Ethics and Policy 8*4cp 32
  - Global Health 8*4cp 32
  - Environmental Health 8*4cp 32
  - Health Leadership 8*4cp 32

AND HSYP Public Health Capstone/PACE 4 4

OR

Required
- Research Project 32cp 32
  AND Elective Unit (Level 800) relevant to project 4 4

TOTAL CREDIT POINTS REQUIRED FOR THIS PROGRAM 64

NOTE - Students with 16cp RPL would only be required to complete 16cp (4 units) from the Option Set.
## MQ Graduate Capabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Units</th>
<th>Option Set: Health Law, Ethics and Policy</th>
<th>Option Set: Global Health</th>
<th>Option Set: Environmental Health</th>
<th>Option Set: Health Leadership</th>
<th>Option Set: Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal or social capabilities</strong></td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(K) creative and critical, analytical and integrative thinking</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P) commitment to continuous learning</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) capable of professional and personal judgement and initiative</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J) capable of professional and personal judgement and initiative</td>
<td>➢➢➢</td>
<td>➢➢➢</td>
<td>➢➢➢</td>
<td>➢➢➢</td>
<td>➢➢➢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L) commitment to continuous learning</td>
<td>➢➢➢</td>
<td>➢➢➢</td>
<td>➢➢➢</td>
<td>➢➢➢</td>
<td>➢➢➢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal capabilities</strong></td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(K) creative and critical, analytical and integrative thinking</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P) commitment to continuous learning</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) capable of professional and personal judgement and initiative</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J) capable of professional and personal judgement and initiative</td>
<td>➢➢➢</td>
<td>➢➢➢</td>
<td>➢➢➢</td>
<td>➢➢➢</td>
<td>➢➢➢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L) commitment to continuous learning</td>
<td>➢➢➢</td>
<td>➢➢➢</td>
<td>➢➢➢</td>
<td>➢➢➢</td>
<td>➢➢➢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAPPING OF PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES (PLOs) TO UNITS</strong></td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Units</td>
<td>Required Units</td>
<td>Required Units</td>
<td>Required Units</td>
<td>Required Units</td>
<td>Required Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>defined role and scope of this unit</strong></td>
<td>Foundation of Public Health (4cp)</td>
<td>Foundation of Public Health (4cp)</td>
<td>Foundation of Public Health (4cp)</td>
<td>Foundation of Public Health (4cp)</td>
<td>Foundation of Public Health (4cp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>program learning outcomes (PLOs)</strong></td>
<td>Health Law, Ethics and Policy (5cp)</td>
<td>Global Health (5cp)</td>
<td>Environmental Health (5cp)</td>
<td>Health Leadership (5cp)</td>
<td>Research (5cp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Describe the history and philosophy of public health as well as its core values, concepts, functions, and leadership roles;</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Explain and apply concepts, methods, and tools of public health data analysis, collection and interpretation, and the evidence-based reasoning and informatics approaches essential to public health practice;</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluate and apply population health concepts, and the processes, approaches, and interventions that identify and address the major health-related needs and concerns of populations;</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Critically review biological, environmental, socio-economic, behavioural, cultural, and other factors that impact human health, influence the global and societal burden of disease, and contribute to health disparities;</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Design opportunities for promoting health and preventing diseases across the life span and for enhancing public health preparedness;</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Demonstrate concepts of project implementation and management, including planning, budgeting, resourcing, assessment, and evaluation;</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Compare the characteristics and organisational structures of the national health care system to health care systems in other countries;</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Examine the legal, ethical, economic, and regulatory dimensions of health care and public health policy, the roles, influences, and responsibilities of the different agencies and branches of government, and approaches to developing, evaluating, and advocating for public health policies;</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Construct public health specific communication and social marketing, including technical and professional writing and the use of mass media and electronic technology;</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Reflect on the cultural context of public health issues and respectful engagement with people of different cultures and socioeconomic strata;</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Exhibit and apply principles of effective leadership, teamwork and functioning within and across organisations and as members of interdisciplinary and interprofessional teams;</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
<td>K T P I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contribution to achievement of PLO**

**Contributions to the achievement of a PLO are based on both the relevance of the work in the unit to the PLO and the PLO's weight in the assessment.

**Contribution to the achievement of a PLO is based on both the relevance of the work in the unit to the PLO and the PLO's weight in the assessment.

### Comments

1. It is expected that each unit will be mapped to a subset of PLOs and Graduate Capabilities, not routinely to all.

2. Any pathway through an award must be able to satisfy all PLOs, i.e. if one PLO is met by units in one option set only, all units within the option set must include that mapping.

3. Option sets MAY be omitted if they do not make any unique contribution to PLO coverage.

4. Option sets MAY be omitted if they do not make any unique contribution to PLO coverage.

5. Additional option sets should be added as needed.
ITEM 11.3  RENAMING THE BACHELOR OF E-BUSINESS (ASQC)

This item was considered and recommended for approval by Academic Senate at the Academic Standards and Quality Committee meeting held 17 November 2015 (Refer to Item 12.1).

For approval.

Recommendation:
That Academic Senate resolve to approve the renaming of the Bachelor of e-Business to the Bachelor of Digital Business effective 2017.
ITEM 11.4  EXAMINATIONS REVIEW WORKING GROUP: RECOMMENDATIONS (ASQC)

This item was considered and recommended for approval by Academic Senate at the Academic Standards and Quality Committee meeting held 17 November 2015 (Refer to Item 12.1).

For approval.

Recommendation:
That Academic Senate resolve to approve:

i. amendments to the Ratification of Results Quality Assurance Framework to identify that Faculty Boards should report summaries of results to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee rather than to Academic Senate; and

ii. the use of Pro-Forma D and the timeframe for each Faculty to present the completed form to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee within seven (7) days of the release of student results.
RATIFICATION OF RESULTS: QUALITY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK

The Ratification of Results Quality Assurance Framework underpins the processes and articulates the framework supporting the ratification of results and comprises:

1. Five **Overarching Principles**
2. A set of **Quality Standards**
3. The **Quality Assurance Cycle** with Expected Actions
4. A set of **Supporting Documents** to encourage consistency in the processes (‘plan’) and reporting (‘check’) stages of the Cycle.

The Framework is visually represented in Appendix A.

OVERARCHING PRINCIPLES

The Framework has been developed based on five overarching principles:

- **Fairness**: just and reasonable action in accordance with accepted rules or principles. Procedural fairness requires that all cases be treated in essentially the same way, subject to the same or equivalent scrutiny, and evaluated using the same or equivalent rules and procedures.
- **Transparency**: the open provision of information. Transparency is operating in such a way that it is easy for others to access and examine process, information, discussion and decision making.
- **Objectivity**: the state or quality of being objective, just and unbiased. Objectivity involves informed and unguarded discussion and review.
- **Reliability**: an indication of consistency. Reliability determines the degree to which processes produce consistent outcomes, and perform their intended function, across varying settings. Information and data must be valid to ensure reliability.
- **Continuous Quality Improvement**: an ongoing effort to improve quality. Continuous Quality Improvement involves incremental and/or breakthrough improvement of processes that lead to the achievement of higher levels of quality.

It is expected that these five principles will be recognised and embedded in all aspects of the quality assurance processes in each Faculty.

QUALITY STANDARDS

The six Quality Standards are key elements of the Quality Assurance Framework:

- **Moderated standards-based assessment**: Assessment is standards-based and is subject to moderation, as outlined in the *Moderation Framework*.
- **Moderated grading**: Grading reflects achievement against the approved standards, and these standards observe the broader University policies on grading and assessment. Grading is subject to moderation, as outlined in the *Moderation Framework*.
- **Identification and reporting of quality issues**: Unexpected results and significant issues are identified and reported.
- **Robust discussion of quality issues**: Unexpected results and significant issues are robustly and objectively discussed.
- **Commitment to resolution of quality issues**: Strategies to address unexpected results and significant issues are proposed, and implemented, to promote continuous quality improvement and conclude a cycle of quality enhancement.
- **Transparent and improvement-focussed processes**: Reporting, review, strategy proposals, progress and outcomes are documented.

In developing the Standards for the Framework, ensuring *fairness*, *transparency*, *objectivity* and *reliability* in the processes and reporting, and promoting *continuous quality improvement* in the review and monitoring components are recognised as important.
### QUALITY ASSURANCE CYCLE

The Quality Assurance Cycle is divided into five stages: Plan, Act, Check, Monitor and Improve. These stages do not stand in isolation from one another and, in fact, must feed into each other to promote continuous quality improvement.

Each stage of the Cycle has a set of Expected Actions which support the evaluation and measurement of performance against the Standards, and contribute to continuous improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Expected actions</th>
<th>Supporting documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Plan</strong></td>
<td>1.1. Each Faculty establishes processes to monitor the ratification of results process against the Quality Standards. These should include subprocesses at the unit and department level.</td>
<td>Example process/es to illustrate application of framework within a Faculty, including a statement of function for the various tiers in the ratification of results process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2. Each Faculty evaluates its processes periodically.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Act</strong></td>
<td>2.1. Each Faculty monitors its performance against the Quality Standards, as per the established Faculty processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2. Each Faculty identifies unexpected results or significant issues in relation to the Quality Standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Check</strong></td>
<td>3.1. Each Faculty reports on its performance against the Quality Standards.</td>
<td>Example reporting models/standardised templates to illustrate the type of information, and level of detail, expected at the various tiers in the ratification of results process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2. Each Faculty reports unexpected results or significant issues in relation to the Quality Standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3. Each Faculty initiates a review of its processes and/or units periodically, or in response to identified issues. Where a review of a unit is required, this should feed into the broader <em>Program and Unit Review Cycle</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Monitor</strong></td>
<td>4.1. The Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) will monitor and review processes in accordance with the annual review cycle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Improve</strong></td>
<td>5.1. Where an issue is identified, the Unit Convenor and/or Department will propose strategies to respond to this issue. These proposed strategies are documented and an evaluation of their effectiveness is provided after the next offering. This should feed into the broader <em>Program and Unit Review Cycle</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2. Each Faculty proposes and implements changes to its processes to address identified issues, where relevant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3. Where broad and systemic issues are identified by the Faculty, they will recommend amendments to University rules, policies or frameworks to ASQC for consideration and/or approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTINUOUS QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderate standards-based assessment</th>
<th>Moderated grading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification and reporting of issues</td>
<td>Robust and objective discussion of quality issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to resolution of quality issues</td>
<td>Transparent and improvement-focused processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLAN

IMPROVE

ACT

CHECK

MONITOR

RELIABILITY

OBJECTIVITY

FAIRNESS

TRANSPARENCY
Example Process: Ratification of Results

**Unit Convenor**
- Moderation of assessment practices (ongoing) and final grades (as per Moderation Framework and established Department/Faculty Moderation processes)
- Unit Convenor oversees assignment of marking against approved standards
- Unit Convenor considers performance against Quality Standards
- Unit Convenor documents unit-level performance against Quality Standards via the ‘Unit Summary Report’

**Department**
- Department reviews, robustly and objectively discusses, and minutes the discussion of ‘Unit Summary Reports’ (with reference to the Moderation Framework)
- Head of Department documents department-level performance against the Quality Standards via the ‘Departmental Summary Report’

**Faculty**
- Faculty reviews, robustly and objectively discusses, and minutes the discussion of ‘Departmental Summary Reports’ (with reference to the Moderation Framework) [Unit Summary Reports attached]
- Associate Dean (S&Q), or nominee, documents faculty-level performance against Quality Standards via the ‘Faculty Summary Report’

**Faculty Board**
- Faculty Board considers the ‘Faculty Summary Report’ (Final Grade recommendations and Department Summary Reports attached)
- Do significant issues/proposed strategies trigger changes to a unit/s? NO
- Executive Dean, or nominee, evidences that faculty-established processes have been followed via the ‘Faculty Board Summary Report’ [Report Pro-Forma D: High-level detail]
- Faculty Board ratifies results

**ASQC**
- ASQC notes ratification of results, considers recommended amendments to process, rules or policy, and monitors and reviews processes in accordance with the annual review cycle.

**Resources**
- Function Statement: A
- Report Pro Forma: A
- Function Statement: B
- Report Pro Forma: B
- Report Pro Forma: C
- Report Pro Forma: D
**UNIT SUMMARY REPORT**

**REPORT PRO FORMA A**
Detailed summary of individual unit information. This may include:
- Comment on Unit Convenor Summary Report from previous offering
- Comment on any issues that were previously raised and how these were addressed in the unit's current offering
- Comment on any changes to the unit and how these changes impacted cohort performance (compared with previous offerings)
- Evidence of moderation practices: in setting standards, designing assessment and grading
- Identifying noteworthy or unexpected results or experiences
- Any proposed amendments to unit following experiences/results/evaluation for the given session (and in light of cohort performance)

**DEPARTMENT SUMMARY REPORT**

**REPORT PRO FORMA B**
Medium-level summary of overall departmental information. This may include:
- Report on any ongoing issues
- Update on any outstanding action items from the last Faculty Assessment meeting
- Report on changes to units which significantly impacted cohort performance (compared with previous offerings)
- Evidence of moderation practices: in setting standards, designing assessment and grading
- Report on any issues with units being offered for the first time
- In light of cohort performance, suggest amendments to teaching strategies, units and/or relevant policies or rules of the University
- Report on any issues, points of concern or positive outcomes that the department wishes to highlight

**FACULTY (QUALITY) SUMMARY REPORT**

**REPORT PRO FORMA C**
High-level summary of overall departmental information. This may include:
- Noteworthy issues, such as matters relating to moderation practices, units offered for the first time or significant changes to units which had an impact on cohort performance
- Outlining Departmental quality assurance process
- In light of cohort performance, suggest amendments to teaching strategies, units and/or relevant policies or rules of the University
- Department Summary Reports and/or Minutes attached for information

**FACULTY SUMMARY REPORT**

**REPORT PRO FORMA D**
High-level summary of overall faculty information. This may include:
- Confirmation that a quality assurance process has been established, and followed
- Identification of common/overall themes
- Highlight/extracts from Department Assessment meeting minutes:
  - ongoing issues/outstanding action items
  - Issues/points of concern/positive outcomes
- Suggest amendments to teaching strategies, units and/or relevant policies or rules of the University
- Faculty (Quality) Summary Reports and/or Minutes attached for information

**AUDIENCE**
- **UNIT SUMMARY REPORT**
  - Unit Convenor/s
- **DEPARTMENT SUMMARY REPORT**
  - Faculty
- **FACULTY (QUALITY) SUMMARY REPORT**
  - Faculty Board
- **FACULTY SUMMARY REPORT**
  - ASQC
  - Executive Dean, or nominee
RATIFICATION OF EXAM RESULTS

FACULTY SUMMARY REPORT PRO-FORMA D

To be completed by the Executive Dean, for presentation to ASQC within 7 days of the release of student results under the Ratification of Results Quality Framework.

(This report should be a high-level overview/summary of overall faculty information with a suggested length between 1-2 pages. Detailed information should be kept within the Faculty.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Session of Report:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Quality Assurance Processes:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overview of the Faculty process to monitor the ratification of results against the Quality Standards, including sub-processes at the unit and department level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Confirmation that the results for the session have been ratified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Issues:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• High-level overview of any broad and/or systemic issues identified as part of the Ratification of Results process (this may include positive outcomes if noteworthy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Actions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• High-level overview of any alterations to patterns of results made at any level (e.g. Department/Program Assessment Meeting, FSQC, Faculty Board)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High-level overview of proposed actions/strategies to address issues identified (e.g. changes to teaching strategies in one or more units)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommendations:
- Recommended changes to any University Rules, Policies, and/or Frameworks proposed for consideration by ASQC

## Review of Actions from previous year’s reports (if applicable):
(i.e. for Reports from Sessions 1 and 2 of previous academic year)
- High-level overview/ update on proposed actions/ strategies to address issues identified in the last summary report

## Faculty (Quality) Summary Reports and/or Minutes attached for information:

Authorised by:  
Signature:  
Date:  
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ITEM 11.5  RECOGNITION OF PRIOR LEARNING PROCEDURES (ASQC & SLTC)

This item was considered and endorsed at the Academic Standards and Quality Committee meeting held 17 November 2015 (Refer to Item 12.1) and at the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee meeting held 9 November 2015 (Refer to Item 12.3).

For approval.

Recommendation:
That Academic Senate resolve to approve:

i. the Procedure for assessing RPL;

ii. the proposal to amend the Procedure for Development of International Articulation Agreements; and

iii. the proposal that the RPL Policy be amended to reflect that the granting of unspecified credit for formal learning is not subject to a currency requirement.
ITEM 11.5 RECOGNITION OF PRIOR LEARNING PROCEDURES

Background

Since the implementation of the Recognition of Prior Learning policy a suite of information collateral has been developed. The key reasons shaping the collection of information are AQF compliance, marketability and competitiveness, and enhanced student and staff experience. Key objectives are to develop simple processes, clear information, and agile approval and renewal. To date assessment of RPL has been conducted according to well established processes. The purpose of this paper is to seek approval on the following:

1. A draft Procedure for assessing RPL;
2. a proposal to amend the Procedure for Development of International Articulation Agreements; and
3. a proposal that the RPL Policy be amended to reflect that the granting of unspecified credit for formal learning is not subject to a currency requirement.

Discussion

An update on information collected in RPL schedules was provided to the September meeting of ASQC.

Additional RPL information is recorded in the following registers:
- Credit Transfer Register used to capture unit to unit precedents
- Articulations Register for the purposes of defining credit yields from programs of formal learning. These are either established agreements or identified arrangements.

The attached procedures have been drafted in the context of these registers.

Consultation

The following offices have been consulted:
Student Administration, Macquarie International, MUIC, Student Systems, Policy unit, Governance services, PVC L&T, Chair ASQC, Chair Senate.
Feedback from the November Senate Learning and Teaching Committee included:

- the inclusion of an explicit reference to PACE alongside people and planet in the procedure
- a request for follow up on a process for arranging challenge tests
- although the group in principle endorsed the waiving of currency for unspecified credit some members suggested this required further consideration

No emendations were made after November Academic Standards and Quality Committee. Feedback from MUIC has been incorporated to ensure the language of the procedure is MUIC inclusive.

For approval

Submitted by
Deidre Anderson, Deputy Vice Chancellor (Students and Registrar)

Prepared by
Brad Windon, Executive Officer, Deputy Vice Chancellor (Students and Registrar)
9850 6404
brad.windon@mq.edu.au
Recognition of Prior Learning Assessment Procedure

1 PURPOSE

To outline the responsibilities and actions required for the assessment or reassessment of applications for Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) for the purpose of admission and/or credit transfer.

2 SCOPE

This Procedure applies to staff and coursework students of Macquarie University, and its entities including the Macquarie Graduate School of Management, the Applied Finance Centre and the Macquarie University International College.

3 DEFINITIONS

Commonly defined terms are located in the University Glossary.

Definitions specific to this Procedure are contained in the Recognition of Prior Learning Policy.

4 RESPONSIBILITIES AND REQUIRED ACTIONS

This procedure requires actions by the following:

Students
Student Administration
Macquarie International
Faculty Exemptions Officers and/or Program Directors
Faculty Boards and MUIC Sub-committee of ASQC
Academic Standards & Quality Committee (ASQC)

RPL is administered by Student Administration, and Macquarie International (Academic Programs) on behalf of Faculties and Departments and the Macquarie University International College (MUIC), which authorise the granting of RPL within defined guidelines.

STUDENT/PROSPECTIVE STUDENT

Prospective and current students may apply for Recognition of Prior Learning either:

• as part of an Application for Admission,
• during their candidature, except for programs offered by MUIC, in which case applications must be received prior to enrolment in the unit for which RPL is sought, or
Applicants must supply evidence to support their request for entry or credit as defined in the Recognition of Prior Learning Policy. Evidence of the student’s prior formal, informal or non-formal learning must demonstrate attainment of learning outcomes required for admission to the specified Macquarie program and/or achievement of the specific learning outcomes of the unit(s) for which credit is sought.

Under certain circumstances set out below, applicants may request a reassessment of RPL.

Applicants whose request for assessment or reassessment of RPL is not approved may appeal through the University’s Academic Appeals process.

STUDENT ADMINISTRATION/MACQUARIE INTERNATIONAL

Student Administration or Macquarie International will:

1. Assess the applicant’s request for recognition of prior learning for credit, or for admission to a reduced duration program, based on approved RPL decisions in the following:
   - Unit to unit precedents recorded in the Credit Transfer Register
   - Articulation or credit arrangements recorded in the Articulations Register
   - Approved informal or non-formal learning scenarios outlined in the RPL schedules (Departmental RPL plans).

2. Direct all other credit requests to the Faculty/Department responsible for teaching the unit or program for which admission or credit is being sought. In the case of Foundation programs, credit requests are to be forwarded to the Associate Director MUIC Programs.

3. Direct requests for unspecified credit designated People or Planet units to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC).

4. Ensure the total credit yield adheres to the Schedule of Minimum Requirements

5. Record the outcome of the assessment on the student record and where a precedent is approved record it in relevant registers or schedules.

6. Where a student changes programs, collate the RPL approval(s), and make any necessary adjustments to the allocation unspecified and specified credit within the student’s new program.

7. Notify the student of any RPL granted in the context of their program, and of the reason for requests that have not been approved.

Student Administration or Macquarie International will determine a student’s total eligible credit in accordance with the RPL Policy, Schedule of Equivalencies, and the Schedule of Minimum Requirements, and may grant unspecified credit to exhaust elective requirements.

Reassessment of RPL

The process for Reassessment of RPL is the same as the process for Assessment of RPL.

Students may request Reassessment of RPL in the following circumstances:
1. Student transfers to another course.
2. Student has identified additional prior learning that was not originally assessed.
3. Student wishes to convert previously granted unspecified credit to specified credit.
4. Student has been readmitted to a program after an absence.

**FACULTY/COLLEGE EXEMPTIONS OFFICERS AND/OR PROGRAM DIRECTORS**

Approval of specified credit, including towards People, Planet and PACE units, is by the Faculty/Department that teaches the unit **(including equivalent MUIC Diploma units)**. Approval is by MUIC for all Foundation program units. The appropriate Faculty/Department/College will assess requests for specified credit that:
- are not covered by a precedent in the Credit Transfer Register or
- where the precedent has lapsed

When approving a unit equivalency, the Faculty/Department/College may determine whether the approved equivalency is to be recorded as a precedent and published on the Credit Transfer Register to enable it to be applied to other students requesting the same credit.

Unit to unit equivalencies held in the credit transfer register may be amended by departments that teach the Macquarie unit.

Approval of block credit is by the Faculty/Department/College that teaches the program for which the student is seeking admission or credit. The process of defining block credit requires that the Faculty/Department/College:
1. Consider how the prior learning has contributed to achievement of the program learning outcomes of the Macquarie program.
2. Determine what portion of the Macquarie program is required to allow the student to build upon the prior learning to meet the Macquarie program learning outcomes.

**FACULTY BOARDS/MUIC SUBCOMMITTEE of ASQC**

Faculties/Departments/the College will regularly review RPL information held in the Credit Transfer Register, the Articulation Register and in RPL Schedules (Departmental RPL Plans) so that information is kept current and relevant.

Articulation and credit arrangements held in the articulations register may be amended according to the Articulations and Associated Arrangements procedure.

Amendments and additions to RPL schedules (Departmental RPL Plans) are approved by Faculty Boards.

**ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND QUALITY COMMITTEE**

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee will approve requests seeking unspecified credit designated People or Planet.

Standards for the assessment of Prior Learning are regularly reviewed and monitored by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC).
5 RELEVANT LEGISLATION

ESOS Legislative Framework

ESOS National Code – Part D Standard 12 – Course Credit

Australian Qualifications Framework (2nd edition 2013)

6 KEY RELATED DOCUMENTS

Recognition of Prior Learning Policy

Schedule of Minimum Requirements at Macquarie

Schedule of Equivalencies: Formal Learning for Undergraduate Programs

Development of International Articulation Agreements and Related Arrangements Procedure

Macquarie University Handbook

7 NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.1</th>
<th>Contact Officer</th>
<th>Deputy Registrar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Implementation Officer</td>
<td>Manager, Student Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Approval Authority / Authorities</td>
<td>Academic Standards &amp; Quality Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Date Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Date of Commencement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Date for Review</td>
<td>The standard review period is 3 years. Indicate a shorter review period if required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Documents Superseded by this Procedure</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Amendment History</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1 Contact Officer

Deputy Registrar

7.2 Implementation Officer

Manager, Student Administration

7.3 Approval Authority / Authorities

Academic Standards & Quality Committee

7.4 Date Approved

7.5 Date of Commencement

7.6 Date for Review

The standard review period is 3 years. Indicate a shorter review period if required.

7.7 Documents Superseded by this Procedure

NA

7.8 Amendment History

NA

REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLISHING TO POLICY CENTRAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category [select ONE only]</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audience [select ALL that apply]</td>
<td>Academic staff Professional staff Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL ARTICULATION AND RELATED CREDIT ARRANGEMENTS PROCEDURE

1 PURPOSE

To:

- outline the procedure for developing an International Articulation, Credit Transfer, or Dual Degree or Transnational Arrangement, and
- outline the relevant decision making timelines.

2 SCOPE

This Procedure applies to all coursework Awards offered by Macquarie University. This Procedure governs all Articulation and Credit Agreements of the University.

3 DEFINITIONS

Commonly defined terms are located in the University Glossary. Definitions specific to this Procedure are contained in the accompanying Recognition of Prior Learning Policy.

4 RESPONSIBILITIES AND REQUIRED ACTIONS

This procedure requires actions by the following:

- Proposer of an RPL agreement / Macquarie International Program Convenor / Head of Department
- Faculty Board / Executive Dean
- Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC)
- Student Administration

PROPOSAL

Proposer

Research and identify programs and markets for Formal Credit Transfer, Articulation, or Dual Degree or Transnational Arrangements.

Scope and compile a proposed arrangement in consultation with the Program Convenor and relevant stakeholders. If the Program Convenor is the proposer in a specific instance, consultation with identified stakeholders will still occur.

Develop the proposed arrangement in accordance with the RPL Policy’s preference for defined entry points enabling block credit. Consider holistically a comparison of the staged program level learning outcomes (when available) between the proposed courses. Where necessary, submission and approval of individual unit equivalencies will follow the standard RPL procedure for unit assessment using the online system or be approved by the Program Convener as appropriate.
Prepare required evidence in accordance with the RPL Policy through the Articulation Agreements and Related Arrangements Template.

Submit the completed online form with supporting evidence to the Program Convener / Head of Department or nominee of Executive Dean.

**APPROVAL**

Program Convener / Head of Department or nominee of Executive Dean

Credit and articulation Credit Transfer, Articulation or Dual Degree Arrangements are to be approved in accordance with the principles contained in the Higher Education Standards Framework, Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) Pathways Policy, and Macquarie Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) Policy.

Decision makers should as a priority assess the prior learning at the program level through the use of program level learning outcomes for the purpose of granting Block Credit. Decision making should be timely, efficient, auditable and be based on maximising the Credit available to students.

Decision makers should take steps to ensure that students are equipped to succeed in the remainder of their Macquarie Program of Study and the academic integrity of the program is not compromised.

The Program Convener / Head of Department should consider the proposed arrangement’s alignment with these principles and within five working days of receiving the proposal:

- recommend the proposal to the Faculty Board, or
- defer the proposal and request further information, or
- reject the proposal.

If recommended, the Program Convener / Head of Department should indicate this on the online form and send the proposal to the Chair of the Faculty Board. This will be circulated to the Board for approval.

Proposals may also be referred to the Executive Dean for review in cases where agreement cannot be reached between Program Convenors / Head of Department and Proposers.

**Faculty Board or Dean or delegate by Executive action**

Assess the proposal and within five working days of receiving the proposal:

- approves, or
- defers decision-making pending further information, or
- does not approve.

**ASQC or delegated working group or Chair by Executive action**

Consider and approve or not approve within five working days of receiving the proposal, formal Credit credit Transfer arrangements that are outside the Schedule of Equivalencies: Formal Learning for Undergraduate Programs or include People, Planet or PACE exemptions.

Consider and approve or not approve Dual Degree Arrangements.

The decision is recorded on the online system and the Proposer, Program Convener and Executive Dean are informed immediately by an email from the Chair of the ASQC or delegate, of the result.
COMMUNICATION

The Proposer, if not from Macquarie International or the Student Administration, will advise Macquarie International and the Student Administration of the approved arrangement and any details required to ensure the proper administration of the arrangement, including integration into admission processes and inclusion on the University’s Articulations Register.

MONITORING

Macquarie International and/or Student Administration (if as applicable), in conjunction with Faculties and Departments, monitor and report student progression/attainment (via GPA) to Faculty Boards at the end of the study period.

Make student progression reports available to ASQC for annual review.

Program Convenor

Identify curriculum change and commence review of the arrangement when applicable.

Rework the entry point or conduct curriculum mapping if required.

ASQC

Periodical review of arrangements triggered when curriculum changes occur in addition to standard 3 year ASQC review cycle.

Partner Institutions

According to the terms of the agreement, partner institutions will advise Macquarie International and/or the Registrar’s Office of any curriculum changes which have a bearing on established Formal Credit Transfer, Articulation, Dual Degree, or Transnational Arrangements.

Macquarie International and/or the Registrar’s Office will advise Program Convenors of the changes which will activate the internal review process.

5 RELEVANT LEGISLATION

6 KEY RELATED DOCUMENTS

Recognition of Prior Learning Policy

International Articulation Agreements and Related Arrangements (Standard Requests) Template

7 NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<tbody>
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<td>7.2 Implementation Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Date Approved</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 Date of Commencement</td>
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<td>January 2016</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
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<td>7.8</td>
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ITEM 11.6 DISRUPTION TO STUDIES POLICY SUITE (SLTC)

This item was considered and recommended for approval by the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee at its meeting held 9 November 2015 (Refer to Item 12.3).

For approval.

Recommendation:
That Academic Senate resolve to approve the:
   i. Disruption to Studies Policy;
   ii. Disruption to Studies Procedure;
   iii. Disruption to Studies Outcome Schedule; and
   iv. the Professional Authority Form.
DISRUPTION TO STUDIES POLICY

1 PURPOSE

This policy governs the processes that enable students to notify the University of a disruption to studies and the basis and mechanisms through which the University will provide support in such situations when assessable activities are affected.

2 BACKGROUND

The University is committed to equity and fairness in all aspects of its learning and teaching. It recognises that students may experience disruptions that adversely affect their academic performance in assessment activities. To assist students through their studies, the University provides support services. Whilst advice and recommendations may be made to a student, it is ultimately the student’s responsibility to access these services as appropriate.

This Policy applies only to serious and unavoidable disruptions that arise after a study period has commenced, and where an assessment has been affected. Such disruptions commonly result from events that are personal, social or domestic in nature and may include illness (either physical or psychological), accident, injury, societal demands (such as jury service), bereavement, family breakdown or unexpected changes in employment situations.

Students with a pre-existing disability/health condition or prolonged adverse circumstances may be eligible for ongoing assistance and support. Such support is governed by other policies and may be sought and coordinated through Campus Wellbeing and Support Services.

3 SCOPE

This Policy will be relevant to:

- undergraduate Macquarie University International College students,
- Undergraduate and postgraduate coursework students;
- Higher Degree Research students
- staff involved in teaching, assessing or managing units of study at the University; and
- Student Administration and Campus Wellbeing and Support Services staff.

4 DEFINITIONS

Commonly defined terms are located in the University Glossary. The following definitions apply for the purpose of this Policy:

**Event critical study period**: Intense academic phase during the study session characterised by the lead-up to or culmination of key academic work.
Evidence: documentation outlined in the Disruption to Studies Supporting Evidence Schedule that demonstrates the severity and impact of a disruption to study.

Fit to Sit: being fit to sit an examination or test, or otherwise submit an assessment.

Professional Authority Form (PAF): a form to document evidence of medical related disruptions (physical or psychological).

Special consideration: Consideration: the provision of an additional opportunity for a student to demonstrate that they have met the learning outcomes of a unit or units, or the award of a Withdrawal Without Academic Penalty should this not be feasible.

Serious and Unavoidable Disruption:

The University classifies a disruption as serious and unavoidable if it:

- could not have reasonably been anticipated, avoided or guarded against by the student; and
- was beyond the student's control; and
- caused substantial disruption to the student’s capacity for effective study and/or completion of required work; and
- occurred during an event critical study period and was at least three (3) consecutive days duration, and / or
- prevented completion of a final examination.

5 POLICY STATEMENT

In order to support students who have experienced serious and unavoidable disruption, the University will attempt to provide affected students with an additional opportunity to demonstrate that they have met the learning outcomes of a unit.

An additional opportunity provided under such circumstances is referred to as Special Consideration. Special Consideration will be granted after careful evaluation of evidence supporting a notification for disruption to studies.

In some circumstances, Withdrawal without Academic Penalty will be considered in place of an additional opportunity. This will be due to the inability to organise an alternative assessment activity, or due to the length of time that has passed since the event has occurred. If a period of more than 18 months has passed since the end of the final examination period for the affected units, then no Special Consideration will be applied.

FIT TO SIT MODEL

Macquarie University operates under a ‘Fit to Sit’ model. This means that in sitting an exam and/or in-class test or otherwise submitting an assessment, a student declares themselves fit to do so. Therefore, if a student is feeling unfit to sit the exam or test, or otherwise submit the assessment (as the case may be), they should not do so. If a student sits an exam or test, or otherwise submits an assessment, knowing that they are unfit to do so, they will not be granted Special Consideration.
It is the responsibility of the student to determine whether they are fit to sit an examination or test or otherwise submit an assessment, or whether a Disruption to Studies claim should be submitted for non-participation.

A student’s sitting an examination or test or otherwise submitting an assessment will not preclude the student from being granted Special Consideration if the student can demonstrate that:

- they were unfit to make reasonable judgement on their fitness to undertake the assessment, due to mental illness or other exceptional circumstances;
- they were taken ill during the assessment (in the case of an examination or test); or
- other exceptional circumstances beyond their control vitiated the Fit to Sit declaration.

DISRUPTION TO STUDIES NOTIFICATION

It is a student’s responsibility to notify the University of their circumstances. All students of the University have the right to provide notification of a disruption to studies that has affected an assessment.

A student may notify the University of a disruption to their studies regardless of whether the disruption meets the serious and unavoidable criteria.

To be eligible for Special Consideration, a student must notify the University of a serious and unavoidable disruption within no later than five (5) working days of the commencement of the disruption (Disruption to Studies notification). All Disruption to Studies notifications are to be made online via the University’s Ask MQ system and must include supporting documentary evidence. Notifications of Disruptions to Studies after 5 days will still be assessed, however they are more likely to have a remedy of Withdrawal without Academic Penalty applied if they are deemed serious and unavoidable.

Students who have sat a final examination are not eligible to be granted Special Consideration unless they notified the University of the disruption prior to, or during, the examination. However, the student will not be ineligible for Special Consideration on this basis if the student can demonstrate that such notification was not reasonably practicable in the circumstances (e.g. because the student could not have reasonably understood the effect of the disruption during the examination). If this is the case, this evidence would be assessed for Special Consideration or Withdrawal without Academic Penalty.

DECISION PROCESS

The determination of whether a disruption is regarded by the University as being serious and unavoidable is a decision made at the Administrative level according to a pre-approved set of criteria described in the Disruption to Studies Supporting Evidence Schedule of this Policy.

Academic performance is not a consideration for the determination of whether a disruption is classified as Serious and Unavoidable.

The evaluation of how a serious and unavoidable disruption relates to an assessment task, which is or was to be undertaken during the period of that disruption, and the determination of appropriate Special Consideration, are Academic decisions.
Where a disruption is considered to be severe, Withdrawal without Academic Penalty will be considered as a remedy to be recommended by the Academic. This final determination to grant a Withdrawal Without Academic Penalty is made at an Administrative level to ensure that all reasonable effort has been made to find a solution through the application of an assessment remedy.

If the award of a W grade is determined to be the most appropriate remedy for a student, the student will also then be independently assessed for Withdrawal Without Financial Penalty in accordance with the Higher Education Support Act. (2003)

A disruption arising from requirements placed upon a student by a PACE unit is governed by the Participation Activity (Disruption) Procedure.

EVIDENCE

A Disruption to Studies notification must be supported by documentary evidence.

The evidence must:

- identify the disruption;
- include dates and/or the length of the disruption;
- explain the severity and impact of the disruption and if related to a pre-existing condition outline that the condition has deteriorated/worsened; and
- clearly describe how the disruption has adversely affected the student’s capacity for effective study to which an assessment relates.

The University’s Professional Authority Form (PAF) is the only form of documentary evidence for notifications pertaining to a medical disruption (physical or psychological). The PAF must be completed by an appropriate professional authority as specified in the Disruption to Studies Supporting Evidence Schedule.

Notifications pertaining to non-medical disruptions must be supported by appropriate documentary evidence as specified in the Disruption to Studies Supporting Evidence Schedule.

All documentary evidence must be submitted electronically within five (5) working days of submitting the Disruption to Studies notification.

The University reserves the right to request and retain the originals of supporting documentation and will conduct regular audits of supporting documentation submitted electronically.

Requests for original documentation will be sent to the applicant’s University email address within six (6) months of notification by the student.

Students must retain all original documentation for the duration of this six (6) month period and must supply original documents to the University within ten (10) working days of such a request being made.

All documentation (in hardcopy or electronic form) relating to a Disruption to Studies notification will be treated in accordance with the University’s Privacy Framework.
The student has the right to withdraw their Disruption to Studies notification up to the point where the determination of whether it is serious and unavoidable has been made. After this determination, the student may not withdraw the Disruption to Studies Notification and must either submit themselves to partake in the assessment activities organised by the Unit Convenor/Program Manager, or accept the ‘W’ status for the unit.

**SPECIAL CONSIDERATION**

Subject to the considerations listed above, Unit Convenors must grant appropriate Special Consideration in all cases where the University has found that a disruption is serious and unavoidable.

In cases where a disruption is found not to be serious and unavoidable, a Unit Convenor/Program Manager may still exercise discretion in granting Special Consideration. The conditions and processes that apply to the granting of this discretionary Special Consideration must be specified in the Unit Guide for the unit of study in question.

The nature of the Special Consideration granted will be determined by each Unit Convenor/Program Manager on a case-by-case basis in accordance with the Disruption to Studies Outcomes Schedule to this Policy.

For each assessment task affected by a Disruption event, there will be a limit of one extra assessable task or remedy applied. If a further event affects the student’s ability to partake in this assessment activity, the student will need to proceed with the grading of the task or submit a further Disruption notification which would be normally be assessed for a Withdrawal without Academic Penalty outcome.

Where Special Consideration is granted in the form of a supplementary examination, the initial examination affected by the disruption will not be marked. The grade of the supplementary examination will be upheld.

In submitting a Disruption to Studies Notification, the student is acknowledging that they may be required to undertake additional work. The time and date, deadline or format of any required extra assessable work as a result of a Disruption to Studies Notification is not negotiable.

In submitting a Disruption to Studies Notification, the student is agreeing to make themselves available so that they can complete any extra work as required. No more than one alternate assessment will be offered to a student in each affected unit, so it is important that the student makes themselves available for the alternative assessment activity.

Where a Withdrawal without Academic Penalty is granted as a result of a Disruption to Studies notification, remission or reversal of the relevant debt will be considered and assessed.

**INTERNATIONAL STUDENT VISA HOLDERS**

Where there is a variation in the student's enrolment load which may affect the student's expected duration of study, the University must act in accordance to Standard 9 of the National Code.
APPEALS

A student may appeal an adverse outcome to a Disruption to Studies notification in accordance with the Academic Appeals Policy and Grade Appeal Policy.

COMPLIANCE AND BREACHES

The University may commence applicable disciplinary procedures if a person to whom this Policy applies breaches this Policy (or any of its related Procedures).

6 RELEVANT LEGISLATION

- Higher Education Support Act (HESA), 2003 (Cwlth)
- The Administrative Information for Higher Education Providers: Student Support (AIP), 2015 (Cwlth)
- The Education Services for Overseas Students (ESOS) Act, 2000, amended 2010, (Cwlth)
- The National Code of Practice for Registration Authorities and Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students

7 KEY RELATED DOCUMENTS

- Academic Appeals Policy
- Disruption to Studies Procedure
- Disruption to Studies Supporting Evidence Schedule
- Disruption to Studies Outcomes Schedule
- Final Examination Policy
- Grade Appeal Policy
- PACE: Managing Other Commitments Procedure
- Participation Activity (Disruption) Procedure
- Privacy Framework
- Professional Authority Form (PAF)
- Disruption to Studies Website
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DISRUPTION TO STUDIES PROCEDURE

1 PURPOSE

To enable students to notify the University when they experience a disruption to their studies and identify the basis and mechanisms through which the University will provide support in accordance with the Disruption to Studies Policy.

2 SCOPE

This Procedure will be relevant to:

- Macquarie University International College students
- undergraduate and postgraduate coursework students;
- Higher Degree research students
- staff involved in teaching, assessing or managing units of study at the University; and
- Student Administration and Campus Wellbeing and Support Services staff.

3 DEFINITIONS

Commonly defined terms are located in the University Glossary. Definitions specific to this Procedure are contained in the accompanying Policy.

4 RESPONSIBILITIES AND REQUIRED ACTIONS

This Procedure requires actions by the following:

- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar)
- Executive Dean/ MUIC Director
- Director, Campus Wellbeing
- Student
- Student Administration Manager
- Unit Convenor/program Manager
- Student Administration Officer (Lifecycle)
- Commonwealth Supported Students Officer
- Manager Pathways and Special Programs COE

DVC STUDENTS AND REGISTRAR

Ensure all services, requirements, timelines and associated systems are available to students and staff.

EXECUTIVE DEAN/MUIC DIRECTOR

Ensure that clear details about Disruption to Studies Policy and Disruption to Studies Notifications are provided in Unit Guides and that the Unit Guides comply with the Unit Guide Policy.
Ensure arrangements are made for any subsequent examinations, assessments, marking and grading.

**DIRECTOR CAMPUS WELLBEING**

Ensure that appropriate support services are made available to students who require support. These services include the provision of a *Professional Authority Form* if necessary as evidence for the disruption.

Provide a referral service to staff assessing Disruption to Studies Notifications in instances where uncertainty exists on the impact of the disruption on the student.

**STUDENT**

All students have the right to advise the University of a disruption to study. If the student determines that a disruption event has affected an assessable activity, a Disruption to Studies Notification may be submitted.

Submit the Disruption to Studies Notification within five (5) working days of the commencement of the assessment task date or due date.

Students who undertake assessments do so on the basis that they are declaring themselves “Fit to Sit”. As a result, students who have already undertaken the assessment task will need to demonstrate that they were unaware of the disruption, Disruption to Studies’ impact on their ability to perform the task in their evidence, that they were taken ill during the assessment (in the case of an examination or test), or that other exceptional circumstances beyond their control vitiated the Fit to Sit declaration.

**Notification**

The Disruption to Studies Notification must be completed by the student and submitted online through [www.ask.mq.edu.au](http://www.ask.mq.edu.au). If the student is in a situation that requires a proxy to submit it on their behalf, this will be taken into account on submission of appropriate evidence as detailed below.

**Validity**

Include all supporting documentary evidence as listed in the *Disruption to Studies: Supporting Evidence Schedule* relevant to the disruption event(s). Supporting documentation must be submitted within five (5) working days at the time of submitting the Disruption to Studies Notification.

Determination of whether the disruption meets the Serious and Unavoidable criteria will commence once supporting documentation has been supplied.

**Withdrawal of notice of disruption**

The student may withdraw their Disruption to Studies Notification up to the point where the determination of whether it is Serious and Unavoidable has been made. After this determination, the student may not withdraw the Disruption to Studies Notification and must submit themselves to partake in the assessment activities organised by the Unit Convenor, or accept the ‘W’ status for the unit.

**Disruptions relating to medical circumstances**

Where the particular circumstances pertaining to the disruption are medical in nature, a completed *Professional Authority Form* is required to be submitted with the Disruption to Studies Notification. Medical certificates will not be accepted as supporting documentation.
A *Professional Authority Form* can be completed by any Professional Authority listed in the *Disruption to Studies: Supporting Evidence Schedule* relevant to the disruption event. Details of the actual medical condition are not required to be included. Staff in Campus Wellbeing and Support Services are available for professional guidance on medical circumstances related to a disruption event or to the completion of a *Professional Authority Form*.

The University may contact the Registered Health Professional or their practice to verify the authenticity of any *Professional Authority Form* or other supporting information provided or to obtain further information from the Registered Health Professional regarding the impact of the medical condition on the student’s ability to complete the assessment task and/or final examination.

**Prior conditions**
Conditions existing prior to commencing a unit of study are covered by other policies, except in the event of deterioration or exacerbation of the condition. The student is responsible for managing their workload in light of any known or anticipated problems. Students with a pre-existing disability/health condition may contact Campus Wellbeing and Support Services for information on available support.

**Disruptions relating to non-medical circumstances**
Where the particular circumstances pertaining to the disruption to studies are non-medical in nature, appropriate supporting evidence indicating the severity (serious / not serious) and impact of the circumstances must be included with the Disruption to Studies Notification as set out in the *Disruption to Studies: Supporting Evidence Schedule*. Details of the actual circumstances are not required to be included if the supporting evidence provides the severity impact of the circumstances.

**Assessment remedy**

**Academic Performance**
Academic performance is not a consideration for the determination of whether a disruption is classified as

In submitting a Disruption to Studies notification, students are agreeing to make themselves available for additional assessment activities when Fit to Sit. If they do not believe they are Fit to Sit, submitted evidence must support this. If an alternate assessment cannot be arranged after a determination of whether a disruption is classified as Serious and Unavoidable disruption.

In submitting a Disruption to Studies Notification, the student is acknowledging that they may be required to undertake additional work. The has been made, then a Withdrawal Without Academic Penalty will be granted. Students are not able to negotiate the time and, date, deadline or format of any required extra assessable work as a result of a Disruption to Studies Notification is not negotiable.

In submitting a Disruption to Studies Notification, the student is agreeing to make themself available so that they can complete any extra work as required.

The student will-The student will be a limit of one additional assessment task arranged for the student in relation to any assessment task for an affected unit.

**Validation of evidence**
Requests for original documentation will be sent to the student’s University email address within six (6) months of notification by the student. Students must retain all original documentation submitted regarding the disruption, and must understand that this may be requested by the University at any time. In the duration of this event, students will be provided six (6) month period and must supply original documents to the University within ten (10 business) working days to submit the original documentation of such a request being made.

**FACULTY STUDENT ADMINISTRATION MANAGER** *(Faculty, MUIC or DVC (S&R))*

Ensure all Disruption to Studies Notifications are kept secure and confidential.

Allow only those staff who are involved in processing Disruption to Studies Notifications to have access to the student’s notification.

No student, with the exception of staff members who are undertaking their normal duties and also enrolled in the University as a student, is to have access to any other student’s documentation at any point throughout the Disruption to Studies determination process.

Arrange for all Disruption to Studies Notifications to be considered.

Note that the determination of Disruption to Studies Notifications is dependent on the validity of the submission.

Arrange for Disruption to Studies Notifications to be processed so that it is possible to ascertain the status of an application at any point.

Ensure appropriate and timely consultation is undertaken and recorded by the administrative staff member.

The judgment of the professional authority who completed the *Professional Authority Form* cannot be questioned. If evidence exists that the information provided is not legitimate in some way, the matter is to be referred to **Manager Student Grievances and Discipline Manager, Governance Services**.

Ensure prior requests for Special Consideration or Disruption to Studies Notifications are not taken into account in the determination of a current Disruption to Studies Notification.

Notify the student of the outcome of the determination within five (5) working days of receipt of the Notification with supporting evidence by the **Faculty University**.

Correspondence to the student will be electronic – either via the web and/or via the student’s official email address.

The outcomes of a Disruption to Studies Notification will be one of the following:

- Notification considered but no additional assessable work required assessed as not serious and unavoidable (Disruption is not Serious and Unavoidable—*Noted*)
- Notification considered with the student being required to undertake additional assessable work (eg A supplementary examination) (Disruption is Serious and Unavoidable)
- Notification considered and Withdrawal without Academic Penalty granted (i.e. 'W' status for the unit) *(Disruption is Serious and Unavoidable)*
- Application is invalid *(Invalid)*

Ensure that Unit Convenors are aware of the timeframe that is appropriate to the individual Disruption for scheduling in further assessment activity.

**UNIT CONVENOR/PROGRAM MANAGER OR DELEGATE**

Refer to the *Disruption to Studies: Outcomes Schedule* to determine the appropriate Special Consideration Outcome to be provided to assess learning outcomes for their unit where a Disruption to Studies Notification has been deemed to be serious and unavoidable.

Consider any duration recommendations from Faculty, MUIC or DVC(S&R) Student Administration Officer in order to ensure the assessment is no longer impacted by the Disruption event.

Record the Special Consideration arrangements provided to the student in accordance with the systems and processes used to manage the student interaction by Faculty / MUIC Student Administration to ensure all parties have access to the appropriate information to give to the student.

If an alternative assessment activity cannot be arranged for the student, then Withdrawal without Academic Penalty can be recommended.

Ordinarily, an alternative assessment activity should be the first consideration for the applicant within session (from the commencement of classes to the final supplementary examination.) After this time, the UC would ordinarily be recommending with Withdrawal without Academic Penalty.

**STUDENT ADMINISTRATION OFFICER (LIFECYCLE)**

If outcome of Disruption to Studies notification is Withdrawal without Academic Penalty, withdraw the student from the unit under consideration within the student system. Amend the student record for the relevant unit to status *W* (withdrawn).

Refer the student request to the Commonwealth Supported Students Team for consideration of Withdrawal without Financial Penalty.

**COMMONWEALTH SUPPORTED STUDENTS OFFICER**

**Application for Withdrawal Without Financial Penalty**

1. Receive and log the application according to University procedures.
2. Ensure that the application is complete and that it includes satisfactory supporting documentation/evidence. Due to HESA requirements, this may involve the provision of further documentation than has been previously provided.
3. Where an application is incomplete inform the student and request additional information as necessary. The claim may be rejected at this point if satisfactory evidence cannot be provided.
4. Determine whether the circumstances outlined by the student and the evidence are consistent with the Guidelines for Applying for Remission/Refund in Special
Circumstances for the purpose of withdrawal without financial liability in accordance with the relevant legislation, (Higher Education Support Act)

5. If the application is approved according to legislation and/or University policy, process the application to effectively remove the debt. For any upfront payments approved for reversal of debt or refund, forward the application to the Office of Revenue Services for processing. Advise the student of the outcome.

6. If the application is denied according to legislation and/or University policy, inform the student explaining why it was unsuccessful. Outline any pathway for appeal.

Withdrawal Without Financial Penalty is governed by the Higher Education Support Act, and the decision making process is independent of the Serious and Unavoidable decision criteria for Academic Penalty. So it should be noted that it is possible for students to receive a W grade as an outcome of the Disruptions to Studies process, but not be successful in a Withdrawal Without Financial Penalty decision.

MANAGER, PATHWAYS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS, COE

Non-award Students
Determine whether special circumstances exist, process application and advise the student of the outcome of their application for withdrawal without financial penalty.

5 RELEVANT LEGISLATION

Higher Education Support Act (HESA), 2003 (Cwlth)
The Administrative Information for Higher Education Providers: Student Support (AIP), 2015 (Cwlth)
The Education Services for Overseas Students (ESOS) Act, 2000, amended 2010, (Cwlth) The National Code of Practice for Registration Authorities and Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students

6 KEY RELATED DOCUMENTS

- Final Examination Policy
- Grade Appeal Policy
- Unit Guide Policy
- Privacy Framework
- Disruption to Studies Policy/ Supporting Evidence Schedule /Outcomes Schedule
- Professional Authority Form (PAF)
- Macquarie International Refund Policy
- Guidelines for Applying for Remission/Refund in Special Circumstances (found at the website below: http://www.mq.edu.au/study/postgraduate/fees_and_costs/remission_and_re-crediting_of_fees/

7 NOTES

| 7.1 | Contact Officer | Manager, Student Connect
|     |                 | Head Student
|     | Implementation Officer | Manager, Student Connect
|     |                       | Lifecycle Manager
|     |                       | Faculty Student Administration Managers

7.1 Contact Officer

Manager, Student Connect
Head Student

7.2 Implementation Officer

Manager, Student Connect
Lifecycle Manager
Faculty Student Administration Managers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Approval Authority / Authorities</td>
<td>Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Date Approved</td>
<td>10 March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Date of Commencement</td>
<td>10 March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Date for Review</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Documents Superseded by this Procedure</td>
<td>Withdrawal without Penalty (Coursework) Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Amendment History</td>
<td>July 2015  – alignment with new Policy Framework template; updated position titles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Disruption to Studies Procedure Flowchart – Draft 9 Dec 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STUDENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DtS: Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAMPUS WELLBEING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DtS: Supporting Evidence Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ask.mq.edu.au</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STUDENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DtS: Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>UNIT CONVENOR</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESOURCES**

- DtS: Website
- DtS: Supporting Evidence Schedule
- ask.mq.edu.au

**ACTIONS**

1. Disruption event affects an assessable activity
2. Gather required ‘evidence’
3. Obtain Professional Authority Form if disruption is of a medical nature
4. Notify University of Disruption Event through ask.mq.edu.au and submit all required ‘evidence’ within 5 days of the assessment task date or due date
5. Does the ‘notified disruption’ meet ‘Serious and Unavoidable’ criteria?
6. Was the assessable task a final examination or in-class test?
7. Did the student sit for the final examination / in-class test (ie they were ‘fit-to-sit’)?
8. Student seeks to Appeal?
9. Arranged ‘appropriate’ additional opportunity (refer Outcomes Schedule)

**RESPONSIBILITIES**

- STUDENT
- CAMPUS WELLBEING
- STUDENT
## DISRUPTION TO STUDIES OUTCOMES SCHEDULE

### 1 PURPOSE

To detail the Special Consideration outcomes that can be granted to a disruption to study that has met the criteria set out in the Disruption to Studies Policy.

### 2 SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result of Disruption</th>
<th>Type of Assessment</th>
<th>Type of Disruption</th>
<th>Possible Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absence</td>
<td>Marked Attendance: lecture, tutorial, on-campus session, field trip, practicum</td>
<td>Serious and unavoidable</td>
<td>Waiving of attendance requirement; <strong>Withdrawal without Academic Penalty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Otherwise</td>
<td>As specified in unit guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence</td>
<td>Graded Participation: tutorial, class, lecture</td>
<td>Serious and unavoidable</td>
<td>Provision of an additional assessment task; <strong>Withdrawal without Academic Penalty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Otherwise</td>
<td>As specified in the unit guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence</td>
<td>In class assessment: tutorial, class, lecture</td>
<td>Serious and unavoidable</td>
<td>Provision of an additional assessment task; <strong>Withdrawal without Academic Penalty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Otherwise</td>
<td>As specified in the unit guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence</td>
<td>Final Examination</td>
<td>Serious and unavoidable</td>
<td>Provision of an additional assessment task; supplementary exam; <strong>Withdrawal without Academic Penalty</strong>; Sit exam next available session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Otherwise</td>
<td>No special consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination performance affected</td>
<td>Final Examination</td>
<td>Serious and unavoidable</td>
<td>Provision of an additional assessment task; supplementary exam; <strong>Withdrawal without Academic Penalty</strong>; Sit exam next available session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Otherwise</td>
<td>No special consideration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preparation affected**

<p>| Assessment (other than final examination): tutorial, class test, lecture, examination, other assessment task | Serious and unavoidable | <strong>Extension of time to complete an assessment task; Provision of an additional assessment task; Withdrawal without Academic Penalty; partake in assessment task next available session</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation affected</th>
<th>Final Examination</th>
<th>Serious and unavoidable</th>
<th>Provision of an additional assessment task; supplementary exam; Withdrawal without Academic Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late submission of assessment item</td>
<td>Assessment (other than final examination)</td>
<td>Serious and unavoidable</td>
<td>Extension of time to complete an assessment task; provision of an additional assessment task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing impact on performance</td>
<td>Assessment (other than final examination)</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>Extension of time to complete an assessment task; provision of an additional assessment task; Recommendation to Withdraw Withdrawal without Academic Penalty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3 NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1 Contact Officer</th>
<th>Chair, Senate Learning and Teaching Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Implementation Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Approval Authority / Authorities</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Date Approved</td>
<td>Academic Senate 12 November 2013 and University Council 5 December 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Date of Commencement</td>
<td>3 March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Date for Review</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Documents Superseded by this Schedule</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 Amendment History</td>
<td>July 2015 – alignment with new Policy Framework template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9 Policy Authorisation</td>
<td>Disruption to Studies <a href="#">Policy</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROFESSIONAL AUTHORITY FORM

ALL FIELDS MUST BE COMPLETED BY A REGISTERED HEALTH PROFESSIONAL
OR PROFESSIONAL WITHIN MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS WELLBEING AND SUPPORT SERVICES

1. INSTRUCTIONS TO THE PROFESSIONAL AUTHORITY PROVIDING DOCUMENTATION

We appreciate your help in providing information regarding the student’s health condition(s). The information that you provide will enable the University to determine the impact of the disruption on the student’s ability to meet academic assessment requirements. Within the limits of confidentiality, this form and/or certificate, must describe the nature and impact of the student’s problem so that an assessment of the possible effects on academic performance can be made.

2. PERSONAL DETAILS OF STUDENT

Student number:  
Family Name:  
Other Names:

3. CONSULTATION

Date of Consultation:  
Period of effect on ability to study

From:  
To:

NOTE: For chronic health conditions complete this form only if there has been an unpredictable exacerbation of symptoms that have adversely impacted the student’s academic performance.

Nature of condition: Please provide a plain English description of any restrictions on the student’s academic functioning, details of the medical diagnosis are NOT required:

___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________

Impact of condition: By signing or stamping below, you are indicating that in your professional opinion there was a likely impact due to the health condition(s) on the student’s ability to attend class, learn, retain or complete assessment requirements by indicating below.

It is my belief that this student’s ability to perform their duties of an academic nature was adversely affected by their condition during the time period noted above.

Signature of Professional Authority:  
Name and Title:  
Provider or Registration Number:  
Phone Number:  
Stamp of Professional Authority

The University collects the personal information from the student identified above to enable their request for special consideration to be considered. Personal information held by the University is subject to the Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998. Where the information collected includes health information as defined under the Health Records and Information Privacy Act 2002, references to personal information in this notice will be taken to also apply to health information. The University may disclose the personal information provided on this form to other University staff involved in the processing and assessment of the request for special consideration. The University will not otherwise disclose the information unless it has the student’s consent or such disclosure is permitted or required by law. The provision of personal information is voluntary, but if a student does not provide the information requested, the University may be unable to process their request. Students who wish to access or inquire about the handling of their personal information may do so by contacting the University Privacy Officer by email at privacyofficer@mq.edu.au.

STUDENTS MUST UPLOAD THIS PAF TO ASK.MQ.EDU.AU AS PART OF THEIR APPLICATION

A successful application may result in an additional assessment task.
ITEM 11.7  MASTER OF RESEARCH EXAMINATION PROCESS FOR 2015 COHORT (HDRC)

This item was considered and recommended for approval by Academic Senate by the Higher Degree Research Committee at its meeting held 4 December 2015 (Refer to Item 12.2).

For approval.

Recommendation:
That Academic Senate approve the proposed examination process for the MRes for 2015 as an interim arrangement subject to the outcome of the external review of the MRes.
Request to Review of 2015 MRes Thesis Examination Process

Issue
The Academic Senate Standing Committee (ASSC) met on 21st September 2015 to consider and determine the actions required to address appeal upheld by the Higher Degrees Research Appeals Committee. As part of its deliberations, the ASSC passed the following resolution in regard to the conduct of the MRes examination process for 2015:

The Committee (ASSC) resolved to request HDRC to provide a report demonstrating how its MRes examinations provisions for 2015 address the findings of the HDRAC, as detailed in its report of cases 40973484 and 42497981.

The ASSC requested that the HDRC review the protocols it has established for the examination of MRes thesis in 2015 to ensure that they address the procedural unfairness identified in the HDRAC appeal reports of cases 40973484 and 42497981. It was determined, that this review also examine the extent to which these examination protocols meet the examination standards established by the Australian Council of Graduate Research in its “Australian Graduate Research, Good Practice Principles” document:

http://media.wix.com/ugd/f39714_e846281b7f0d40528463846bbaa86377.pdf

Action
1. The ASSC asked the HDRC to examine how:

   1. The process used to moderate the reports and marks recommended by examiners and to determine a final mark. In particular, it should demonstrate how the 2015 process would ensure that well-informed and independent academic judgement, of appropriate discipline expert(s), is applied to resolving disputes between examiner reports.

   2. Whether the examination process adequately addresses standards 6.2, 6.5 and 6.6 of the “Australian Graduate Research, Good Practice Principles” these being:

      - 6.2 The University has clear and transparent procedures for the nomination and appointment of examiners, the identification of inappropriate examiners, a timely examination process, the evaluation of examiners’ reports, and mechanisms for appeal.

      - 6.5 Examiners provide written recommendations to the University on whether or not the thesis meets the award criteria.

      - 6.6 The University’s processes for the (sic) determining the outcome of the examination process are available to candidates, supervisors, examiners, and others, and include the opportunity for written communication between the candidate and committees involved with determining the examination outcome.

2. The ASSC also asked HDRC to address the following specific recommendations and to provide guidance on the extent to which they can be implemented for the 2015 MRes thesis examination round:

   1) All references to the averaging of marks should be elided from the materials sent to students, staff and examiners,

   2) All examiners views and marks should be moderated through the vehicle of an expert discipline / Faculty level appraisal of examination reports,

   3) That all examiners should be provided with comprehensive instructions, consisting of a marking rubric, a more detailed description / benchmarking of expected standards, a clearer explanation of the structure and duration of the research project component of the MRes, and information about the way that marks will be used in the awarding of PhD places and scholarships.

On 26 November 2015 the response from the HDRC was reviewed in a workshop facilitated by Philip Pogson, involving members of the Program and Examination Sub-Committee of HDRC, members of the Higher Degrees Research Appeals Committee, the Director of the Higher Degrees Research Office and the Head of Governance Services. It was noted that an external review was scheduled of the MRes in 2016. There was unanimous agreement from all in attendance that, with the addition of a Director of Research from an independent Department, the proposed approach to the examination of theses of the 2015 MRes cohort addressed the concerns raised by the HDRAC. It was determined that this approach be recommended to Academic Senate for approval for the 2015 cohort, pending the outcome of the external review of the MRes.
At its meeting on the 4th December 2015, the HDRC resolved (HDRC 15/641) to recommend the following procedure for MRes examination for 2015:

**Step 1:** When two examiner reports are received, they are forwarded to Faculty Associate Dean/ HDR, except in cases where at least one examiner recommends Revise and Resubmit. In these cases, the thesis is sent to a third examiner, and then all three reports are provided to the Supervisor for Step 3.

**Step 2.** The AD/HDR consults with the Supervisor and Department MRes Director or Advisor, to decide whether a result can be determined based on two examiner reports, or if there is the need to go to a third examiner. If decision is made to determine result immediately, then the AD/HDR recommends a percentage grade and brief report to PESC, which makes a final recommendation to HDRC: (process ends).

If No, a third external examiner is sent the thesis.

3. When third examiner report is received, all reports are sent to the AD/HDR, who asks for a written report from the Supervisor. The AD/HDR, the Department MRes Director or Advisor, an independent Department MRes Director or Advisor from another Faculty and another researcher in a cognate discipline (but outside the department) recommend a grade, taking into consideration all reports, that is then signed off by the Head of Department and presented at PESC for a final recommendation to HDRC (process ends).

The process suggested above responds directly to the request made by the ASSC for moderation via an expert discipline / Faculty level appraisal of examination reports (point 2.2 above)


When this form was designed, ACGR members were canvassed about the processes their universities adopted to exclude unsuitable examiners. Most universities simply rely on the judgement of supervisors; some provide the candidate the opportunity to provide a list of unsuitable examiners, while some like Macquarie (in its HDR examination) require the candidate to see a long list of examiners that they must approve. There was significant feedback from faculties that adopting this latter approach in the MRes would take time and make it easier for potential examiners to be excluded, when examiners were already hard to find, so the decision was made to adopt the second option. Therefore the NOE form specifies “Candidates must be given the opportunity to provide names of those who they do not want to be examiners.”

In relation to 6.5 and 6.6, the university has always required written reports from examiners; it has also consistently communicated the examination process to candidates, both directly and through FAQ’s. If the approach suggested above is adopted, it will be communicated to candidates. Candidates will also receive information about appeals, and that in the first instance, they can ask PESC to review their grade, and receive written feedback.

As the MRes theses for 2015 have already been submitted and are currently under examination, it is not possible to change the information sent to candidates or examiners.

As the body charged with the examination of research theses, HDRC regularly reviews the documents sent out to examiners and candidates. These documents have already been subject of circulation and consultation around the university, and all the issues mentioned in 3 have been considered in some detail. The documents sent to examiners in 2015 contain revisions of the information sent out in 2014.

In its annual review of the examination process in February, HDRC will review the documents sent to examiners, and consult with the faculties about whether further or different information should be provided.

**Recommendation**

That the approach to the MRes examination procedure proposed by HDRC be approved by Academic Senate for the 2015 cohort, pending the external review of the MRes.

**Consultation**

Professor Julie Fitness Chair, HDRAC
A/Professor Chris Bauman, member HDRAC
A/Professor Brian Atwell, member HDRAC
Dr Alison Holland, member HDRAC
Professor Lorne Cummings, member PESC
Submitted by: Professor Nick Mansfield, Dean Higher Degree Research

For enquiries contact: Jennifer Martin, jennifer.martin@mq.edu.au or ext 7663.
ITEM 11.8 AMENDMENTS TO HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH RULES (HDRC)

This item was considered and recommended for approval by Academic Senate by the Higher Degree Research Committee at its meeting held 4 December 2015 (Refer to Item 12.2).

For approval.

Recommendation:
That Academic Senate resolves to recommend to University Council the amendments to Part 14: Discontinuation and Exclusion of the Higher Research Degree Rules.
Proposed Changes to the Higher Degree Research (HDR) Rules
14. Discontinuation and Exclusion

Issue
The Business Process Improvement project for HDR Terminations and Appeals was initiated by project sponsors Professor Nick Mansfield (Dean, Higher Degree Research), Dr Ren Yi (Director, Higher Degree Research Office) and Professor Dominic Verity (Chair, Academic Senate).

The objective of the project is to provide the University with a timely and consistent HDR termination and appeals process with clear and distinct stages so that decisions of the HDR appeals are appropriate, transparent and fair.

The scope of the project is from when the HDR candidate is asked to show cause to the outcome of the HDR review.

Further details on this Business Improvement Project are available at: http://www.mq.edu.au/about_us/offices_and_units/strategic_planning_and_information/strategicinitiatives/business_process_improvement/projects/hdr_terminations_and_appeals/

The Rapid Improvement Event took place in August 2015. The recommendation from the Rapid Improvement Event was to replace the terminology of ‘show cause’. This term implies that the termination step is inevitable for the candidate if they don’t provide adequate reasons for their candidature to continue, rather than being an intervention into identified candidature progress issues where termination may be one potential outcome; and there is a great deal of confusion over what “show cause” means.

Candidates are asked to “show cause” when they have not made satisfactory progress relative to the time of enrolment in a higher degree research degree. The Project Team and Sponsors proposed that in the situation where the supervisor feels that a candidate is not making satisfactory progress, they are both invited to a Formal Review. The Terms of Reference of the Formal Review panel specify that the task of the Formal Review panel is to decide if the candidate is making satisfactory progress, relative to the time of enrolment and if the candidate can complete the degree in the remaining period of candidature. One possible outcome of the Formal Review is a recommendation that the candidature be terminated.

Since August, the project team has met regularly, working on key major tasks including the supervisor toolkit to assist reviewing student’s progress and deciding on the whether formal review is required or another intervention is more appropriate, the associated procedural templates for the formal review by the Faculty (e.g. Terms of Reference for the review panel, meeting minute templates etc.), online formal review form, repository for associated documentation, online appeal lodgment form and the team is working with Governance Services to improve the HDR and MRes appeals procedures in line with the University-wide improvement of the appeals policy and associated procedures.

For the specific action item of updating the HDR and MRes Termination of Candidature Procedure on Policy Central to reflect to procedure name of ‘formal review’ and ensure the procedure is consistent with the project team’s improvements, changes to the Higher Degree Research Rules 14. Discontinuation and Exclusion are required.

Action
The proposed rule changes have been discussed at the Business Improvement project team meetings, with the project’s sponsors and escalated to the Higher Degree Research Committee for discussion and recommendation.

The below proposed rule changes were presented to the Higher Degree Research Committee meetings on the 13 November and 4 December 2015. The Committee Resolved (HDRC 15/642) that the suggested changes below be recommended to Academic Senate for discussion and recommendation to Macquarie University Council for approval.

Proposed changes to Higher Degree Research Rules
14. Discontinuation and exclusion

(1) If a candidate discontinues studies:
(a) the candidate is required to apply for readmission; and
(b) the Executive Dean of the Faculty in which the candidate seeks to register, or if applicable the Dean of the MGSM, is to determine the application and may specify conditions for enrolment.

(2) The Executive Dean of the Faculty, or applicable the Dean of the MGSM may form the opinion that the candidate’s progress is unsatisfactory and must:
(a) advise the candidate of the reasons; and
(b) invite the candidate to a Formal Review of progress to show cause why candidature should not be terminated.
The outcome of the Formal Review A show cause submission received from a candidate under rule 14(2):

(a) is to be considered by the Executive Dean of the Faculty, or if applicable the Dean of the MGSM or by a committee of the Faculty or the MGSM; and

(b) the Executive Dean of the Faculty, or if applicable the Dean of the MGSM, may recommend that confirm the termination of candidature or permit the candidate to remain re-enrol and enrolled and may impose conditions upon such re-enrolment continuing enrolment.

If a candidate does not show cause or the Executive Dean of the Faculty, or if applicable the Dean of the MGSM recommends confirms the termination of candidature:

(a) the Executive Dean of the Faculty, or if applicable the Dean of the MGSM, is to report accordingly to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research); and

(b) the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) is to advise the candidate of termination including the reasons for such a decision.

A candidate advised of the termination of their candidature under rule 14(34) may appeal to the Committee. The Committee may dismiss the appeal or permit the candidate to re-enrol and may impose conditions upon such re-enrolment.

6) The partner university will be advised of steps relating to termination of candidature in regards to a candidate enrolled in a Joint Research degree

Recommendation
That the proposed changes to the Higher Degree Research Rules 14. Discontinuation and exclusion be discussed by Academic Senate and recommended for approval by Macquarie University Council at its next available meeting.

Consultation
Associate Professor Judi Homewood, Associate Dean Higher Degree Research Faculty of Human Sciences and BPI HDR Terminations and Appeals Project team member
Business Process Improvement Project HDR Terminations and Appeals project team
Higher Degree Research Committee

Submitted by: Professor Nick Mansfield, Dean Higher Degree Research and BPI HDR Terminations and Appeals Project Sponsor

For enquiries contact: Jennifer Martin, jennifer.martin@mq.edu.au or ext 7663.
ITEM 11.9  APPROVAL TO PROCEED: REVIEW OF HDR SUPERVISION POLICY (HDRC)

This item was considered and recommended for approval by Academic Senate by the Higher Degree Research Committee at its meeting held 13 November 2015 (Refer to Item 12.2).

For approval.

Recommendation: That Academic Senate approves the review of the Higher Degree Research Supervision Policy.
### APPROVAL TO PROCEED CHECKLIST

#### Policy Cycle Stage 1

Complete this checklist and send to the relevant Approval Authority and the **Policy Unit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Policy Document(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HDR Supervision Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date the Policy Document(s) need to come into force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Identify any Policy Document(s) or supporting documentation that may also need development or review as a result of this proposal**

   

3. MQSR fields in database
   
4. Supervision Enhancement Strategy information to participants

**Summarise the reasons why a new Policy Document or an amendment to an existing document/s is required.** [Refer to: Attachment 1 When is a Policy document required? and Policy Cycle Stage 1 Tip Sheet]

1. The HDR Supervision Procedure is noted for review February 2016

2. As part of the review it is proposed to review those sections of the policy that exclude Adjunct Supervisors and Co-Supervisors from being entered in the MQSR. An anomaly currently exists where Adjunct and Co-Supervisors are required to complete the “Initial SEP” and “Update SEP” requirements, but completion and maintenance is not recorded anywhere.

3. Lack of facility to be included in the MQSR works against the inclusion and ongoing CPD of Co-Supervisors. This has important consequences in an environment of employment contracts of less than 3 years duration, and the MQ capacity to draw on the expertise of, and continually develop, those early in their Supervisory careers.

4. Lack of facility to be included in the MQSR mediates against the inclusion, ongoing CPD, and tracking of the involvement of external supervisors (Adjunct Supervisors) in HDR supervision at MQ.

5. The proposed changes to policy will subsequently mean that the MQSR would need to be updated. New fields would be added and defined (Co-Supervisor, Adjunct Supervisor). These
fields would be displayed when a search is done of the data-base, so that the approved status of the supervisor was clear in a search result.

6. The policy also needs general revision to be inclusive of changes to the scope of HDR supervision (such as the introduction of MRes) since its last revision.

7. The policy and procedure need to be revised together to ensure consistency across both

---

**Indicate who has already been consulted on this proposal** (e.g. Committee Chairs; Policy Unit; the MQ Compliance Coordinator; etc.). [Refer to Policy Cycle Stage 1 Tip Sheet]

Professor Nick Mansfield, Dean Higher Degree Research

**Using the Criteria for Consequence Matrix (Attachment 2), indicate the potential risk rating and context of not having this policy document / not undertaking the amendments.**

*Rating:* Insignificant / Minor / Medium / Major / Severe

*Context:* Reputation / Academic Matters / Legal & Compliance / Financial / HSE / Infrastructure

Add other relevant information:
The aim of the Dean Higher Degree Research to professionalise HDR Supervision for all appointment categories is enabled by the proposed Policy revision.

[Refer to Policy Cycle Tips Stage 1 and Stage 2 to complete this section]

**Recommended Implementation Officer:**
Associate Professor Merilyn Childs, Convenor SEP

**Recommended Policy Writer:**
Associate Professor Merilyn Childs

**Recommended Policy Project Team:**
Professor Nick Mansfield
Associate Professor Merilyn Childs
Two Associate Deans HDR (TBA)
Dr Juliet Lum, Head, HDR Learning Skills
Richard Lee, HDR Management Coordinator (Data and Systems)

**Submitted by:**

Proposer Name: Professor Nick Mansfield  
Position: Dean Higher Degree Research  
Ext / Email: nick.mansfield@mq.edu.au

---

**Approval to proceed:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval Authority*</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Policy Cycle Toolkit:  [mq.edu.au/policy](http://mq.edu.au/policy)
* The Approval Authority/ies refers to the position/s authorised in the Delegations of Authority Register to approve Policy Documents in a particular functional area. Where the application of a Policy Document has a significant impact on more than one functional area, co-approvers may be required. If unsure of the appropriate Approval Authority/ies, please contact the Policy Unit.

Return to the Proposer Named above with a copy to Policy Unit
ATTACHMENT 1: WHEN IS A POLICY DOCUMENT REQUIRED?

University policy documents express intent, aspirations, and expectations, and may articulate specific requirements to assist or direct decision-making. They provide a connection between organisational strategy and frameworks, external legislation and standards, and day-to-day operations, to indicate how specific activity is expected to be undertaken.

Policy documents include policies, codes, schedules, procedures, and associated instructions and workflows. A policy document will be required when:

- legislation \(^{(1)}\) dictates that the University must have a policy and directs the specific stance that the University must adopt in relation to the matter/s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Required policies</th>
<th>Specific provisions that must be included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Public Interest Disclosures Act 1994              | Public authorities must have “an internal reporting policy and procedures in place for receiving, assessing and dealing with public interest disclosures.” | “This policy must have regard to the NSW Ombudsman’s model policy and guidelines.”  

- legislation \(^{(1)}\) dictates that the University must respond to a particular matter but leaves open the manner in which it is enacted/implemented. The University determines that it is appropriate to acknowledge the legislation by framing the University’s approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Examples of University response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection (Working with Children) Act NSW</td>
<td>Children at Macquarie Policy and Procedure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) standards | Recognition of Prior Learning Policy  
  Senate Statement on Postgraduate Curriculum                                                   |
| Poisons and Therapeutic Goods Act 1966 (NSW)     | Storage and Use of Drugs of Addiction used in Research Procedure                           |

- the University resolves to make a binding statement to direct actions and behaviours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Examples of University response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct</td>
<td>Code of Conduct for Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Honesty Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptable Use Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental concerns</td>
<td>Sustainability Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) Legislation includes Acts, By-Laws, Regulations, determinations as well as Standards and Codes that are aligned with these.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insignificant</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Severe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reputation</strong></td>
<td>Student disaffected; Authority notes concern</td>
<td>Authorities formally seek clarification; Student Groups register separate concerns; MQ student body media traffic; Localised social media traffic</td>
<td>Authorities and Government register strong concerns and threaten investigation; State based media; Social media traffic (mainly spurious); Multiple Student Groups voice concerns; Prominent Academic resigns</td>
<td>Targeted enquiry and investigation by Authorities / Gov; Aust Wide press interest; Short term spike in adverse social media traffic; Widespread disaffected Student Community; Faculty Dean or DVC resign; Loss of standing within the Research Funding Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Matters</strong></td>
<td>Minor course development or introduced postponed</td>
<td>Course development or introduction delayed</td>
<td>Loss of external accreditation of course; Load sharing to support signature courses and or research; Research projects not progressed; New courses not developed or introduced; Ability to seek new research opportunities are limited</td>
<td>Suspension of/conditional Provider Status; Partial closure of Dept; Suspension of viable/signature course; Material breach of Research grants / conditions; Limitations on research opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal and Compliance</strong></td>
<td>Technical non-compliance</td>
<td>Regulator enquiry; Minor legal issues and, or breach of regulation</td>
<td>Regulator issues warning; Fine and legal costs up to $15M; Major litigation; Class Action;</td>
<td>Regulatory sanction resulting in suspension of license and or conditions on accreditation; Fine and legal costs up to $50M; Major litigation; Class Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial</strong></td>
<td>Cash loss of &lt;50K Cost/loss able to consumed in the current budget</td>
<td>Funds are reallocated to continue initiatives; Cash loss of 50K -1M</td>
<td>Non- major initiatives are reallocated to the following financial year; Cash loss of 1M-15M</td>
<td>Additional cost which limits strategic projects/initiatives exceed budget and OFS provisions; funds are diverted to support critical activities only; Cash loss 15 - 50M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HSE</strong></td>
<td>First aid incident; Minor reversible impact to low significance environmental location</td>
<td>Hospitalisation of person; Short term reversible impact on environment</td>
<td>Serious personal injury / moderate irreversible disability/impairment; Significant localized impact to environment</td>
<td>Single death and disability; Long term damage to the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Teaching facilities are unable to be occupied at the allocated time; Small no of users impacted by IT systems being temporarily unavailable</td>
<td>Parts of a building within the Uni is unable to be occupied for prolonged period (greater than 1mth during teaching semester); IT Systems do not operate efficiently eroding performance</td>
<td>One building within the Uni is unable to be occupied for prolonged period (greater than 1mth during teaching semester); IT Systems do not operate efficiently eroding performance</td>
<td>More than one building within the Uni are unable to be occupied for prolonged period (greater than 1mth during teaching semester); Temporary loss of one or more Faculty / Dept data; Critical IT Systems unable to be recovered to support operations for up to 1mth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM 11.10  PROPOSALS FOR JOINT PHD PROGRAMS (HDRC)

Refer to the Higher Degree Research Committee Report to Academic Senate on 6 October 2015 (Item 11.3).  Link to agenda.

Recommendation:
That Academic Senate approves the establishment of Joint PhD Programs with the:
   i.  University of Toronto;
   ii. Pierre and Marie Curie University; and
   iii. Radboud University Nijmegen Netherlands.
ITEM 11.11  AMENDMENTS TO ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS – BPHIL/MRES (HDRC)

Refer to the Higher Degree Research Committee Report to Academic Senate on 6 October 2015 (Item 11.3). Link to agenda.

Recommendation:
That Academic Senate approves the amendments to the admission requirements for the BPhil/MRes in the Department of Philosophy to be increased to a GPA of 3.0 overall and 3.25 in 300 level or equivalent.
ITEM 12.1 ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND QUALITY COMMITTEE

Attached is the report of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee meeting held 17 November 2015.

Refer to Items 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, 11.4 and 11.5.

For noting.
1. Amendment to Recognition of Prior Learning Schedule of Minimum Requirements

The ASQC proposed an amendment to the Recognition of Prior Learning Schedule of Minimum Requirements to allow greater flexibility for cognate double/dual degree Award types.

**RESOLUTION**

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee resolved to recommend that Academic Senate approve the following amendment to the Schedule of Minimum Requirements at Macquarie University:

> “The minimum requirements for all other coursework postgraduate Award types will be approved on a case-by-case basis and recorded in this schedule as an exception. The minimum requirements for all double degree Award types will be approved on a case-by-case basis and recorded in this schedule as an exception. In all cases, where a postgraduate Award has a Capstone or Professional-Practice requirement, the student must complete this requirement at Macquarie University. In all cases, the student must complete a majority at least 50% of the 800 and/or 900 level units of the Award at Macquarie University. To ensure this, the student’s minimum requirements of the Award at Macquarie University must consist of units at 800 and/or 900 level.”

2. RPL Schedule Of Minimum Requirements - Master of Advanced Conference Interpreting

**RESOLUTION**

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee resolved to recommend that Academic Senate approve an exception to the RPL Schedule of Minimum Requirements at Macquarie to allow students who have completed one of the Macquarie masters level 9 Translating & Interpreting (T&I) awards (under which they will have completed either 40, 48 or 64 credit points of T&I units at 800 level or above), to be exempt from the requirement to study 32 credit points to gain the award Master of Advanced Conference Interpreting.

3. Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences: Approval of a New Postgraduate Award 2017 - Master of Public Health (MPH)

**RESOLUTION**

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee resolved to recommend that Academic Senate approve an exception to the RPL Schedule of Minimum Requirements at Macquarie to allow students who have completed one of the Macquarie masters level 9 Translating & Interpreting (T&I) awards (under which they will have completed either 40, 48 or 64 credit points of T&I units at 800 level or above), to be exempt from the requirement to study 32 credit points to gain the award Master of Advanced Conference Interpreting.

4. Faculty of Science and Engineering - Renaming the Bachelor of e-Business to the Bachelor of Digital Business

**RESOLUTION**

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee resolved to recommend that Academic Senate approve renaming the Bachelor of e-Business to the Bachelor of Digital Business effective 2017.

5. Report from the Examinations Review Working Group

**RESOLUTION**

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee resolved to recommend that Academic Senate approve:

i. amendments to the Ratification of Results Quality Assurance Framework to identify that Faculty Boards should report summaries of results to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee rather than to Academic Senate; and

ii. the use of Pro-Forma D and the timeframe for each Faculty to present the completed form to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee within seven (7) days of the release of student results.

6. Appeal (Sn 42853729)

**RESOLUTION**

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee resolved to recommend that Academic Senate invoke the Saving Clause to allow student (Sn 42853729) to qualify for the Bachelor of Speech and Hearing Sciences without meeting the planet requirements, provided that all other course requirements are met.

**ITEMS FOR NOTING**

7. Changes to Course Transfer Schedule for Session 1, 2016

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee approved amendments to the Session 1 2016 undergraduate course transfer schedule, for the following:

- Bachelor of Arts with Bachelor of Education (Primary)
- Bachelor of Arts – Psychology with Bachelor of Education (Primary)
- Bachelor of Laws
- Bachelor of Business Leadership and Commerce
8. Late changes to the 2015 Schedule of Programs, Majors or Specialisations

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee noted that the Chair, ASQC (under delegated authority) on 6 November 2015 approved the request by the Centre for Open Education for session 3, 2015 availabilities for Non-Award Courses.

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee approved late changes to the 2015 Schedule of Programs, Majors or Specialisations for the following:

- Master of Creative Media
- Bachelor of Security Studies

9. Late changes to the 2016 Schedule of Programs, Majors or Specialisations

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee noted that the following late changes to the 2016 Schedule of Programs, Majors or Specialisations were approved by the Chair of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee under delegated authority following the 20 October 2015 ASQC meeting:

- OUA Availabilities to be made active in 2016
- MQC Foundation units for deletion in 2016

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee approved late changes to the 2016 Schedule of Programs, Majors or Specialisations for the following:

- Co-teaching of ECH216 Infancy and Early Development and ECHE118 Infancy and Early Development
- Bachelor of Philosophy/Master of Research (Arts) and Master of Research (Arts);
- Master of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism/Master of International Security Studies; Master of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism; and Master of International Security Studies;
- Business Valuation (BVA21S) and Retirement Outcomes (REO21S) specialisations

10. Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences – Master of Public Health Specialisations

The Committee considered proposed specialisations as part of the Master of Public Health to commence in 2017, and noted that a new prefix HSYP (Health Systems and Populations) had been created for new units in the specialisations.

(i) That following approval of the academic case of the Master of Public Health (MPH) by Academic Senate, the Academic Standards and Quality Committee approve (by the Chair under delegated authority) the following specialisations in the Master of Public Health program effective 2017:

- Research Specialisation;
- Health Leadership Specialisation;
- Health Law, Ethics and Policy Specialisation;
- Global Health Specialisation; and
- Environmental Health Specialisation.

(ii) The Academic Standards and Quality Committee approved the new prefix HSYP (Health Systems and Populations) effective 2017.

11. Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences; Expression of Interest - Doctor of Medicine

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee assigned critical friends to assist the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences with the next program development and proposal stage of the Doctor of Medicine (MD) to commence in Session 2, 2017.

12. Faculty of Science and Engineering: New Major in Chemical and Biomolecular Sciences; Deletion of Biomolecular Sciences Major and Deletion of Chemistry Major

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee approved, effective 2017:

- the establishment of the new major in Chemical and Biomolecular Sciences;
- the deletion of the Biomolecular Sciences major; and
- the deletion of the Chemistry major.

13. Faculty of Science and Engineering – New Major in Cybersecurity

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee approved the new major in Cybersecurity effective 2017.

14. Faculty of Arts – Expressions of Interest
The Academic Standards and Quality Committee assigned critical friends to assist the Faculty of Arts with the next program development and proposal stage for the following:

- Master of Planning
- Master of Creative Industries with the degree of Master of Future Journalism
- Master of Criminology
- Master of Development Studies and Global Health with the degree of Master of Policy and Applied Social Research
- Master of International Communication with the degree of Master of International Public Diplomacy
- Master of International Relations with the degree of Master of International Law
- Bachelor of Media
- Bachelor of Security Studies with the degree of Bachelor of Laws (Honours)

15. **TEQSA Registration Renewal Submission (November 2015)**

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee endorsed the following list of proposed documents to be submitted as evidence of the TEQSA Core Assessment requirements:

- Section 2.1: Planning and Performance (Document 2.1.6);
- Section 2.1: Planning and Performance (Document 2.1.31 and Document 2.1.38);
- Section 3.3: Sample Program – B Engineering (Document 3.3.15); (Documents 3.3.21 to 3.3.23);
- Section 3.4: Student Outcomes (Document 3.4.2);
- Section 4.1: Student Experience and Support (Documents 4.1.1 to 4.1.36);
- Section 4.1: Grievances (Documents 4.1.37 to 4.1.44).

16. **Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) Procedures**

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee endorsed the draft Recognition of Prior Learning Assessment Procedure and the Development of Articulation and Related Credit Arrangements Procedure.

17. **Macquarie International - Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) Precedents For Exchange Units**

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee noted that Macquarie International will process RPL for exchange students in the same way as RPL for other students and that decisions on exchange unit equivalencies will be centrally recorded in the Credit Transfer Register and will become precedents for subsequent decisions.

18. **Other matters considered by the ASQC**

- An implementation plan from the Unit Approval Review will be considered in 2016.
- **Standalone Minors**
  The Committee noted a proposal from the Faculty of Science and Engineering to introduce new minors for 2017 that would not have a major of the same name. The proposal was not supported at this time. A paper will be prepared to clarify the rules for minors for existing degrees for consideration at the ASQC meeting on 2 February 2016.
- The Committee noted the report of the Macquarie University International College (MUIC) Subcommittee meeting of 22 October 2015.
- The Committee noted the Individual Case Reports from the Faculty of Arts and Faculty of Human Sciences.

The next meeting of ASQC will be held on Tuesday 2 February 2016.

A full copy of the minutes summarised above will be accessible after the next meeting of ASQC via this [link](#).

**Associate Professor Pamela Coutts**

Chair, Academic Standards and Quality Committee
ITEM 12.2 HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Attached is the report of the Higher Degree Research Committee meetings held 3 November, 13 November and 4 December 2015.

Refer to Items 11.7, 11.8 and 11.9.

For noting.
ITEM 12.2: HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT

A. MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

HDRC 03 November 2015

Members were asked to consider the proposed moderation panel for the MRes for SN40966208. Following lengthy discussion members acknowledged that there was a need to address the specific circumstances presented by the MRes appeals upheld by the Higher Degree Research Committee and other candidates in the same cohort and position. There was unanimous agreement that the proposed approach for this group of candidates does not establish a precedent for future cases. The Higher Degrees Research Committee resolved to approve the appointment of internal moderators to review the original MRes examiner’s reports and candidate thesis, and to propose a final mark for SN40966208. The Higher Degrees Research Committee noted this extraordinary process does not form a precedent for future cases.

The Chair briefed members on the pressing need to come to a resolution for the two candidates in question. There was lengthy discussion about the approach taken by the moderators and the advice that they had been provided in terms of their responsibility. Several members were dissatisfied with the way in which one of the external examiner’s reports had been disregarded and whether this was appropriate. As a consequence of the divergent views of members a vote was taken on whether to accept the moderators’ reports and ratify the recommended final grades. Ten members voted to support the result from the moderation panel for both SN42497981 and SN40973484 as a one off case and five members voted to support returning the result back to the moderation panel for SN40973484 for further consideration with weighting for all external examiners’ reports. The Committee resolved to ratify the results recommended by the moderation panel as the final MRes results for candidates SN42497981 and SN40973484. The Higher Degrees Research Committee noted again that this extraordinary process does not form a precedent for future cases.

HDRC 13 November 2015

Associate Professor Judy Homewood presented HDR targets and strategy on behalf of the Faculty of Human Sciences, who believes the HDR target for 2024 is achievable with support strategies in place.

Member of HDRC discussed the MRes examination process for 2015 in particular in relation to the Research Frontiers 2 grades and the moderation process. The Committee also discussed the changes to the potential outcome for a post revise and resubmit thesis examination. The Committee resolved that the Research Frontiers 2 grades be accepted after moderation and that only Pass and Fail outcomes are available for future MRES Revise and Re-examination candidates. Professor Mansfield informed members of cases where candidates do not submit their corrections reports within the timeframe and sought advice on the best way to proceed. The Committee resolved that candidates who do not complete corrections within one year will receive an incomplete outcome.

Dr Yi updated members on current commencement and completion data to. At 13 Nov 2015, 787 candidates were enrolled in HDR programs. 187 BPhil candidates and 600 candidates are under RTS (PhD MPhil and MRES). 427 candidates completed the degree including 150 MRES and 277 PhDs. Dr Yi tabled the Cotutelle and Joint PhD report to the committee. At 13 Nov 2015, MQ had 238 Cotutelle and Joint PhD candidates, which includes 87 enrolled and 151 completed. Dr Yi tabled the signed MRES Exchange Agreement with JLU Giessen - Germany and Ecole Centrale de Lyon - France. Dr Yi tabled the Joint PhD Agreement with University of Edinburgh - UK, the Cotutelle MOU with Tsinghua University and Tianjin University - China, and University of Zagreb - Croatia.

Ms Robinson tabled the International Agreements signed by Macquarie International and the delegations hosted by Macquarie International. Ms Robinson also briefed members on the recent trip to France and Germany.
Professor Roger Chung (Associate Dean HDR, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences) led the discussion on the proposed Master of Public Health with Research Specialisation. Members endorsed the proposal subject to ASQC approval for the MPH program for Year 1. Dr Noah Basil led the discussion on Law units in the first year of the MRes Program. Members are hesitant to change the BPHIL MRES structure. Members discussed implementing a similar MPH program to the law school as well.

**HDRC 04 December 2015**

Professor Phillips reported that the process of awarding the University Medal has been reviewed and that the Policy is currently going through the approval stages. She advised that there is a new template for nominating candidates for the University medal.

Professor Pretorius reported that he attended the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) researcher mobility workshop in Jakarta this week with the Director, Higher Degree Research Office. Macquarie University was the only Australian University represented. In October 2016 there will be an APEC Ministers of Education Meeting held in Peru. On the agenda will be encouraging the Australian Research Integrity code to be accepted across all APEC countries.

Professor Pretorius brought the HDR completions item to the attention of members with 488 completions to date, aiming for the 500 completions mark. He flagged that these numbers will count positively for the next Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC). He asked that members convey this great achievement to their Faculties. Professor Pretorius reported that he and colleagues have also contributed to the current Australian Council of Learned Academies (ACOLA) review of Australia’s Research Training Scheme (RTS), and that members of the review panel made reference to the “Macquarie Model” and the “Macquarie way”.

Professor Pretorius highlighted the excellent Macquarie Excellence in Research Australia (ERA) results announced today. The 2024 targets have been achieved, and these excellent labels will remain with us for the next three years. Fourteen of our research areas rated 5 at the four digit level. Psychology, Philosophy and Cognitive Science were also close to achieving this standard. A few areas were mentioned where focus needs to be on publishing in top quality journals for the next round in Earth Sciences, Marketing and Accounting.

A/Prof Childs was introduced to the Committee by Professor Mansfield, and distributed a summary handout of the strategies for the Supervision Enhancement Program (SEP). The overall goal is to provide Macquarie’s research candidate’s with inspirational supervision.

Key strategies for 2016 to work on achieving this goal include; reviewing the current workshop offerings, implementing open learning, diversifying pathways for SEP, a focus on the ‘red flag area’ of having difficult progress related conversations with candidates, implementing mental health first aid training for supervisors and promoting a culture of zero tolerance to bullying.

Professor Mansfield advised that the workshop on the 26th November for members of HDRAC and PESC was held with a positive spirit, and that issues will be managed with communication between the two committees as they arise.

Professor Mansfield reported that the RTS Review consultation had taken place recently with one on one review meetings and a public consultation session attended by the Executive Officer of the DVCR. The focus of the interviews for Macquarie participants was largely the MRes and the framework of pathways to the PhD. Dom English is a known supporter of the MRes involved in this review process. The participants were asked about implementation challenges and recommendations for others implementing the MRes. Another focus of the reviewers was employability of PhD graduates. The final report is due out in March 2016.

Professor Mansfield reported that PhD graduates employability was also a key topic at the recent Australian Council of Graduate Research (ACGR – formally DDOGS) meeting. Discussions included that the real problem is that there is a lack of data in this area, and much policy is based on assumptions. The only longitudinal study on this was started in New Zealand, but results have not been published. Professor Mansfield advised that the Learning Skills
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advisors in his office will be doing employability skills sessions in 2016. Other items on the agenda included the ACOLA RTS review, challenges of managing difficult candidature situations and PhD by publications, an area which Macquarie seems ahead of many other Universities.

Ms Martin reported that the statistics are available as per the attached reports, with the high completions numbers noted by the DVCR. The Cotutelle and Joint PhD report is provided for noting. The new Memorandum of Understanding with strategic partner Fudan is attached for noting. The previous MOU expired, and the signing of the new MOU is a sign of this important partnership continuing.

### COMPLETION OF REQUIREMENT (PHD/MPHIL)

**ABEWARDANA J, BEESHANGA**

**FOSE**

**PHD**

Principal Supervisor: Professor Eryk Dutkiewicz  
Associate Supervisor:  
Thesis submitted for examination: 25 August 2015  
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

**ALBA, BEATRICE**

**FOHS**

**PHD**

Principal Supervisor: Dr Simon Boag  
Associate Supervisor: Professor Ladd Wheeler  
Thesis title: Status Consciousness: Individual Differences in How People Think About Social Status  
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

**ANAGNOSTOU, EVANGELIA**

**FOA**

**MPHIL**

Principal Supervisor: Dr Kyle Keimer  
Associate Supervisor:  
Thesis submitted for examination: 10 June 2015  
Thesis title: In the Garden of the Gods: Models of Kingship from the Sumerians to the Seleucids  
Award Recommended: Master of Philosophy

**BARNECHE ROSADO, DIEGO**

**FOSE**

**PHD**

Principal Supervisor: Dr Andrew P. Allen  
Associate Supervisor: Dr John Alroy  
Thesis submitted for examination: 01 May 2015  
Thesis title: Scaling Fish Energetics from Individuals to Communities  
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

**BARTULA, IRIS**

**FOHS**

**MPHIL**

Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Kerry Sherman  
Associate Supervisor:  
Thesis submitted for examination: 09 September 2015  
Thesis title: Assessment of Sexual Dysfunction in Women Diagnosed with Breast Cancer  
Award Recommended: Master of Philosophy

**BIKAR SINGH, SOON SINGH**

**FOHS**

**PHD**

Principal Supervisor: Dr Grant Keelman  
Associate Supervisor: Dr Penelope Van Bergen  
Thesis submitted for examination: 09 February 2015  
Thesis title: The impacts of geography information systems integrated teaching on the motivation and achievement in geography of form four underachieving students of smart school in Sabah, Malaysia.  
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

**BURKE, MATTHEW**

**FOSE**

**PHD**

Principal Supervisor: Dr Richard Garner
ASSOCIATE SUPERVISOR: Professor Dominic Verity
Thesis submitted for examination: 30 April 2015
Thesis title: Synthetic Lie Theory
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

CARUANA, NATHAN FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Genevieve McArthur
Associate Supervisor: Dr Alexandra Woolgar, Dr Jonathan Brock
Thesis submitted for examination: 07 August 2015
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

CHANG, CHU LIN FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Ingrid Piller
Associate Supervisor: Dr Kimie Takahashi
Thesis submitted for examination: 03 February 2015 Resubmitted: 31 August 2015
Thesis title: Language Learning, Academic Achievement, and Overseas Experience: A Sociolinguistic Study of Taiwanese Students in Australian Higher Education
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

DAVIS, BELINDA FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Sheila Degotardi
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Jane Torr
Thesis submitted for examination: 02 June 2015
Thesis title: Working with Infants and Toddlers: What Discourses Shape Educators’ Understandings and Practices
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

DENNISON, SIOBHAN FOSE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Adam Stow
Associate Supervisor: Dr Martin Whiting
Thesis submitted for examination: 26 August 2015
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

ERFANI, SEYEDZAHRA FOBE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Yvette Blount
Associate Supervisor: Dr Babak Abedin
Thesis submitted for examination: 21 April 2015
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Thesis title: Investigating the Impact of Social Network Sites on the Psychological Wellbeing of Cancer Affected People
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

ETCHELL, ANDREW CHRISTOPHER Fac: FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Paul Sowman
Associate Supervisor: Dr Blake Johnson
Thesis submitted for examination: 27 August 2015
Thesis title: Neuromagnetic Beta Band Abnormalities in Stuttering During the Perception and Production of Rhythm
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

FARINA, MIRKO FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor John Sutton
Associate Supervisor: Dr David Kaplan, Professor Max Coltheart
Thesis submitted for examination: 10 August 2015
Thesis title: Plasticity, Embodiment and Learning: An Integrative Approach to Sensory Substitution Devices and Embodied
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

FRANKLIN, JANE LOUISE FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Jennifer Cornish
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Judi Homewood, Associate Professor Ann Goodchild
Thesis submitted for examination: 05 August 2015
Thesis title: Orbitofrontal Cortex Function: The Behavioural and Molecular Consequences of Exposure to Sugar and/or Caffeine in Rats
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

GAO, YUYA FOSE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Sue O’Reilly
Associate Supervisor: Professor William Griffin, Associate Professor Norman Pearson
Adjunct Supervisor: L. Xian Hua
Thesis submitted for examination: 03 June 2015
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

GIBSON, JANET FOA PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Yuji Sone
Associate Supervisor: Dr Nicole Matthews
Thesis submitted for examination: 03 July 2015
Thesis title: (Not) The ‘Right Kind’ of Dementia Story: Re/Presenting Identities in Reality Theatre and Performance
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

GOPICHANDRAN, SOWMYA FOSE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Shoba Ranganathan
Associate Supervisor: Professor Mark Baker
Thesis submitted for examination: 15 June 2015
Thesis title: Protein-protein Interactions: A Structural Bioinformatics Approach
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

HAGEER, YASMIN FOSE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Linda Beaumont
Associate Supervisor: Professor Sandra Harrison, Professor Iain Prentice
Thesis submitted for examination: 17 March 2015
Thesis title: Modelling the Distributions of Australian Shrublands and Shrub Species: The Role of Climate and Soil Properties
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy
HAMMERSLEY, LAURA ANN  FOA  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Associate Professor Kate Lloyd
Associate Supervisor:  Associate Professor Andrew McGregor, Associate Professor Sandra Suchet-Pearson
Thesis submitted for examination:  09 June 2015
Thesis title:  “It’s About Dignity Not Dependency”: Reciprocal Relationships in Undergraduate Community-based Service-learning
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

HAN, CHAO  FOHS  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Associate Professor Mehdi Riazi
Associate Supervisor:  Ms. Helen Slatyer
Thesis submitted for examination:  17 March 2015
Thesis title:  Building the Validity Foundation for Interpreter Certification Performance Testing
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

HAQUE, MD. MOMINUL  FOSE  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Dr Danny Wong
Associate Supervisor:  Dr Christopher McRae
Thesis title:  Development and Characterisation of Electropolymerised Polypyrrole and Polypyrrole-reduced Graphene Oxide Composite Films as a Potential Treatment method for Azo Dyes
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

HARRISON, BRONWEN  FOBE  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Associate Professor Denise Jepsen
Associate Supervisor:  Professor Leigh Wood
Thesis submitted for examination:  31 August 2015
Thesis title:  The Use of Awards to Signal Performance Excellence
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

HERZOG, ANDREAS  FOSE  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Dr Lee Spitler
Associate Supervisor:  -
Adjunct Supervisor:  R. Norris, Q. Parker, E. Middelberg
Thesis submitted for examination:  07 August 2015
Thesis title:  The Broadband Spectra of Infrared-faint Radio Sources
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

ISLAM, MD. RABIUL  FOA  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Dr Greg Walkerden
Associate Supervisor:  Dr Marco Amati
Thesis submitted for examination:  07 August 2015
Thesis title:  Social Capital and Cyclones: How Households’ Social Networks Contribute to Disaster Resilience and Recovery in Bangladesh
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

JAEGGER, ANNE DOREEN  FOHS  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Associate Professor Robyn Langdon
Associate Supervisor:  Professor Max Coltheart
Thesis submitted for examination:  09 June 2015
Thesis title:  Delusional Ideation Associated with Obsessive-Compulsive Symptoms
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

KALEECKAL KRISHNANKUTTY NAIR, VISHNU  FOHS  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Professor Lyndsey Nickels
KARMOKAR, DEBABRATA KUMAR  FOSE   PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Professor Karu Esselle
Associate Supervisor:  Professor Michael Heimlich
Thesis submitted for examination:  26 August 2015
Thesis title:  Microstrip Leaky-Wave Antennas for Advanced Wireless Systems
Award Recommended:   Doctor of Philosophy

KHETRAPAL, NEHA  FOHS   PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Associate Professor Rosalind Thornton
Associate Supervisor:  Professor Nicholas Smith
Thesis submitted for examination:  19 June 2015
Thesis title:  Grammatical Knowledge in Children with Autism
Award Recommended:   Doctor of Philosophy

LLANERA, TRACY ANN  FOA   PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Associate Professor Jean-Philippe Deranty
Associate Supervisor:  Professor Andrew Try
Adjunct Supervisor:  W. Hancock
Thesis submitted for examination:  03 August 2015
Thesis title:  Plasma Proteomics for Detection of Early Stage Colorectal Cancer Biosignatures
Award Recommended:   Doctor of Philosophy

MCDONALD, PETER WILLIAM LUKE  MGSM   PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Professor Charles Areni
Associate Supervisor:  -
Thesis submitted for examination:  18 December 2014
Award Recommended:   Doctor of Philosophy

MURPHY, ROSANNA  FOSE   PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Associate Professor Norman Pearson
Associate Supervisor:  Professor Suzanne O’Reilly, Professor William Griffin
Adjunct Supervisor:  R. Quay, Z. Popovic
Thesis title:  Stabilising a Craton: The Origin and Emplacement of the 3.1 Ha Mpuluzi Batholith
Award Recommended:   Doctor of Philosophy

PEREIRA, AARON  FOSE   PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Professor Anthony Parker
Associate Supervisor:  Professor Michael Heimlich, Professor Neil Weste
Adjunct Supervisor:  R. Quay, Z. Popovic
Thesis title:  GAN Power Switches for X-Band EFPA Supply Modulators
Award Recommended:   Doctor of Philosophy

PRABOWO, TRI JATMIKO WAHYU  FOBE   PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Professor Philomena Leung
QIN, HUA YU  FOSE  MPHIL
Principal Supervisor:  Professor Ian Paulsen
Associate Supervisor:  Professor Paul Haynes
Thesis submitted for examination:  10 December 2014
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

SCOTT, TIMOTHY JOHN  FOA  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Associate Professor Andrew Gillett
Associate Supervisor:  Professor Alanna Nobbs, Dr Danijel Dzino
Thesis title:  The Discipline of ‘Germanic’ Antiquity and Its Contemporary Intellectual and Socio-Political Environment
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

SHIN, YOUSUN SUNNY  FOBE  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Professor David Throsby
Associate Supervisor:  Dr Jordi Mckenzie
Thesis submitted for examination:  03 August 2015
Thesis title:  Cultural Diversity and International Trade in Cultural Products
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

STARTSEV, MICHAEL ANDREI  FOSE  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Dr David Inglis
Associate Supervisor:  Professor Ewa Goldys
Adjunct Supervisor:  M. Andersen
Thesis submitted for examination:  04 September 2015
Thesis title:  Nanofluidics for Biomolecular Separations
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

SUMER-BAYRAKTAR, ZEYNEP  FOSE  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Professor Nicolle Packer
Associate Supervisor:  Associate Professor Mark Molloy
Adjunct Supervisor:  M. Andersen
Thesis title:  Protein Glycosylation at the Single and Total Membrane Protein Level
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

TANG, HUI ZHEN  FOHS  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Distinguished Professor Stephen Crain
Associate Supervisor:  Dr Jonathan Brock, Dr Michael Proctor
Thesis title:  Dual Representations of Temporal Modulations in Human Auditory Cortex
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

TAYAR, MARK  FOBE  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Dr Robert Jack
Associate Supervisor:  -
Thesis title:  Competing Institutional Logics in the Internationalisation of Australian Universities
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy
TEMLER, MARIE SOPHIE FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Amanda Barnier
Associate Supervisor: Professor John Sutton
Thesis submitted for examination: 02 April 2015
Thesis title: Autobiographical Memory Variability: Individual and Social Factors
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

WANG, LANG FOSE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Kevin Cheung
Associate Supervisor: -
Adjunct Supervisor: C. Chih Pei, L. YiHe
Thesis title: Impacts of Large-Scale Reforestation Programmes on Regional Climate Change: A Regional Climate Modelling Study on the Loess Plateau, China
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

WEARNE, TRAVIS ASHLEY FOHS PHD/MCLINNEUROPSY
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Jennifer Cornish
Associate Supervisor: Dr Ann Goodchild
Adjunct Supervisor: C. Chih Pei, L. YiHe
Thesis submitted for examination: 02 September 2015
Thesis title: Inhibitory Regulation of the Prefrontal Cortex in an Animal Model of Methamphetamine Behavioural Sensitization: Implications for the Maintenance of Chronic Psychoses
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy and Master of Clinical Neuropsychology

WOON, SAMANTHA SHAN MEI FOHS MPHIL
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Kerry Sherman
Associate Supervisor: The Late Associate Professor Doris McIlwain
Adjunct Supervisor: Dr JianPing Zheng
Thesis title: Psychological Outcomes of Nipple Sparing Mastectomy
Award Recommended: Master of Philosophy

XIONG, QING FOSE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Sue O’Reilly
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Norman Pearson, Professor William Griffin
Adjunct Supervisor: Dr JianPing Zheng
Thesis submitted for examination: 17 April 2015
Thesis title: Shenglikou and Zedang Peridotite Massifs, Tibet (China): Upper Mantle Processes and Geodynamic Significance
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

COMPLETION OF REQUIREMENT (MRES)
ALLISON, KIMBERLEY FOHS
ALTROWS, AIYANA FOA
AQUINO, YVES FOA
BARNIER, ELLISE FOHS
BHAYAT, IMTIAZ MGSM
CABRERA, EMERSON FOSE
CAMILLERI, NATHAN FOSE
CHATFIELD, MADELINE FOA
CHAU, DANIEL FOA
CHEEMA, MOEEN UMAR FOBE
CHEUNG, KELLY FOHS
DARGUE, NICOLE FOHS
EVERETT, NICHOLAS FOHS
EVERSON, NATHAN FOA
RESOLVED
That the decisions listed above be accepted.

CONSIDERATION FOR VICE-CHANCELLOR’S COMMENDATION

CARUANA, NATHAN
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Genevieve McArthur
Associate Supervisor: Dr Alexandra Woolgar, Dr Jonathan Brock
Thesis submitted for examination: 07 August 2015
On 04 December 2015, the Higher Degree Research Committee recommended that Nathan Caruana’s PhD thesis be awarded subject to the completion of corrections as specified by the examiners and as outlined by the supervisor to be carried out to the satisfaction of the Higher Degree Research Committee.

The following comments were received from the examiners:

“I think it is an outstanding thesis and that he deserves the highest level of support. I actually find myself in the very unusual position of having no suggested revisions. It is essentially perfect as a thesis just the way it is. I also believe that this will serve him well as a body of research from which to launch several published papers. Nathan is clearly on track to be a rising star in the field! “

“The submitted thesis ambitiously and successfully seeks to provide both theoretical as well as empirical contributions to our understanding of the neurocognitive mechanisms of joint attention, a most important and from a neuroscientific perspective under-researched phenomenon. In a general introduction (Chapter 1) the importance of joint attention during social interactions and for cognitive development is described while already pointing towards the need for the development of a more ecologically valid, yet well controlled experimental paradigm to investigate this interactively constituted phenomenon. Furthermore, in Chapter 2 different components of joint attention are analyzed and the suggestion is made that an evaluative process is relevant for monitoring whether joint attention has actually been achieved. Results of the behavioral patient study demonstrate that initially group differences in behavior exist, which are later not detectable, because those patients with high systemizing abilities adapt to the task demands. This is a most interesting finding as it demonstrates how individuals with high-functioning autism use compensatory strategies to solve social tasks. Taken together, the results of the above described studies, which make use of an impressive range of different methodologies together with an innovative, interactive experimental paradigm, provide important new insights into the neurocognitive mechanisms of joint attention both in healthy controls as well as individuals in high-functioning autism. The high quality of these studies is further documented by the fact that two of them have already been published in well-respected, international peer-reviewed journals. I gladly and unreservedly recommend acceptance of the submitted thesis towards the attainment of a PhD degree by Mr. Caruana.”

“This thesis presents an innovative, complex, and potentially ground breaking set of studies exploring the neural markers of eye gaze, joint attention and the components underlying this. It uses both control participants and those with autism (who are not easy to recruit) and conducts a series of well integrated studies to highlight the critical role of context… The introduction was concise, its integration novel and the critical evaluation thorough. I certainly enjoyed reading the introduction and think this was a scholarly review of the literature. This body of experimental work would have required an enormous amount of preparation and planning, owing to its novel experimental design and associated tasks developed, the gaze contingent tasks, scanning, and ERP assessments. The student should be commended for such a comprehensive sequence of investigations teasing apart these different applications, from modifying the catch the burglar task, to evaluating direction of gaze and gaze contingent response within the task, to applying interesting neural assessments for response. This really was an excellent body of work and the student should be commended for such a comprehensive set of study designs and interesting projects. It already contained much more than what was necessary for a thesis…”

Taking into account the examiners reports and the above comments, the committee noted that the thesis was of exceptional merit.

RESOLVED

WEARNE, TRAVIS ASHLEY FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Jennifer Cornish
Associate Supervisor: Dr Ann Goodchild
Thesis submitted for examination: 02 September 2015
Thesis title: Inhibitory Regulation of the Prefrontal Cortex in an Animal Model of Methamphetamine Behavioural Sensitization: Implications for the Maintenance of Chronic Psychoses

On 11 November 2015, the Program and Examination Sub-Committee recommended that Travis Ashley Wearne’s PhD thesis be awarded subject to the completion of corrections as specified by the examiners and as outlined by the supervisor to be carried out to the satisfaction of the Higher Degree Research Committee.

The following comments were received from the examiners:
“This, quite simply is an outstanding thesis, and based on this document, I wholeheartedly recommend the candidate be awarded a Ph.D. The thesis addresses and interesting and important question regarding the effects of repeated methamphetamine exposure on prefrontal GABA networks, using a variety of molecular approaches. There are numerous strengths to this thesis: The introduction is extremely scholarly, and the candidate does an outstanding job at integrating findings from considerably different literatures (schizophrenia research, drug abuse, anatomy, molecular biology). I personally learned a lot from this portion of the thesis. The results are relatively straightforward, and their interpretation reflects and honest and measured assessment of the findings. Again, the candidate has done an outstanding job at integrating these findings with the broader literature. I was particularly impressed with the regional analyses of the effects of methamphetamine, given that so little work has been conducted on how this may affect orbitofrontal function. I suspect the novelty of these findings will have a considerable impact on the field. Another great aspect to this work is that, despite the focus on molecular assays, the candidate does an excellent job at proposing functional consequences to the changes that have been induced by these treatments. I reiterate that this is an outstanding document that would easily meet criteria for a more-than-satisfactory Ph.D. thesis at my institution.”

“The thesis examines changes within the prefrontal GABAergic system following sensitization to methamphetamine. Employing proteomic and genomic techniques we see a thorough investigation across two subregions of the frontal cortex in response to methamphetamine. The thesis is well written and presented in a logical fashion. The research is original with two of the four experimental chapters already published, and the rest presented at local or international conferences. The outcomes of this thesis advance current understanding and provide the basis of many more interesting questions to be answered in the future, many of which I fashioned, and was happy to see were discussed in the final chapter. I want to particularly note that I think the writing in this thesis is very good and well thought out, the coverage of background research, the discussion of findings, all clear, informative and up-to-date. Very well done! The general introduction is well-written and informative; the topics of discussion carefully selected and provide a rounded but well-focused introduction to the thesis studies. In all honesty, I found some difficulty in the concept of a linkage between methamphetamine psychosis and schizophrenic symptomatology; however the arguments were well-presented and I found myself considering these and deciding to trust the thesis, and did not find it lacking, with many of my questions and thoughts addresses in the final conclusion of the thesis. This (discussion) presented an overview of the findings with respect to the current literature and outlined important future directions”

“The thesis presented by Travis A Wearne to the Dep. Psychology of Macquarie University as a requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy/Master of Clinical Neuropsychology clearly shows dedication to the study of the neurosciences, advanced comprehension of brain GABAergic mechanisms and important scientific contribution in the area of drug abuse. Considering that Travis A Wearne participated as the main researcher in all sets of experiments, one may conclude that the PhD candidate developed skills in behavioral observations, tissue extraction, proteome research, qPCR and Real Time PCR. The concluding remarks are very well written and are a fine summary to be taken as an illustration of the overall work. In my view, the document presented represents an excellent thesis in the area of Neuropsychology and, therefore, I present my recommendation that Travis A Wearne should to be awarded with the degree of Doctor of Philosophy/Master of Clinical Neuropsychology.”

Taking into account the examiners reports and the above comments, the committee noted that the thesis was of exceptional merit.

RESOLVED
That Travis Ashley Wearne’s PhD thesis entitled “Inhibitory Regulation of the Prefrontal Cortex in an Animal Model of Methamphetamine Behavioural Sensitization: Implications for the Maintenance of Chronic Psychoses” be awarded a Vice-Chancellor’s Commendation.

B. MATTERS FOR RECOMMENDATION

HDRC 13 November 2015
Professor Mansfield sought feedback on the proposed Supervision Policy from the members. The Committee discussed the policy in details and resolved to endorse the policy.

The Committee
RESOLVED
To Recommend to the Academic Senate
That the attached supervision policy be [Attachment A] be accepted.
Item 1:
Professor Mansfield provided members with the proposed procedure on MRES examination. The proposed procedure was discussed and agreed to by members of both the Programs and Examination Subcommittee of HDRC (PESC) and the Higher Degree Research Appeals Committee (HDRAC) at the workshop of these two committees held on the 26th November facilitated by Philip Pogson.

The proposal was discussed, and three amendments to the procedure [Attachment B] were agreed to by HDRC

1) To be added to Step 1, in cases where one examiner recommends Revise and Resubmit the thesis will be examined by a third examiner automatically. Step 2 will therefore be unnecessary in these cases and the Supervisor will receive all three examiners reports before being asked to submit their response with these to the expert panel in Step 3, rather than needing to submit two reports. This will have the benefits of not delaying this process for these students, and providing the Supervisor and expert panel with all the relevant input before making their recommendation to PESC.

2) In Steps 2 and 3 of the procedure,’ Department MRes Director’ is to be changed to 'Department MRes Director or Advisor’ to be consistent with the terminology currently being used at the Faculties

3) In Step 3 of the procedure, an independent Department Master of Research Director or Advisor from another Faculty is to be added to the expert panel moderating results at the Faculty level to make the result recommendation to PESC.

Professor Mansfield advised that further meetings will be held between members of PESC and HDRAC to work together on key items. These currently include deciding the grounds of HDR and MRes student appeals and the appropriate management of any upheld appeals cases. Professor Mansfield will provide Faculty staff will a summary document to enable consistent implementation of this new MRes examination procedure for students completing their MRes in 2015.

The Committee
RESOLVED
To Recommend to the Academic Senate
That the approach to the MRes examination procedure proposed by HDRC, with the three amendments approved by the HDRC at its meeting on the 4th December be approved for the 2015 MRes cohort.

Item 2:
Professor Mansfield advised that this item (Proposed University HDR Rules Change – Show cause with Formal Review) [Attachment C] discussed by the Committee at the 13th November requires formal recommendation by the Committee to Academic Senate.

Associate Professor Homewood advised that this recommendation is made to the HDRC by the Business Process Improvement HDR Terminations and Appeals Project Team for the HDR Rules Section 14 to be consistent with the procedure improvements being made by this project team. The term ‘show cause’ is replaced by ‘formal review’.

The Committee
RESOLVED
To Recommend to the Academic Senate and the University Council
That the proposed changes to the Higher Degree Research Rules 14. Discontinuation and Exclusion to ensure consistency with the procedure improvements of the Business Process Improvement HDR Terminations and Appeals Project Team be approved by the Academic Senate and University Council.
ITEM 12.3  SENATE LEARNING AND TEACHING COMMITTEE

Attached is the report of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee meetings held 9 and 24 November 2015.

Refer to Items 11.5 and 11.6.

For noting.
ITEMS FOR APPROVAL
Disruption to Studies
At its meeting held 12 October 2015 the SLTC resolved to recommend the Disruption to Studies Policy, Procedure, Professional Authority Form; and Disruptions Outcome Schedule to Academic Senate subject to advice from the Office of General Counsel. Following receipt of that advice these are now provided to Academic Senate for approval.

ITEMS FOR NOTING
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) report
- Macquarie University International College (MUIC) has opened. The soft launch target figures (70) were exceeded with 160 students enrolling.
- Strategy
  i. Learning and Teaching Strategic White Paper is in the final stages of review.
  ii. The Indigenous Strategy development is progressing, significant consultation will be held across the University.
- TEOSA Submission has been lodged. The DVC A is confident that the submission represents the University as a whole.

Strategy and Policy
Assessment Policy Review
At its meeting held 9 November, the Committee considered Schedule 1: Grades and Schedule 2: Unit Assessment Requirements were considered. The Committee resolved to endorse in principle Schedule 1: Grades. The Committee held an additional inquorate meeting on 24 November with the members of the Assessment Working Group present, Schedule 4: Final Examinations and Schedule 5: Moderation were discussed in detail with minor suggested amendments actioned.

Placement Co-ordination Task Force
A progress report was submitted and discussed. The Task Force sought feedback on the definition of ‘placement’; it was determined that the definition required simplification. The Task Force is to provide an additional report in 2016.

Session Offering Working Group: Discussion Paper
The feedback sought by the Working Group was reviewed by the Committee. Associate Deans Learning and Teaching are to revisit the proposal following the receipt of additional data from the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences and MUIC in relation to units run throughout the Winter Session in intensive mode.

Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) – Schedule for Entry to Undergraduate Programs
The Committee endorsed the proposal that the Associate Deans Quality and Standards and the Associate Deans Learning and Teaching devise an appropriate RPL Schedule for subsequent endorsement by the Academic Standards and Quality committee and approval by Academic Senate.

Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) – Assessment Procedure
The Committee considered three proposals in relation to: a draft RPL Assessment Procedure; amendments to the existing procedure for Development of International Articulation Agreements; and proposed amendments to the RPL Policy. The Committee provided feedback and subject to that feedback, endorsed the proposals. It was noted that the Academic Standards and Quality Committee will be consulted prior to seeking approval from Academic Senate.

General Business
- Early Enrolment. The Chair verbally reported that early enrolment is underway, first year students will commence on 14 December. The Chair thanked all Faculties and staff involved in preparing the program guides.
- Themed Presentation - Andrew Burrell and Adelaide Chan from the Centre for Open Education facilitated a discussion on Gifted and Talented Students. It was confirmed that further work within this area will return to the Committee.
- iLab and Student Learning Outcomes. A student email providing negative feedback on iLab was considered. The Committee, noting the lack of data available, were reminded to lodge OneHelp tickets for all issues experienced. The Chair undertook to communicate the concerns raised with Dr Mary Davies, Chief Information Officer.
- Departing Committee Members. The Chair acknowledged Associate Professor Ian Solomonides for his contributions to the Committee.

Reports from the Faculties:
Reports from the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences were noted. The 2016 SLTC meeting dates were noted at the meeting held 9 November. The next SLTC meeting will be held on Monday 1 February 2016.
A full copy of the minutes summarised will be accessed via this link once ratified.

Professor Sherman Young
CHAIR
ITEM 12.4 QUALITY ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE

Attached is the report of the Quality Enhancement Committee meeting held 26 November 2015.

For noting.
ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

There were no items requiring Academic Senate approval.

GOVERNANCE AND STRATEGY

The Executive Officer for the DVC A presented an update on the University’s re-registration as a higher education provider. As the University has self-accrediting and low risk status thus the renewal required coverage of the 4 core assessment areas:
- Governance
- Planning and performance outcomes
- Academic Quality Assurance
- Student Experience and Support

As part of the Academic Quality Assurance section, TEQSA requested documentation of sample programs in five categories:

- one recently accredited course: undergraduate, with an online component – B Engineering (FoSE)
- one course delivered onshore and offshore – MBA (MGSM)
- one clinical course – D Physiotherapy (FMHS)
- one teacher education course – B Arts with B Education (Secondary) (FoHS)
- one recently reviewed course – postgraduate – M Creative Writing (FoA)

MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

QEC considered and endorsed or approved:
- Review of the Department of Sociology – Final Report
- Review of Department of Indigenous Studies – Final Report and Implementation Plan
- Review of Interdisciplinary Women’s Studies, Gender and Sexuality Gender Studies – Final Report and Implementation Plan
- Review of the Museum of Ancient Cultures – Final Report
- Review of the Law School – Implementation Plan

It also noted an update on Review of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar).

The Committee discussed and supported a proposal for dedicated resourcing to support two of the key areas of activity for the Quality Enhancement Committee; the review and realignment of the University’s Quality Enhancement Framework and the development of an Academic Risk Register.

The next meeting of QEC will be held on 18th February 2016 and agenda items are due Thursday 4th February.

PROFESSOR DOMINIC VERITY, CHAIR OF ACADEMIC SENATE
CHAIR, QEC
ITEM 12.5 HIGHER DEGREES RESEARCH APPEALS COMMITTEE

Attached is the report of the Higher Degrees Research Committee meeting held 15 September 2015.

*For noting.*
A meeting of the Higher Degree Research Appeals Committee was held on Thursday 17th September 2015 at 10am in the Higher Degree Research Office Meeting Room C5C Level 3 (East Wing)

PRESENT: Professor Julie Fitness (Chair)
Professor Anne Castles (Faculty of Human Sciences)
Associate Professor Brian Atwell (Faculty of Science and Engineering)
Dr Alison Holland (Faculty of Arts)
Associate Professor Chris Baumann
(Faculty of Business and Economics)
Professor Alberto Avolio (Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences)

IN ATTENDANCE: Ms. Jennifer Martin (Higher Degree Research Office)

APOLOGIES:
Ms. Amanda Phelps (Academic Governance)

A meeting of the Higher Degree Research Appeal Committee (HDRAC) was held to determine the Committee’s response in the case of PhD Candidate 40813053.

1. **Procedural introduction**
The Chair provided the running order for the Committee proceedings. The current policy and procedure for thesis preparation, submission and examination was provided in the meeting agenda.

2. **Conflicts of Interest**
n/a

3. **Candidate 40813053**
   **Committee Discussion from documentation**
The Candidate submitted their thesis on the 31 July 2014. From the documentation provided for this meeting, it is noted that this is a specialized topic and that the supervisors found it challenging to find suitable examiners for this topic. From the documentation provided, they did identify who they thought to be suitable supervisors.

The examination results returned were two examiners recommending award with corrections and one recommending revise and resubmit (referred to as the ‘third examiner’ in these minutes).

The Committee noted that this recommendation is perceived by the academic community as a rare and extreme result which requires additional work by both candidate and supervisors to address serious (but potentially correctable) faults with the thesis.

The examiners’ reports and recommendations were considered by the Program and Examinations Subcommittee (PESC) in the normal process. Based on these reports and the supervisors’ response to the reports, PESC advised the decision of revise and resubmit in the letter dated 13 February 2015. Further details on the reasons behind this decision-making are
not available. From the candidate and supervisors’ perspective, it was perceived that PESC favoured the third examiner’s recommendation over the other two examiners.

The Candidate, with support from the supervisors, appealed this decision through management channels. The appeal was considered by PESC at its meeting on the 20th May 2015. It was decided that the original decision of revise and resubmit be upheld. In the letter from the Dean. Higher Degree Research to the candidate communicating this decision, it is advised that the thesis would go back to the original examiners to satisfy them but that the candidate could make a case for the thesis not to go back to the third examiner (the only one who requested a revise and resubmit). It is the opinion of the Committee that this letter does not engage with the substance of the problem identified by the Candidate and the Supervisors, namely: a) the examiner requesting revise and resubmit made it clear in his report that he did not believe the thesis was salvageable since it was so flawed in its conceptualization it would not meet the requirements for a Masters thesis; b) relatedly, the lack of any direction re how the candidate would satisfy the requirements of this examiner other than to undertake a new thesis; and c) the decision to privilege this examiner’s recommendation above the recommendations of the other two examiners.

In regards to how to resolve this issue, from the Committee’s understanding the Candidate and Supervisors remain unclear on what they need to do to have the thesis completed to the satisfaction of three external examiners and also PESC.

It is noted by the Committee that this is the candidate’s thesis topic is subject to many different academic interpretations. Revise and resubmit is warranted for theses where there are errors in analysis or interpretation to correct. However, the Committee queried whether this is the right result when there are philosophical differences which cannot be reconciled. In the Committee’s opinion it is unclear who the thesis would need to be resubmitted to as one of the examiners has indicated they will not be available to re-examine the thesis if required and the third examiner who recommended revise and resubmit would examine the thesis again, but has indicated that only a complete reconceptualization and interpretation would potentially satisfy him of its merits. In the opinion of the Committee, it would need to be a whole new thesis to satisfy this third examiner.

The Committee discussed some possible outcomes, specifically whether it would be possible to recommend that this third examiner be excluded from the outset from re-examining the thesis rather than having to go through an application process with a potential outcome that this examiner is used again. It was also noted that by excluding this examiner, the need for revise and resubmit is also made redundant.

**Appeal Claims:** The Candidate is appealing the processes relating to the decision to award the PhD result of revise and resubmit, specifically
- that academic decision-making procedures were not applied fairly in determining the disputed claim that the thesis contained original material and that the third examiner’s recommendation was given more weighting than the two other examiners,
- that the PESC Committee did not take into consideration in a procedurally just and fair manner the supervisors’ detailed responses to the examiner’s reports and
- that it would not be procedurally fair to rely upon the re-examination of the third examiner to determine the final outcome for the thesis.

**The Candidate presented to the Committee at 10.30am with their support person and PhD supervisors**

The Chair thanked the Candidate and Supervisors for their attendance at the meeting to provide the Committee with the full details of the appeal. In response to questioning from the
Committee, the Candidate and Supervisors provided the following details:

- the thesis looks at three theologians that had never been studied together before, comparing and contrasting them through the lens of the context in which they lived, not through our current context
- there is a narrative in the thesis that looks at what they have in common
- the Candidate acknowledged that they could have done more to flag for the readers the originality in the thesis in the document itself, however, as noted by one of the other examiners, there is no doubt that there is much original material in the thesis
- in regards to the Nomination of Examiners process, the Supervisors acknowledged that they had discussed with the Candidate early in their candidature that finding suitable supervisors for this type of comparative thesis could be an issue. The Supervisors also advised that one of the final examiners used was not on the original list and was not on the reserve list (though was later approved): two other potential examiners that may have been more suitable for this type of thesis was not available to examine at the time this thesis went under examination the first time; - the basis of the appeal is the procedures around the result of being told to revise and resubmit the thesis. It is acknowledged that most candidates need to do corrections on their thesis, but in the opinion of the Candidate and Supervisors the third examiner ‘trashed’ the thesis including making ‘nasty’ and not constructive comments and quoting the introduction of the thesis rather than showing they had read and critiqued the whole thesis
- in the Supervisor’s opinion, their response to the examiners was ignored by the PESC Committee. In this response they assert that there is no point to undergoing revise and resubmit given that there is clearly no way of satisfying this particular examiner, and in light of the scope and quality of the reading/data collection and analysis undertaken by the Candidate already. One Supervisor added that the Candidate had undertaken the first translations of two of the theologians from Greek and Latin in the course of the thesis, an extraordinary achievement.
- the Candidate takes on board the critique of one of the examiners in particular, and would be comfortable making corrections based on these points. The Candidate also acknowledges that they would rewrite their conclusion to make it stronger, would focus on points of originality - the Candidate is asking for a final result of Award with Corrections, and seeks to correct the thesis based on the two examiners’ critiques to the satisfaction of their Supervisors. The Candidate stated that they have experienced stress and anxiety with time ‘in limbo’ between submission and now and that they would have resubmitted at the start of the process if not for the question mark over the third examiner and the thesis seemingly needing to go back to them to be re-examined which, in the Candidate and Supervisors opinion, would be pointless
- the Candidate and Supervisors are also of the opinion that other Universities do not require what Macquarie interprets as being required from the Government’s guidelines, and that other Universities would be satisfied with two examiners awarding a thesis and supervisors being satisfied with the quality of the thesis. It is unclear to the Candidate and Supervisors why PESC has seemingly ignored the case made by two of the three examiners together with the Supervisors that the thesis undergo corrections.

After the presentations, the Committee deliberated further on the case.

From the presentations, the Committee noted that:
- the intellectual capacity of the Candidate is confirmed
- that the Supervisors feel ignored through the implementation of the current examination procedures, and in the Committee’s opinion this feeling is justifiable
- it is an impossible position to have the third examiner be a possible examiner for re-examination given their fundamental opposition to the current thesis

In regards to a suitable suggested action from this appeal, the Committee noted that this is to be decided by management. The suggestions were made that a third external examiner could be engaged to appraise the three reports and the supervisors response for an outcome and clear action for the Candidate to then undertaken with their Supervisors to complete their thesis.
Alternatively it was suggested that it would still meet the Government’s requirements and be in line with other Universities for PESC to review the decision and be able to determine for the thesis to be awarded with corrections to the satisfaction of the Supervisors given two of the three examiners have already recommended award with corrections.

From all the evidence provided, the Committee concluded that there were procedural irregularities and unfairness in the implementation of the University’s current examination procedures in this case.

4. Conclusion

The Committee agreed that the appeal of Candidate 40813053 is to be upheld on the grounds that the academic decision-making procedures do not provide clear guidance to the Candidate and Supervisors on how to satisfy the requirements of the third examiner who determined the thesis undergo re-examination.

It is decided that it is procedurally unfair to make the Candidate and Supervisor make a case for this examiner not to be included in the re-examination. It is also decided that the Supervisors response to the examiners reports has not been engaged with and acknowledged in a procedurally fair manner by PESC.

5. Next Meetings
To be confirmed.

6. Procedure improvements suggested through the investigations for this case:
The Committee suggests the opinions of the Supervisors for this case are debated and may inform future changes to examination policy and procedure. The document from the Supervisors as supplied to the Chair, HDRAC (de identified) is copied below.
Postgraduate examination procedures at Macquarie University – Supervisor opinion paper provided to Chair, HDRAC

1. Macquarie University's examination process is not the same as that of other universities. It is much tougher. My recent experience of UNSW, UNE and UQ suggests to me that they are much less strict in their requirements. Why are we so keen to disadvantage our own students?

2. If we have 3 examiners rather than 2 and we insist that all three pass it, we have increased the chances of failing or falling short by 50% over those who have only two examiners. There is no requirement of the Australian Council of Graduate Research that all three examiners have to be satisfied.

3. Not enough notice is taken of the supervisors' responses to examiners' reports. I know supervisors' reports are biased in favour of the candidate, but if PESC is going to take no notice of them, don't ask for them. They take a lot of time. Some supervisors are very experienced. I count myself as one. I'm biased in favour of all my students, but I do know when one thesis is a lot more worthy than another. The Candidate's thesis is more deserving of a doctorate than most of my students by a factor of five.

4. We should think twice and then again before we ask for a resubmission and rewrite or fail them. Show some empathy for the student. They have often had a very enjoyable and rich research experience which makes them fond of Mac Uni and of research. Then it gets destroyed by a draconian decision by the HD examination committee.

5. If we have three examiners why not go for a 2-1 decision instead of expecting all three to come on board? By deciding to privilege the third over the other two you are setting yourself up as a fourth examiner.

6. Of the three cases of resubmit and rewrite I have had this past year, two have resulted from the third examiner saying, 'I really have a difficulty asking you to do this, but I think on balance it could be done better and therefore reluctantly I'll go for a rewrite and resubmit.' Every thesis could be done better. But we all have other things to do with our lives. If two examiners are happy with it and for the third it is a borderline decision, for goodness sake pass it.

7. If you decide to knock it back on the basis of one of the examiners then why not resubmit it just to that one examiner? Why send it back to all three and then make the supervisor find another examiner if one of those who has already passed it does not want to re-examine it? The current system is expensive, time-wasting and unjust. It is also an insult to the examiners who have already passed it, and they don't want to read it a second time anyway. This requirement must be abolished.

8. If an examiner is very negative about a thesis and can see no way in which it can be improved, but nevertheless agrees to re-examine it, the student should be allowed to ask for another examiner as he or she will know that the examiner will be inclined to defend his first decision. Again, show some empathy for the student. How confident will he or she be about reworking his/her thesis with this examiner in mind? After a decade of her life spent on her thesis, the Candidate says she will withdraw rather than be expected to resubmit to the examiner who alleged her thesis was without originality, whereas she (and the other examiners) are confident of its originality.
9. I do not know enough about how the examiners’ reports are assessed by the HD examination committee, but is PESC the best committee to do that and is it too centralized? Is it too dominated by the sciences? There are real issues here. There can be genuine differences of opinion among examiners on Arts subjects. It is very likely that an examiner of a thesis in Arts will condemn it on ideological grounds without even knowing necessarily that they are doing this.

10. Does the chairman of PESC have too much power? Are its members prepared to dissent from him if they disagree with him?

11. The University’s reputation is on the line. I have been advised by academic staff in Ancient History, on the basis of feedback at conferences, that Macquarie University is considered to be out of step in its examination processes. I know of one Sydney academic who refuses to assess MU theses.

12. The requirement that at least one of the three examiners must be in an Australian university often creates difficulty for the Ancient History Department, especially as no examiner can be appointed internally. The argument that ‘any academic can assess any thesis’ has a point, but is not sensible, nor is it fair to the candidate who deserves to be examined by those familiar with the field, nor is it consistent with the university’s own guidelines that it must appoint ‘high quality examiners in the field of research’.

13. Future PhD thesis examinations at MU are going to find even more problems in the future as doctorates now have to be completed in three years which allows even less time either for thoroughness of research or proof-reading. Expect more appeals. They too will cause unhappiness as the present appeals system takes far too long. The Candidate submitted her thesis over a year ago.

My present feeling is that doing a doctorate at Macquarie is a lottery. It has a lot more to do with good luck than good management. Unless this system is changed dramatically and quickly I would advise postgrads to go to Sydney or UNSW.
ITEM 13.1 REPORT FROM THE FACULTY OF MEDICINE AND HEALTH SCIENCES FACULTY BOARD

Attached is the report from the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences Faculty Board meeting held on 2 November 2015.

For noting.
ITEMS FOR APPROVAL BY ACADEMIC SENATE

There were no items requiring Academic Senate approval.

ITEMS FOR NOTING

Report from the Executive Dean
The Chair provided a verbal report on the following matters:

- **New Programs**
  Both the Global MD and the Master of Public Health have been resource intensive during development. The submission to the Australian Medical Council for the Global MD has now been submitted. The Executive Dean passed thanks to Hayley Harris for her work in the submission process.

- **Staff Updates**
  Hayley Harris has been formally appointed as the Program Manager, Education and Faculty Initiatives.

- **WHS Committee**
  The Faculty Board members were reminded that Active Shooter Training is currently available.

- **Doctor of Physiotherapy Graduation**
  The graduation of the first cohort took place on 22 September 2015. This is a significant landmark for the Faculty.

- **Bachelor of Clinical Science**
  A Working Group is developing and planning the program. Recent data received from UAC indicates that the program is either first or second choice in a high number of future students.

- **MQ Open Day**
  The Open Day held on 12 September was a success for the Faculty.

Reports from Faculty Committees

- **Education Committee (FEC)**
  The report from the FEC meeting held 21 September and 19 October 2015 were noted and the following resolutions made:
  - The Faculty Board approved the appointment of Professor Simon Wilcock; Hayley Harris and Dr Lisa Pont to the Committee.
  - The Faculty Board endorsed the proposal for the new award Master of Public Health and recommends its approval by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee.
  - The Faculty Board endorsed the expression of interest for the new award Doctor of Medicine (Global MD) and recommends its approval by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee.
  - The Faculty Board approved the assessment changes to PHTY 816 and PHTY 819.

- **Higher Degree Research Committee (FHDRC)**
  The report from the FHDRC meeting held 7 October 2015 was noted. Changes to the Committee’s Terms of Reference and membership were approved in principle by the Faculty Board.

- **Research Committee (FRC)**
  The report from the FRC meeting held 9 September was noted.

Reports from the Associate Deans

Reports from each of the Associate Deans were received or provided verbally.

- **Dr Panos Vlachopoulos, Acting AD Learning and Teaching:**
  - The planning days for both the Global MD and the Master of Public Health have been held.
  - The development of the Bachelor of Clinical Science is continuing with strong interest in the program shown at the MQ Open day.
  - Assessment Policy Review remains underway by the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee and its Working Group.
  - Learning and Teaching Strategic Plan remains under consultation with the white paper expected to be launched by the end of 2015

- **Professor Roger Chung, AD Research and Higher Degree Research**
  - Briefing notes regarding the Faculty’s Research targets and the research definitions were presented to the Faculty Board. Following consideration, the Faculty Board resolved to endorse:
    i. the ‘Research targets 2024’; and
    ii. the ‘Research active and research productive definitions’.
  - An update was provided regarding the grant outcomes within the Faculty, confirming that two ARC Discovery Projects (2016) have been awarded within the Faculty and NHMRC have released the outcomes of the latest funding applications.
• Professor John Cartmill, AD Clinical
  – The Faculty Board noted the provided report.
• Professor John Boyages, AD International and Engagement
  – The Faculty Board noted the provided report and further discussions were held in relation to Faculty’s Engagement Plan. There is currently work underway reviewing the model to adopt that will capture all staff details to assist with engagement and communication.

Minutes from Departments
The minutes and reports of the meetings held by the Australian Institute of Health Innovation, the Department of Clinical Medicine, the Department of Health Professions and the Department of Health Systems and Populations were noted.

Other Business
• The Faculty Board considered the discussion paper ‘Assessment Policy Review – Invitation to Comment’ requesting Faculty Board’s feedback in relation to the draft policy principles. Professor Catherine Dean, as a member of the Faculty Board and the Assessment Review Working Group will provide Faculty Board’s feedback at the upcoming scheduled review meetings.
• The Faculty Board was reminded that submissions for the Learning and Teaching Infrastructure grant applications are due by close of business 23 November 2015.

The next meeting will be held Tuesday, 8 December 2015 where exam results will be considered. General business agenda items are due Monday, 30 November 2015.

Professor Patrick McNeil
CHAIR