MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY

A meeting of the Academic Senate will be held at 9.30am Friday 18 July 2014 in the Senate Room, 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 Ms Amanda Phelps, University Committee Secretary (phone 61 2 9850 7316 or e-mail senate@mq.edu.au).
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ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Attached are the minutes of the meeting held on 3 June 2014.

Recommendation

That the minutes of the meeting held on 3 June 2014 be signed as a true and correct record.
MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY

ACADEMIC SENATE

MINUTES OF MEETING OF 3 JUNE 2014

Minutes of a meeting of Academic Senate held on 3 June 2014 at 9.30am in the Council Room, Building E11A.

Present:  A/Professor Sherman Young (Acting Chair)
Dr Wylie Bradford
Ms Karee Chan
A/Professor David Coutts
A/Professor Pamela Coutts
Professor Alex Frino
Professor Mark Gabbott
Professor Simon George
Professor Janet Greeley
Professor Mariella Herberstein
Professor Lori Lockyer
Professor Catriona Mackenzie
Professor Peter Nelson
Professor Sakkie Pretorius
Mr Alexander Read
Ms Cathy Rytmeister
Professor John Simons
Ms JoAnne Sparks
George Tomossy
A/Professor Michelle Trudgett
Mr Vikas Veerareddy
Dr Edward Watts
Mr Lachlan Woods
A/Professor Lisa Wynn
Dr Rod Yager

In Attendance:  Mr Benjamin Andrews
Mr Keith Barksdale
Ms Heather Bennett
Ms Ellen Carlson
Ms Trudy De Vries
Ms Ainslee Harvey
Mr Paul Luttrell
Mr Peter McCarthy
Ms Roberta Palfreeman
Ms Amanda Phelps
Ms Zoe Williams
Mr Jonathan Wylie

Apologies:  Professor Dominic Verity (Chair)
Deidre Anderson
Professor John Croucher
Professor Bruce Dowton
A/Professor Mark Evans
Mr James La Faucheur
Professor Jim Lee
Professor Nick Mansfield
1. **APOLOGIES /WELCOME**

This meeting was Chaired by Deputy Chairperson Professor Sherman Young Pro Vice Chancellor (Learning, Teaching and Diversity) as the Chair of Senate was attending a research trip at Harvard University, Boston Massachusetts, USA and would provide an update later in the meeting via Google+Hangout.

Academic Senate welcomed Ms Cathy Rytmeister the new non-faculty representative and Ms Ellen Carlson the new Policy Manager to the meeting. The Deputy Chair acknowledged and welcomed the six new student representative members to their first meeting of Academic Senate noting the attendance of Ms Karee Chan, Mr Alexander Read, Mr Vikas Veerareddy and Mr Lachlan Woods and the apologies from Mr James La Faucheur and Mr Mohammed Sulemana.

The Academic Senate also noted that apologies were received from Professor Dominic Verity (Chair), Deidre Anderson, Professor John Croucher, Professor Bruce Dowton, A/Professor Mark Evans, Professor Jim Lee, Professor Nick Mansfield, Professor Jacqueline Phillips, A/Professor Mehdi Riazi and Professor Dick Stevenson .

Also in attendance were Ms Heather Bennett, Mr Benjamin Andrews and Mr Keith Barksdale, student interns from Auburn University Alabama, USA.

2. **ARRANGEMENT OF THE AGENDA**

The following items were starred for discussion:

4.1 Academic Senate items requiring action  
6. Chair Oral update  
7. Questions on Notice  
8.1 Academic Standards and Quality Committee  
8.2 Curriculum Standards Framework Committee  
8.3 Higher Degree Research Committee  
8.4 Senate Learning and Teaching Committee  
9.1 2014 Federal Budget update  
9.2 Nomination for Award of the Title of Macquarie University Emeritus Professor – Professor Judyth Sachs  
9.3 Student Discipline Rule Supporting Policy and Procedures  
9.4 Draft 2016 Academic Year Plan  
9.5 Call for comment - Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF)  
9.6 Academic Senate - Risk Assessment: against HESF  
9.7 Honorary, Visiting and Clinical Academic Appointments Policy  
9.8 Higher Degree Research Appeals Committee

2.1 The Chair requested that Senate members declare any conflicts of interest.

Mr George Tomossy noted that he had previously declared a conflict of interest associated with the proposal for Bachelor of Laws with Honours at the Academic Standards and Quality Committee held on 20 May 2014, of which the minutes and the proposal would now be discussed.

No other conflicts were recorded.
3. **MINUTES OF MEETING HELD 1 APRIL 2014**

**Resolution 14/71**

*That the minutes of the meeting held on 1 April 2014 be signed as a true and correct record.*

4 **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

4.1 **Academic Senate items requiring action**

The Acting Chair spoke to a number of the outstanding matters during the course of the meeting and noted in particular that most outstanding action items were either currently in progress or underway.

**Item 5.2** Professor Janet Greeley sought clarify regarding the success surrounding the 2014 prioritisation of the scheduling of 100 level units by the Faculty of Business and Economics Timetabling team. The Executive Dean Professor Mark Gabbott advised that the Timetabling team were taking into consideration this requirement but noted that prioritising between the hours of 9am - 5pm provided ongoing challenges to be overcome.

5. **CONSIDERATION OF UNSTARRED ITEMS**

**Resolution 14/72**

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

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

6. **CONSIDERATION OF CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS**

**Standing Committee on Appeals**

The minutes of the Standing Committee on Appeals held on 10 April 2014 were noted.

**University Discipline Committee**

The minutes of the University Discipline Committees held on 2 April and 8 May 2014 were noted.

7. **CHAIR ORAL UPDATE**

Professor Verity reported from Boston via Google Hangouts. The Chair reported on the recent work on the Academic Senate communication and engagement strategic plan, in part demonstrated by the Chair providing his oral update via Google+ Hangout directly from Harvard, Boston Massachusetts, USA. The plan includes increased use of social media platforms to communicate with the Macquarie University community about the activities of Academic Senate. This work is being conducted in consultation with Mr David Sams, Macquarie University, Internal Communications Manager.

Further consultation is currently ongoing to finalise the Faculty Rule. This process has created a better understanding of the requirement for standardisation between the Faculties. The differentiation between the management function of each Faculty compared to the operation of each Faculty Board is being included as part of the consultation.

Since the seminar/presentation meeting of Academic Senate meeting held in May, the
Chair identified that further work is required to consolidate on the development of a strategic plan for how Senate will operate and its role within the University. An off-site workshop is to be planned for 2 days towards the end of 2014.

The Chair also advised Senate that the AQF initial accreditation is nearing completion, there are ongoing challenges with AQF transition and ESOS processes around degree programs to be resolved.

A number of working parties have been recently created, most notably the Assessment, Grading, Unit Guide and Examination Policy Working Party, English Language Policy Working Party, Inherent Requirements Policy Working Party and the Academic Appeals Policy Working Party.

The Chair provided an update on the most recent work of the Curriculum Standards Framework Committee in developing the standards and processes for the Recognition of Prior Learning framework in the areas of the recognition of formal and informal learning.

Academic Senate noted the update provided by the Chair of Senate.

Professor Dominic Verity disconnected from meeting after providing his report.

8. VICE-CHANCELLOR ORAL UPDATE

The Vice-Chancellor was an apology to this meeting and therefore no update was provided.

9. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Nil received.

10. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

10.1 Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC)

The Chair of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee spoke to both the reports of the meeting held 29 April 2014 and 20 May 2014 and highlighted the following:

1. Diploma of Languages - The Chair of ASQC provide background to the development of this program and the creation of a number of principles that have been referred to the Curriculum Standards Framework Committee for consideration and comment, which will then be reported to Academic Senate.

   Academic Senate noted that it would be provided with a set of principles in the future.

2. New definitions for unit offerings – the new definitions have undergone widespread consultation and have resulted in not only revised existing definitions but a number of new definitions. A further definition for the term “blended” is required and will be considered at an upcoming ASQC meeting. The Curriculum and Planning team will look at implementing these new definitions as soon as possible.

   Academic Senate was supportive of these definitions and plans for definition for the term “blended”.

3. Future of MA and MSc – after extensive consultation, two Faculties identified that further admissions into these programs was not required. The original proposal for consideration requested deletion of these programs,
however it was determined to close both programs for new admissions and not formally renew either of these programs.

Academic Senate confirmed that they were supportive of this approach.

4. **LLB with Honours** – the proposal for this approach had been discussed at ASQC, with ASQC noting that a similar proposal would also be forthcoming from the Faculty of Science in relation to Engineering. The proposal centred around the requirement of professional bodies to have an undergraduate Law degree be Honours (Level 8 AQF) awards. ASQC had recommended in principle the adoption of the proposal to

Academic Senate discussed at length the rationale for the requirement of establishing and Honours program, noting the contradiction between the University wide approach of ceasing Honours programs and the creation of the MRes program. Noting in particular that Honours would only be available for existing students to internally transfer into in the last semester of their candidature.

Academic Senate endorsed the proposal noting the possible disadvantage to students if it was not to be implemented. The Deputy Chair asked that ASQC formulate and communicate principles to ensure that any other proposals of this nature would be evaluated consistently.

5. **ASQC membership and role** – from August 2014 ASQC will adopt a more quality assurance role. The current membership is under review.

**Resolution 14/73**  
That the Committee recommend in principle the introduction of a suite of “Bachelor of Law with Honours” awards at AQF level 8, to mirror the existing “Bachelor of Laws” single and double awards at AQF level 7. These awards will only be available for internal transfer in the last semester of candidature.

Academic Senate noted the report of the meeting of 29 April 2014 and resolved as recommended:

**POSTGRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS 2015**

**Resolution 14/74**  
That the following Undergraduate awards and Postgraduate Awards and specialisations listed below are deleted effective 31 December 2014:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2014 Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Applied Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Creative Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of International Trade and Commerce Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of International Trade and Commerce Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG specialisation</td>
<td>Creative Writing CRW31S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG specialisation</td>
<td>Human Geography HUG11S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG specialisation</td>
<td>Human Geography HUG21S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution 14/75
That the following new awards, majors and specialisations listed below are approved effective 1 January 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Program code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate of Finance</td>
<td>GradCertFin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate of Community Interpreting</td>
<td>GradCertCommInter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma of Specialised Medicine</td>
<td>GradDipSpMed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate of Gender Studies</td>
<td>GradCertGenStud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate of Law</td>
<td>GradCertLaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Wireless Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Computing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Information Systems &amp; Business Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resolution 14/76
That the following awards, majors and specialisations listed below are renewed effective 1 January 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postgraduate</th>
<th>2014 Name</th>
<th>2015 name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Actuarial Practice</td>
<td>Master of Actuarial Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>Master of Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>Master of Clinical Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Clinical Sciences</td>
<td>Master of Clinical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Data Science</td>
<td>Master of Data Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Economics</td>
<td>Master of Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Engineering Management</td>
<td>Master of Engineering Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Financial Regulation</td>
<td>Master of Financial Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of International Business</td>
<td>Master of International Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of International Communication</td>
<td>Master of International Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of International Communication with the degree of Master of International Relations</td>
<td>Master of International Communication with the degree of Master of International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of International Relations</td>
<td>Master of International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Marine Science and Management</td>
<td>Master of Marine Science and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Medical Practice</td>
<td>Master of Medical Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Specialised Surgery</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma of Specialised Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Radiopharmaceutical Science</td>
<td>Master of Radiopharmaceutical Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Translating and Interpreting with the degree of Master of International Relations</td>
<td>Master of Translation and Interpreting Studies with Master of International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Biostatistics</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate of Biostatistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Clinical Leadership</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate of Clinical Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Commerce</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Data Science</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate of Data Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Economics</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate of Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Environment</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate of Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Laboratory Quality Analysis and Management</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate of Laboratory Quality Analysis and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Management</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Social Impact Assessment</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate of Social Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Wildlife Management</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate of Conservation Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Applied Statistics</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma of Applied Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Auslan-English Interpreting</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma of Auslan-English Interpreting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Biostatistics</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma of Biostatistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma of Clinical Psychological Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Data Science</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma of Data Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Environment</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma of Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Information Technology</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma of Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Laboratory Quality Analysis and Management</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma of Laboratory Quality Analysis and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Management</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Social Impact Assessment</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma of Social Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma of Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Wildlife Management</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma of Conservation Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Management</td>
<td>Master of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG specialisation</td>
<td>Actuarial Studies ACT11S</td>
<td>Actuarial Studies ACT11S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG specialisation</td>
<td>Business Management and Organisations BMO11S</td>
<td>Business Management and Organisations BMO11S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG specialisation</td>
<td>Economics ECO11S</td>
<td>Economics ECO11S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG specialisation</td>
<td>Environmental Studies ENV11S</td>
<td>Environmental Studies ENV11S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG specialisation</td>
<td>Finance FIN11S</td>
<td>Finance FIN11S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG specialisation</td>
<td>Marketing MKT11S</td>
<td>Marketing MKT11S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>2014 Name</th>
<th>2015 Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Actuarial Studies with the degree of Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>Bachelor of Actuarial Studies with the degree of Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Advanced Science - Astronomy and Astrophysics</td>
<td>Bachelor of Advanced Science - Astronomy and Astrophysics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Advanced Science - Biology</td>
<td>Bachelor of Advanced Science - Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Advanced Science - Biomolecular Sciences</td>
<td>Bachelor of Advanced Science - Biomolecular Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Advanced Science - Chemistry</td>
<td>Bachelor of Advanced Science - Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Advanced Science - Mathematics</td>
<td>Bachelor of Advanced Science - Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Advanced Science - Palaeobiology</td>
<td>Bachelor of Advanced Science - Palaeobiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Advanced Science - Physics</td>
<td>Bachelor of Advanced Science - Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Advanced Science - Software Technology</td>
<td>Bachelor of Advanced Science - Software Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts with the degree of Bachelor of Commerce</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts with the degree of Bachelor of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts with the degree of Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts with the degree of Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Business Administration with the degree of Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>Bachelor of Business Administration with the degree of Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Commerce with the degree of Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>Bachelor of Commerce with the degree of Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of e-Business</td>
<td>Bachelor of e-Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering with the degree of Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering with the degree of Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering with the degree of Bachelor of Commerce</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering with the degree of Bachelor of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering with the degree of Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering with the degree of Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Environment - Environmental Management</td>
<td>Bachelor of Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Planning</td>
<td>Bachelor of Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Diploma of Languages - Chinese</td>
<td>Diploma of Languages - Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Diploma of Languages - Croatian</td>
<td>Diploma of Languages - Croatian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Diploma of Languages - French</td>
<td>Diploma of Languages - French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Diploma of Languages - German</td>
<td>Diploma of Languages - German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Diploma of Languages - Italian</td>
<td>Diploma of Languages - Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Diploma of Languages - Japanese</td>
<td>Diploma of Languages - Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Diploma of Languages - Modern Greek</td>
<td>Diploma of Languages - Modern Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Diploma of Languages - Polish</td>
<td>Diploma of Languages - Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Diploma of Languages - Russian</td>
<td>Diploma of Languages - Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Diploma of Languages - Spanish</td>
<td>Diploma of Languages - Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG major</td>
<td>Astronomy and Astrophysics ASA01</td>
<td>Astronomy and Astrophysics ASA01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG major</td>
<td>Computer Engineering CEN02</td>
<td>Computer Engineering CEN02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG major</td>
<td>Corporate and Commercial Law COR01</td>
<td>Corporate and Commercial Law COR01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG major</td>
<td>Electronics ELE01</td>
<td>Electronics ELE01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG major</td>
<td>Electronics Engineering EEN02</td>
<td>Electronics Engineering EEN02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG major</td>
<td>Human Biology HUB01</td>
<td>Human Biology HUB02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG major</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering MEC01</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering MEC01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG major</td>
<td>Mechatronic Engineering MEN02</td>
<td>Mechatronic Engineering MEN02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG major</td>
<td>Modern History MHS01</td>
<td>Modern History MHS01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG major</td>
<td>Palaeobiology PAL02</td>
<td>Palaeobiology PAL02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG major</td>
<td>Philosophy PHL01</td>
<td>Philosophy PHL01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution 14/77
That Academic Senate approves the proposal of offering the Diploma of Languages award.

Resolution 14/78
That Academic Senate approves the revisions to the structure of the approved dual degree with MAAppFin at ECNU (East China Normal University).

Academic Senate noted the report of the meeting of 20 May 2014 and resolved as recommended:

Resolution 14/79
That the following Undergraduate awards and Postgraduate Awards listed below are deleted effective 31 December 2014:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2014 Name</th>
<th>2015 Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Arts</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Arts</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Certificate of Languages</td>
<td>Certificate of Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Biotechnology with the degree of Master of Commerce</td>
<td>Master of Biotechnology with the degree of Master of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Associate Degree in Information Technology</td>
<td>Associate Degree in Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Marine Science - Marine Geoscience</td>
<td>Bachelor of Marine Science - Marine Geoscience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resolution 14/80
That the following new awards, majors and specialisations listed below are approved effective 1 January 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2015 Name</th>
<th>2015 Award Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of International Law, Governance and Public Policy</td>
<td>MintLawGovPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma of Law</td>
<td>GradDipLaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Creative Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Children's Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma of Children's Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG specialisation</td>
<td>S2:International Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG specialisation</td>
<td>Media and Technology Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG specialisation</td>
<td>Corporate and Commercial Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG specialisation</td>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution 14/81
That the following awards, majors and specialisations listed below are renewed effective 1 January 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2014 Name</th>
<th>2015 Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Accounting (ACCA Extension)</td>
<td>MAcc(ACCA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Doctor of Medical Science</td>
<td>DMedSc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Biotechnology and Business</td>
<td>MBioBus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2014 Name</th>
<th>2015 Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Juris Doctor</td>
<td>S2:Juris Doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Indigenous Education</td>
<td>S2:Master of Indigenous Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of International Public Diplomacy</td>
<td>S2:Master of International Public Diplomacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of International Trade and Commerce Law</td>
<td>S2:Master of International Trade and Commerce Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Laws</td>
<td>S2:Master of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Policing, Intelligence and Counter</td>
<td>S2:Master of Policing, Intelligence and Counter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terrorism with the degree of Master of International</td>
<td>Terrorism with the degree of Master of International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security Studies</td>
<td>Security Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Indigenous Education</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate of Indigenous Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Indigenous Education</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma of Indigenous Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Politics and Public Policy</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma of Politics and Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Policing, Intelligence and Counter</td>
<td>S2:Master of Policing, Intelligence and Counter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terrorism with Master of International Security</td>
<td>Terrorism with Master of International Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studies (OUA)</td>
<td>Studies (OUA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG specialisation</td>
<td>Environmental Law ENL11S</td>
<td>S2:Environmental Law ENL12S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG award</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>S2:Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG major</td>
<td>Chinese Studies CHI01</td>
<td>S2:Chinese Studies CHI01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG major</td>
<td>Croatian Studies CRS01</td>
<td>S2:Croatian Studies CRS01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG major</td>
<td>French Studies FRE01</td>
<td>S2:French and Francophone Studies FRE01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG major</td>
<td>German Studies GER01</td>
<td>S2:German Studies GER01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG major</td>
<td>Italian Studies ITL01</td>
<td>S2:Italian Studies ITL01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG major</td>
<td>Japanese Studies JAP01</td>
<td>S2:Japanese Studies JAP01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG major</td>
<td>Modern Greek Studies MGK01</td>
<td>S2:Modern Greek Studies MGK01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG major</td>
<td>Polish Studies POS01</td>
<td>S2:Polish Studies POS01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG major</td>
<td>Russian Studies RUS01</td>
<td>S2:Russian Studies RUS01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Accounting (CPA Extension)</td>
<td>S2:Master of Accounting (CPA Extension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Accounting (Professional)</td>
<td>S2:Master of Accounting (Professional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Accounting (Professional) with the degree</td>
<td>S2:Master of Accounting (Professional) with the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Master of Commerce</td>
<td>degree of Master of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of International Business with the degree</td>
<td>S2:Master of International Business with the degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Master of International Communication</td>
<td>of Master of International Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of International Business with the degree</td>
<td>S2:Master of International Business with the degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Master of International Relations</td>
<td>of Master of International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG specialisation</td>
<td>Accounting ACC11S</td>
<td>S2:Accounting ACC12S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG specialisation</td>
<td>Corporate Governance COR11S</td>
<td>S2:Corporate Governance COR12S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG specialisation</td>
<td>Financial Crime and Governance FCG11S</td>
<td>S2:Financial Crime and Governance FCG12S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Doctor of Clinical Practice</td>
<td>S2:Doctor of Clinical Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Master of Advanced Translation</td>
<td>S2:Master of Advanced Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Professional Psychology</td>
<td>Master of Professional Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Environmental Planning</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate of Environmental Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG award</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Sustainable</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate of Sustainable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution 14/82
That the following Awards listed below are deleted effective 31 December 2014:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014 Name</th>
<th>2014 Award Abbreviation</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master of Conference Interpreting</td>
<td>MConfInt</td>
<td>Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Translating and Interpreting</td>
<td>MTransInter</td>
<td>Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Translating and Interpreting with the degree of Master of Applied Linguistics</td>
<td>MTransInterMAppLing</td>
<td>Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Translating and Interpreting with the degree of Master of International Relations</td>
<td>MTransInterMIntRel</td>
<td>Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Wildlife Management</td>
<td>MWldMgt</td>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Advanced Surgery</td>
<td>PGCertASurg</td>
<td>Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Biostatistics</td>
<td>PGCertBiostat</td>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Clinical Leadership</td>
<td>PGCertClinLship</td>
<td>Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Commerce</td>
<td>PGCertCom</td>
<td>Faculty of Business and Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Data Science</td>
<td>PGCertDataSc</td>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Early Childhood</td>
<td>PGCertEChild</td>
<td>Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Economics</td>
<td>PGCertEc</td>
<td>Faculty of Business and Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Editing and Electronic Publishing</td>
<td>PGCertEditElecPub</td>
<td>Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Education Studies</td>
<td>PGCertEdS</td>
<td>Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Environment</td>
<td>PGCertEnv</td>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Financial Regulation</td>
<td>PGCertFinReg</td>
<td>Faculty of Business and Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Higher Education</td>
<td>PGCertHEd</td>
<td>Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Intelligence</td>
<td>PGCertIntell</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of International Security Studies</td>
<td>PGCertIntSecStud</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Laboratory Quality Analysis and Management</td>
<td>PGCertLabQAMgt</td>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Management</td>
<td>PGCertMgt</td>
<td>MGSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism</td>
<td>PGCertPICT</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Politics and Public Policy</td>
<td>PGCertPP</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Professional Psychology</td>
<td>PGCertProfPsych</td>
<td>Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Social Impact Assessment</td>
<td>PGCertSIA</td>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of TESOL</td>
<td>PGCertTESOL</td>
<td>Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Wildlife Management</td>
<td>PGCertWldMgt</td>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Applied Linguistics</td>
<td>PGDipAppLing</td>
<td>Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Applied Statistics</td>
<td>PGDipAppStat</td>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Auslan-English Interpreting</td>
<td>PGDipAusEngInt</td>
<td>Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Biostatistics</td>
<td>PGDipBiostat</td>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Clinical Neuropsychology</td>
<td>PGDipClinNeuro</td>
<td>Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>PGDipClinPsych</td>
<td>Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Commerce</td>
<td>PGDipCom</td>
<td>Faculty of Business and Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Data Science</td>
<td>PGDipDataSc</td>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Economics</td>
<td>PGDipEc</td>
<td>Faculty of Business and Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Education Studies</td>
<td>PGDipEdS</td>
<td>Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Environment</td>
<td>PGDipEnv</td>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Information Technology</td>
<td>PGDipInfoTech</td>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of International Security Studies</td>
<td>PGDipIntSecStud</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Laboratory Quality Analysis and Management</td>
<td>PGDipLabQAMgt</td>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Management</td>
<td>PGDipMgt</td>
<td>MGSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Organisational Behaviour</td>
<td>PGDipOrgBeh</td>
<td>Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism</td>
<td>PGDipPICT</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Social Impact Assessment</td>
<td>PGDipSIA</td>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Special Education</td>
<td>PGDipSpecEd</td>
<td>Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Sustainable Development</td>
<td>PGDipSusDev</td>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Translating and Interpreting</td>
<td>PGDipTransInter</td>
<td>Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma of Wildlife Management</td>
<td>PGDipWldMgt</td>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours degree of Bachelor of Psychology</td>
<td>BP Psych(Hons)</td>
<td>Faculty of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resolution 14/83**

That Academic Senate approves the following revised unit level definitions for Internal, External, Day and Evening offerings and the introduction of new unit offerings of Block, Online, Fieldwork and Weekend:

**External**  
Most learning activities and/or classes are delivered online or via correspondence on a regular basis over the duration of the study period. There may be a small number of on-campus or off-campus/fieldwork sessions.

**Internal**  
Most learning activities and/or classes are delivered face-to-face on a regular basis over the duration of the study period. These may be supplemented by a small number of off-campus/fieldwork or online sessions.

*Note: If a unit has a face-to-face lecture strand that is also recorded and available through iLearn, it remains an internal offering for the purpose of this definition.*

**Weekend**  
Most learning activities and/or classes are delivered face-to-face on a regular weekend basis over the duration of the study period.
These may be supplemented by online or off-campus teaching.

**Online**
Learning activities and/or classes including all assessments are delivered fully online on a regular basis over the duration of the study period. These do not require any on-campus attendance.

**Fieldwork**
Most learning activities and/or classes are delivered face-to-face under supervision off campus over the duration of the study period. This includes fieldwork, internships, industry work experience or similar placements. There is no regular on-campus attendance although some supplementary on-campus attendance may be required.

**Block**
Block Day + Block Evening: Most learning activities and/or classes are delivered face-to-face in an intensive mode in a sequence of days that may include weekends. These may be supplemented by online or off-campus teaching.

Block Online: Learning activities and/or classes, including all assessments, are fully online and delivered in an intensive mode in a sequence of days that may include weekends. These do not require any on-campus attendance.

Block Fieldwork: Most learning activities and/or classes are delivered face-to-face off campus under supervision in an intensive mode in a sequence of days that may include weekends. This includes fieldwork, internships, industry work experience or similar placements. There is no regular on-campus attendance although some supplementary on-campus attendance may be required.

**Day/Evening**
Day offerings are used for learning activities and/or classes between 8am and 6pm. Evening offerings are used for learning activities and/or classes between 6pm and 10pm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Mode</th>
<th>Internal/External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day S1 day</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening S1 evening</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend S1 weekend</td>
<td>Internal or External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online S1 online</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block S1 Block</td>
<td>Internal or External</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resolution 14/84**
That Academic Senate approves the revised Course Transfer Schedule for mid-year 2014 subject to the amendment to the Bachelor of Engineering wording from specialisation to major.

**10.2 Curriculum Standards Framework Committee (CSFC)**

Report of Meetings of 24 March and 16 April 2014

Academic Senate noted the report of the meetings of 24 March and 16 April 2014.
10.3 Higher Degrees Research Committee (HDRC)

Academic Senate noted the report of the meeting of 11 April 2014 and resolved as recommended:

**Resolution 14/85**

That the students included in the report of the Higher Degree Research Committee of 11 April 2014 (Item 8.3 Academic Senate Agenda 3 June 2014) have satisfied the requirements for the Awards stated.

10.4 Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC)

Report of Meetings of 7 April and 12 May 2014

Academic Senate noted the report of the meetings of 7 April and 12 May 2014 had been condensed into a document summarising the key activities of both meetings, the full minutes of each of these meetings are accessible via the following link [http://senate.mq.edu.au/sltc/agendas.html](http://senate.mq.edu.au/sltc/agendas.html)

**Resolution 14/86**

That Academic Senate approves the revised Learning Technologies Policy That the Academic Senate notes that the associated Learning Technologies Procedures were approved by the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee on 12 May 2014.

11. GENERAL BUSINESS

11.1 2014 Federal Budget Update

Mr Peter McCarthy, Director, Government Relations, spoke to this item providing an update on the implications for the Higher Education Sector with the release of the 2014 Federal Budget. At this stage it was noted that further modelling would be required if and when the Federal Budget legislation is passed into law

Senate was advised that the Vice-Chancellor has plans to provide the University with further information regarding the Federal Budget after his recent attendance at a meeting with the other NSW University Vice-Chancellor’s.

Academic Senate thanked Mr McCarthy for his presentation.

Please refer to Attachment 1 for a copy of the presentation.

Mr Peter McCarthy and Professor Alex Frino departed the meeting at 11:20.

11.2 Nomination for Award of the Title of Macquarie University Emeritus Professor – Professor Judyth Sachs

The members of Academic Senate discussed the nomination submitted and agreed unanimously to recommend an award of the title of Macquarie University Emeritus Professor to Professor Judyth Sachs.

**Resolution 14/87**

That Academic Senate recommends to Council that Professor Judyth Sachs be awarded the title of Macquarie University Emeritus Professor.
11.3 Student Discipline Rule Supporting Policy and Procedures

University General Counsel Mr Paul Luttrell provided an update to Academic Senate on the background behind the creation of the new Student Discipline Rule and progress of the development of the Student Discipline Rule supporting Policy and Procedures.

The need for documented processes and comprehensive training were identified as key elements to have in place prior to full implementation. It is hoped that these will be in place by the end of 2014. Senate noted that further progress updates will be provided.

Academic Senate thanked Mr Luttrell for the update.

Please refer to Attachment 2 for a copy of the implementation chart (tabled at the meeting).

Mr Paul Luttrell departed the meeting at 10:49 am.

11.4 Draft 2016 Academic Year Plan

Academic Senate noted the draft 2016 Academic Year plan and additional comments were invited to be provided to Ms Zoe Williams, Manager, Governance Services before a finalised plan would be submitted to Academic Senate for approval.

11.5 Call for comment - Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF)

Academic Senate noted the request for comment on the proposed revisions to the current High Education Standards Framework. The Macquarie University response to the proposed draft is being coordinated by the Executive Officer for the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic), Ms Barb McLean.

Resolution 14/88

That Academic Senate members provide any feedback on the Higher Education Standards Framework to the Head of Governance Services by close of business Thursday 12th June 2014 for submission to the Executive Officer, DVC (A).

11.6 Academic Senate - Risk Assessment: against HESF

Academic Senate noted the presentation by Ms Trudy De Vries providing a summary of the workshop activities at the last Academic Senate meeting on 6 May 2014.

The purpose of the workshop had been to identify activities that are currently undertaken that support the requirements and to identify what additional activities or actions would be required to enhance our position.

Further work is to conducted with the preparation of a more robust list to be prepared after further consultation. Senate noted that further updates will be provided.

Academic Senate thanked Ms De Vries for the presentation.

Please refer to Attachment 3 for a copy of the presentation.

11.7 Honorary, Visiting and Clinical Academic Appointments Policy

Ms Roberta Palfreeman, Human Resources Project Officer spoke to consultation process involving the draft of the Honorary, Visiting and Clinical Academic Appointments Policy.

The key areas of discussion were identified as concerning the current definition of “honorary people” and the length of appointment.
Academic Senate suggested that if other Australian universities the recognition of visiting honorary academics then Macquarie University should also adopt this as part of the draft policy.

Roberta requested that any feedback is to be provided directly to her.

The policy is to return to Academic Senate for future consideration.

11.8 Higher Degree Research Appeals Committee

Resolution 14/89
That the Academic Senate approves the extension of the terms of the Higher Degrees Research Appeals Committee (HDRAC) members be extended until 31 December 2014, with members:
• Associate Professor Doris McIlwain (Faculty of Human Sciences, Chair)
• Associate Professor Brian Atwell (Faculty of Science),
• Dr Chris Baumann (Faculty of Business and Economics)
• Dr Alison Holland (Faculty of Arts)

Resolution 14/90
That Academic Senate nominate a representative for the Faculty of Human Sciences to sit on HDRAC.

11.9 Saving Clause Cases – ratification of recommendation

Academic Senate noted that the Chair of Academic Senate approved the following saving cases on 24 February 2014:

Faculty of Arts

Resolution 14/91
That the Saving Clause be invoked to enable the student identified as 41219090 to enable the student to satisfy degree requirements for the 2009 Bachelor of International Studies with the Bachelor of Laws, provided all other degree requirements are met.

Faculty of Business and Economics

Resolution 14/92
That the Saving Clause be invoked to enable the student identified as 42246466 to satisfy degree requirements for the Bachelor of Commerce without completing BBA340 Cross Cultural Management, provided all other degree requirements are met.

Faculty of Human Sciences

Resolution 14/93
That the Saving Clause be invoked to enable the student identified as 40009270 to satisfy degree requirements for the Bachelor of Arts with Bachelor of Education (Primary) without completing the People/Planet units from two different Faculties, provided all other degree requirements are met.

Resolution 14/94
That the Saving Clause be invoked to enable the student identified as 42100364 to satisfy degree requirements for the Bachelor of Arts with the Diploma of Education without completing the People/Planet units from two different Faculties, provided all other degree requirements are met.
Resolution 14/95
That the Saving Clause be invoked to enable the student identified as 42113946 to satisfy degree requirements for the Bachelor of Arts with Bachelor of Education (Primary) without completing the People/Planet units from two different Faculties, provided all other degree requirements are met.

Resolution 14/96
That the Saving Clause be invoked to enable the student identified as 42128048 to satisfy degree requirements for the Bachelor of Arts with the Diploma of Education without completing the People/Planet units from two different Faculties, provided all other degree requirements are met.

Faculty of Science

Resolution 14/97
That the Saving Clause be invoked to enable the student identified as 40441962 to satisfy the Bachelor of Science without completing the People/Planet units, provided all other degree requirements are met.

Academic Senate noted that the Chair of Academic Senate approved the following saving cases on 4 March 2014:

Faculty of Business and Economics

Resolution 14/98
That the Saving Clause be invoked to enable the student identified as 42219590 to satisfy degree requirements for the Bachelor of Commerce without completing 18 credit points at 300 level or above, and without completing a People unit, provided all other degree requirements are met.

Faculty of Human Sciences

Resolution 14/99
That the Saving Clause be invoked to enable the student identified as 41760158 to satisfy degree requirements for Bachelor of Arts-Psychology with Bachelor of Laws without completing People and Planet units provided all other degree requirements are met.

Resolution 14/100
That the Saving Clause be invoked to enable the student identified as 41762932 to satisfy degree requirements for the Bachelor of Arts with the Diploma of Education without completing the People/Planet units from two different Faculties, provided all other degree requirements are met.

Academic Senate noted that the Chair of Academic Senate approved the following saving cases on 28 March 2014:

Faculty of Arts

Resolution 14/101
That in accordance with Bachelor degree Rule 19, the Saving Clause be invoked to enable the student identified as 41767632 to satisfy degree requirements of the Bachelor of Arts - Media without having to complete MAS 105 and MMCS115, provided all other requirements have been met.

Resolution 14/102
That in accordance with Bachelor degree Rule 19, the Saving Clause be invoked to enable the student identified as 42114381 to satisfy degree requirements of the Bachelor of Arts without completing the People and Planet units from two different Faculties, provided all other requirements have been met.

Faculty of Science

Resolution 14/103

That in accordance with Bachelor degree Rule 19, the Saving Clause be invoked to enable the student identified as 42108152 to satisfy degree requirements of the Bachelor of Science without completing the People and Planet units requirement, provided all other requirements have been met.

Academic Senate noted that the Chair of Academic Senate approved the following saving cases on 13 May 2014:

Faculty of Arts

Resolution 14/104

That the Saving Clause be invoked to enable the student identified as 41210263 to satisfy degree requirements of the Bachelor of Arts - Media without completing the People and Planet units, provided all other requirements are met.

Resolution 14/105

That the Saving Clause be invoked to enable the student identified as 41810309 to satisfy degree requirements of the Bachelor of Commerce with the degree of Bachelor of Laws without completing the People and Planet units, provided all other requirements are met.

Faculty of Human Sciences

Resolution 14/106

That the Saving Clause be invoked to enable the student identified as 42114640 to satisfy degree requirements of the Bachelor of Business Administration with the degree of Bachelor of Arts - Psychology without completing the People and Planet units from two different Faculties, provided all other requirements are met.

Resolution 14/107

That the Saving Clause be invoked to enable the student identified as 42247764 to satisfy degree requirements of the Bachelor of Arts with the degree of Bachelor of Education (Primary) without completing People and Planet units from two different Faculties, provided all other requirements are met.

11.10 Report on Academic Appeals – Session 2 2013

The Academic Senate noted the outcome of the seventy five Session 2 Academic Appeals against exclusion from enrolment considered by the Academic Appeals Committee.

11.11 Late additions to the May 2014 qualification list

The list of late additions to the May 2014 Graduation list was approved by the Chair of Academic Senate on 30 April and 1 May 2014.

Resolution 14/108

That Academic Senate notes the list of 6 qualified students (as attached in Item 9.11 of the 3 June 2014 Academic Senate Agenda) for addition to the May 2014 Graduation List.
11.12 Vice-Chancellor’s commendations

Academic Senate ratified the award of Vice-Chancellor’s Commendations for six Master Coursework graduands that were previously approved by the Chair of Academic Senate.

**Resolution 14/109**

That Academic Senate notes that the Vice-Chancellor’s Commendation be awarded to the 6 Master coursework graduands previously approved by the Chair of Academic Senate as attached in Item 9.12 of the 3 June 2014 Academic Senate Agenda.

Academic Senate ratified the award of Vice-Chancellor’s Commendations for 1 Undergraduate coursework graduand that was previously approved by the Chair of Academic Senate.

**Resolution 14/110**

That Academic Senate notes that the Vice-Chancellor’s Commendation awarded to the 1 Undergraduate graduand was previously approved by the Chair of Academic Senate as attached in Item 9.12 of the 3 June 2014 Academic Senate Agenda.

11.13 Undergraduate and Postgraduate Students Qualified for an award

The list of qualified students from 2 April to 22 May 2014 was tabled at the meeting.

**Resolution 14/111**

That the candidates in the report have satisfied the requirement for the awards stated in the submission.

12. OTHER BUSINESS

Nil.

There being no further business the meeting was declared closed at 11:40 am.

Professor S Young  
*Acting Chair*
Attachment 1: Federal Budget update

Presented by Peter McCarthy
Academic Senate
3 June 2014

2014-2015 Budget—Implications for Macquarie University
The Political Context

‘Government subsidies for higher education are a transfer from the lifetime poor to the lifetime rich. So long as there is a system to ensure that everyone can access higher education (such as HECS) then there is no rationale for continued government subsidies for university. This subsidy should be immediately halved (saving $5 billion) in 2014-15 and then completely removed as soon as possible.’

(NSW Liberal Democrat Senator-elect, David Leyonhjelm)
The Political Context

'Regardless of university fees for overseas students, Australians should not have to pay HECS fees #auspol, Sun 18th May 14 18:28‘

(Tweet from Clive Palmer)
And so we’ll see at lot more of . . .
Deregulating Fees

‘Universities will be able to set their own tuition fees for the courses they offer. This gives universities autonomy and freedom to improve educational quality. $1 of every $5 of additional revenue raised by higher education providers from fees will be used to set up Commonwealth Scholarships.’

(Budget 2014-15: Higher Education, 13 May 2014)
New Funding Tiers

*Note that these arrangements are subject to passage of legislation.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding tier</th>
<th>Discipline(s) within funding tier</th>
<th>Australian Government contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding tier 1</td>
<td>Law, Accounting, Administration, Economics, Commerce</td>
<td>$1,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding tier 2</td>
<td>Humanities, Social Studies, Communications (excluding Audio-Visual)</td>
<td>$6,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding tier 3</td>
<td>Computing, Behavioural Science, Welfare Studies, Education, Visual And Performing Arts, Built Environment, Other Health</td>
<td>$9,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding tier 4</td>
<td>Mathematics, Clinical Psychology, Allied Health, Nursing, Engineering, Science, Surveying, Environmental Studies, Foreign Languages</td>
<td>$12,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding tier 5</td>
<td>Dentistry, Medicine, Veterinary Science, Agriculture</td>
<td>$18,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes to HELP Payments

‘Rebalance the Commonwealth’s contribution towards course fees for new students, with a reduction of 20 per cent on average, with effect from 1 January 2016.

‘Graduates will begin to repay their HELP debt when they start earning over $50,638 [estimate only] from 1 July 2016.

’The Government will lend to students at a rate that reflects the cost of Government borrowings to fund their student loans, with a maximum rate of 6 per cent.’

(Budget 2014-15: Higher Education, 13 May 2014)
# Department of Education Budget Statements: Program 3.4 KPIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average amount of debt ($)</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>18,600</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of years to repay debt</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of new debt not expected to be repaid (%)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Retention the Demand-Driven System: Sub-bachelor and Bachelor Qualifications

‘For the first time ever, the Commonwealth will provide direct financial support to all students studying higher education diplomas, advanced diplomas and associate degree courses, as well as those studying bachelor degrees, at all approved higher education institutions.’
Retaining the Demand-Driven System: Postgraduate Qualifications
Postgraduate Research Qualifications

‘Research Training Scheme (RTS) doctoral students will be required to make a modest contribution towards the cost of their degree through a small reduction in Government funding for the RTS. HELP loans will be available so that RTS students do not have to meet these costs up front. Universities may choose to offer scholarships to cover these costs (saving $173.7 million over three years).’
International Students

‘Australia should have at least one university in the top 20 in the world, and more in the top 100.

‘The higher education sector is being held back and cannot compete with the best in the world. We need to set our sights higher.’

(Budget Speech, 13 May 2014)
The Medical Research Future Fund

‘Tonight, I announce the Government’s commitment to build with your contributions, a $20 billion Medical Research Future Fund.

‘This fund will, within six years, be the biggest medical research endowment fund in the world.

‘The Medical Research Future Fund will receive all the savings from the introduction of a $7 Medicare co-contribution, modest changes to the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme and other responsible changes in this Health Budget, until the Fund reaches $20 billion.’

(Budget Speech, 13 May 2014)
Research Funding: Dementia

‘$200 million to accelerate research into dementia, including $26 million through the ARC, providing hope for the 320,000 Australians and their families who suffer from dementia.’

(Budget 2014-15: Higher Education, 13 May 2014)
Research Funding: The ARC

‘A one-off efficiency dividend will be applied to the ARC, consistent with the approach adopted to generate savings for Australian Government departments and statutory agencies (saving $74.9 million over three years).’

(Budget 2014-15: Higher Education, 13 May 2014)
Research Funding: Future Fellowships

‘Future Fellowship Scheme, awarding 100 four-year research fellowships each year from 2015.’
Research Funding: Infrastructure

‘$150 million in 2015-16 to continue the National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy, to ensure that the nation secures the benefits of the $2.5 billion investment in state-of-the-art research infrastructure since the Strategy was created by the Howard Government in 2004.’

(Budget 2014-15: Higher Education, 13 May 2014)
The CRC Program

‘support for research institutions to increase the fields of research at or above world-class standard under the Collaborative Research Networks’

(Department of Education, *Budget Statements*, May 2014)
More Things to Look Out For

- The emergence of new forms of delivery including colleges;
- Incentives for language study;
- Changes to teacher-training;
- Changes to NHMRC and ARC grant conditions;
- Greater support for philanthropy;
- A possible Commonwealth takeover of universities; and
- Alternative funding for infrastructure.
Attachment 2: Implementation Chart for Student Discipline Rule supporting Policy and Procedures

Presented by Paul Luttrell
Attachment 3: Risk Assessment against HESF

Presented by Trudy De Vries
Draft Higher Education Standards

The Senate Committee review of the potential risks for Macquarie University's adoption of the standards

Workshop Output from 6 May, 2014
Presentation Date: 3 June, 2014
Purpose of the workshop

To identify the uncertainties for Macquarie University in adopting the requirements if the Draft Higher Education Standard (HES)

To identify what activities are currently undertaken that support the requirements

To identify what additional activities or actions would be required to enhance our position.
Domains in Focus

- 1.4. Progression
- 1.5. Learning Outcomes and Assessments
- 2.4. Student Grievances and Complaints
- 3.1. Course Design
- 3.2. Course Delivery
- 4.1. Research
- 4.2. Research Training
- 5.1. Course Approvals and Registration
- 5.2. Academic Integrity
- 5.3. Monitoring, Review and Improvement
- 6.2. Academic Governance
## Identified actions related to High Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.4. Progression.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent levels of support across Facilities to support students and ensure equal opportunities</td>
<td><strong>ACTION.</strong> Development of best practice standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2. Course Delivery.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining 'expected learning outcomes' may be compromised due to a high reliance on casual staff numbers</td>
<td><strong>ACTION.</strong> Publish staffing standards; develop employment practices that comply with HESF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements to support research and contemporary teaching and learning approaches for roles are not clear or in place</td>
<td><strong>ACTION.</strong> None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Identified actions related to High Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1. Research.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Research is not consistently aligned to the Research Framework or related policies and procedures | **ACTIONS.**  
  Complete and implement the Research Integrity Framework;  
  Complete and train all on key processes relating and interfacing with RO  
  Ensure access and knowledge of key policies and procedures |
| New research areas may not be currently considered in the Framework | **ACTIONS.** None |
| MQ approach to intellectual property may result in loss of opportunity | **ACTIONS.** Secure a review of the MQ IP approach;  
  Raise the issues of 'turn around' and seek resolution |
| Research partners walk away as we take too long to secure an appropriate contract/ agreement | **ACTIONS.** Secure a review of the contractual drafting process to build standard contracts that accommodate size and scale |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.2. Research Training.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent application of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Conduct</td>
<td><strong>ACTIONS.</strong> Complete the Research Integrity Framework and train relevant persons (students and staff)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Identified actions related to High Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.1. Course Approvals and Registration</th>
<th>ACTION. Develop and implement strategic framework; clear planning and business research relative to the market.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unclear cyclical process around course approvals and accreditation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.3. Monitoring, Review and Improvement.</th>
<th>ACTION. Develop data; more benchmarking; implement 5.1 above; clear communication about why we are doing this - culture change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit conveners are disengaged as comprehensive real time program support tools are not provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Identified actions related to High Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6.2. Academic Governance.</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fragmented oversight in some areas of teaching and learning are not resolved</td>
<td><strong>ACTION.</strong> Senate role in clearly articulating expectations; Execute the strategic change program to raise the profile and need for clear and consistent oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear interface between Academic Governance and operational</td>
<td><strong>ACTION.</strong> Implement initiative to clarify how Academic Governance operates in MQ; Establish protocol to review, debate and resolve issues that fall into the 'grey'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to confirm consistent application of policies and procedures</td>
<td><strong>ACTION.</strong> Establish rules to support Faculty based Academic Governance structures; Build communication strategy around AG its roles and interaction within the broader Academic structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

- Complete the risk profile
- Provide the completed profile to support our response to the Draft standards
- Identify the forum to monitor and close out the agreed action items
ITEM 4.1: ACADEMIC SENATE ITEMS REQUIRING ACTION

For information.
### Academic Senate items requiring action as at 18 July 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14/02/13</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>The Executive Dean, Faculty of Business and Economics to communicate this resolution to the Timetable Project Team. (Related Resolution 13/03 That lectures for First Year day units are prioritised within the timetable for scheduling between the hours of 9am to 5pm.) The Executive Dean advised that the Timetabling Team had indicated that for the 2014 they would definitely be prioritising the 100 level scheduling, but further clarification was required to determine precisely what was meant in some unusual circumstances. Otherwise the Timetabling Team were concerned that they might unnecessarily create some dynamics that weren’t intended, or conversely, not apply a principle that they should.</td>
<td>Clarification required</td>
</tr>
<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>1/10/13</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>The current prerequisites for PSYC105 – Introduction to Psychology II to be discussed with further consultation with the Psychology Department. This matter is to be discussed at the next ASQC meeting on 22 October 2013.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/13</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>That a copy of the Professional Authority Form (PAF) referred to in the Disruptions to Studies policy is circulated to the members of Academic Senate.</td>
<td>To be provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/02/14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>That a Working Group is established to benchmark Macquarie University to the “The Purpose and Function of Academic Boards and Senate in Australian Universities” paper and provide a report to the 1 April 2014 Academic Senate meeting.</td>
<td>In progress</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>
ITEM 4.2: HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH APPEALS COMMITTEE NOMINATION FROM FACULTY OF HUMAN SCIENCES

For ratification.
ITEM 4.2 HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH APPEALS COMMITTEE – FOHS MEMBERSHIP

**Issue:**
The 3 June 2014 Academic Senate meeting confirmed the extension of the Higher Degree Research Appeals Committee (HDRAC) members until 31 December 2014. The Senate recommended that a representative for the Faculty of Human Sciences be nominated to sit on HDRAC.

The Faculty of Human Sciences nominated Professor Anne Castles from the Department of Cognitive Science.

**Recommendation:** That the Faculty of Human Sciences nomination of Professor Anne Castles as the representative on the Higher Degree Research Appeals Committee is ratified.

**Submitted by:** Amanda Phelps – University Committee Secretary

**For enquiries contact:** Amanda Phelps – University Committee Secretary (9850 7316)
ITEM 8.1: SESSION 1 2014 FACULTY EXAMINATION REPORTS FROM EXECUTIVE DEANS

For approval.
The examination meeting was held on 9th July. All departments were represented and the great majority of units reflected profiles which were comparable with past years. Where variants were reported these had all been considered and analyzed by the departmental examination committees. As in previous years there was ample evidence of a range of moderation processes.

The main issues of general note were as follows:

1. As in previous years academic failure due to lack of capability was very rare. Almost all students who failed had not completed the work. Failure rates could be mitigated by ensuring students withdraw in a timely manner (many seem unaware of this option even though they have given up the unit). However Senate may also wish to consider a revision of the current requirement that each unit have three assessment tasks. Assuming a student load of four units that means each student has a minimum of twelve tasks per semester and given the highly decentralized nature of our programmes there is no obvious way to construct a schedule for assessments which are not formal examinations. It is suggested that a more liberal policy be adopted which allows departments to devise their own best fit models for their disciplines. In many cases this is likely to lead to a reduction in the assessment load and, potentially, a higher success rate.

2. There was considerable discussion about lack of attendance at lectures and, increasingly, failure to listen to the iLearn versions. Not participating in classes does not, however, appear to have a catastrophic effect on ability to pass. It is recommended that Senate promote a serious debate on this matter in which the university is honest about the realities of the current attendance pattern and tries to understand reasons for non-attendance bearing in mind that these are complex and go beyond mere teacher charisma or time poverty due to working commitments. As a university we might consider what are the real alternatives available (bearing in mind resource constraints), how our culture might need to change, the importance of keeping students engaged with their studies and how, realistically, we can proceed with a new strategy. Currently, hours of time are being wasted (in an environment where most academic staff feel pressure of time) and capital planning risks following defunct models. Finally, the fact that many students are passing without coming to lectures calls into question the integrity of any relationship, real or imagined, between the learning outcomes of our units and their delivery. To put it baldly: if students are passing without coming to lectures they must be meeting the learning outcomes so the lectures can have no role in delivering the learning outcomes and, if this is the case, why do we have them? But if lectures are necessary to deliver the learning outcomes then students who do not attend should not be
passing. Another approach to this issue is to be found in a consideration of attendance as an academic good in itself based in tightly designed learning outcomes.

3. There was considerable disquiet from almost every department about the role of Campus Wellbeing in assessing disruptions to study. This had a number of facets as follows:

- Failure to inform departments in a timely manner about cases which will require action from the departments
- Failure to involve departments in the assessment of unavoidable disruption claims, inconsistency in assessment and inaccuracy in assessment (e.g. if a student has a chronic mental illness that does not constitute unavoidable disruption as is currently the case but rather a long term issue requiring intervention and careful management)
- Failure to communicate with departments on decisions around special examination arrangements and giving students unrealistic expectations about what they can expect (in other words departments find out very late that they need to provide, say, extra time or extra rooms for five students when they have no control over either time or rooms).

This issue has never arisen before so clearly changes to the previous modus operandi require monitoring and review.

4. That student difficulties can be mitigated by the use of early supplementary assessments to mitigate failure.

5. That there was very varied around penalties for late submission of assignments (with a range from automatic failure through to a sliding scale of light penalties). The faculty will work towards a consistent practice but it may be better if Senate considered this a matter of the university at large as all students work in more than one faculty.

Professor John Simons
Executive dean, Faculty of Arts
10 July, 2014
MEMO

TO: Chair Academic Senate

FROM: Professor Mark Gabbott, Executive Dean, FBE

SUBJECT: Final Grade Report for FBE Session 1 2014

DATE: 11 July 2014

FBE Examination Results for Session 1 2014

Report to Senate

I present herewith the report to Senate of the final results for the Faculty of Business and Economics Session 1 2014. All student marks were collated by the unit conveners and presented to four Departmental Examination meetings. Once reviewed and approved by the relevant Head of Department as the Chief Examiner, the results were forwarded to the FBE FSQC for recommendation to Faculty Board for approval before being submitted to Senate under my signature.

I have attached the standard reporting template to FSQC which provides considerable detail on the results for consideration by Senate. The template is broken down into five key sections and under each section the four departments plus the Applied finance Centre and the Master of Research (MRes) are reported.
General Comments

(1) Communication skills

Ongoing concerns over communication skills have been raised consistently in exam meetings over the past few years. Recent HoD and Unit Coordinator reports seem to have narrowed down the problem to written communication in invigilated assessment. In early 2015 the A/Dean C&QA will scope a project to address this issue.

(2) Disruptions Policy

The University Disruptions Policy has impacted the Faculty quite considerably and the Faculty is concerned that the scope of the policy may need some adjustment. In particular staff were concerned about a number of practices; students sitting the main exam, then claiming disruption requiring double marking, claiming work disruption for assignments requiring new assessments and re-marking, or claiming disruption for supplementary exams requiring another exam to be set. FBE deals with over 3,000 disruption applications per session, and some of the grounds contained in the policy appear over generous and at the scale we operate cause significant additional workload for staff.

(3) Low Student Engagement

There are ongoing concerns over student engagement and attendance raised consistently in exam meetings over the past few years. For example the lack of attendance at lectures was signalled, and this was coupled with low access rates to Echo360 which suggests students are neither attending lectures nor accessing them online later. There is a clear correlation between attendance and unit performance.

(4) Units with High Failures Rates

HoDs reported on failure rates of 20% or greater. Of concern were units that had a failure rate of 30% or greater. This included ACST851 and BUSL250.

(5) Units with Pass Rates 95% or greater

20 units in the Department of Marketing of Management have a pass rate of 95% or greater, in comparison to 30 in Session 2, 2013. Most of the units with high pass rates are PACE, internship or capstone units with very high levels of student engagement; or postgraduate units with small class sizes allowing for individualised attention feedback.
(6) Group Work

At the Session 1 FSQC exam meeting, HoDs reported that all units comply with the University assessment policy requirement that no more than 30% of the mark be derived from group work.

It is worth noting that the examinations review process at the Departmental and Faculty level has become considerably more streamlined. Despite this the pressure on academic staff to meet the tight marking and reporting deadlines is of concern to Heads of Department and the Faculty. The number of scripts marked and the extensive data handling and coordination involved shouldn’t be underestimated. I would like to thank all my academic, adjunct and professional staff for their work.

MG
1. **Report on:**
   1.1. Any ongoing issues
   1.2. Outstanding Action Items from the last exam FSQC meeting

**Economics**

There are no ongoing issues or outstanding action items for Economics.

**Applied Finance and Actuarial Studies**

All units have been audited to ensure percentage of group work is compliant with Assessment Policy. AFIN310 in particular is now compliant (20% group work).

All units have been audited to ensure that participation marks are not awarded for attendance. AFIN329 in particular is compliant in this regard.

The implementation of the “satisfactory performance in the final exam to pass the unit” rule in AFIN838 has been reviewed. The definition of “satisfactory performance” has been moderated, and as a result this unit has fallen out of the group of units with pass rates in excess of 95%.

The finance foundation unit ACST101 remains under review. The role of AFIN100 is included in that review. Discussions are on-going within the Department as well as with the ED and AD-L&T, with a view to implementation in S1 2015.

**Applied Finance Centre**

**High fail rates in initial units.** There were high fail rates in the Financial Instruments core unit in Session 1 2014. The AFC contacted these students. Student feedback indicates that students underestimated the demands of part time study with full time work and family commitments. The AFC will continue its practice of running advisory sessions for new students and the active monitoring of students at risk.

As reported in Session 2 2013, there were high levels of FA’s in the first two core units, ECFS865 Investments and ECFS867 Financial Instruments, in both the Melbourne and the Sydney part time programs. The level of FA’s in these units decreased in Session 1 2014. As mentioned above, the AFC continues its practice of running advisory sessions for new students.

**Marketing and Management**

**Concerns about English language proficiency:** Numerous staff continued to express serious concerns about language proficiency and comprehension levels of international students and some also noted issues with domestic students. A number commented that evidence of poor English language skills became particularly evident in exam performance. Staff continued to
question the value of IELTS testing results suggesting that students who passed the tests did not have a high level of competence. One adjunct who also teaches at SIBT noted that the quality of English comprehension had deteriorated so that pass rates at SIBT had decreased to 56%. The adjunct noted that the quality of SIBT students’ English skills had a knock on effect for our 2nd and 3rd year students. A number of staff noted that they had introduced early diagnostics to identify students with language issues. These units included: BBA 280 Business Models and Organisation structure; BBA340 Cross Cultural Management; HRM328 – Strategic HRM; BUS 832 – Leadership and Management; BUS851– Comparative Human Resource Management; MKTG801 – International Marketing; MKTG 811- Brand Management; MKTG833 – Social Media Management. Two convenors of HRM units noted that they had recommended students avail themselves of relevant University services but that students did not follow up. Another staff member teaching across MKTG and Entrepreneurship units noted that this problem had an impact on inter-cultural relations particularly in the context of group work. Another staff member recommended that an English skills unit be embedded in the programs much like maths is for the more quantitative units.

**Groupwork in BBA 360 and MKTG 309:**

**BBA 360 (PACE Unit):**
This unit had previously been given permission to exceed the 30% cap on group work from Senate. Nevertheless, this year the group work in this unit was reduced to 30%.

**MKTG 309 (People Unit):** Group work compliant with 30% cap and new weekly Online Discussion Board introduced to enhance participation. This initiative was extremely successful.

- over 1300 online posts across 80 topics
- over 200 people contributed with half posting quality comments
- 22 is the maximum number of posts by any one individual
- 6 is the maximum number of quality comments made by one individual
- 80 different threads were initiated
- 7 is the maximum number of different threads initiated by one individual

**Incorporate room booking process into induction:**
Information continues to be incorporated into Department induction for casual and adjunct staff events and in the Department Induction Kit

**Friday scheduling of units:**
Numerous staff commented on the impact of timetable scheduling on enrolments and attendance at lectures. This session the focus was extended beyond Friday scheduling, although serious concerns were expressed about late afternoon Friday and evening times for lectures. Numerous staff also commented that 8am schedules had an immense impact
Accounting and Corporate Governance

Ongoing issues:

**Poor attendance by students at lectures:** The Department has implemented alternative teaching structures in an attempt to engage with students. ACCG326 and ACCG340 moved to a 3 hour seminar which has proven to be effective in reducing the fail rate in these units. Other units have decreased the lecture time to allow greater focus on teaching in smaller groups.

**Poor communication skills** of students have always been an issue. Students struggle to interpret final exam questions, especially theory / discussion type questions.

Outstanding Action Items from the last exam FSQC meeting:

**Request for feedback concerning the use of group work within accounting units:** A review of the use of group work in S2, 2013 revealed that 6 undergraduate units and 12 postgraduate units had group assessment tasks. In the Assessment Policy group assessment has to be limited to 30% and only graded as pass/fail if individual student's contribution cannot be identified. The review indicated that all units were complying with the assessment policy.

**Requested feedback on the change in format of ACCG260:** This unit was not offered in Session 1 and hence the feedback will be provided at the end of Session 2, 2014.

Masters of Research

There are no outstanding items from the last meeting.
2. Report on any issues with new units being offered for the first time

**Economics**

There are no units being offered for the first time in Session 1, 2014.

**Applied Finance and Actuarial Studies**

No new units offered this session.

**Applied Finance Centre**

AFCP859 Advanced Valuation for Corporate Finance was offered for the first time in Sydney and Melbourne. Student feedback on this new unit was excellent.

**Marketing and Management**

MKTG216 (Consumer Demographics) is a new unit in this session. It has successfully achieved all learning outcomes specified in the Unit Guide, including:

- knowledge and appreciation of the relationships between population trends and changes in markets and consumers;
- knowledge of the applications of demographics techniques in understanding consumer populations in Australia and other countries;
- skills in accessing data, information and literature and ability of analysing different segments of consumer populations;
- competence in writing reports/essays on topics related to consumer demographics; and
- ability to communicate results/findings in research projects through an oral presentation.

Students in this unit gained much hands-on skills and knowledge on data analysis and research through a group project on income distribution/inequality and mortgage expenditure in two Local Government Areas (LGAs), which requires students' accessing to ABS Census data using TableBuilder program. Cross-tabulations generated by each individual student in the group, a 5000-6000 words written group report, and a 10 minutes oral group presentation are required as part of group project assessment. Anticipating the potential challenges of the group project, a very detailed instruction was provided to students, a staged progressive submission method was implemented, and all groups were monitored and supervised closely by teaching staff throughout the period of completing the group project. Consequently, most of the groups performed very well and delivered high standard written reports and presentations. The better-than-expected results in group project largely contributed to the elevated the overall grade distribution.

As MKTG216 is a new unit, there is no previous reference in terms of students' capacity in handling the course materials that involve analysing numerically-based data and information...
and incorporating the results in report writing. There were some degree of "over cautious" and "hand-holding" when preparing students for the group research project largely due to lack of prior information on students' capacity in this unit. The experience gained and lessons learned from this unit will provide valuable information and reference for the future offerings. The issues encountered in this session could be avoided in the future.

**Accounting and Corporate Governance**

ACCG315 Accountants in the Profession was offered for the first time in this session with no issues reported. It is a PACE unit created in conjunction with industry partners to help undergraduate accounting students understand what life as an accountant or business professional will be like. A number of industry professionals were invited to the lectures, delivering presentations that captured the breadth, scope and challenges of the accounting profession.

**Masters of Research**

This is the second time that the MRes has been run in the first session as the program commenced at the beginning of 2013. The first session consists of FOBE710, 720 and 730, as well as shell units FOBE751-754. MRes students enrol in the shell units and then attend the 4 specified 800 level unit offered within each department (last year they were able to choose any 800 level unit). We will need to run with shell units for the remainder of 2014. For 2015, each department has developed specific 700 level units that will be co-taught with the 800 level electives (see attached) with differences being in the nature of the assessments. Therefore students will be able to enrol in the units directly, and we will not need to have shell units for 2015.

This year’s shell units were restricted to the specified 4-8 units in each department from the full range of 800 level units available last year. The assessment criteria for the MRes students in S1/2014 has changed from the other students enrolling in the 800 level units directly, with a greater emphasis on research based assessment. For 2015 this assessment criteria will change further with the design of specific 700 level discipline specific MRes units.

There were 2 students in FOBE710 Research Frontiers (Research Seminar), being the seminar unit which was offered by AFAS in second session as they only had 2 MRes student doing that unit. The other MRes students did FOBE710 in first session. The failed student didn’t turn up to class and is being managed within the department.
3. **Report on:**

   **Units where the failure rate is 20% or greater**

   **Differentiate between FW, FA, and F grades in these units**

---

**Economics**

**ECON110: Macroeconomic Principles.** Enrolment 551. Failed 28% (F_20%, FA_7%, FW_2%). The failure rate is practically the same as that of the previous offering (S2, 2013) and somewhat higher than for the offering prior to that (S1, 2013) which had a failure rate of 20%. There was a tendency among the group of students who failed to perform poorly on all of the assessment tasks and not to access the resources available to reinforce learning. The text was considered weak and is under review.

---

**Applied Finance and Actuarial Studies**

**ACST851 FW 0%, FA 0%, F 31%**

Small cohort of 13 students (co-taught with ACST202) where the grade distribution can show significant variability from year to year. Poor lecture/tutorial attendance and poor English language skills were noted.

**ACST859 FW 0%, FA 0%, F 20%**

Small cohort of 15 students where the grade distribution can show significant variability from year to year.

**AFIN252 FW 0%, FA 4%, F 29%**

The grade distribution is consistent with corresponding session in 2013. The assessment was changed with the essay being replaced by a group project and the class test weighting increasing from 10% to 15%.

**AFIN329 FW 1%, FA 3%, F 26%**

Grade distribution is very similar to previous offerings. A new textbook was introduced this session and the course topics revised to reflect the requirements of the new Bachelor of Applied Finance Program. Poor lecture attendance was noted.

**AFAS300 FW 0%, FA 0%, F 20%**

Grade distribution is slightly weaker than the last offering. In this session, students were required to pass the final exam in order to pass the unit.

---

**Applied Finance Centre**

**ECFS867 SYD FT ECFS867 28% F, 7% FA, 3% FW; SYD ECFS867 21% F, 9% FA, 2% FW;**
ECFS867 Financial Instruments is one of the first two core units in the Master of Applied Finance program. Higher failure rates reflect a number of factors: students commence the program with varying academic backgrounds; students are adjusting to the demands of study and full time work; over commitment in terms of units taken. The results for these units are consistent with past semesters. AFC continues to monitor the situation and actively monitors students identified as “at risk”.

SYD FT ECFS868 Financial Risk Management 25% F
5 out of 22 students failed this unit. The unit convenor confirmed these students did not display the learning standards required to pass this unit. Two of the failed students performed poorly in prerequisite units.

Marketing and Management
None of the units in the Department of Marketing and Management have a failure rate of 20% or greater.

Accounting and Corporate Governance
ACCG100 Accounting 1A – the fail rate (21%) is slightly lower than both S1, 2013 (22%) and S2, 2013 (26%). There is a high percentage of students who were absent from the final exam, and did not apply for a supplementary exam (FA 5%), while 3% of students received an FW. The assessment tasks were similar to the last offering.

ACCG224 Intermediate Financial Accounting – the failure rate (21%) is slightly higher than both S1, 2013 (20%) and S2, 2013 (19%). 7% of students were awarded an FA and 1% received an FW. A number of students who have obtained good course work marks (50% or above) performed poorly on the final exam and hence failed the unit. A higher weighting was given to the theoretical component of the final exam and students performed poorly on these questions. The assessment tasks were similar to the last offering, although a 10% participation mark replaced the random homework collection.

BUSL250 Business Law – the failure rate (32%) is significantly higher than both S1, 2013 (24%) and S2, 2013 (18%). Only 3% of students received an FA and 0% (2 students) were awarded an FW. Fortnightly two hour tutorials were introduced in replacement of weekly one hour tutorials this session. Students had difficulty understanding the fortnightly timetabling structure on e-student, consequently taking longer to settle into their correct tutorial classes. The fortnightly timetabling structure also caused lower tutorial attendance due to students forgetting their tutorial weeks. Some students found that the gap between fortnightly tutorials interrupted their focus on the unit. There was no change in the assessment from the previous offering. This unit had PAL in session 1, and the UCs StAR program. The UC has indicated that despite the assistance
provided, many students failed to complete their online quizzes, and not bothering to turn up to tutorials. Those that worked consistently, attended consultations and came to lectures performed very well.

**BUSL301 Corporations Law** – the failure rate (26%) is consistent with S1 2013 (26%) while significantly higher than S2 2013 (16%). Only 1% of students received an FA and 1 student received an FW (0%). Students performed poorly on the final exam. Students were not keen to engage in tutorial class discussions, which resulted in poor class participation marks (out of 20%).

**ACCG611 Principles of Accounting** – the fail rate (26%) is higher compared to Session 2, 2013 (22%) but lower when compared to Session 1, 2013 (27%). This high fail rate could be attributed to students’ being new to accounting and the ‘open book exam’ employed. The FW and FA are both 1% in the session. It is also worth noting that the Fail rate of Macquarie City Campus for session 1, 2014 is 42% compared to the 26% fail rate here at the main campus.

**ACCG615 Quantitative Methods** – the fail rate (20%) is higher compared to Session 2, 2013 (17%) and Session 1, 2013 (13%). The FWs are 1% while the FAs are 2%. The UC indicated that it was a poor cohort of students who struggled to cope with the contents of the course. It was also noticed that the face to face consultations were more than usual which indicated that the students were struggling to cope with the course contents.

**Masters of Research**

FOBE710 had a pass rate of 100% and this is a seminar unit run across each of the 4 departments. FOBE751, 753 AND 754 had pass rates of 100%, but these were shell units.
4. Report on Units with a pass rate of 95% or greater

**Economics**

**ECON336: Economic Development.** Enrolment 65. Passed 97%. For the second year in a row, the failure rate is significantly lower than it had been in earlier years (8% and 9% in 2011 and 2012). This is possibly attributable to the fact that one-third of the student cohort had a GPA greater than three.

**ECON350: Money and Finance.** Enrolment 523. Passed 93%, (Failed 2% and Incomplete 3%). The grade distribution is practically identical to the previous offering. In particular, the failure rate is practically unchanged when the proportion of incompletes is included in it.

**ECON632: Intermediate Microeconomics.** Enrolment 41. Passed 93%, Failed 5% and Incomplete 2%. In the two previous offerings of this unit the pass rate was 100%. The enrolment in the unit has steadily increased from 13 in S1, 2012 to 42 currently. As in previous years, the student cohort is strong with 25% having a GPA better than 3.5 and 75% better than 1.5.

**ECON846: International Monetary Policy.** Enrolment 45. Passed 96%. The grade distribution is practically unchanged from last offering where the pass rate was 95%.

**ECON857: Economic Development and World Economic Order.** Enrolment 14. Passed 100%. The Pass rate is the same as the last time the unit was offered.

**ECON991: Economics for Actuaries.** Enrolment 61. Passed 93%, Failed 5%, Incomplete 2%. Pass rate is similar to the previous offering of the unit.

**Applied Finance and Actuarial Studies**

The below units are all small (enrolment under 100) or excellent cohorts, most of which are consistent with previous offerings:

- ACST152 (96) 96%
- ACST402 (22) 95%
- ACST603 (87) 95%
- ACST834 (19) 95%
- AFIN890 (28) 96%
- FOBEB301 (9) 100% (This is the last offering of this unit)
Applied Finance Centre

Core Units: SIN ECFS874 Legal Risk in Finance 100% (19 students): Higher pass rate than normal in this unit. This Singapore cohort was extremely engaged in class, which resulted in good performances in all assessment components of this unit.

Elective Units: The class sizes for elective units are small. Students enrol in these units after completing core units and self-select elective units based on their area of expertise and interests. The pass rate in electives is therefore generally much higher than core units. The following units had pass rates of 95% or greater:

SYD ECFS842 Mergers and Acquisitions 100% (14 students) SYD ECFS880 97% (29 students)
SYD ECFS886 Debt Capital Markets 96% (45 students)
SYD ECFS888 Economics of Financial Markets 95% (20 students) SYD ECFS899 Modelling Prices and Risk 100% (17 students)
SYD ECFS908 Interest Rate Portfolio Management 100% (8 students) SYD ECFS991 Equity Capital Markets 96% (25 students)
MLB ECFS842 Mergers and Acquisitions 100% (20 students)
MLB ECFS888 Economics of Financial Markets 96% (23 students)
SIN ECFS902 Resource industry Investment Analysis 100% (9 students) SIN ECFS991 Equity Capital Markets 100% (19 students)

Marketing and Management

There are 20 units in Session (1, 2014) that had pass rates of 95% or greater, compared to 30 units last session (2, 2013).

Of the 20 units this session (S1, 2014), 5 of the units were new occurrences in this report (BUS851, MGMT255, MKTG804, MKTG811, MKTG833)

Of the 20 units this session (S1 2014), 15 of the units were common with units in S2 2013 that had pass rates of 95% or higher.

Accounting and Corporate Governance

ACCG315 Accountants in the Profession – This unit was offered for the first time in Session 1, 2014. Overwhelmingly positive feedback was obtained from both staff and students. Students have expressed their appreciation of being given chances to meet and engage with industry partners. The unit has no final exam, 31% of students have achieved higher grades (HDs and Ds), while only 2% of students failed the unit.

ACCG399 Issues in Accounting Theory and Practice – This capstone unit has no final exam and the failure rate (1%) has slightly improved compared to both S1, 2013 (2%) and S2, 2013 (2%).
Embedded in an interactive learning environment, students have perceived a real integration of accounting content across their studies, its application to the real world and relevance to the accounting profession. A great deal of international students have indicated that this unit enables them to see things in a different way, induce their creativity, allow them the ability to more readily express themselves in a classroom environment and creates a capacity to form deeper relationships with fellow peers through conversation and a free exchange of ideas.

**BUSB377 Japanese Trade Law** – While the failure rate (3%) is the same as S1, 2012 it is higher than S1, 2013 (0%). This could be attributed to an increase (decrease) in the weighting of short answer questions (multiple choice questions) in the Class Test (30%), and an increase in the weighting of essay type questions in the final exam (50%).

**ACCG613 Intermediate Managerial Accounting** - The unit has a fail rate of 0% in Session 1, 2014 while the fail rate was 7% last session and 29% in Session 1, 2013. This good performance is attributed to the fact that all the students (7 students enrolled) had a good understanding of the fundamentals of accounting and hence performed well in the course work and final exam.

**ACCG847 Forensic Accounting** - The unit has a fail rate of 4% in Session 1, 2014 while the fail rate was 6% last session and 11% in Session 1, 2013. This good performance is attributed to the fact that nearly all the students (25 students enrolled) were involved in good class interactions and were well motivated to learn and hence performed well in the course.

**ACCG848 Business and Professional Ethics** - The unit has a fail rate of 0% in S1, 2014 and S2, 2013. There were 9 students in the unit and all the students were quite engaged in the course.

**ACCG811 Advanced Auditing and Assurance Services** - which is co-taught with ACCG925 (Auditing and Assurance Services) – The unit has a fail rate of 0% in session 1, 2014 while the fail rate was 18% in session 2 2013. Only 6 students were enrolled in this unit.

**ACCG930 Enterprise Risk Management** - The unit has a fail rate of 0% in Session 1, 2014 while the fail rate was 4% last session and 0% in Session 1, 2013. Only 16 students were enrolled in this unit.

**ACCG951 Legal Governance for Business Enterprises** – The unit has a fail rate of 3% in Session 1, 2014 but the fail rate was 0% in last session and in session 1 2013. This course had 29 students and all the students were quite engaged in the course throughout the session. The enrolment doubled this session compared to session 2, 2013. Students who were at academic risk were identified early in the session and were provided with study support and were monitored closely.
ACCG877 Emerging Issues in Financial Crime – The unit has a fail rate of 0% this session. This unit was offered for the first time last session and also had a failure rate of 0%. There were 7 students enrolled in the unit and all performed quite well. The unit was based on a series of seminars based on a different case study each week. Guest lecturers from both industry (ICAC, Fraud Squad) and academia (PICT, ACG- cybercrime) presented on relevant fraud topics using the political, economic, social, cultural and environmental theme underpinning the unit. A number of students had industry experience in various fields and this experience enhanced seminar discussions. The quality of discussions in the online forums was outstanding and students became quite competitive in their other assessment tasks.

Masters of Research

None were noted.
5. **Report on units with significant grade distribution changes (change 15% or greater from the previous session)**

**Economics**

**ECON110: Macroeconomic Principles.** The proportion of Pass’s fell from 49% (S1, 2013) to 32% currently (S1, 2014). Correspondingly, there was an increase at both the top and bottom ends of the grade distribution. Specifically, the proportion of HD’s and D’s increased together by 8% while the proportion of F’s increased by 6%. The top end is stronger due to changes in the unit. The assessment program was changed to include weekly homework submissions and the lecture slides and examples were re-worked. (Enrolment 551).

**ECON111: Microeconomic Principles.** The failure rate fell from around 30% in S1, 2013 to 18% in S1, 2014. The distribution of grades moved upwards with proportionately more HD’s, D’s and CR’s and proportionately less P’s, although the current distribution is almost identical to the distribution in S1, 2012, which was the last time this unit convenor took charge of the unit. The improved distribution, particularly the reduction in the percentage of F’s, is likely due to the introduction of a more pronounced strategy of identifying students at risk. This involved an assignment in Week 5 which was both encouraging and challenging and which gave students a reliable indication of where they stood and what was expected of them. In addition, the final examination was re-structured so that there was a more even level of difficulty across sections of the exam. The content and level of difficulty of the unit matched those of earlier offerings. (Enrolment 1269).

**ECON356: Evolution of Economic Ideas.** While the failure rate remained low, the proportion of Pass grades increased with the proportion of CR grades falling commensurately, which the unit convenor attributed to a somewhat lack of engagement by students in this range. The proportion of HD’s and D’s also increased somewhat indicating that the best students were fully engaged. (Enrolment 41).

**ECON361: Economic and Business Forecasting.** There is an upward shift in the distribution of grades with the failure rate remaining low. The proportion of Pass and CR grades fell by 13% and 8%, respectively, while the proportion of HD’s and D’s both increased by around 5%. This upward drift in the grade distribution is consistent the improved distribution of GPA’s. The unit is of moderate size. (Enrolment 55).

**ECON632: Intermediate Microeconomics.** The enrolment increased from 17 (S1, 2013) to 42 (S1, 2014). The grade distribution moved down with the proportion of P’s increasing from 24% (S1, 2013) to 40%. This was matched by small falls in the proportion of HD’s, D’s and CR’s. This likely reflects the shift downwards in the GPA distribution. In 2014, 25% of students had a GPA greater than three compared with 75% in
ECON840: Applied Econometrics I. While the failure rate was slightly higher than in the previous offering, the most noticeable difference is that the proportion of D’s and CR’s fell while the proportion of HD’s and P’s increased which may be due to the higher proportion of students with a GPA between 2.5 and 3 in the current cohort. (Enrolment 32).

ECON857: Economic Development and World Economic Order. There has been an upward shift in the grade distribution with most notably a much higher proportion of D’s and a much lower proportion of CR’s. As there were only 14 students in the unit, comparisons with previous offerings should be interpreted cautiously. (Enrolment 14).

ECON860: Advanced Microeconomics. While the failure rate was unchanged from the previous offering, the proportion of HD’s, and particularly D’s, increased and the proportion of P’s correspondingly decreased. This was attributable to somewhat more emphasis being placed on economic applications and the empirical validation of key economic concepts and to a stronger group of students (in terms of GPA) at the upper end. (Enrolment 41).

ECON991: Economics for Actuaries. There is a downward movement in the grade distribution with proportionately more P’s and CR’s and correspondingly proportionately less HD’s and D’s. This is primarily due to the unit being available this session to a wider variety of students, not just those with an actuarial training. (Enrolment 61).

Applied Finance and Actuarial Studies

AFIN818 (169)
Grade distribution is consistent with the Session 2 2013 offering, where assessment changed to include an invigilated class test and final exam.

FOBE302 (127)
Grade distribution is consistent with the Session 2 2013 offering, where assessment was tightened along with the moderation standards. In addition, students were required to pass the case study to pass the unit.

Smaller Units
ACST402 (22) CR from 22% to 55%, P from 33% to 9%
ACST818 (36) CR from 48% to 33%, P from 22% to 39%
ACST851 (13) CR from 37% to 15%, F from 5% to 31%
ACST859 (15) D from 38% to 20%, F from 0% to 20%
ACST860 (13) D from 18% to 0%, P from 45% to 69%
ACST861 (41) P from 55% top 39%
AFIN806 (23) P from 36% to 52%
AFIN828 (29) P from 60% to 31%
AFIN832 (46) P from 35% to 17%
AFIN838 (88) P from 32% to 17%
AFIN839 (29) P from 47% to 31%
AFIN890 (28) P from 35% to 54%
FOBE301 (9) D from 63% to 22%, CR from 13% to 33%, P from 25% to 44%

**Applied Finance Centre**

**Core Units :**

**SIN ECFS865 Investments:** Significant % changes in this distribution result from a small class size in this unit (11 in Session 1 2014, 15 in Session 1 2013).

**SYD ECFS865 Investments:** Credits were higher and passes were lower in Session 1 2014 in comparison to Session 2 2013. Students were better prepared for the mid session exam and carried this performance through to the final exam.

**ECFS866 Corporate Finance:** The following comments are applicable to the Corporate Finance unit in all teaching centres. In Session 1 2014 assignments were modified to provide students with more formative assessments, thereby assisting students to be more prepared for examinations. The assessments were modified in two ways: (1) a pre-course assignment was included (with a weighting of 5%), which focussed on building financial modelling skills and (2) the format of two other assignments (with weightings of 15% and 10%) were changed to provide students with a greater range of skills to assist in their exam preparation. These assessment changes resulted in students performing much better in examinations.

The Melbourne class (with a class size of 15) had four high distinctions in Session 1 2014. The students who were awarded these high distinctions have performed extremely well in other units in the Master of Applied degree.

The change in grade distributions for ECFS866 Corporate Finance are:

**SYD ECFS866 Corporate Finance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>FA</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SYD FT ECFS866 Corporate Finance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>FA</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S2 2013 0% 17% 44% 28% 6% 0% 0% 6% 100%

MLB ECFS866 Corporate Finance

HD D CR P F FA FW I TOTAL
S1 2014 27% 13% 33% 7% 0% 0% 0% 100%
S2 2013 4% 17% 33% 29% 8% 0% 0% 100%

SIN ECFS867 Financial Instruments: Significant % changes in this distribution result from a small class size in this unit (8 in Session 1 2014, 25 in Session 1 2013). Two students in Session 1 2014 received FA’s.

SYD FT ECFS867 Financial Instruments: This is one of the first core units that full time students study in the Master of Applied Finance degree. This was a mature group of students with strong work experience which resulted in great class discussions. Many students however, had not studied formally for some time, which affected their performance in examinations.

MLB ECFS867 Financial Instruments: There were more passes (and less credits) in Session 1 2014 in comparison to Session 2 2013. Students in this cohort performed poorly in the mid session exam (worth 20%) even though the level of difficulty of this mid session exam was consistent with prior sessions and in other teaching centres. The majority of students performed much better in the final exam, resulting in less fails than the previous session. Overall, the poor performance in the mid session exam resulted in fewer credits but more passes.

SYD FT ECFS868 Financial Risk Management: Curriculum and assessment changes in Session 1 2014 make it difficult to compare Session 1 2014 to Session 2 2013. This involved changes to topics, introducing the flipped classroom and using quizzes for formative assessment. These changes were implemented for the full time cohort only in Session 1 and will be rolled out in other teaching centres in Session 2.

MLB ECFS868 Financial Risk Management: Distinctions were lower and passes were higher in Session 1 2014 in comparison to Session 2 2013. Significant percentage changes in this distribution result from a small class size in this unit (15 in Session 1 2014, 22 in Session 1 2013).

SYD ECFS874 Legal Risk in Finance: No discernable reasons for the change in grade distribution. There was no change in unit convenor or assessment types.

Elective units:
The class sizes for elective units are in general much smaller than core units. These small class sizes can result in significant variations in the distributions across sessions for many of our elective units. These distribution changes have not been reported here.
Marketing and Management

Units with significant grade distribution changes (change of 15% or greater from the previous session):

**BBA 360 – Business Project (87 students)**

20% increase in Credits
16% decrease in Passes
In 2014.1 there were no failures and a swing occurred towards more students attaining a Credit grade (52% compared to 32% in 2013.1). The HD and D grades were steady, with only change being between Credit and Passes. Up until 2014 Session 1 this unit had a group project weighted at 50% (approved). This session a decision was taken to reduce the weighting to 30% and this work is also peer assessed. Interesting to note, that this has had a positive effect on final grade outcomes. Students have appeared to embrace the many student consultation times set aside for this Unit (being both a PACE and a Capstone unit) by ensuring they are conferring with Unit staff at every available opportunity. The Unit Co-ordinator also met with their respective external partner organisations as needed, to ensure the students were task focussed and embracing the partner organisation’s needs.

**BUS 651 – Work, Organisation and Management (35 students)**

16% increase in Distinctions
26% decrease in Credits
Results are consistent with earlier years. The slightly higher number of Distinctions stems from the high standard of the students’ major essay. Students’ work improved in response to poor performance in an earlier assessment and the feedback that was provided.

**BUS 832 – Leadership and Management (36 students)**

UC compared with S2 2013:

26% increase in Credits
19% decrease in Passes
An early diagnostic was introduced to identify students with poor English. The cohort was overall stronger than previous sessions’ offerings with higher percentage of Credits as compared to last year’s with a number of non-English speaking students progressing quite well during the session. On the other hand there were at least 3 students who were very close to getting the Distinctions but their accumulative marks did not result in higher marks.

**BUS 851 – Comparative Human Resource Management (38 students)**

16% increase in Distinctions
19% decrease in Credits
The distributions of grades is similar to previous years 2012 and 2011. The difference in grade distribution with 2013 mainly due to the use of in-class test in 2013, instead of a formal final exam scheduled during the exam period.

BUS 854 – Leading and Managing in Culturally Diverse Environments (46 students)
17% decrease in Passes
This unit now runs both F2F and online, which led to a change in assessments and the inclusion of reflective exercises. This resulted in an increase in Ds and a decrease in passes.

FOBE200 – Professional and Community Engagement (69 students)
17% increase in High Distinctions
16% decrease in Credits
These students have been selected for internships from a competitive application process, therefore the students are not a representation of the entire student population so do not fit the normal distribution.

FOBE300 – Student Leadership in Community Engagement (77 students)
20% increase in High Distinctions
20% decrease in Credits
These students have been selected for internships and other business community engagement experiences through a competitive application process. Accordingly they are not a normal representation of the entire student population, and do not fit the normal distribution. This session also included students who were invited to participate in the Deloitte Fastrack Experience, which was highly competitive and attracted over 150 applicants for a maximum of 50 places and all applicants had a GPA of 3.5 or greater (actually most had 4.0 GPA). This skewed results towards the top end of the gradings.

HRM 300 – Human Resources Learning and Development (15 students)
25% increase in Distinctions
19% decrease in Passes
There is a marked change in the distribution of grades – with a much larger proportion of distinctions leading to smaller proportions of credits and passes. This is explained by the size of the cohort. There were only fifteen students and attendance was extremely high (perhaps because absence was so obvious). The class size permitted extensive discussion and clarification, which probably facilitated learning. Also, one of the project groups contributed an exceptionally good group report. This drop in numbers is a one-off linked to the shift of this unit from 2nd year to 3rd year and its transformation to a PACE unit. All those who had completed the unit in 2nd year could not do it as a third year unit. Numbers will increase with the new cohort of
MKTG202 – Marketing Research (406 students)

17% increase in Credits
17% decrease in Passes
This session, significantly fewer students failed this unit that in previous sessions. Decrease in failures attributed to an exceptionally good cohort and the non-grades weekly quiz that students need to complete in order to access materials needed for the following week.

MKTG204 – Integrated Marketing Communications (184 students)

UC compared with S2 2013:

24% decrease in Credits
26% increase in Passes
The number of distinctions and credits is also lower than the previous offering (i.e. S2, 2013) while the number of passes has increased. One possible reason for this change is that an individual assignment task weighted at 20% was introduced in place of class presentation.

MKTG208 – Marketing Management (131 students)

16% decrease in Distinctions
This unit was scheduled on Fridays at 3pm and the numbers decreased because the number of units in the required units list was expanded giving students a greater choice of units. Harvard cases were introduced to this unit and many students found this a difficult exercise.

MKTG696 – Introduction to Marketing Management (58 students)

27% decrease in Credits
Grades are slightly lower, partly as a result of a tougher mid-term quiz.

MKTG801 – International Marketing (80 students)

19% decrease in Passes
Decrease in number of Ps and slight increase in number of CRs and Ds. This is attributed to an early diagnostic test in week 4 and a higher degree of personal consultation with UC. This unit was offered online as well as F2F. Exam was removed. Slightly different assessments were used for the two offerings. The online outcomes inflate the results

Face to face
Total: 68 students H= 1; D= 10; CR= 32; P 24; F=1
Online

22
Total: 12 students H=0; D=4; CR=4; P=4
If the online cohort is removed the results are fairly within the range of Sem 1, 2012 (they had 2 H.D and 9 Distinctions) and Sem 1 2013 (for credits and pass). The online students had nearly 33.33% with D grade (4 out 12). In S2 the assessments between the two delivery modes will be aligned more effectively. The students who attained Ds were very strong students.

**MKTG804 – E-Business Marketing (25 students)**

UC compared with S2 2013:

15% decrease in Distinctions
25% increase in Passes
Relatively higher number of “P”. This was due to poor performance in the final exam (fail average of 15/35). Many students performed poorly in questions which they were expected to demonstrate some integrated thinking (i.e., broader questions that require application of knowledge from more than one topic). This is rather disappointing, given that MKTG804 is a postgraduate unit. In addition, students were allowed to bring “one-A4 double-sided handwritten note. The use of notes did not appear to have helped their performance in final exam.

**MKTG806 – Applied Marketing Strategy (35 students)**

18% increase in Credits
The distribution reflects the change in Assessment focus to a format the blends both individual and group work. Increase in credits attributed to Group work and peer assessment of group work

**MKTG833 – Social Media Management (21 students)**

17% decrease in Credits
30% increase in Passes
This year the unit was taught by a new full-time staff member. This year only 1 student (5%) achieved a grade of HD, compared to 5% in 2013 and 8% in 2012, and grades distributions compare well with previous offerings.
Distinction grades (19%, 4 students) are in line with distributions in 2012 – but vary from 2013 offering (31%). Credit (24%) grades are lower than in previous offerings (41% and 38% respectively). Pass (48%) grades vary from 2013 offering (18%) and is slightly lower than from 2012 offerings.
There is only one Fail grade (5%, 1 student), which reflects the Fail rates in previous offerings. The failing student had serious psychological problems that affected her study. Overall feedback suggests students enjoyed the unit – the vast majority enjoyed the variety of case study topics, and put in a strong effort into their assessments tasks and produced very good work during the
session. We see this in the overall spread of marks and grades, with over 24% achieving a Distinction grade or higher.

**Accounting and Corporate Governance**

**ACCG200 Fundamentals of Management Accounting** – the failure rate has decreased from 34% (in session 2, 2013) to 19%. This failure rate is in line with the first session offering in 2013. The failure rate in first session is traditionally lower.

**ACCG250 Accounting Systems Design and Development** – A lower percentage of students (24% compared to 39% in S2, 2013) received a Pass grade. A higher percentage of students (52%) were awarded higher grades (CR, D, and HDs) than in S2, 2013 (33%).

**ACCG326 International Accounting** – While a higher percentage of Ds (23% compared to 3% in S2, 2013) and a lower percentage of F grades (15% compared to 32% in S2, 2013) were awarded it should be noted that only 13 students were enrolled in this unit.

**ACCG811 Advanced Auditing and Assurance Services** (co-taught with ACCG925) – The D grades have increased from 0% in Session 2, 2013 to 17% in Session 1, 2014 while the F grades have decreased from 18% in Session 2, 2013 to 0% in Session 1, 2014. There were only 6 students enrolled in this unit.

**ACCG925 Auditing and Assurance Services** - The P grades have decreased from 61% in Session 2, 2013 to 44% in Session 1, 2014. A higher percentage of students received a D or CR grade (46%) compared to S2, 2013 (30%).

**ACCG927 Current Issues in Accounting** - The D grades have decreased from 26% in Session 2, 2013 to 5% in Session 1, 2014. The CR grades have decreased from 47% in Session 2, 2013 to 24% in Session 1, 2014 while the P grades have increased from 19% to 62%. The percentage of students obtaining D and CR grades has decreased significantly and this has resulted in a substantial increase in P grades. Feedback from the teaching staff and from the Unit Convenor’s own analysis of the scripts indicated that students’ performance on two questions was not satisfactory. These two questions had a number of components and a significant number of students simply focused too narrowly on the questions.

**ACCG612 Intermediate Financial Accounting** – The D grades have increased from 0% in Session 2, 2013 to 17% in Session 1, 2014. The CR grades have increased from 0% in Session 2, 2013 to 33% in Session 1, 2014 while the P grades have decreased from 50% in Session 2, 2013 to 33% in Session 1, 2014 and the F grades have also decreased from 50% in Session 2, 2013 to 17% in Session 1, 2014. There were only 6 students enrolled in this unit.
ACCG613 Intermediate Managerial Accounting - The HD grades have increased from 0% in Session 2, 2013 to 29% in Session 1, 2014. The CR grades have increased from 20% in Session 2, 2013 to 57% in Session 1, 2014 while the P grades have decreased from 53% in Session 2, 2013 to 0% in Session 1, 2014.

ACCG822 Information Systems in Business - The D grades have decreased from 30% in Session 2, 2013 to 9% in Session 1, 2014.

ACCG825 Management Accounting: Strategy and Control – The CR grades have decreased from 56% in Session 1, 2013 to 33% in Session 1, 2014. There were only 12 students enrolled in this unit.

ACCG828 Management Control Systems – The CR grades have decreased from 43% in Session 2, 2013 to 29% in Session 1, 2014. The P grades have increased from 27% in Session 2, 2013 to 43% in Session 1, 2014. This cohort of students seemed to experience challenges with critical, analytical and integrative thinking which may account for the change in the grade distribution. In some instances students really seemed to struggle with their English Language skills.

ACCG835 International Accounting - The CR grades have increased from 14% in Session 2, 2013 to 30% in Session 1, 2014 while the F grades have decreased from 31% in Session 2, 2013 to 12% in Session 1, 2014. In Session 1, 2013 the Unit Convenor had commented that ACCG835 is a theory based unit and students often struggle to understand the reading materials and have a tendency to rote learn lecture materials. Students were exposed to more reading materials in this session and were also discouraged to rote learn in the weekly lectures and the final revision lecture.

ACCG847 Forensic Accounting - The P grades have increased from 29% in Session 2, 2013 to 44% in Session 1, 2014. In this session the final examination was replaced with 2 class tests. These tests were moderated. The tests were set and invigilated at a standard equivalent to final examinations. Both tests were case based short answers questions. There were no multiple-choice questions in any part of the assessment. There were 25 students enrolled in this unit.

ACCG848 Business and Professional Ethics - The D grades have decreased from 60% in Session 2, 2013 to 44% in Session 1, 2014 while the CR grades have increased from 0% in Session 2, 2013 to 22% in Session 1, 2014. There were 9 students enrolled in this unit.

ACCG871 Advanced Corporate Accounting - The D grades have decreased from 26% in Session 2, 2013 to 4% in Session 1, 2014. The CR grades have decreased from 43% in Session 2, 2013
to 25% in Session 1, 2014 while the P grades have increased from 4% in Session 2, 2013 to 50% in Session 1, 2014. There were 28 students enrolled in this unit.

**ACCG877 Emerging Issues in Financial Crime** - The D grades have decreased from 29% in Session 2, 2013 to 14% in Session 1, 2014 while the CR grades have increased from 29% in Session 2, 2013 to 57% in Session 1, 2014. There were 7 students enrolled in this unit.

**Masters of Research**

There were excellent results for FOBE710 Research Frontiers (Seminar Series) with 80% of students obtaining a HD or D, up from 73% in S1/2013. For FOBE720 Qualitative Research, 56% of students obtained a HD or D, up from 45% last year. For FOBE730 Quantitative Research 1, 52% of students obtained a HD or D, up from 47% last year. There were excellent results for the MRes students across 751-754 with many D and HDs, and an increase in performance from last year, but these are shell units so they cannot be assessed as a unit per se, as they are a line grouping of various units across departments.

### 6. Report on any issues, point of concern, or positive outcome that the department wishes to highlight (regardless of any other criteria)

**Economics**

The department is pleased with the reduction in the failure rate for ECON111: Microeconomic Principles to below 20% at this offering. To achieve this, the unit convenor (Andrea Chareunsy) put in place a more pronounced risk management strategy to help those students at the lower end. This involved students undertaking a comprehensive assignment early in the session (Week 5) that was carefully designed to reflect what was expected of them and which would provide them with a reliable and accurate indication of how they were performing in the unit. A discussion forum was specifically opened for the assignment to assist the weaker students. The assignment and the discussion forum meant that students were more likely to start the unit well and maintain steady progress throughout.

The department would also like to acknowledge the efforts of Prashan Karunaratne in ECON131: Quantitative Methods in Economics, Business and Finance. An issue in this unit arises from the wide disparity in the mathematical backgrounds of the students who undertake this unit. This was to some extent addressed by introducing some NCCW conditions. Even so, considerable disparity remains. Prashan addressed this issue by introducing a specific tutorial that he himself taught, which weaker students could self-select. The tutorial material was presented in a way that was specifically designed to reach weaker students and it was followed-up straight after by an hour of consultation that Prashan also conducted. This tutorial and
follow-up consultation proved very popular. It also had the effect of making the tutorial groups more homogenous across the unit which was a positive externality.

**Applied Finance and Actuarial Studies**

As foreshadowed last session, a document outlining Departmental “best practices” in assessment was developed in S1 2014 (with credit and acknowledgement to Leonie Tickle for her excellent work). While not prescriptive, it identifies non-standard assessment schemes situations that need to be discussed and agreed with the HoD, as well as providing a framework for consistent practice and standards across the Department.

A detailed process is now in place to ensure that all unit outlines are reviewed before publication to ensure compliance with relevant policies, as well as consistency with the Departmental “best practices” document.

The “best practices” document acknowledges open book exams and formula sheets as good practice. A number of units have adopted this practice, with what appears to be an associated decrease in rates of academic dishonesty.

In the Departmental Examination Meeting a number of general issues were raised that are worth of note:

- Some deterioration in cohort quality was noted;
- The negative implications for assessment of the new “Disruptions to Studies” Policy were noted by many UCs;
- As the analytics out of iLearn dealing with usage improve, it is becoming clear that overall use of available (often vital) resources as well as the bias to usage late in the session (“cramming”) are significant issues;
- Student engagement continues to be a concern (with a number of noteworthy exceptions);
- The English language capabilities of many international students continues to be a concern;
- There was perceived to be an excessive focus by PAL on past exams. Apart from this being seen as poor practice generally, it is particularly dangerous when the style of assessment changes from previous sessions;
- More generally, the lack of coordination between UCs and PAL, and potential uncertainty in the eyes of students as to the status and role of PAL was seen as being of concern;
- Some concerns in particular units about timetabling were expressed;
- Some discussion took place regarding the lack of a pre-requisite structure in the MCom, and a “two cohorts” problem in some units arising out of the units students had previously undertaken as well as their background generally.
- There remains some uncertainty around the implementation of the group work policy, and in particular the requirement to grade on a pass/fail basis if individual contributions cannot be identified;
Some incidents of calculators being confiscated for a significant portion of an exam while they were investigated for compliance were noted.

**Applied Finance Centre**

At this stage, results for the units ECFS845, ECFS908 and AFCP859 have not been submitted as these units commenced late in the session. In line with agreed procedures, these results will be released initially as Incompletes.

**Marketing & Management**

**Disruption to Study:** An extensive number of UCs reported that students in their units either i) requested a supplementary prior to the exam and then sat for the final exam OR ii) sat the final exam and then sought a supplementary.

Units affected were as follows:
- BBA111, BBA 310, BBA 315, BBA 340
- HRM 201, HRM 222, HRM 300
- MKTK 101, MKTG 306, MKTG 311, MKTG 203.

**Online delivery:** Staff reported generally very positive outcomes. However, staff were extremely concerned about the instruction from Associate Dean L & T to hold online open book exams. BUS 800 UC noted that over the past 8 years online exams had been closed book and invigilated. This session with the requirement for open book exams there were a number of plagiarism cases being investigated (5 students). The UC for this unit noted that the recommended approach for open book exam questions from L & T Centre to circumvent this problem did not assist in preventing it. Similar development occurred in MKTG 696. Problems referred to Discipline committee.

**Intensive mode delivery:** Reduction from 13 weeks to 6/7 weeks: UCs noted that (i) exam timetabling for these units needed to be developed so the exams can be held closer to the end of the delivery; (ii) Communications systems need to be improved. Many students were not aware that the units had been shifted to intensive mode. This information needs to be conveyed more effectively to students during enrolment.

2 units – BUS 800 and MKTG303 (marketing strategy)

Re: MKTG303 (marketing strategy) in Session 1 experiment with an intensive mode of delivery combined of 3 hour seminars (lecture plus tutorial) held over a seven week period. The seminars were compulsory and attendance taken with a maximum class size of 50 students. The course assessment consisted of 3 case studies, a simulation game, a reflective journal and a final exam held in the normal exam period. Student results compared with last session using a conventional 13 week approach showed a 2 point increase in overall results and the failure rate decreased.
from 9% to 5%. From a teaching perspective lecturer feedback was overwhelming in favour of the seminar approach for senior undergraduates. They commented that the increased 3 hour time allowed a much closer engagement with the students than the conventional mode of delivery and more time to work with students during the simulation game phase of the course. In addition, we experienced close to 100% class attendance for all seminars. Anecdotal student feedback showed strong positive support for the changed format. They really liked the fact that they could finish most of the assessment items in the first half of the session however they were a little insecure having the exam in the normal exam period. In terms of improvement to the intensive mode course design for 1st session 2015 we intend to remove the final exam and reduce the number of assessable cases to one so that the course can be fully completed within 7 weeks. Given the nature of the simulation game and the time required to adjust to its complexity it would be difficult to squeeze the course down to six weeks.

**Problems with Turnitin:** A number of UCs experienced problems when Turnitin went down. Students could not submit by deadline. Those who had previously submitted lost their submissions and when they resubmitted the results showed a high rate of similarity. This created immense anxiety for students and increased the workload for the staff who had to deal with an immense increase in students queries via email.

**Issue of high pass rates for internship units (eg. FOBE 200):** Extensive number of HDs because students on international internships do exceptionally well and usually achieve far higher results than is normal for their other units. Staff expressed concerns and suggested that these units need clearer criteria and perhaps a pass/fail regime.

**Prizes for MRES students:** Staff expressed concerns that top students in their Masters units who were MRES students could not be awarded the prize for the unit. Staff requested attention to this issue.

**Peer Observation initiative:** The department’s peer observation initiative working very well and being rolled out to include units run by adjuncts. Issue remains vis-à-vis tutors. Large numbers of requests from casual tutors for LETs criticized by L & T Centre. Question is how do they get feedback without conducting LET’s as it is not logistically possible to undertake peer observation for all tutorials.

**Outstanding Engagement with Industry:** The Department has mapped its extensive continuous engagement with industry through its four PACE units and guest lectures in units across all programs.
Accounting and Corporate Governance

**Undergraduate units:** The 21 units averaged 4% HDs, 15% Ds, 29% CRs, 31% Ps and 16% Fs. This represents a slight improvement (by 3%) on the previous session in respect to the higher grades (HDs, Ds, and CRs).

The Department successfully introduced the PACE unit ACCG315 Accountants in the Profession for the first time. Students performed extremely well in this unit and the capstone unit, ACCG399.

The failure rate decreased in 9 units, and remained at a similar level (within 3%) in 8 other units, and only increased by more than 3% in 3 units (BUSL250, BUSL301 and ACCG330). The failure rate was only 6% and 7% in the latter two of these units.

**Postgraduate units:**

Positive Outcomes

- A number of PG Units have come up with innovations in teaching and as a result of the students’ engagement in the units and performance has improved compared with previous sessions.
- A revision workshop on the fundamentals of accounting and a research seminar were conducted during the session and are recommended in the future as well, as the students were very engaged and their feedback was very positive. This has been reflected in their performance in the final exam in units such as ACCG923.
- The use of the block mode of teaching has been found to be quite effective. ACCG877 (Emerging Issues in Financial Crime) was based on three key modules in compressed mode over three block Saturdays. Each module comprised of a series of seminars based on different case studies. Guest lecturers from both industry (ICAC, Fraud Squad) and academia (PICT, ACG-cybercrime) presented on relevant and recent fraud topics using the political, economic, social, cultural and environmental theme underpinning the unit. The student cohort had little industry experience so there was great interest in the seminar discussions. Once again the quality of discussions in the online forums was outstanding and students became quite competitive in their other assessment tasks.

Concerns

- Students are still lacking the understanding of the theory components of the units and the application of the conceptual framework in their learning.
- International students are still struggling with both written and oral communications in English.
- The students also have poor analytical and critical thinking skills.
- Students seem to experience challenges with critical, analytical and integrative thinking.
A greater focus on “Academic Writing Skills” is required in courses which aim to teach research skills.

In line with the new Disruption to Studies Policy students who have passed the final exam and passed overall have been awarded an IS grade and will sit a supplementary exam. While the policy states that ‘the initial examination affected by the disruption will not be marked’ the timing of the notification of special considerations is such that many of these papers have already been marked. While the policy indicates to award the supplementary exam result there is concern that students who have passed the original final exam may fail or perform worse in the supplementary exam and be able to view their original paper.

Master of Research

There was significant administrative work managing the shell units, but this has been eased somewhat given that the electives were streamlined in 2014 from the broader offering in 2013. In 2015 there will be no shell units and MRes students will be able to enrol in the 700 level MRes units (which mirror the designated 800 level units, albeit with different assessment criteria to emphasize research skills) directly. This should reduce the administrative burden further.

A positive outcome to funding should see an increased in MRes enrolments going forward. The DVC (R), with the backing of Executive, has moved to change stipend payments to MRes Year 2 candidates. In 2015, high performing MRes year 2 domestic full-time candidates who enter the program (either via the BPhil or from outside) who have average 85 or more in their entry score, will receive a stipend equal to the APA/MQRES. This is currently $25,392, and is indexed annually. This means that high performing students we direct into MRes year 2 rather than PhD will receive the same scholarship amount that they would get if going directly into PhD. International students who apply through the IPRS/iMQRES round for 2015, and are awarded scholarships to complete MRes Year 2 before formally entering the PhD, will also receive the higher level of stipend. In 2015, FT domestics who score 75 or above but less than 85 will still get the current offer of $16000. From 2016, we will move away from guaranteeing a stipend based on score thresholds, and award APA-equivalent stipends by merit. Payments to incoming first year BPhil students will remain unchanged.
Faculty of Human Sciences
Report on Examination Results
Semester 1 2014

The Faculty of Human Sciences held its Semester 1 Examiners’ Meeting on 9 July 2014 (see Minutes - Attachment A). It was a joint meeting of Faculty Board and Faculty Standards and Quality Committee chaired by the Executive Dean. Heads of Departments or their representatives presented their Summary Examination Reports (Attachments B). Committee members were given the opportunity to question Departmental Reports and to raise other matters regarding the grading process. Comments will be discussed below.

Summary of Process

Result processing in the Faculty of Human Sciences followed a standard format:¹

1. Convenor submits completed spread sheet(s) to student administration (see Student Administration Report – Attachment C);
2. Grades checked and entered by student administration staff;
3. Convenor is sent Student Study Package Results Report (AMIS) and Unit Results Summary Report (AMIS);
4. On basis of (3), convenor completes Individual Summary Examination Report;
5. Individual Summary Examination Reports are used to populate the Head of Department’s Summary Examination Reports with originals stored on shared drive;
6. Departmental meetings held to discuss and approve results (see below);
7. Faculty meeting with HoDs or nominees presenting Departmental results focused on any issues;
8. Endorsement of results by Faculty.

The Summary Examination Reports included:

1) Comment on how students have met the learning outcomes for the unit to the required standards for the grades awarded,
2) moderation practices
3) unexpected outcomes
4) activities to support students at risk and improve retention

¹ There was some local variation. For example: Health Professions used GoogleDocs throughout the process hence avoiding the need for email; there is no Department meeting for Faculty Units; and Psychology includes an extra step with UG and Post-graduate results discussed in separate meetings prior to a full department meeting.
A total of 246 units were examined in S1 2014, 103 undergraduate and 145 postgraduate. It should be noted that approximately 40% of all units had fewer than 20 students enrolled. The majority of small UG units were Honours, MRes units or speciality units required for accreditation. The proportion of low enrolment units has decreased by 2% from 2013.

### Departmental Examinations Meetings

All Departments held formal Examination Meetings in which the results for each unit were presented and reviewed individually. Overall unit performance was compared with that of other units at the same level and anomalies were noted and discussed. Matters discussed focused on issues identified in Summary Examination Reports (see above). Convenor presentations to Departments included summary presentations of key points such as failure rates, numbers of incomplete grades, detailed reports on units with unusual outcomes and concerns about failure to complete assessments and perceived learning needs of particular cohorts of students.

### Faculty Examinations Meeting

The minutes of the Faculty Meeting are included. As was the case in 2013, tabled listings of each unit were not presented this year; rather case studies of units identified as having atypical outcomes were presented. Commentary from other departments focused on highlighted issues. Detailed listings of all units were made available to the Faculty.

### Anomalies in Grade Distributions, Unexpected Outcomes, and other points of interest

Substantial variation in distribution of grades relative to previous offerings or other units within the department at the same level were used as one indicator of units requiring further discussion. High failure or withdrawal rates were another indicator used. Subsequent explanations focused on a range of issues including: changes in assessment; change in mean GPA of the cohort; new unit convenor. The explanations given and proposed modifications for future offerings were accepted (see Minutes – Attachment A), except in one case from Education to be discussed in some detail below. General points of interest and discussion included:

---

### Table: Departmental Examination Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of UG units</th>
<th>Number of PG units</th>
<th>&lt; 10 enrolments</th>
<th>&gt;10 but &lt;20 enrolments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASAM</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>PG 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEC and Special Education</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>UG 2; PG 1</td>
<td>UG 2; PG 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>UG 7; PG 4</td>
<td>UG 2; PG 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>UG 2; PG 9</td>
<td>PG 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>UG 3; PG 3</td>
<td>PG 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>PG 2</td>
<td>UG 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 M Res</td>
<td>PG 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (FOHS)</td>
<td>3 Shell units</td>
<td>4 M Res</td>
<td>UG 3; PG 3</td>
<td>PG 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>UG 17; PG 41</td>
<td>UG 5; PG 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Concerns were raised about student engagement in 2013, particularly among first year students. This was not raised as a concern this semester. Indeed, a number of convenors have noted improved student outcomes due to increased engagement from their respective cohorts.

2. There are continued concerns about the increasing number of requests for Special Consideration and alternate arrangements for assessment.

3. A number of Departments noted that a substantial proportion of failures are due to either non-submission of assignments or students being unaware they need to withdraw.

4. There is a concern that academic failures often result from students failing to act on formative feedback. **Action:** Faculty to convene working party on Feedback.

5. IEC have achieved positive outcomes in practicum units with relatively minor changes to the assessment regime: namely, including early formative tasks prior to the practicum experience.

6. It was noted that there has been a reduction in the number of incomplete grades across the undergraduate program in IEC.

7. There is a continuing issue of a relatively high proportion of incomplete grades in placements and practicum units due to late placement and late supervisor reports.

8. A variety of moderation practices are used across the Faculty including: annotated sample scripts for markers; double marking; comparison of grades across tasks; reliability checks to compare markers; detailed marking rubrics.

9. Education and Psychology noted a drop in enrolments in some units where an additional offering of the unit is available in Session 3.

10. Psychology noted that there has been a systematic change to assessment practices across some of the post-graduate programs. The catalyst was discussions provoked by Accreditation. Previously, grades tended to be inflated. This has been rectified such that performance previously considered a Credit is now awarded a Pass. It was noted that grading in the clinical placement unit remains unchanged as grading here was not previously inflated.

11. Psychology noted concerns with the three MRes students in the co-badged honour units: namely, the MRes students tended to be less able. One possible reason is these students may not have completed the statistics units which are required for honours entry.

12. Education noted success in first-year units in dealing with plagiarism by including the Student Academic Honesty Module as an early formative assessment task.

13. Education identified inconsistencies in **200 Level** grade distribution in the Department meeting. Rod Lane (Undergraduate Studies Coordinator) and Lori Lockyer (Head of Department) re-examined units on July 10 leading to substantial re-distribution of grades in one unit. The unit convenor for EDTE251 was consulted about the allocation of Pass grades to students who did not meet unit learning outcomes in two of three pieces of assessment. Further review of results was undertaken by the UG Coordinator and HoD and 13 students were assigned Fail grades for the unit.
14. Linguistics identified issues with three service units in Academic Communications: namely, high failure rates due to non-submission of assessment tasks. Engagement and retention issues need to be investigated in future offerings.

15. Parsell expressed a minor concern about the post-exam process for Faculty units: namely, a lack of department meetings or sign-off between convenor and Faculty level.\(^2\)

The Faculty of Human Sciences confirms that the examination of students within the Faculty was conducted in accordance with University policy and that the final grades have been considered at Department and Faculty level, as required, and I hereby recommend the results to Senate for approval.

---

\(^2\) There are a limited number of Faculty-level units at both Undergraduate (FoHS 300, 301 and 302) and MRes (FoHS 700, 720, 721 and 724) levels. FoHS301 and 302 are special interest units of 1 and 2 credit points respectively to allow students from the old curriculum to complete their degree with the required credit points. FoHS300 is the Faculty PACE unit. FoHS 720, 722 and 724 are MRes shell units. FoHS700 is the Faculty MRes Research Frontiers unit. Faculty units are not owned by any department.

Professor Janet Greeley
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Apologies</th>
<th>Nominee</th>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Anne Castles</td>
<td>Head, Cognitive Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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IN ATTENDANCE
Judy Lawrie, Executive Officer

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Apologies – Professor Janet Greeley, Executive Dean

2. Faculty Prizes, Awards and Scholarships – Ms Linda Maher, Student Administration Manager referred to the list of prize winners and the new leaner format. 

   \textit{It was moved that the prizes, awards and scholarships for Semester 1, 2014 be approved. A vote was taken and the motion was carried. Dr Mitch Parsell seconded the motion.}

3. Semester 1, 2014 Results
Final approval of the Semester 1, 2014 results by FSQC and Faculty Board. Each Department Head or nominee to report.

3.1 Psychology
Presented by Mike Jones
Psychology considers results of Undergraduate and Post-Graduate units at separate sub-committees prior to endorsement at the full Department committee.

   No substantial differences were observed between distributions for 2014 offerings compared to previous years.
**Undergraduate**

**PSY104** has over 1000 students with a slightly lower ATAR than previous years. **PYS246** had a relatively high fail rate, but it is actually lower than previous offers. There has been a change of convenor and a slight increase in student numbers (619 enrolled compared to 522 last year). The unit is an option in the Bachelor of Speech and Hearing Science and attracts students outside the Psychology major stream. **PYS247** has a stable distribution of incoming students relative to GPA, but an improved failure rate (8%). This is due to the work and the commitment of the convenor (Kevin Brooks). **PSY248** is 2nd year and a compulsory unit with a relatively high fail rate (32%), but this rate is actually an improvement on previous offerings. Enrollment of 400 which is a drop off of about 100, however, approximately 100 students are taking this unit in Session 3.

**Post-Graduate**
There has been a systematic change to assessment practice in the clinical psychology program. The catalyst for change was discussions provoked during the accreditation process. Previously marking tended to inflate grades; this has been rectified such that performance previously considered a Credit is now awarded a Pass. Grading in the clinical placement units remain unchanged as these were not previously inflated.

**Honours program** – There were three MRes students in the co-badged honours units, with some concern the MRes students were the less able. One possible reason is these students may not have completed the statistics units which are required for honours entry. 

*Mike Jones moved that the Psychology results for Semester 1, 2014 be approved. A vote was taken and the motion was carried. Avril Moss seconded the motion.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post Graduate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presented by Greg Robertson</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 units with a total of 296 enrolments with an average enrolment of approximately 25 students. These enrolment numbers indicate that the post-graduate program has survived the loss of CSP places.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 6% failure rate was observed across the post-graduate program with failures typically resulting from students failing to complete assessment tasks. This will be reviewed next semester.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department meeting considered the awarding of HDs in two units where none were offered but students had relatively high numerical grades (i.e. 83%). One convenor accepted a HD was awardable; the other (who is presently overseas) will discuss the issue with the Associate Dean L&amp;T upon her return.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Undergraduate** |
| **Presented by Rod Lane** |
| 36 units offered; focus of presentation was units with unusual or unexpected patterns of results. |
| As with previous years, Incompletes are relatively high in Prac units due to late placement and outstanding paperwork. As is usually the case, it is expected that these will resolve themselves over the next few weeks. |
EDUC 105 is noteworthy for the use of the Student Academic Integrity Module as an early assessment task. There are presently 18 incompletes where the students will be sitting supplementary exams. This unit has a slightly higher fail rate due to a number of students not completing assessment tasks but sitting the exams – this is believed to relate to the requirements for receiving AUSTUDY.

EDUC108 has 7 of 22 fails on academic grounds and the rest are due to students not handing in assessments.

EDUC251 has a higher proportion of Ds and HDs than previous offerings. This was explained by the cohort being stronger; perhaps in part due to the offering of this unit in Session 3 (45 student enrolments in Session 3 and 45 left the Session 1).

EDUC363 shows a relatively high failure rate due to lack of academic literacy. These skills need to be more robustly delivered at 100/200 levels.

EDUC289 – although the failure rate is down, literacy is an issue. This is a matter of significant concern given the importance of this ability for pre-service teachers and the introduction of exit tests in literacy/numeracy for this group of students.

200 Level – an issue was identified in the Department meeting concerning consistency of distribution of grades for 200-level units. These are to be reviewed and if required moderated and re-graded.

Note: The review occurred on July 10 – see Dean’s Submission to Senate.

It was noted that a number of students have failed due to either a failure to withdraw or students failing to take note of formative feedback.

Action: It was decided that a Working Party on feedback will be formed for next semester (Parsell).

Rod Lane moved that the Education results for Semester 1, 2014 be approved. Mike Jones seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion was carried.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3 Linguistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presented by Lynda Yates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Undergraduate units and 52 Post-Graduates units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department meeting identified a problem with three service units in Academic Communications: namely, high failure rates due to non-submission of assessment tasks. Engagement and retention issues need to be investigated in future offerings. It was noted that a new member of staff is running these units with a great deal of care and attention. Nevertheless, both the curriculum and the delivery need to be reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACSH100 had a particularly high fail rate of 23% - see comments re: Academic Communications units above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING248 had a fail rate of 10%. This is a People unit that is being convened by a new staff member. A new assessment regime has been implemented, but students struggled with basic requirements. There appears to be a need for extra support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPH309 was identified as problematic at the Department meeting: the grades appeared too generous relative to previous offerings, the incoming cohort and other unit grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
distributions at the 300-level within the Department. The grades were returned for re-examination.

CAUD813 shows a high number of incompletes due to leave of 2 staff members.

Action: Review the curriculum and delivery of the 3 service units in Academic Communication.

笑话 Yates moved that the Linguistics results for Semester 1, 2014 be approved. Mike Jones seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion was carried.

3.4 Institute of Early Childhood (and MUSEC)  
Presented by Sheila Degotardi  
23 Undergraduate units, 2 are 700 level units, and Post-Graduate units (with enrolment 487).

Undergraduate  
ECH120 is a foundation unit where continued work on formative feedback has paid off in the form of improved exam results. It was noted that a majority of fails are students not handing in work.

ECHP222 is the 2nd prac unit that shows a relative increase in HDs. This is a result of changed assessment: namely, a formative assessment task was moved to earlier in the year before students went on prac.

ECHP424 is a 4th year prac unit that shows a similar shift upwards in grade distribution. Again this is due to changed assessment: a small preparation task before prac that appears to have assisted the students. It was also noted that the convenor has changed.

ECH431 had a shift up with a relatively high number of Ds. This was explained by quality and engagement level of cohort.

It was noted that there has been a reduction in the number of incomplete grades across the undergraduate program.

Post-Graduate  
ECED601, which is the Introduction to the masters unit, showed strong performance. This was explained relative to the incoming cohort: namely, more students who have a range of degrees plus industry experience.

There has been an overall continuation of enrolment gains  
SPED units – new program next year  
ECED units are drawing some other students from Arts

SPED – units still have 55 people doing prac. Waiting for reports to be returned.

Sheila Degotardi moved that the Early Childhood and Special Education results for Semester 1, 2014 be approved. Manjula Waniganayake seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion was carried.
### 3.5 Australian School of Advanced Medicine
Presented by Ros Smith

A total of 12 clinical students and 2 MRes students. The two MRes students enrolled in Science.

**Incompletes** in MSP807, MSP808, MSP809 – students have extensions.

**Students at risk**: one student in M AdvSurg with written language difficulties; one student in MRes Yr 2 – research project was not appropriate for student’s interests.

**Clinical units** – Master of Surgery had 2 students with 1 student who failed.

**MAS and MEDI** units all students passed.

**AMED -884** all 5 students passed.

**MRes** all 10 enrolled students passed.

*Ros Smith moved that the ASAM results for Semester 1, 2014 be approved.* Rod Lane seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion was carried.

### 3.6 Physiotherapy
Presented by Mark Hancock

Few unexpected results

**Note**: 2 students failed in their second semester. This is the semester prior to prac. The failures are due to students failing one of two threshold tasks for successful completion of the unit. This was a change approved via FSQC to ensure students have both essential skill sets before going on prac.

**Procedures of moderation** – the Department has a consistent and systematic approach to moderation including double marking, rubrics and comparisons of grade distributions at the Department meeting.

**Procedures for students at risk** – Anyone who gains a pass is considered at risk and is provided with counselling.

*Mark Hancock moved that the Physiotherapy results for Semester 1, 2014 be approved.* Robyn Bishop seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion was carried.

### 3.7 Cognitive Science
Presented by David Kaplan

**COGS201** had a slightly higher failure rate than previous offerings. This was the first time this unit was offered as a people unit. This resulted in a 50% increase in enrolments and a cohort with a broad diversity of backgrounds. There will be possible changes to the assessment in the future with an early task focused on science writing and research methods skills. It was noted that a number of failures resulted from non-submission of assessments.

**MRes units** – showed no unexpected or unusual results.

*David Kaplan moved that the Cognitive Science results for Semester 1, 2014 be*
approved. Linda Maher seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion was carried.

### 3.8 Faculty Units
**Presented by Mitch Parsell**

Three undergraduate units - FOHS300, FOHS 301 and FOHS302; and four MRes units - FOHS700, FOHS720, FOHS721 and FOHS724

Only FOHS300 and FOHS700 were discussed - FOHS 301 and FOHS302 are special units with a total of 3 students and no failures; while FOHS720, FOHS721 and FOHS724 are MRes shell units.

**FOHS300 units** shows a continuing problem with a high number of incompletes due to later placements with supervisor reports still to be submitted.

**FOHS700** has 18 students with 3 incompletes; the distribution of results was high. The cohort explained this: namely, high performing students engaged in areas centrally concerned with their research trajectory. It was noted that all assessments were double marked.

Parsell expressed minor concern about the post exam process: namely, a lack of department meetings or sign-off between convenor and Faculty level.

*Mitch Parsell moved that the Faculty results for Semester 1, 2014 be approved. Rod Lane seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion was carried.*

### 4. Any other business

The Executive Dean spoke to the group about the announcement of the new Faculty. It has some implications for Physiotherapy but the Faculty will be working through this. No implications for other Departments. FoHS will continue to contribute to the other Health areas.

Q: Small Faculties need assistance - will they keep needing FoHS assistance? Not clear yet. If they do, resourcing will certainly be looked at.

### 5. Close – 1:25
ASAM

Report on Examination Outcomes

Semester 1 2014

1. Insert unit code
2. Number of students enrolled
3. Were the assessment tasks moderated? Was there moderation of grades within the unit?
4. Were there any unexpected experiences?
   Please comment on any issues identified or plans to change offering based on this semester’s experience
5. What strategies are in place to identify and assist students at academic risk?
6. Comments on items 3-5 can be placed in the right-hand column
### Faculty of Human Sciences Examinations Results Summary Sheet – S1 2014

#### Department: ASAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit code</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>Moderation Yes/No</th>
<th>Unexpected Results or Experiences</th>
<th>Students at Academic Risk</th>
<th>Comments on items 3, 4 and 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMED884</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Individualised and regular feedback</td>
<td>Please refer to Course Convenor Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP 801</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Individualised and regular feedback</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP 802</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Individualised and regular feedback</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP 803</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Individualised and regular feedback</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP807</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP808</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP809</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMP804</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Awaiting Results</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMP805</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Awaiting Results</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASP801</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Individualised and regular feedback</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASP802</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Individualised and regular feedback</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASP803</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Individualised and regular feedback</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASP804</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Individualised and regular feedback</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASP805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Individualised and regular feedback</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASP806</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Individualised and regular feedback</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDI863</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Individualised and regular feedback</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COGNITIVE SCIENCE

Report on Examination Outcomes

Semester 1, 2014

1. Insert unit code
2. Number of students enrolled
3. Distribution (Comment). How does the distribution of grades compare with previous offerings?
4. Were the assessment tasks moderated? Was there moderation of grades within the unit?
5. Were there any unexpected experiences?
   Please comment on any issues identified or plans to change offering based on this semester’s experience
6. What strategies are in place to identify and assist students at academic risk?
7. Comments on items 3-6 can be placed in the right-hand column
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit code</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>Distribution (Comment)</th>
<th>Moderation</th>
<th>Unexpected results or experiences</th>
<th>Students at academic risk</th>
<th>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COGS 201</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>- Review of all assignments marked as fail, with feedback provided to students. - Meetings with students marked down for previous plagiarism - Close contact maintained with Campus Wellbeing to identify and keep track of students at risk. - Regular announcements made on iLearn and in tutorials to remind students course requirements and assessment due dates. - Due to broader range and some deficiencies in background, we are rethinking assessment structure in order to provide more scaffolding for the final written assessment task. - We are considering more emphasis on developing basic science writing and research methods skills in this unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COGS 700</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>#s too small</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Maintain close contact with each student via email, iLearn. - All absences followed up by email requests to students and appropriate supervisors. - Extra 1-1 meetings for students struggling with the material or seeking advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COGS 710</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>#s too small</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Small class size allowed close contact with students and follow-ups via email after any absences. - As some students experienced difficulties selecting their individualised research topics, we may revise Assignment 3 (the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Extra one on 1-1 for students struggling with the material or seeking advice.
- Constant email contact and responses where necessary.
- Final essay) to narrow the choice of topics from which the students can choose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>#s too small</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COGS 720</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small class size allowed close contact with students and follow-ups via email after any absences.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Given the variable backgrounds of the MRes students, we are discussing the possibility of including additional meetings in future offerings of this unit to cover seminal papers in the field to further strengthen this unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Department of Education

Report on Examination Outcomes

Session 1, 2014 – Examinations Meeting – Wednesday 9 July, 2014, C5A201

1. Insert unit code
2. Number of students enrolled
3. Comment on how students have met the learning outcomes for the unit to the required standards for the grades awarded.
4. Were the assessment tasks moderated? Was there moderation of grades within the unit?
5. Were there any unexpected experiences?
   Please comment on any issues identified or plans to change offering based on this semester’s experience
6. What strategies do you use to identify students at risk and/or encourage student retention?
7. Comments on items 3-6 can be placed in the right-hand column
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit code</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>Comment on student performance against the required standards.</th>
<th>Moderation of (1) tasks (2) final grades in the unit?</th>
<th>Unexpected results or experiences</th>
<th>Strategies to encourage student retention</th>
<th>Comments on items 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 (please note number of incompletes and when they will be resolved)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCN800</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4% failed to meet the minimum required standard, 29% met the minimum standard standard, 68% surpassed the minimum required standard.</td>
<td>(1) and (2); yes, statistically and against graded work samples.</td>
<td>None; grade distribution was consistent with previous cohorts.</td>
<td>Regular and progressive assessment tasks linked to areas of student interest, and extensive feedback, scaffolds the development of students’ understanding and provides them with opportunities for them to identify and remedy weaknesses.</td>
<td>Concern with preparedness of some international students. The two incomplete grades will be resolved by the beginning of session 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCN806</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 students - diverse performance.</td>
<td>Double marking of assignments when either an F or HD grade was awarded.</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Individual supervision, regular face to face meetings, progressive assessment, continuous feedback and support.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCN814</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Large cohort. Some students struggled to satisfy</td>
<td>Yes - task moderated against sample scripts.</td>
<td>Students not responding to formative feedback. Time</td>
<td>Continual monitoring and feedback.</td>
<td>Concern re: lack of attention to formative feedback/failure to address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCN818</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Students performed consistently with previous years in a range from Credit to High Distinction</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Frequent feedback and engagement in tasks. 1 incomplete to be resolved by 8th July.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCN831</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Engaged online interaction involving school and early childhood educators and assessment tasks demonstrated learning outcomes being met.</td>
<td>Assessment reflected previous moderation processes.</td>
<td>This was a particularly strong cohort of students. Close monitoring and detailed feedback. Of two students shown as ‘Fail’ one did not commence and the other failed to complete.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCN841</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Large group with grades reflecting the wide range of abilities and engagement.</td>
<td>Not this Semester, but assessment decisions for this Unit have been moderated in previous semesters.</td>
<td>No, similar distribution to previous semesters. Close monitoring and detailed, prompt feedback. Five of the students shown as ‘Fail’ actually failed to complete.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCN843</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Small group, a majority of whom are Macquarie staff. Generally a high standard of contributions and assessment tasks; online participation below par in some cases, largely due to workload in current roles (not course workload).</td>
<td>Neither systematically moderated, however I did seek feedback from peers on some individual assignments where grades were “borderline”.</td>
<td>None - in this unit, being about universities and with the majority of students reasonably senior and experienced university staff, high levels of achievement are the norm. Early engagement and encouragement to participate. The two students who dropped out did so for personal and work-demand reasons.</td>
<td>A very strong group. This unit was challenging but incredibly interesting to teach this year, due to the substantial changes in HE policy and funding context brought about or foreshadowed by, firstly, the funding cuts announced in 2013, secondly, the reports of a number of Government reviews and proposed changes to the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TEQSA Act and HE Standards,** and thirdly, the measures announced in the 2014 Budget.

2 incompletes, one should be resolved shortly (all work submitted, just need to moderate and finalise assessment), the other should be resolved before S2 commences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCN845</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Students have generally met the learning outcomes as expected. Double marking of all assignments with either a HD or a Fail grade. There were no unexpected outcomes. Most students maintained a similar level of achievement throughout the semester. There are four assignments in this unit and extensive feedback was given to each individual on the first three assignments, both as individuals and collectively with global feedback presented through the unit website. Use of the university's study skills services for postgraduates was also reinforced. The enrolments almost doubled in comparison to the last two years (n=11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCN847</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>A strong mix of experienced practising educators resulted in learning outcomes being met through engaged online discussions reflected in Assessment reflected previous moderation processes. Similar distribution to previous semesters but with slightly more at the HD level. Overall retention was strong. One incomplete due to a medical condition. Will be resolved within 6 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCN862</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Similar to previous cohorts. One fail due not submitting final task. Marking rubric established this year were based on grade descriptors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCN865</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Very similar to previous years with five, productive and reflective task relating to classroom practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCN871</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>As with most of previous years, all students passed the unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
come to a consensus mark. This prompted the need to redevelop 2 rubrics to clarify meaning. the cohort come from disciplines without a strong tradition in academic writing. difficulties are advised to seek assistance from university services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDCN873</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>All students met all the unit learning outcomes, with most achieving a standard of a credit or higher. Double marking as moderation, and all assessment tasks were designed and mapped through a collaborative workshop with all colleagues. No student results or experiences were unexpected this session.</th>
<th>A low-risk task is part of the assessment schedule that has the role of providing early feedback and acting as a quick diagnostic task.</th>
<th>I want to increase student engagement with the feedback they receive. To work towards this, the final assessment task will be redesigned to include a short “reflective feed-forward summary”.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDTE251</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>Due to transition this unit doubled in size to previous years. Sample student work for markers, collaborative moderating session to compare grading and analyse criteria, exam sample answers were refined, HD &amp; F double marked. The unit results were similar to past years once the incompletes were resolved. This year the block professional experience reduced the number of incompletes traditionally seen in this unit. Additional information and resources were provided on ilearn, close monitoring of ilearn discussion board, identification of students from tutors, meetings with students who failed assignments.</td>
<td>27 Late Professional Experience placements - waiting for reports to be submitted 9 supplementary exams 14/7/2014 2 academic dishonesty cases waiting a decision from the committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTE301</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>PE Unit. Seven students incomplete due to late. Students assessed by Supervising teacher against ‘At Risk ’ students interviewed and a program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDTE301
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDTE302</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Prac. Unit. 16 students incomplete due to late placement and/or 'yet to submit documentation'.</td>
<td>Students assessed by Supervising teacher against Professional Teaching Standards (Graduate)</td>
<td>‘At Risk’ students interviewed and a program of additional supervision put in place where appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTE353</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Outcomes appear to be met. Balanced distribution.</td>
<td>Convenor cross checked markers + Fs double-marked.</td>
<td>Meetings with students At Risk. Additional supervisory visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTE403</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>Similar to 2013</td>
<td>Standardised Supervisor’s report</td>
<td>Incompletes will be resolved upon submission of paper work by student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTE404</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PE Unit – One student incomplete due to late placement and/or non-submission of paper work</td>
<td>Students assessed by Supervising teacher against Professional Teaching Standards (Graduate)</td>
<td>‘At Risk’ students interviewed and a program of additional supervision put in place where appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTE405</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PE Unit – One student incomplete due to late placement and/or non-submission of paper work</td>
<td>Students assessed by Supervising teacher against Professional Teaching Standards (Graduate)</td>
<td>‘At Risk’ students interviewed and a program of additional supervision put in place where appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTE455</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Unit outcomes met mainly at the P-Cr levels.</td>
<td>Fs and HDs double marked. Independent academic reviewed upper and lower</td>
<td>Students who have problems are always encouraged to contact Is and ISs to be resolved by mid August at the very latest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Academic Staff Remarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTE480</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>All students enrolled in this unit [[GCertTeach(8-12)]] have already completed a four-year birth to eight teaching qualification and most are practicing teachers. They are enrolled in this unit to up skill themselves to be able to teach ages 8-12 in the primary skill. To meet the outcomes of the unit, they are required to listen to online lectures, read prescribed readings and participate in online activities. The 17 students have responded well to the unit's requirements and demonstrated the achievement of the relevant undergraduate standards. As there were only 17 students in the unit, each assignment was marked by only one marker. The first two assignments build towards the final assignment of the unit. If students responded to the feedback from the first two assignments they should have achieved well in the final assessment, and this happened in the majority of cases. Each assessment description for the unit included an explicit rubric for student reference when preparing their work. All markers received a more detailed rubric to enable a more precise alignment of marks.</td>
<td>Students in this offering did not experience as many difficulties as in the previous offering. Any problems were addressed through discussion on the iLearn site. One student experiencing particular difficulties, attended the campus, spoke with Megan Darin and showed better understanding in subsequent submissions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC105</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>Similar to last year. 81% met the minimum standard and 16% failed to meet the Exam and essay which were high stakes assessment were moderated to reflect Not really. This is the second semester that topics (not specific questions) Students who have problems are always encouraged to contact. Incompletes will be resolved after supp. exam. A number of the Fails were</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC107</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>The distribution is broadly consistent with previous offers, but with slightly less spread in the CR to HD: namely, grades have tended to regress to the mean. This may reflect over-reliance of creative responses (see 5). The Convenor individually checked each student’s full pattern of results and reviewed/ moderated any anomalies. Dr Parsell acted as Moderator: checking all fails and HDs on the main assessment task. All results were carefully examined and the distribution patterns considered and reviewed for consistency across all assessment measures. The early task (Task 1) allowed students to conceptualise their basic knowledge and understanding of the foundational pillars of education, however the combination of this task with Task 4 (Final Concept map) and Task 3 (Creative Response) may have weighted too heavily on creative responses. In the next offer staff will consider whether to include 3 tasks instead of 4, and have only one task as a creative response. Ongoing support for, and discussion with, any student was available and this occurred throughout the semester. Students who failed to attend tutorials without providing a reason, who submitted assessments past the due date, who sought extensions on assessments, or who achieved low and/or anomalous grades in assessments were monitored, with time made for a discussion. Individual counselling was provided for students expressing particular concerns about...</td>
<td>minimum standard. average for all markers. Sample double marking prior to main marking and external markers. Marking discussions. Marking rubric was given to markers beforehand. were given before exam. This worked better as far as outcomes for most students. I would delete one of the topics for exam for next semesters. Assessment gives a good range of tasks and adding MQ Academic Integrity Modules as a first assessment was effective. tutor/convener and student services or student well being. Announcements are given frequently through iLearn so assessment dates are not missed. due to not completing assessments rather than lack of knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC108</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Over 40% of the candidature scored a Credit or above; of the approximately 10% of students who did not meet the minimum standards, a large proportion discontinued the course before completing all of the assignments; the greater majority of students who completed the course achieved the course outcomes. Assignment 2 was check marked by a third marker, to ensure validity and reliability; the marks for the final examination were moderated. None; grade distribution was consistent with previous cohorts. Students were provided with ample opportunity to attend other tutorials if they were unable to attend their regularly scheduled time; additional practical sessions were set up for students who missed a weekly tutorial; lectures and tutorials contained more than 30% common material, with the latter designed to reinforce lecture content and skills; strong support provided to students to prepare for the final exam. In 2015, it is planned to provide for students an initial research training session with library staff, to enhance student research skills and literature review capabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC221</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>As to be expected in a low intake unit with highly motivated students, outcomes were very strong (although slightly below previous offerings - see question 5). One essay for each student was double marked by an external marker. With reduction of teaching weeks in 2014 composition of assessment tasks was slightly modified - this may have been impact student outcomes (causing a regression to the mean). This will be monitored in 2015. As with past years students receive individual interviews after the submission of each major assignment task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC258</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>There was an improvement at the top end of the grade scale which was pleasing and reflects general view among staff that most students engaged productively with the unit content. Slightly fewer outright fails for similar reasons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fails on the assignment were double marked. Some moderation of the final grades took place: raw scores in range 45-49 were checked against exam performance and some were adjusted up to 50. Also, a high number of raw scores of 65 so these were also checked against exam and some taken down to 64.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slightly higher number of HD and D grades is pleasing and appears to reflect student effort.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a low risk task (online quiz) in Week 3. Students who failed the quiz or did not sit for it were individually emailed and encouraged to seek extra support if required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All 6 Incompletes will sit supplementary exam on July 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUC260</th>
<th>380</th>
<th>Wide range of activities &amp; asst measures - very diverse cohort; strong scaffolding, improved exam performance and overall a pleasing increase at top end; See note in 7 for fails</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant &amp; ongoing standard setting / collaboration/ sample &amp; check/double marking and moderation practices; experienced team and convenor’s assessment expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved exam performance was pleasing; Ongoing concern about students who enrol and seem to move in /out of unit &amp; /or tasks etc and complete selective aspects - see note in 7; Some students appear to misinterpret the level of linguistic competency required for this unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing support &amp; monitoring; multiple resources provided; learning is scaffolded for all students; early diagnostic task &amp; self monitoring reviews; Communication with at risks &amp; absentees; wide variety of pedagogical approaches as modelling /engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fails: 13 students did not present for exam; another 15 completed exam but failed - could not meet learning outcomes; some repeats failed; this unit challenges students’ own skills of literacy and language - there are personal &amp; professional requirements and implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 incompletes sitting supplementary exam 16th July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td>Summary of Student Achievement and Assessment of Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC261</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Students achieved outcomes similarly to previous years, based on design tasks and examination. Yes tasks were moderated by convenor. None other than increase in students claiming disruption to studies for stress / anxiety reasons. Considering a variety of options based on low lecture attendance and emerging tertiary pedagogies. Early assessment task, engaged tutors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC264</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>The assessment tasks for this unit have been designed to cover all learning outcomes specified. All students receiving a passing grade have met the required standards. Assessment tasks include presentations, incorporating peer review and marks from tutor, essays marked by class tutor and another tutor, and an exam all marked by the convenor. The exam incorporated multiple choice, short answer and short essay tasks. Nothing unexpected was discovered in the assessment of students in this unit. The rubric will be redesigned to provide greater feedback. At-risk students would be identified in tutorials or during on-campus days for external students. 3 incompletes will be resolved on 14 or 17 July when students sit supplementary exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC289</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>Distribution of grades broadly consistent with previous years except for the decline in Fail grades – The percentage of students failing the unit has declined (from 13% in 2013 to 7% in 2014). The proportion of students gaining a Credit increases slightly Markers collaborated to ensure marking standards were comparable across the cohort. Double marking was used to confirm standards. Examination results were used to moderate the final distribution of grades. Examination questions are marked ‘vertically’ to ensure consistency. There has been an improvement in the performance of students in the mid-ability range. The latter is reflected in the higher percentage of Credits awarded this year. This development reflects the provision of detailed advice on how each element of the major assignment should be completed and greater guidance given in terms Where appropriate, ‘at risk’ students are referred to the relevant University support services. Where the student’s academic writing is an issue he or she is encouraged to complete and academic writing module. Applications for Special Consideration were taken into account when determining final grades. An additional on-campus day was conducted for IEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 362</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9% failed usually because they did not submit assessment tasks. The four assessment tasks were matched against the program and unit outcomes and all needed to be completed to ensure students achieved the standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
system converted most grades to fails. A one-help request was immediately put in, and the reply did not arrive for about 4 days and the issue was not addressed. It took a further 4 days to eventually get a resolution after about 3-4 people had claimed it was fixed. As this occurred during the last 2 weeks of session, the students were quite anxious and this caused the tutors to have to confirm each mark with an individual student email. So after about 10 days the situation was resolved but not before the damage had been done.

EDUC363 99

<p>| <strong>EDUC363</strong> | <strong>99</strong> | <strong>Distribution of results reflected a slightly higher proportion of students achieving in Credit and above grading bands in keeping with strategies employed in the unit. 7% fail similar to 2013 cohort; 3 incomplete grades</strong> | <strong>All grades were moderated with statistical comparisons across markers after sample sets of tasks graded against marked sample; random sample reports and exam scripts double marked; all Fail and marginal reports and exam scripts double</strong> | <strong>Results were slightly improved in this cohort, perhaps due to learning support strategies attached to reduced 11 week curriculum; explicit guidance in new exam format and practice in critical thinking and</strong> | <strong>Rapid feedback and explicit developmental feedback strategies applied; regular reminders to students to check assessment feedback and apply to exam preparation e.g. need to think critically, explain how concepts work or apply to</strong> | <strong>At risk students received group level feedback in response to mid-semester knowledge quiz; explicit study strategies offered.</strong> | <strong>Concern about low level of academic literacy and reading preparedness in</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Distribution/patterns</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th>Grade distribution</th>
<th>Additional information and resources</th>
<th>Consideration should be given to staging assessment tasks across units to minimise competing due dates particularly for students undertaking block prac placements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUC371</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>Distribution of grades similar to previous years</td>
<td>Assignments marked against established criteria. Moderating meetings, sample papers, HD and F double marked by convenor.</td>
<td>Grade distribution was consistent with previous cohorts.</td>
<td>Additional information and resources were provided on ilearn, close monitoring of ilearn discussion board, identification of students from tutors, meetings with students who failed assignments</td>
<td>1 special case 3 academic dishonesty cases waiting a decision from the committee 9 supplementary exams - 18/7/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC386</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Distribution of results similar to previous cohorts with a slight decrease at Credit level. Small increase in the number of students withdrawing after census.</td>
<td>All assignments marked against assessment criteria. All HD and F marked tasks were double-marked by a second marker. Assessment tasks 2 and 3 checked marked by convenor to ensure consistency (2 new inexperienced team members). Small sample of major assignment checked marked by an external marker. Some moderation of the final grades took place against the standards.</td>
<td>Number of special considerations seeking extensions increased particularly for the major assignment (due during the first week of prac block).</td>
<td>Close monitoring of online postings. Ongoing support with regular online announcements and prompt responses to online and emailed queries. Detailed feedback on assignments and request interview with students who have failed assessment tasks.</td>
<td>Consideration should be given to staging assessment tasks across units to minimise competing due dates particularly for students undertaking block prac placements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 special case 1 supplementary exam - 14/7 1 academic dishonesty case - penalty applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Benchmark Scripts</td>
<td>Undergraduate Comparison</td>
<td>Close Monitoring and Feedback</td>
<td>Special Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC704</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The performance of these students was consistent with the credit descriptor (2 students) and distinction descriptor (2 students) in the undergraduate standards.</td>
<td>Benchmark scripts were used for moderation.</td>
<td>This is the first time this Unit has been offered, so no basis for comparison.</td>
<td>Close monitoring, detailed guidance and prompt feedback.</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC705</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>One performed well, two performed poorly against required standards.</td>
<td>(1) Yes (2) Yes</td>
<td>This is the first time this Unit has been offered, so no basis for comparison.</td>
<td>Close monitoring, detailed guidance and prompt feedback.</td>
<td>No incompletes. One ‘Fail’ after student’s work subject to careful moderation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEP 387</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>This is a much larger cohort than in previous years following the introduction of the BEd(Secondary) and the discontinuation of TEP395. Despite the change in the mix of students the distribution of grades is broadly consistent with 2012 and 2013.</td>
<td>Markers collaborated to ensure marking standards were comparable across the cohort. Double marking was used to confirm standards.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Where appropriate, ‘at risk’ students are referred to the relevant University support services. Where the student’s academic writing is an issue he or she is encouraged to complete and academic writing module. Applications for Special Consideration were taken into account when determining final grades.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEP 395</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Similar distribution to 2013. No students demonstrating very top of HD range.</td>
<td>Moderation of tasks and final grades against standards.</td>
<td>Several student missed start of unit thinking it ran in February.</td>
<td>Continual monitoring and feedback from tutors in workshop groups.</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEP 401</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>PE Unit. The majority of students are still incomplete due to late placement and/or ‘yet to</td>
<td>Students assessed by Supervising teacher against Professional Teaching Standards (Graduate)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>‘At Risk’ students interviewed and a program of additional supervision put in place where</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>TEP 402</td>
<td>TEP 421</td>
<td>TEP 423</td>
<td>TEP 425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>PE Unit. One student incomplete due to late placement and/or 'yet to submit documentation'.</td>
<td>Small cohort. Performed</td>
<td>Similar to 2013 distribution - however, only one student performing at HD level (with slightly more Ds). Remainder is evenly distributed between Cs and Ps.</td>
<td>Relatively small cohort (19 students) but is larger than in previous years as more History students elect to have Geography as a second teaching subject thereby enhancing their employability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Students assessed by Supervising teacher against Professional Teaching Standards (Graduate)</td>
<td>Moderation of tasks and final grades against standards.</td>
<td>All tasks were check-marked (small sample, blind) by a second marker. Tasks were marked against criteria derived from standards and final grades were moderated against standards.</td>
<td>There is a single marker involved in grading students' work. The unit convener reviewed a sample of the tasks submitted before confirming the final grades.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Reduction in the number of teaching weeks (from 13 to 11) presented some initial challenges in adequately pacing/covering course content. Pacing and workshop activities were accordingly adjusted.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>‘At Risk’ students interviewed and a program of additional supervision put in place where appropriate.</td>
<td>Continual monitoring and feedback during weekly tutorials.</td>
<td>Low-risk initial assignment (10%), weekly quizzes of required readings, careful monitoring of assignments, attendance and prac reports fed back from tertiary supervisors. Weekly discussions between tutors to flag students struggling.</td>
<td>Where appropriate, ‘at risk’ students are referred to the relevant University support services. Where the student’s academic writing is an issue he or she is encouraged to complete and academic writing module. Applications for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TEP 427

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>High proportion of strong performing students (D/HD grades).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to each assignment being, we marked about 5 – 10% of the scripts independently to ensure our consistency. Final grades were not modified as the distribution and range appeared to be reasonable satisfactory and included 4 fails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disappointed with 4 fails but students submitted so late with no communication with the Course Convenor or with supporting documentation that they left no alternative. I will also reassess the timing and nature of these tasks based upon the change to practicum and to the number of weeks within the unit. I’d recommend that TEP 388 be taken by the same person that takes TEP 427 so the 3 semesters can run smoothly and build upon the foundation skills of taught in TEP 388 subject specific workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student information appears a number of times in the unit outline regarding academic and well being assistance available on campus. This is discussed extensively in the first workshop and referred to throughout the unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students at risk are made aware of this as soon as it is noticed. Usually a one on one discussion occurs and strategies to address this risk discussed. They are advised to visit the services available as they appear in the course outline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TEP 429

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Small cohort. Two students consistently produced work of very high standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All assignments marked against assessment criteria. There was no moderation of the individual assessment tasks. Some moderation of the final grades took place. For those students who scored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shift to 11 weeks required some adjustment to schedule but I felt the content was still covered to suitable breadth and depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At risk students identified in February during TEP395 and encouraged to make greater effort and seek additional help if required. Ongoing feedback provided to students through assessment tasks and informally during</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
close to grade boundaries, adjustment was made based on performance on the major assignment, if appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEP 431</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>Students were able to meet the learning outcomes for the unit through attending the workshops, discussions, question and answer and readings. Some students grasped the material better than others and the matrices for the 3 Assignments were well able to differentiate these students. A couple of students needed assistance in satisfying the assignment requirements in order to be able to obtain a 'pass' grade and these students worked closely with Staff in order to address issues that needed attention.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderation took place on any of the assignments. Assignment 1 - samples double marked with Robyn Moloney. Assignments 1, 2 and 3 - marked strictly in accordance to criteria and marking matrices. Final results consultation with Judy Adnum took place on Friday 27th June 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Results were as expected and good indicator of student’s effort, understanding and application of the knowledge, content and skills acquired throughout the course. The German exchange student did not perform well in the assignments with the exception of Assignment 1 (nor did she follow the university’s procedure for submitting assignments so perhaps this needs to be made clearer to exchange students in the future). Assignment 2 was problematic as students were expected to write and deliver differentiated lessons and submit evaluation &amp; reflection and observer feedback on them but as several students had not yet undertaken their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The total number of students at the end of the course was 21 so the retention rate was good. 2 students dropped out due to family and personal reasons respectively. 1 student was causing concern, as he did not seem to be coping with Practicum as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
practicum in their language methodology, they were unable to complete the latter section. These students also found it difficult to plan and write lessons without the context of a practicum and with a real class in mind. In terms of equity, a possible solution is to remove this section of Assignment 2 although it is a very important component of this assessment. A better solution (although it may not be possible) is to try and place all students in a Languages practicum in Semester 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEP 433</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24% of students received a distinction grade or higher, reflecting a solid group of high achievers. However there was an uncharacteristic group of 12% Fail students. Two of the three failed to demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes by not submitting assignments; The class size enabled marking by a single person. Results were discussed by both members of staff. Having different markers for the three assignments also served to provide an added perspective. The final set of marks has had very minor alterations to respond to student</td>
<td>Aside from the three Fails. The practitioner research required in two of the three assignments requires more explicit modelling and advocacy for students. While the majority of students have conducted research in their undergraduate science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance was monitored and reinforced throughout the unit. Students at risk of failing the unit were contacted by email and personally coached by unit staff. For some students this approach was successful – however two students did not respond.</td>
<td>Reduction of face-to-face teaching time has impacted on the unit and presents a challenge to meet student expectations of support and action-on-reflection of their experiences on the practicum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEP 441</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Insert unit code
2. Number of students enrolled
3. Distribution (Comment). How does the distribution of grades compare with previous offerings?
4. Were the assessment tasks moderated? Was there moderation of grades within the unit?
5. Were there any unexpected experiences?
   Please comment on any issues identified or plans to change offering based on this semester’s experience
6. What strategies are in place to identify and assist students at academic risk?
7. Comments on items 3-6 can be placed in the right-hand column
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit code</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Moderation</th>
<th>Unexpected results or experiences</th>
<th>Students at academic risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FoHS300</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Problem with Incompletes (50%)</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>I am concerned that project planning is an area little understood by most students and I intend to review and change the unit structure to provide more information and direction for students.</td>
<td>I always meet my students prior to their commencing the unit to gauge their interests, motivations, and understanding of expectations for the unit. I actively encourage them to visit, email or phone if they have any concerns, and if a student is not progressing, or appears to be struggling in their studies, I will put in more effort to discover what the problem is, and identify strategies to assist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoHS301</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Consistent with student level and previous years</td>
<td>Double-marked by the unit convenor and supervisor.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Supervisors remain in contact with their students throughout the session to monitor progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoHS302</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consistent with student level and previous years</td>
<td>Double-marked by the unit convenor and supervisor.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Supervisors remain in contact with their students throughout the session to monitor progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoHS700</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>High achieving cohort working on issue relevant to their research - very highly performance. Distribution schemed towards the very top; compounded by two pass/fail assessments that constituted 25. The number and value of will be discussed with staff.</td>
<td>Moderate reliability and consistency across disciplines.</td>
<td>As above, the number and weighting of pass/fail tasks resulted in greater skewing of distribution than otherwise expected. This is to be discussion with team with possible changes implement to number or weighting in future offerings.</td>
<td>All students were tracked by discipline convenors throughout the semester. Three “at risk” students where identified and have been offered personalized support. These students presently comprise the incompletes within the unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoHS720</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SHELL UNIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoHS721</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SHELL UNIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoHS724</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SHELL UNIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Insert unit code
2. Number of students enrolled
3. Distribution (Comment). How does the distribution of grades compare with previous offerings?
4. Were the assessment tasks moderated? Was there moderation of grades within the unit?
5. Were there any unexpected experiences?
   Please comment on any issues identified or plans to change offering based on this semester’s experience
6. What strategies are in place to identify and assist students at academic risk?
7. Comments on items 3-6 can be placed in the right-hand column
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>Distribution (Comment)</td>
<td>Moderation Yes/No</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences</td>
<td>Students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHTY804</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Appropriate and similar to previous delivery</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Students who receive a pass grade will receive additional support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHTY805</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Appropriate and similar to previous delivery</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Students who receive a pass grade will receive additional support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHTY806</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Appropriate and similar to previous delivery</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Students who receive a pass grade will receive additional support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHTY807</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Appropriate and similar to previous delivery</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2 students did not achieve LOs for cardiorespiratory module (and scored less than 50/100) and would have likely not scored 50% for neurological module without mastery marks. Intend to request change at FSQC so students need to pass each module without mastery marks.</td>
<td>Students who receive a pass grade will receive additional support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Support Notes</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHTY808</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Lots of support from MQCEP</td>
<td>Good outcome with student avoiding falling behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHTY809</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Lots of support from MQCEP</td>
<td>Good outcome with student avoiding falling behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHTY812</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Good, first time delivered</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Students who receive a pass grade will receive additional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHTY813</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Good, first time delivered</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>60% of results are incomplete due to clinical component finishing on 4th July. Results should be available by 11th July.</td>
<td>Students who receive a pass grade will receive additional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHTY814</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Good, first time delivered</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Students who receive a pass grade will receive additional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHTY815</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Good, first time delivered</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Students who receive a pass grade will receive additional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLTH300</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Appropriate and similar to previous delivery</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Students who receive a pass grade will receive additional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLTH310</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Appropriate and similar to previous delivery</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Students who receive a pass grade will receive additional support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Health Professions Department Examiners Meetings minutes

Agenda

2 July 2014

1. Recap Process
   a. Unit convenors to present results to Dept
   b. Upload dept approved marks to spreadsheet on google docs to be entered by Student Admin by Marios Elles
   c. Upload Results summary 4questions to googles doc
   d. Check the google docs result summary
   e. HOD sign off results entered
   f. Dept rep (MH) present results to Faculty

2. Result release principles (discussion)
   a. No release of assessment results during exam week
      i. Move assessment tasks earlier if need to provide early feedback

3. Results
   a. UG Health Units
      i. Health 300
         Moderation documented in summary results approved by dept
      ii. Health 310
         Moderation documented in summary result approved by dept

   b. DPT intake 2013
      i. PHTY804
         Moderation documented in summary results approved by dept
      ii. PHTY805
         Moderation documented in summary results approved by dept
      iii. PHTY806
         Moderation documented in summary results approved by dept
      iv. PHTY807
c. DPT intake 2012
   i. PHTY812
      Moderation documented in summary results approved by dept
   
   ii. PHTY813
       Incomplete due to clinical components
   
   iii. PHTY814
       Moderation documented in summary results approved by dept
   
   iv. PHTY815
       Moderation documented in summary results approved by dept

Clinical Results
PHTY808 AE approved
PHTY809 DC approved
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The purpose of this exercise is to assure and enhance quality in our assessment and examination processes. At this time we are gathering information that may be useful to enhance future practices. Any suggestions on opportunities for improvement are welcome.

Use the following table to report on the Examination Outcomes for Units. Comments are only necessary where anomalies are observed or significant change has occurred in outcomes since the last offering of this unit.

1. Insert unit code
2. Number of students enrolled
3. Comment on how students have met the outcomes in connection with the grades awarded (Distribution)
4. Were the assessment tasks moderated? Was there moderation of grades within the unit?
5. Were there any unexpected experiences?

Please comment on any issues identified or plans to change offering based on this semester’s experience

6. What strategies are in place to identify and assist students at academic risk?
7. Insert comments on items 3-6, where appropriate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit code</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>Distribution (Comment)</th>
<th>Moderation</th>
<th>Unexpected results or experiences</th>
<th>Students at academic risk</th>
<th>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABEC213</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not relevant due to small numbers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(4) Unit convener was the only marker. 60% of the assessment was from in-class quizzes and the ranking of marks across students was reasonably consistent indicating the quizzes were good indicators of relative status of students. quizzes were good indicators of relative status of students. Only one student failed the major assignment and he submitted a very late, incomplete assignment (e.g. half the required length, only four references when ten were required). Unit convener asked him to submit the incomplete assignment as she was concerned he wouldn’t submit anything and would ultimately fail the unit. He was able to pass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABEC240</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Not relevant due to small numbers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(4) The unit convener marked all work but called on an independent marker to double mark any assignment awarded a high distinction or fail grade. The final grades were considered carefully to ensure they reflected the students’ achievement across all assessment tasks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) Results were unsurprising given the mixed cohort. There were reduced face to face hours for students during this session along with a number of class clashes during block sessions which meant that students...
missed essential classes. Co-ordinator feels this may have disadvantaged some students, particularly those who were in their first semester of study at Macquarie. Students in their first semester of study should be advised in future to complete 100 level units before being encouraged to enroll in this unit.

(6) Students identified at risk are encouraged to use the University study skills and writing support programs and can access tutors during both Block and at-home study periods. Unit coordinator kept in contact with students and their tutors to work through any issues early in the semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Enrolments</th>
<th>Change in Credits and above</th>
<th>Incompletes</th>
<th>Markers take first 4-5 marked assignments</th>
<th>Final Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECH113</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>A slight increase in credits and above</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes 3 Incompletes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|             |            |                              |             |                                          | (3) Slightly higher Cs and Ds from last year - mainly due to small quizzes inflating the marks very slightly. Approximately 80% of those who failed did not submit all pieces of work, but did not withdraw from the unit. 35% repeating students failed again – and of those failing for the second+ time, all did not submit all pieces of work.
|             |            |                              |             |                                          | (4) Markers were provided with sample pieces of work and their first 4-5 marked assignments were checked by the convener for consistency and appropriateness of comments. All fails were checked by a second marker (convener or one experienced tutor- JB). The work of students on the cusp of a grade boundary was checked by the convener and JB to determine the final grade.
|             |            |                              |             |                                          | (5) The high drop out rate continues to cause concern, as does increasing disquiet from student over the expected performance in written assignments (i.e. complaints that we are too tough). Incompletes – 3 due to disruption. All should be resolved by mid-late July.
|             |            |                              |             |                                          | (6) Early quiz and first written assignment were used to identify students at-risk. Students referred to Learning Skills unit and asked to meet with convener or tutor. |
| ECH120      | 255        | Higher Ds and lower Ps and Fs | Yes         | Yes 16 Incompletes (6%)                  | Yes          |
|             |            |                              |             |                                          | (3) Stronger performance this year, reflecting students’ effort on following up on original feedback. Particularly strong exam performance.
|             |            |                              |             |                                          | (4) Sample work at various grade levels was circulated to all markers, double marking of failing assignments was undertaken, exam was marked collaboratively to ensure consistency of marks. Final grades were assessed but raw marks provided an accurate sense of student’s achievements and understanding.
|             |            |                              |             |                                          | (5) 16 Incompletes – 6 will sit a supplementary, and the remaining are due to incomplete tasks (awaiting student response) All will be resolved |
mid July

6) Assessment tasks are designed to ease students into academic study and provide a range of tasks to allow students to make up marks if they do poorly in any one. Teaching staff are careful to provide considerable constructive feedback to allow students to improve. However, as this is the first unit many students do, it does typically have a high attrition rate – with a significant number of students deciding not to pursue university study and withdrawing without completing the unit (25 pre census and 21 post).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Change in Distribution</th>
<th>Incompletes</th>
<th>Passed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECH126</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>No significant change in distribution</td>
<td>4 Incompletes (1%)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECH216</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>Slightly fewer Ds balanced by increased Cs</td>
<td>7 Incompletes (2%)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Meetings with all markers were held before marking and samples of students work were marked and circulated to all staff marking on the unit. All failed assignments were double marked and High Distinctions were also double marked. The students who were on the borderline of a grade were checked by the unit convener and RD to determine the final grade.

5) 4 incompletes - all supplementary exams.

6) The students did their first low risk assessment in Week 3 to help engage them in the unit. The library staff delivered a session in every internal tutorial and at the on-campus session for the students to help them with using Multi search and notes on using this were uploaded onto iLearn for all students. Uniwise sessions were also put up on the iLearn site and students were encouraged to attend these. All tutors were available to discuss grades and the unit coordinator offered consultations throughout the semester.

3) Slightly lower higher grades, but consistent with 2013.

4) All assessments were rigorously checked and moderated, including online quiz. 20% of essays were double marked, and marker distributions were check. Markers assessed designated exam question to ensure consistency.

5) The 35% essay may have had too many criterions, and some students struggles with this. Convener may add a short writing task to next year’s offering to scaffold students into this core essay-writing skills

Incompletes = 7. 6 will sit a supplementary exam. One has a pending WWP, - will follow up with CWB.

6) These students typically emerged through direct contact (email) indicating difficulties in completing the unit. Most at-risk students often
emerged through multiple requests in Tracker for special consideration. An early assessment task (online quiz in Week 4) is also an indicator. Student retention is encouraged through face-to-face tutorial offerings (including tutors flying interstate for Guardian external students), as well as additional supports (e.g., I conducted a face-to-face group Q&A session for the essay assessment to provide advice about essay-writing, consistent Dialogue and Forum involvement by convener).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Assessed</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECH231</td>
<td></td>
<td>294</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
<td>(3) Overall, students showed good level of engagement with the unit content, and grades were slightly stronger, with some particularly strong students achieving HDs. Most failing students did not submit work. (4) All assignments marked online, facilitating comparison of marking and reference to sample student work. Qualitative rubric was helpful. All assignments awarded a Fail by the first marker were double-marked and other assessments checked. The unit convener, in consultation with other teaching staff, considered in detail the final results of students who achieved HD and any who were at the borderline of grades. (5) Changes made or registered in 2014 seemed to have positive outcomes. Specifically, the timing of students’ professional experience (in the middle rather than, as in 2013, towards the end of the session), students’ stronger familiarity with online assessment and the additional mini-lecture on Assignment 3 can explain the improved results. The change from 2hr to 1.5hr weekly internal tutorials was also well received and allowed for a slight increase in the number of lectures and improved student focus during tutorials. incompletes = 4 - Approved disruption - expected resolution end of August (6) Information about relevant academic and other student support available at the university is provided. There is a low risk assessment task early in the semester. Online marking also allowed all markers to provide detailed and consistent feedback and students who failed their first and/or second assignment were encouraged to meet with the unit convener. However, most of the academic and writing skills workshops are available for students at the very beginning of the semester, before students at risk can be identified or realize they need this additional support, and many of those students prefer face-to-face workshops to online options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECH319</td>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 incomplete</td>
<td>(3) The distribution of marks shows excellence at the top end of the scale and the majority of the marks being passes and credits. There are 4 fails - 1 fail from poor standard of work; and 3 Fails as a result of non</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

142
than 2013 attendance and/or non submission of work. There was a strong level of engagement across the cohort, and a strong response to extensive marker feedback received by students who failed the first assignment. (4) Each student’s 3 assignments were marked by the three different staff members on the unit for equity, and to utilize the expertise of the marker in the art form being assessed. All Failing grades were double marked, samples of assessments across all grades were distributed to ensure consistency across markers. (5) A significant number of students required special consideration due to severe illness or challenging circumstances. Incomplete: 1 due to file corruption (resolved by end July). (6) An early assessment was set for students that enabled us to gauge students’ engagement and academic literacy skills. Students who failed or received low marks for this first assessment were provided with information about the range academic support services at the university. Student retention is encouraged through group performance work and peer scaffolding. Students who miss a tutorial are contacted to encourage them to come to a make-up class in that same art form at another date.

| ECH333 | 171 | Slightly fewer Ds and slightly higher Fs | Yes | 6 (1%) Incompletes | Yes |

(3) Unit being convened by different academic this year (KC on maternity leave). Lower higher grades - early practical task was not included as convener sith specialised knowledge was on leave - previously, students had scored highly in this task. Higher fails due to students not completing yet not withdrawing. (4) All assignments were marked using a detailed qualitative rubric. Some benchmarking of a range of assignments was done before marking was distributed for each assignment. Double checking of both failing and lower standard assignments was done. Marks for each assignment were moderated by the unit convenor before grades were finalized. (5) Incompletes = 6 – All with disruption requests. Some are not responding to emails, so a resolution date is yet to be determined. (6) An online forum was set up for each assignment so that students could support each other. Students with outstanding work were contacted shortly after each due date if they did not initiate contact. In person, email or phone contact was offered and utilized by all at risk students for most of the semester. Flexibility was offered through Disruption to Studies processes for all students with reasonable grounds...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECH335</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Very consistent with previous offerings</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Distribution of grades is similar to previous years, with most students demonstrating skills over semester to meet the learning outcomes. (4) Approximately 30 percent of each assignment was double marked. Including all fails, Distinctions, High Distinctions and work that was “borderline” for a higher grade. A random sample of all markers work was double marked to ensure consistency of grades across markers. Marking rubrics were available to students and markers. Each marker was assigned a different group of students for each assessment. (5) Slightly higher Fs and FWs, due to health/wellbeing concerns - students have been advised to WWP. (6) Students were identified at ‘academic risk’ if they failed their first assignment. These students were invited to meet with the Unit Coordinator to discuss their progress and receive support. Students failing quizzes were also asked to meet to enable appropriate support and strategies for success were given. Only 4 students accepted this assistance, with all four of these students successfully completing the unit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECH400</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Small numbers, but overall stronger than 2013 - more similar to 2012</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) The results for an individual project appear to be always disparate. The students come from Arts, Law and Education. All students were encouraged to commit to the suggested timeline or submit their own, based on the commitments they faced in the semester. As such students were able to work on their ECH400 assignments as their workload demanded. (4) Students work was marked by individual supervisor with no moderation. Markers were also supervisors for the students and mentored them as necessary throughout the semester. (5) Marks for a subject such as this are expected to be widespread. Some students are completing their studies and this subject is convenient – these students put less effort into this unit and appeared to be content to pass. Other students, especially the Grad. Dip., presented assignments of a very high standard. As a result there are more high and low results than in the middle range. (6) Individual support provided to all students due to one-on-one supervisory role. Timelines were negotiated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECH431</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Higher Ds balanced by</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Higher HDs seems to be reflective of this 400-level cohort (4) Approximately 30 percent of each assignment was double marked.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Key Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECH435</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Students were identified at ‘academic risk’ if they failed their first assignment (online postings). These students were invited to meet with the Unit Coordinator to discuss their progress and receive support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECH452</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Largely consistent with previous offerings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ECH435**

- Slightly higher Ds and HDs
- Yes
- 1 incomplete (1%)
- Yes

(3) Overall student performance in the 2014 cohort of ECH 435 was slightly improved against those in the previous two years. Assignments were revised following feedback from the previous two years and an optional exam was introduced so that students could choose a final assessment task that suited both their time commitments and learning style. A case study / problem based learning model (first trailed in 2013) was refined and resulted in stronger engagement in tutorials and on-campus sessions.

(4) A sample of assignments were marked by the Unit coordinator and then distributed to other markers to ensure consistency of expectations. Detailed marking rubrics were used. All high distinction and failed assignments were double marked by a member of the marking team. Final results were carefully considered to ensure that the final grade reflected the students’ achievement of the unit outcomes.

(5) Some Graduate Diploma students struggle with a return to study after some years away. These will be contacted in future to provide support.

1 Incompletes: Disruption approved - expected resolution mod July

(6) Students who are identified at risk after the first assignment are encouraged to access study skills and writing support services. Students who have experienced disruption to study have been supported through extensions to complete their work on the unit in a reasonable time frame.

**ECH452**

- Small numbers
- No
- 1 incomplete

(3) Largely consistent with previous offerings

(4) Convener marked all assessments

(5) There were no pieces of assessment awarded a failing grade in this unit. The two students who were awarded a final grade of fail didn’t submit a final piece of assessment (worth 45%). One of these students...
had exceptionally difficult circumstances and has been encouraged to apply to Withdraw without penalty

(6) Early low risk assessment and accessible convener re subsequent assignments. 1 incomplete = disruption due to surgery. Anticipated resolution early S2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>General Performance</th>
<th>Marking</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>At Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECHE350</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Small numbers - generally high grades</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|          |          | 3) Students are experienced graduated ECE teachers who are highly motivated to complete their Grad Cert/, hence high grades. The scope for developing assignments based on personal interest and on bringing ‘the world’ into the classroom was very engaging for the students. Results were slightly higher than the previous semester as there were no new graduates in the group, whereas there were some in the previous cohort.  
4) As this was a very small cohort there was no formal moderation of assessments. However this was done in Semester 2, 2014, in conjunction with ECH230, which contains parallel content. After consultation, expectations were scaled up due to the fact that all students in ECHE350 are already qualified teachers. Detailed feedback was provided for each assignment so students could improve in subsequent assignments. There was no double marking as there were no Failing assignments.  
6) There were no students at risk. As this was a completely online unit, I kept in contact with students regularly and replied to all messages promptly. |
| ECHE455  | 10       | High level of achievement overall | Yes | No | Yes |
|          |          |                     |         |          |         |
|          |          | (3) As per ECHE350 - Students were all actively engaged in weekly forum posts with peer feedback required- each post relating to the weeks’ content. Within these, they demonstrated through design, analysis and supporting research, various features of Literacy and Numeracy in Stage 2 and 3.  
(4) Comparison across spreadsheet of student results in forum posts in this unit, as well as previous assignment tasks comparison. The 2 major assignments were marked within turnitin and double marking only occurred with HD results. There were no fails among 9 students.  
(6) Using the weekly posts in iLearn to monitor student interpretation of content and encourage research that will assist through the unit in all assessment tasks was beneficial to identify any potential students at risk. With students who were struggling, regular dialogue contact and ‘wellness checks’ were carried out over the semester. Students responded back consistently in these circumstances. Fortunately they were able to overcome issues to complete the unit well. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Grade Distribution</th>
<th>Incompletes</th>
<th>Modifying Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECHP222</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Higher HDs balanced by lower Cs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4 incompletes (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) HDs higher than previous years (12%). Online quiz skewed results and used due to early placement for prac. 3 failed prac, 1 failed academically, and the other 4 fails did not complete all assessment pieces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Each student had at least 2 different markers grade their work. There were virtual marking meetings for every assessment. All Fs double marked and HDs reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) 3 incompletes due to late prac. 1 has a missing prac evaluation form.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Early low risk allows identification. Students asked to reflect on any barriers in week 1 and those who expressed concerns were contacted by convener.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHP323</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Higher Cs, balanced by lower Ps</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 incomplete (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) 6 FWs - 2 withdrew after being placed at-risk during prac, 2 withdrew during prac, 1 did not submit final assessment and withdrew, 1 decided that they did not want to teach school-aged children. 3 Fs were academic fails, 1 did not engage in unit at all and 1 other discontinued in unit but did not withdraw.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Details rubrics were available to students and markers. Assignments marked online for the first year. Unit convener marked randomly chosen assignments. All HDs and Fs were double-marked. Student work was marked across different markers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Convener was concerned at a perceived low level of academic literacy in 2013 cohort so clear unit expectations were provided for students in lecture 1 with regard to academic literacy, plus extensive feedback after assignment 1. Academic literacy improved in assignment 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Early assignment identified those at academic risk. Unit coordinator was available for consultations for these students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHP421</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Higher grades have increased</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3 (2%) Incompletes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) The larger cohort in this year’s ECHP421 have achieved overall slightly higher results that in the previous two years, which is reflective of the other compulsory 400-level unit. Academic fails have been limited to two students with the remainder of fails withdrawing from the unit post census date. There was only one Professional Experience fail in the unit this year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Marking meetings were held to establish and refine marking criteria. A qualitative rubric was used and the unit coordinator cross checked a random selection of assignments across all grades. All assignments awarded a fail grade were double marked and HDs were reviewed. A final moderation meeting was held by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
markers to ensure that final grades awarded reflected student achievement across all assessment tasks. 

(5) Students received considerable feedback on the first assessment tasks as a scaffold to their final major assignment. An additional assessment task was included (as a pass/fail requirement) to ensure that students were well prepared to begin their Professional Experience. A considerable number of students were highly engaged in this challenging unit and attendance at both tutorials and on-campus was exceptionally good.

3 Incompletes - 2 have medical issues and 1 has not submitted prac documentation. Each will be monitored.

(6) Students at risk are identified early in the semester both through initial assessment and in-class participation. There is consideration given to their PE placement and an experienced PE advisor is assigned to ensure they receive suitable support. One on One consultation is offered to all students who wish to discuss feedback from their assignments. A number of students took advantage of this opportunity this year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Incompletes</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECST220</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Higher fails and higher Ds and HDs than 2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 incomplete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) More students achieved high grades (Ds and HDs) this year, reflecting an excellent level of engagement with the unit content. At the other end, a number of students showed almost no engagement in the unit content, and submitted work of a very poor and un-theoretical nature. Last year, a quiz worth 30% inflated student marks, and this quiz was removed this year. This probably accounted for the higher F rate, as last year many students passed on the basis of their quiz result.

(4) All assignments were marked by the Sheila Degotardi and grades were checked and confirmed by Belinda Davis, who also checked all failing assignments. These were discussed and marks were changed accordingly. Final grades were discussed and confirmed together.

(5) Some students performed poorly despite clear and constant messages about expectations. 1 Incomplete due to disruption –will be resolved early July

(6) An early assessment task was added this year to promote engagement from the early part of the session. Those who did not meet expectations were given clear feedback as to how to improve in future assignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Incompletes</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECST330</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Lower higher grades than</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4 (10%) Incompletes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) 4 written assignments may have skewed marks downwards? Previous cohorts were smaller numbers, so this could account for distribution 'volatility'

11
(4) For assignment 1 and 4 there was only one marker (the unit convener). There were 2 markers for assignments 2 and 3. The markers have worked together extensively on the B Teach program and have a shared understanding of the progression of knowledge within the program. The markers met to talk through assignment requirements and also double marked/confirmed on assignments throughout the course of grading.
(5) 4 Incompletes – 3 disruptions (all from B.teach, ECS) and one due to assignment submission technical problems.
(6) ECST330 is a relatively small unit and as such it is easy to keep up communication and close correspondence. Most students kept me updated as to issues they were experiencing and we were able to work through support mechanisms for them. This helped to get several students through who may have otherwise withdrawn. Students were informed of their options in terms of applying for disruptions to studies and support services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Attempts</th>
<th>Similar distribution to previous offering</th>
<th>Incomplete</th>
<th>Withdrawal</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPED101</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) The majority of students met the learning outcomes for the unit. As with last year, there were a number of students who demonstrated high performance across all assessment components and they were awarded HD and D grades. There were also a small number of students who performed consistently poorly across all aspects of the unit.
(4) A detailed marking key was used in all assessment tasks. Grading cutoffs and distributions for each assessment task, as well as the overall unit results, were reviewed with an academic colleague. All failing work across the semester was double marked and a sample of work was checked by a second academic, with high consistency between markers.
(6) Early low risk assessments were included in the first 4 weeks of the unit (weekly quizzes). Problem solving activities conducted in tutorials early in the semester provided extensive opportunity for students to evaluate their own understanding of concepts, to critique the work of fellow students and receive constructive feedback.
### 2nd Attempts in UG units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>2nd time</th>
<th>Passed</th>
<th>Failed</th>
<th>FA</th>
<th>FW</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABEC213</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECH113</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13 (72%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECH120</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8 (62%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECH126</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9 (64%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECH216</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16 (69%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECH231</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24 (86%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECH319</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECH333</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECH435</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECH452</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHP222</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9 (75%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHP323</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8 (66%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHP421</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECST220</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECST330</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

The majority of repeat fails in 100 level units were due to the non-completion of work

When compared with 2013, a significantly higher proportion of 2nd attempt students have passed the unit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit code</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>Distribution (Comment)</th>
<th>Moderation Yes/No</th>
<th>Unexpected results or experiences</th>
<th>Students at academic risk</th>
<th>Comments on items 3-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECED 600</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Increased enrolments from 16 in 2013; high performing cohort reflected in HDs &amp; Ds &amp; fewer Passes.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(4) All failing assignments double marked. Moderation of high/low assignments discussed. (6) Students who did not do well for Assessment 1A and 2 met unit convener to overview work in detail. Students who disclosed personal challenges strongly recommended to see Campus Wellbeing. Additional support through individual consultations with unit convener as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECED 601</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Increased enrolments from past two years. Credit level average different from 2013.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(3) Credit average accurately reflects the extent to which they engaged in the material, increased their knowledge and critically evaluated relevant and contemporary information. (4) Comparison of grades and discussion of marking criteria using samples of all assignments with unit convener from 2013. (5) Late withdrawal by one student came as a surprise as no indication presented earlier. (6) Talks and email interactions by unit convener with those students who were struggling. Some were also referred to student support services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECED 602</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Fewer HDs and more Ds than 2013. Two Fails – one student did not submit any work (FW); other did not complete all assessment tasks.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(3) Assessment tasks reflected general student engagement and aptitude. (4) Final grades reviewed to ensure marks reflected overall engagement and performance in unit. (6) Early assessment to identify students at risk; individual consultations to provide feedback and advice on strategies for successful performance on subsequent assessment tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>Distribution (Comment)</td>
<td>Moderation Yes/No</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences</td>
<td>Students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECED 820</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Increase in enrolments from last year. About 50% of students from MA, MEdL, Indigenous Ed, &amp; MECh (n=20+). Grade distribution comparable to 2012 than 2013.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(3) By blogging regularly students remained engaged in the unit &amp; reflected in overall results in this unit. (4) Fail &amp; HD assignments double marked and reviewed respectively. Other assignments selected at random to double mark to check for consistency. (6) Students who did not do well in Assignment 2 advised to seek academic support for writing. Students completed a 'Who Am I?' introduction in week 1 and those who disclosed issues that could impact on their studies were emailed privately and referred to appropriate services, eg, Campus Well-being. Students falling behind encouraged to apply for special consideration as appropriate. Convener also had individual consultations with any students who requested support with their assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECED 825</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>The distribution of grades is as expected within a small cohort of students. Grades ranged from High Distinction to Pass</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(4) Any concerns discussed with IEC's Professional Experience Coordinator. One (1) incomplete – late practicum placement. (5) A new assignment was trialed this year which meant students focused on regular professional journal entries related to their orientation days at their centre. This seemed to work very well to prepare students for their block of student teaching. (6) This has not been an issue for students in the second year of the M Teach program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECED 826</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Students have done exceedingly well with half the cohort achieving Distinctions or High Distinctions.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3) Students were very engaged in the unit, displayed strong academic skills and as a result performed very well. Unit now completed as a second year unit. 4) Two academics collaborated in marking by comparing marks to ensure consistency and double marking any fails. 6) Flexibility of offering a mix of on-campus and regular tutorial attendance worked well and enabled all students to complete the unit satisfactorily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>Distribution (Comment)</td>
<td>Moderation</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences</td>
<td>Students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECED 828</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Overall distribution comparable to 2011. Decrease in HDs could be attributed to change of assessment task that contributed to large number of HDs in 2012.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(4) Double marking of all Fail assignments. (5) The Reading Journal assignment is a new assessment task and was scaffolded too highly this semester, resulting in slightly inflated marks for that task. More emphasis will be placed on independence and high analytical standard expected next offering. (6) Students are offered alternatives for assessment depending on experience and program in which they are enrolled. Students identified as at risk for academic skills (often international students) and directed to appropriate in-person or online support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECED 886</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Comparable to previous years with slightly higher proportion of results in the HD and D range, and lower in the Credit and Pass range. 2 Fails due to non-submission of final assignment.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(3) Can be attributed to scaffolding of online interactions involving both peers and unit convener; and allocation of 10% marks to this work. (4) Timely feedback from unit convener &amp; peers enrolled in this unit. (6) Active online participation enabled early identification of those at risk. Assessment tasks also build on each other so feedback on earlier tasks contributes to improvement in subsequent tasks. Students who fail any task encouraged to meet with unit convener.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>Distribution (Comment)</td>
<td>Moderation Yes/No</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences</td>
<td>Students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SPED 801  | 55        | Against 2013, there was a small reduction in % of Ds and Cs with the bulking of Ps and FWs. | Yes              | No                               | Yes                   | (3) Unable to comment further on distribution until incompletes (n=6) resolved  
(4) Double marking was completed for the two problem solving exercises and the assignment, with a high level of agreement. Assessments & grade distribution reviewed and discussed with another.  
(5) 6 incompletes – awaiting prac completion  
(6) Early low risk assessments. Several drop in sessions, discussion forums as well as individual support by phone, email, Skype and face-to-face. |
| SPED 802  | 93        | Increased enrollments. Cannot comment on final distribution as 24 incompletes; to be resolved as soon as practicum is completed. | Yes              | No                               | Yes                   | (3) Typically the results indicate most students meet the learning outcomes. To date most have received a Credit grade or above. As this is the first unit that post-graduate students complete in special education, it typically has a higher fail and drop-out rate than other PG SPED units.  
(4) Failing assessment tasks double marked. A detailed marking guide and a single marker assisted with consistency. Grade distribution for each task and final grades discussed with a senior academic.  
(6) Identified though assessments and through interaction on the website. Assistance and advice is available through individual consultation with staff. Optional quizzes allow student to monitor their own understanding of content. Several drop-in sessions were provided so students could seek help on specific issues. Many of the discussion activities involved demonstrating skills taught in seminars and allowed feedback from the convener and peers. |
| SPED 805  | 70        | Increase in enrolments since 2013 by 15. | Yes              | No                               | Yes                   | (3) Shift in C grades however, unable to comment on distribution until incompletes (n=15) resolved.  
(4) All Fails double marked. Grading cut-offs and distributions discussed with another colleague.  
(5) 14 incompletes – awaiting prac completion  
(6) Non-compulsory quizzes were monitored and support offered. Several drop in sessions, discussion forums as well as prompt email responses from Convener. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit code</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>Distribution (Comment)</th>
<th>Moderation</th>
<th>Unexpected results or experiences</th>
<th>Students at academic risk</th>
<th>Comments on items 3-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPED 807</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Enrolments have increased by 15 since 2013. A different distribution pattern compared to 2013; more like 2012.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(3) Shift in all grades however, unable to really comment on distribution until incompletes resolved (4) All failed assessment components were double-marked and samples of assessments were reviewed by a second academic. Marking was very similar across the two academics. Distribution of grades for each assessment task was also discussed with a senior colleague, as was the overall final distribution of grades. (5) 8 incompletes—awaiting prac reports or return of equipment. One student due to injury. (6) Quizzes were used as early low risk assessments for Topics 1-5. Quizzes were not graded this year but allowed students to evaluate their own progress. Problem solving activities incorporated in topics 1-5 also provided the opportunity for students to evaluate their understanding of concepts and receive constructive feedback from staff and other students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 901</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A only two students</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(3) Both students enrolled have submitted all required pieces of assessment. Final literature reviews are currently being marked. (6) As students produce one large piece of written work (100%), there are several strategies used to identify students at risk, for example, keeping meetings with supervisors, submitting a literature search and submitting a draft literature review. Both students submitted the final literature review on time and these are currently being marked.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Insert unit code
2. Number of students enrolled
3. Comment on how students have met the learning outcomes for the unit to the required standards for the grades awarded.
4. What moderation took place in the Assessment Tasks (including Exams): (e.g. sample double marking, sample student work circulated, comparison of marking distributions, external marker etc.) and what moderation took place of final grades in this unit?
5. Were any student results or experiences unexpected? Comment on any changes you might make to the unit in light of this semester.
6. What strategies do you use to identify students at risk and/or encourage student retention?
7. Comments on items 3-6 can be placed in the right-hand column
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Code</strong></td>
<td><strong>Enrolment</strong></td>
<td><strong>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACBE100</strong> J Brick / C Liardet</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Students complete a 4-part portfolio project that progressively scaffolded their acquired skills. To succeed in the unit, students have to consistently demonstrate proficiency across the range of skills.</td>
<td>All assignments moderated in tutor meetings to discuss marking criteria &amp; rubric &amp; collaborate on sample student texts. Some tasks cross-marked by tutors other than the students’ assigned tutor.</td>
<td>*7 students neglected to submit final assignment (&amp; no special consideration). If there was a final exam, then these students would be FA instead of F grade. 11 students dropped out of unit.</td>
<td>Moderation meetings held between the tutors and conveners &amp; tutors asked to flag students who have high absence rates and/or problems with assignment submissions. The unit conveners work closely with the “Next-Step Pathway” student advisors to monitor these students’ progress in the unit.</td>
<td>*High number of fails-21. Most did not hand in any work, nor did they withdraw. First year students did not seem to realize they need to formally withdraw. Will be investigating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACSC100</strong> J Brick / C Liardet</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Use of scaffolded learning</td>
<td>Sample double marking on reports, essay, brochure. Comparison of marking distribution. Final marks moderated by 2 convenors.</td>
<td>Reduce number of assignments. Reconsider use of language development program.</td>
<td>Extensive use of peer review. Extensive use of scaffolded learning. Multiple small assignments with rapid feedback.</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACSH100</strong> M Herke / C Liardet</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Students required to complete four-part portfolio project that progressively scaffolded their acquired skills. To succeed in the unit, students have to consistently</td>
<td>All assignments were moderated in tutor meetings.</td>
<td>A few students neglected to submit final assignment. If there was a final exam in place of these final texts, those students would be “FA”</td>
<td>Tutors flag students who have high absence rates and/or problems with assignment submissions. The unit conveners also work closely with the “Next-Step Pathway” student advisors to monitor these students’ progress in the unit.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Code</strong></td>
<td><strong>Enrolment</strong></td>
<td><strong>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING109</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>*See results report</td>
<td>Double marking for extreme and possibly anomalous marks – ie. Fails, HDs, and marks out of keeping with each other or tutor expectations.</td>
<td>The early writing task is designed to ‘net in’ writers at risk. Remarkably, a review of some recommendations to students who failed showed that the recommendations were NOT acted upon by the students. This inaction produced a small set of very low marks. The changes recommended in Q1 should help us to bring these students into a better preparatory framework before the exam period (when it is too late).</td>
<td>*Ds &amp; Cs are a bit higher than last year. Two changes need to be made-1 external student who needs to be changed to a Pass. Another needs the grade changed to a Credit as his blogs were lost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LING120</strong></td>
<td>308</td>
<td>*For quite a few students the exam results were very disappointing, reflecting a lack of sustained engagement with the concepts of the unit. Had we made a pass in the exam compulsory, there would have been a very high failure rate. For the two essay tasks, Unit Convener reviewed all HD and Fail papers as well as a selection of papers in the other grades. Tutors also brought any problematic cases to my attention. For the 40% Results &amp; student experiences similar to past few years. We already scaffold the learning in a much more hand holding environment than we used to need to do ten years ago. This perhaps reflects the level of pre-university achievements of tutors are encouraged to inform me as soon as possible of students they feel are at risk and I then invite the students to come for a chat. This semester we have had considerable success with around ten such cases, two of them going on to achieve a Distinction. ilearn site used to upload model answers to assessment tasks, and the answers to the tutorial.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Butt/ A Lukin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Spinks</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Distribution more like 2012. Last year was the worst cohort ever seen. 6 Incompletes. Special student Graeme Hadfield holds a special club in the Food Court every Tuesday morning for those students who might need help in Grammar or other Linguistics subjects. He used to be the PAL Support person, but Faculty no longer funds this position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ds & Cs are a bit higher than last year. Two changes need to be made-1 external student who needs to be changed to a Pass. Another needs the grade changed to a Credit as his blogs were lost.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LING217</strong></td>
<td>187</td>
<td><em>This is a challenging unit that requires sustained effort to achieve good results. High Distinctions are not easily come by and are a true reflection of dedication and talent. Distinctions too are highly prized. A Pass reflects that the minimum standard of learning outcomes have been achieved. Students are required to have completed each assessment task to be eligible for a passing grade.</em></td>
<td>3 tutors marked 1/3 of the students transcription work each. Detailed comparisons then made and marks adjusted if necessary. Exam 2 tutors &amp; 1 external marker with detailed answers provided to markers &amp; distributions compared. Approx 10% were remarked.</td>
<td>The results are similar to those from previous offerings.</td>
<td>A low risk phonemic transcription assessment task (5%) is submitted in week 4. This allows us to identify students at risk and provides extra support for such students in the following phonemic transcription assessment (20%). Also, a lower risk (5%) initial phonetic transcription assessment precedes a higher risk (20%) phonetic transcription assignment, alerting us and the students who need help. An additional debrief session was held to go over the second transcription assignment. Two PAL sessions were run initially but one was cancelled due to lack of attendance. Different learning styles are catered for by presenting</td>
<td><em>Huge increase in cohort. Challenging unit. Mainly Speech and Hearing students. Crs a bit higher than last year.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Huge increase in cohort.*

Challenging unit. Mainly Speech and Hearing students. Crs a bit higher than last year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Code</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LING218</td>
<td>A Lukin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Difficult course. Students with very poor knowledge of grammar. Most students were able to achieve the learning outcomes</td>
<td>Double marked all HDs and FAILS for all assessment tasks &amp; a sample of papers at other grades across all assessment tasks.</td>
<td>No results or experiences were unexpected. Considering changes to order of the topics in unit. Additional online materials to support their understanding of the verbal group. Reconsidering which text book is appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Code</strong></td>
<td><strong>Enrolment</strong></td>
<td><strong>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LING248</strong></td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Combination of acting convenor and updated assessments and materials makes comparisons with standards in relation to learning outcomes from previous years difficult.</td>
<td>Comprehensive marking criteria used. Moderation between tutors as the marking progressed. Then moderated by the convenor. Marking for the final exam was done collaboratively, and final grading was discussed in the marking meetings.</td>
<td><em>Some unexpectedly low results for first two written assignments. Students struggled with basic requirements for referencing &amp; academic literacy. Our response: include exercises &amp; support materials focusing on these areas in the tutorials and lectures. Future iterations of the unit should cover broader range of sociolinguistic theories, and continually update materials to incorporate contemporary examples of Computer Mediated Communication.</em></td>
<td>At risk students identified using a diagnostic reflective essay submitted in week 3. Those identified as at risk were provided with information describing the types of writing support offered by the university, including web-based resources available via the MQ Student Portal.</td>
<td>LING248 is a people unit and attracts students from across the disciplines with each cohort having a different range of abilities. <em>New assessment regime - more writing required. Challenging for students. Extra support given. 8 students – no show for exam. 2 students – to take a supplementary exam. 2 students - before an academic honesty committee.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING289</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>All students who passed unit demonstrated ability to articulate features of discourse that can be studied to examine “what goes on” and “what goes wrong” in communication in social situations.</td>
<td>All marking done by unit convenor. Major assign for 1 student was double marked due to question about how grading criteria should apply to her approach.</td>
<td>*1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; time unit run. Future final exam could include more challenging questions to identify students who mastered material to a high level.</td>
<td>Students complete on-line quiz week 4 to check mastery of key concepts.</td>
<td>*Core unit in Bachelor of Human Sciences — for this reason the unit was run though small numbers. Half of the students are from physiotherapy and the rest are doing it for interest. Excellent students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING332</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Two in class quizzes, one research project plus report, weekly reading reviews and blogs</td>
<td>*Marking distributions compared. Fractions scaled down. Special considerations taken into account.</td>
<td>Higher marks/grades chiefly because of higher level of engagement with flipped classroom.</td>
<td>Blog entry in week two and three. Quiz in week 6. Open door policy. Good level of in-class engagement even though participation was not marked.</td>
<td>*No budget for other staff for double marking etc. **Excellent, highly engaged students, who worked hard. More than half are not Linguistics students but FBE. Experiment with flipped classes a success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING334</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Students completed 2 online quizzes and completed 2 homework assignments. The 2nd homework assignment was a research project in which students mined data from a database of child language and assessed its fit to</td>
<td>The 2 Homework Assignments were all marked by one person, so there was consistency across the class. For the final exams, the unit convenor marked the first two sections of all exams, and a PhD student marked</td>
<td>Distribution of grades looks different this year. Class much weaker cohort than previous years. So more students in the Pass range, and some Fails.. It may be advisable to change the format of the</td>
<td>*Extra tutorial held each week to help students consolidate lecture material, but not very well attended. Students are always welcome to make appointments, and many did seek help with the homework assignments. Tutor spent a lot of time answering questions both in office and on discussion board.</td>
<td>The class increased in size from 78 to 98 this year, due to an increase in number of students enrolled in the BSPlHSc degree. These students appear not to be very strong. Most students don’t bother coming to lectures, and this is most likely affecting their grades. *Roz gave extra tutorials and lectures; but students were not interested and did not attend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING337 J Brick</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Range of assessment tasks. Results slightly lower than last year, reflecting increase in no. of students with little experience in units requiring research &amp; critical comparison concepts.</td>
<td>All assignments marked by unit convenor.</td>
<td>A substantial group of students had no previous experience of linguistics and were unfamiliar with e-reserve, using the library to find resources or reading journal articles.</td>
<td>Early low risk assignment to identify students at risk. Extensive range of materials on academic literacy available on iLearn. Academic literacy development built into all lectures. Individual consultations for at risk students.</td>
<td>Planet Unit. Weaker cohort than last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING397 J Tent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>All students met the learning outcomes to the required standards of grades awarded.</td>
<td>All assignments were assessed by convenor &amp; external marker. No moderation of final grades was therefore deemed necessary as assessment was totally</td>
<td>Students felt the second assignment ought to have been worth more given the amount of work required for it. I have agreed to do so for 2015. Nevertheless, students thought</td>
<td>Continuous one-to-one consultation during and outside of timetabled tutorial/lecture sessions. Students receive personalised guidance throughout the duration of the unit.</td>
<td>4 Incomplete. 4 Fails. Students who bothered to turn up were very engaged. Again the 3rd year cohort who were a weak 2nd year cohort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit Code Enrolment</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assignment-based.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>that the assignment should not be altered in any way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING398 F Cox</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>These are high achieving students enrolled in Grad. Dip Speech &amp; Communication. Raw marks were scaled because a simple tally of results resulted in 8 HD and 12 D. The resulting spread was achieved by recalculating one assessment task that returned marks on aggregate that were much higher than those of the other tasks.</td>
<td>Articulator Phonetics Assessment 20% Externally marked – detailed answers provided to marker. Other assessments convenor marked.</td>
<td>The results are similar to those from previous offerings. One assignment will be marked differently to allow for a better spread of marks in future.</td>
<td>This is an external unit. There is an early low risk (10%) assessment task in week 4. Students are offered three on-campus sessions across the semester which are recorded by ECHO360. Students are provided multiple resources including access to lectures recorded for LING217 (as an ancillary resource), online phonetics materials associated with their textbook and our Centre for Language Sciences materials along with staff support via ilearn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPH308 R Mannell/ F Cox</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Half of the students enrolled have achieved CR grades or above, 26 students performed at an appropriate level for a P grade. Only a small number</td>
<td>Each question was marked by a single examiner. Double marking of randomly selected assessments to ensure</td>
<td>No unexpected experiences</td>
<td>Students are encouraged to talk to staff if they are worried about any aspect of the unit, including assessment.</td>
<td>Ds have decreased and Ps have increased. Weaker students. Very challenging assignment in first semester that had plenty of scaffolding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPH309</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Highly engaged group of students. Displayed a great interest within the subject matter.</td>
<td>consistency between examiners. Rechecking of cusp grades.</td>
<td>There were no unexpected results.</td>
<td>Assessment early on in semester conducted to determine students at risk. These students are met with and their progress discussed. Plans of study are formulated if required</td>
<td>High grades. Excellent and highly engaged students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Kim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPH310</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>All students, with complete grades, met the unit learning outcomes. On the most part, students were keen and enthusiastic, and attended lectures. Many are focused and keen on post-graduate study in either speech-language pathology or audiology.</td>
<td>*No Moderation. Quality control via: Reading over random selection of assessments to gauge standard; checking back on other students’ work and making comparisons; double marking of random sample.</td>
<td>Nothing unexpected.</td>
<td>3 assessments throughout semester allows students academically at risk to be identified. Students given opportunities to ask questions anonymously about the course material. This enabled me to see if students were experiencing problems with the material, and if so, what they were. Students were also encouraged to contact convenor with questions and/or concerns about overall progress</td>
<td>42% increase in student numbers this year. *Assessment tasks worked through very carefully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Ballin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPH312</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Mannell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slightly weaker cohort. Crs increased and Ds decreased. 1F and 2Incomplete. Of the latter 1 will become a Fail and 1 will be incomplete.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPH490</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Honours unit. (Sam Bentink will re-enroll for Second Semester.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPL900</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Learners have completed assessment tasks whose requirements and marking criteria are matched to the unit objectives. The relative success of students on the assessments reflects their ongoing and accumulative achievement of the unit objectives.</td>
<td>None - one teaching staff.</td>
<td>The weighting towards high grades continues in this unit. A significant portion of the assessment is ‘right or wrong’. I may make changes to the weighting of assessment tasks, though they are well matched to the curriculum and objectives. In the longer term some changes may be made to the presentation of the content and also to the content, but this is a relatively new unit that has had different teaching staff in every iteration (three so far) so I want to give it some time to ‘settle’ before deciding whether to make significant changes.</td>
<td>Monitoring of students in class or online discussions and tasks. Early Assignment 1. Retention is not an issue in our program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPL902</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>The learning outcomes of the unit were translated into different activities of the assessment tasks and were also represented in the assessment criteria used to assess students’ performance. Accordingly, the grades are representative of the degree of achievement of the learning outcomes of the unit.</td>
<td>External marker marked the assignments for this unit. A sample of assignments from each grade category was re-checked by the unit convenor to ensure marking consistency. Final grade distribution was compared to the distribution of grades in S1 2012 and 2013</td>
<td>There were no unexpected results. Each year I try to create more engaging learning activities to enhance students’ learning.</td>
<td>First assignment is designed to act as formative assessment task to diagnose problems in students’ performance and alert them to take appropriate action not to repeat them in their subsequent assignments. Individual feedback provided to each student so that they learn from their performance and improve their achievement.</td>
<td>Excellent cohort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPL912</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Most students met the learning outcomes well and several have consistently produced a high standard of work. 3 students yet to complete all assignments.</td>
<td>Borderline fail assignments were moderated by a colleague who teaches on the MAppLing program.</td>
<td>No unexpected results or experiences.</td>
<td>Early completion and assessment of first assignment allows identification of students experiencing difficulty with course content and/or academic writing.</td>
<td>2 MRes Students who got HDs. These results go to Faculty directly and will be presented by Mitch at the Faculty Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPL920</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Students who have passed the unit have successfully completed 4 assessment tasks designed to address the unit outcomes, which have been mapped onto graduate student outcomes for PG students.</td>
<td>Moderation between Phil Chappell and Heather Jackson</td>
<td>No. Changes made over the past two semesters have resulted in more predictable responses from students to content, learning activity and assessment tasks.</td>
<td>Early pre-assessment task online and in class. Students encouraged to meet lecturer if have concerns. Some students may be advised to amend enrolment to part time if there are on-going concerns.</td>
<td>60% more enrolments than last semester. More undergraduate students who do not have previous teaching experience. More Ps reflect UG students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPL921</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Students participated well in class and were keen and motivated. In class and online discussion of assignments meant that the majority of students were clear about the unit’s expectations and worked hard to meet these. Many students were trained (primary) teachers and so 2nd marker was brought in to help with marking. Moderation of potential F and HD graded papers for all units in the PG Cert TESOL was also conducted by Phil Chappell and Heather Jackson.</td>
<td>2nd marker was brought in to help with marking. Moderation of potential F and HD graded papers for all units in the PG Cert TESOL was also conducted by Phil Chappell and Heather Jackson.</td>
<td>3 students failed to meet the grade for this unit and there was 1 withdrawal. This is high but not when considered in light of the high student numbers this semester. No changes are envisaged for S2 as the course is changing in 2015 so planning is for the new units rather than review of current units.</td>
<td>Discussion with student, discussion with Phil Chappell and if necessary co-ordination with services such as student well-being.</td>
<td>Large student cohort this semester, made on campus classes quite difficult to manage. More Passes. New undergraduate students with no experience of micro teaching and peer teaching, found this unit challenging. Separate cohorts could be an answer. There is a small group of international students as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Code</strong></td>
<td><strong>Enrolment</strong></td>
<td><strong>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPL922</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Pass or Fail unit. Due to the high intake this semester many students have not yet completed APPL922 but are due to do so by end July. This pattern is likely to continue in future semesters as we are dependent on the timetables of external institutions and availability of external mentor teachers.</td>
<td>No formal written assessments; students submit a portfolio of work and undertake observation and teaching of ELT classes in various institutions. There is liaison with the students’ mentor teachers and written reports are submitted by the mentor teacher on each student which allow the assessment to be made as to whether students have demonstrated the requisite skills to graduate from this unit. In the case of students who are not succeeding with the practicum, discussion with their mentor teachers and Phil Chappell takes places and intervention is made as and when necessary.</td>
<td>The practicum will be revised in 2015 in light of changes to the course. One of these changes is likely to be the offering and overseeing of the practicum on campus.</td>
<td>Some students are advised to take their practicum after completion of the other units in the PG Cert TESOL (i.e. APPL921 &amp; APPL921). Liaison with mentor teachers during students’ practicums to ensure that any students at risk can be identified early. Many hours spent communicating with students either F2F, via ilearn or by email to check that students’ practicums are running smoothly. So far we have been able to retain students in this unit and ensure that the practicum is a rewarding experience for both students and mentor teachers and that it provides students with the best start in their new ESL careers.</td>
<td>19 Incompletes because students are completing their practicums at school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**APPL923</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Most students have met the learning outcomes well. The exceptions are three students who have yet to complete all the course assignments.</td>
<td>Marking was shared between the co-convenors, who were each responsible for the complete marking of two assessment tasks.</td>
<td>No HDs were awarded this year, but 30% of the cohort were in the D range.</td>
<td>Early completion and assessment of first assignment allows identification of students experiencing difficulty with course content and/or academic writing.</td>
<td>No HDs but more Ds. Some students had serious writing problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit Code: APPL922**

H Jackson

**Enrolment:** 35

**Comments:**

- Students have not yet completed APPL922 due to high intake this semester.
- Assessment tasks include portfolio submissions and observation of ELT classes.
- Mentor teachers submit weekly reports to assess students' progress.
- Practicum revised in 2015.

**Comments on APPL923:**

- Most students have met learning outcomes well.
- Exceptions: three students yet to complete all course assignments.
- Marking shared between co-convenors.
- No HDs awarded; 30% cohort in D range.
- Early completion and assessment allow for timely feedback.

**Notes:**

- Student risk identified early.
- Liaison with mentor teachers to support students.
- Practicum remains rewarding for students and mentors.

---

**Incompletes:**

- 19 students due to practicum completion.

---

**Unit Code: APPL923**

JM/PB

**Enrolment:** 35

**Comments:**

- Most students have met learning outcomes well.
- Three students yet to complete course assignments.
- Marking shared among co-convenors.
- No HDs awarded; 30% in D range.
- Early completion allows early feedback and intervention.

---

**Incompletes:**

- 19 students due to practicum completion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Code</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</th>
<th>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</th>
<th>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</th>
<th>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</th>
<th>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPL942</td>
<td>J Brick</td>
<td>Varied assessment tasks involving three different genres gave students the opportunity to create some of the most common genres in academic discourse; genres that they will in turn be teaching to their students. Fail student did not complete 3rd assignment.</td>
<td>All assignments marked by unit convenor</td>
<td>As expected.</td>
<td>Early relatively low stakes assignment to identify difficulties, followed by referral to Learning Centre. Extensive academic literacy materials on iLearn. Detailed description of generic requirements of each assessment. Continued availability of one-to-one discussion about problems</td>
<td>Results a little weaker than last semester. Japanese/Korean teachers who mostly teach at the primary level found this class quite difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUD802</td>
<td>M Sharma</td>
<td>All students have met the learning objectives</td>
<td>All the marking has been done by the convener</td>
<td>All students passed. Consistent performers on quiz and essays. 3 incompletes due to special consideration</td>
<td>No, all students’ performance across the units is very similar and there were no unexpected results</td>
<td>All students who appear to be struggling to achieve adequate grades are asked to meet with several staff members to identify ways in which they can improve their grades and to identify the reasons for their performance. Referral is made to university services where necessary (i.e. academic writing courses, counseling services, etc).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUD803</td>
<td>C McMahon</td>
<td>All students have met the learning objectives.</td>
<td>All the marking has been done by the convener and hence no moderation has taken place. All students’ performances were compared across the units and if there were any concerns, appropriate strategies</td>
<td>All struggling students are asked to meet with several staff members to identify ways in which they can improve their grades and to identify the reasons for their performance. Referral is made to university services where necessary (i.e. academic writing courses, counseling services, etc).</td>
<td>Similar to other ACUD units.</td>
<td>Similar distribution to last year. Students with high GPA, but did not do as well as expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUD804</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practicum unit 2 Co-Ordinators on leave. One on maternity leave. Results not in yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUD808</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The students have demonstrated satisfactory performance on assessment tasks and clinical placements to receive a satisfactory grade. This includes feedback from clinical educators on clinical performance.</td>
<td>No double marking usually but if students’ work is of poor quality, double marking may be applied. All Viva exams have 2 examiners so is 100% double marked. No comparison of marking distributions as this is an ungraded unit.</td>
<td>No. This is a repeat offering and only has 3 students enrolled in the unit. The one student who has received an incomplete grade will be offered a supplementary viva exam. His poor performance was of no surprise as his attitude, clinical and academic performance conduct has been borderline.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUD811</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUD812</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>All students met the learning outcomes for this unit.</td>
<td>Marking conducted by unit convenor &amp; 1 other marker. Some assessments double marked by both. Regular meetings were held with the marker to ensure consistency within and between assessments. The unit convenor also encouraged the other marker to re-marking selected submissions, and to vary the order in which student</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unit conv. consulted closely with MCAUD program staff re. student performance across the program to identify students at risk. All at risk students were offered meeting with unit conv. to support participation in the unit. The unit conv. also informed MCAUD program staff about student progress. Student retention was 100%.</td>
<td>Similar to other CAUD units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUD813</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>The students awarded with a satisfactory grade have demonstrated satisfactory performance on assessment tasks and clinical placements. This includes feedback from clinical educators on clinical performance</td>
<td>All marking in informed by MCAUD program assessment grading rubric.</td>
<td>No unexpected results.</td>
<td>No double marking for assessments is standardly implemented, however, if a student's work is of poor quality, double marking may be applied. No comparison of marking distributions as this is an ungraded unit.</td>
<td>No double marking for assessments is standardly implemented, however, if a student's work is of poor quality, double marking may be applied. No comparison of marking distributions as this is an ungraded unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUD814</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>All students showed that they had met the basic learning outcomes of the unit (although one only marginally) through successful completion of the unit assessments and final examination.</td>
<td>Comparison was made between assessment outcomes this and previous years, grades were well spread out and no scaling was needed for the final grades.</td>
<td>Nothing of significance</td>
<td>All students who appear to be struggling to achieve adequate grades are asked to meet with several staff members to identify ways in which they can improve their grades and to identify the reasons for their performance. In this unit it was necessary to go through the process of sitting with several students.</td>
<td>Incompletes due to part time parental leave. Results in hopefully by Monday.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAUD813
Y.Stone/A.Miles

CAUD814
J.Newall
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Code</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAUD818</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>All students showed that they had met the basic learning outcomes of the unit (although again, one only marginally) through successful completion of the unit assessments and final examination. Some particularly good group assignments this year as well!</td>
<td>Comparison was made between assessment outcomes this and previous years, grades were well spread out and no scaling was needed for the final grades.</td>
<td>Nothing of significance.</td>
<td>All students who appear to be struggling to achieve adequate grades are asked to meet with several staff members to identify ways in which they can improve their grades and to identify the reasons for their poor performance. Referral is made to university services where necessary (i.e. academic writing courses, counseling services, etc).</td>
<td>Similar to last year. Technical Unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUD819</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>All learning outcomes were evaluated across the breadth of the assessments</td>
<td>There was comparison across all the units and if any student was identified to be doing poorly, strategies were put in place.</td>
<td>No, all students performances are consistent across the 3 units</td>
<td>All students who appear to be struggling to achieve adequate grades are asked to meet with several staff members to identify ways in which they can improve their grades and to identify the reasons for their poor performance. Referral is made to university services where necessary (i.e. academic writing courses, counseling services, etc).</td>
<td>Similar distribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDIT981</td>
<td>A Smith</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Students with HDs demonstrated a clearly professional level across all learning outcomes. Those with Ds demonstrated similarly high levels for most, but slightly lower levels for one or two of the learning outcomes (while still demonstrating a professional standard). Those with Credits had a consistent level over learning outcomes, but slightly below professional standard. Those with a Pass need to work on several learning outcomes to reach a professional level of competency.</td>
<td>Everything marked by unit convenor</td>
<td>General standard good. Majority of students achieving Distinction or above. Will reschedule assignment deadlines, to put less pressure on students taking both E &amp; P units in the semester, and will consider keeping assessable bulletin boards open for longer to allow more time for contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDIT982</td>
<td>A Smith</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Students with HDs demonstrated a clearly professional level across all learning outcomes. Those with Ds demonstrated similarly high levels for most, but slightly lower levels for one or two of the learning outcomes.</td>
<td>Everything marked by unit convenor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

174
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Code</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</th>
<th>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</th>
<th>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</th>
<th>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</th>
<th>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LING903</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>learning outcomes (while still demonstrating a professional standard). Those with Credits had a consistent level over learning outcomes, but slightly below professional standard. Those with a Pass need to work on several learning outcomes to reach a professional level of competency.</td>
<td>Compared distribution of marks, but no other staff involved</td>
<td>No unexpected experiences.</td>
<td>Early quiz and weekly feedback on blog</td>
<td>Low numbers as 5 other units time tabled at the same time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING903</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Weekly reading review/blog 2x quiz Ethics Module Research project plus report/essay</td>
<td>Compared distribution of marks, but no other staff involved</td>
<td>No unexpected experiences.</td>
<td>Early quiz and weekly feedback on blog</td>
<td>Low numbers as 5 other units time tabled at the same time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING932</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dissertation unit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING934</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dissertation unit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING935</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dissertation unit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPH800</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>All students met the learning outcomes to a satisfactory level. One student withdrew from the MSLP mid-semester and there is one Incomplete. There is a higher proportion of D and No moderation</td>
<td>No moderation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Retention is very high. This is supported by a peer Mentor program between Y1 and Y2 cohorts; also student-selected class reps who meet with program staff at least twice per semester and at other times as requested by students. These activities foster routine and clear</td>
<td>First year, first semester unit. Complex unit. More Ds and Cs compared to last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPH802 E Harrison</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>lower proportion of CR compared to the last 2 years. There’s no obvious reason for this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>communication between students and program staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPH810 E Harrison</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Students met all learning outcomes for this Year 2 unit, which has a focus on evidence based practice and research design. Students who enrol in SPH821 Research Project (prerequisite is a high GPA in Year 1) do not take this unit. The SPH810 grades this year are lower than 2013, reflecting the fact that there are 8 high achieving students in SPH821 this year and none in 2013.</td>
<td>The unit convenor was the only marker for this unit and there was no moderation.</td>
<td>No unexpected experiences and I don’t plan to make significant changes</td>
<td>Retention is very high. This is supported by a peer Mentor program between Y1 and Y2 cohorts; also student-selected class reps who meet with program staff at least twice per semester and at other times as requested by students. These activities foster routine and clear communication between students and program staff.</td>
<td>Eight students are undertaking research projects this year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPH812 R Kim</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>This was a highly engaged group of students. They displayed a great interest within the subject matter.</td>
<td>No moderation took place as all assessment marked by the unit convenor.</td>
<td>There were no unexpected results.</td>
<td>An assessment early on in semester is conducted to determine students at risk. These students are met with and their progress discussed. Plans of study are formulated if required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPH825</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>All students met all learning outcomes. Grades have a wider spread than 2013 and reflect the adjustment made this year to one assessment, which was felt to be too easy last time (very high proportion of D in 2013).</td>
<td>No moderation. Marking of the final assessment was shared between 3 markers who worked from model responses, and cross checked a sample of assessments.</td>
<td>No unexpected results. No further changes anticipated.</td>
<td>Regular program meetings to discuss student progress in coursework and practical units. All students attend all classes so any issues can be identified early by program staff and supports can be put into place in a coordinated manner. Retention is very high. This is supported by a peer Mentor program between Y1 and Y2 cohorts; also student-selected class reps who meet with program staff at least twice per semester and at other times as requested by students. These activities foster routine and clear communication between students and program staff.</td>
<td>First year, first semester unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Harrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPH827</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>All students met the learning outcomes for this unit, which is focused on analysing social communication for clinical practice in speech pathology.</td>
<td>The unit convenor was the only marker for this unit. I moderated my marking by re-marking selected submissions, varying the order in which student submissions were marked, using comprehensive rubrics to guide marking decision-making, and by consulting with colleagues on marking decisions for selected submissions.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Regular program meetings to discuss student progress in coursework and practical units. All students attend all classes so any issues can be identified early by program staff and supports can be put into place in a coordinated manner. Retention is very high. This is supported by a peer Mentor program between Y1 and Y2 cohorts; also student-selected class reps who meet with program staff at least twice per semester and at other times as requested by students. These activities foster routine and clear communication between students and program staff.</td>
<td>Second time Unit has been taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Barnes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk and clear communication between students and program staff.</td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN820</td>
<td>Y Qian</td>
<td>Students have shown evidence of meeting the learning outcomes at the appropriate levels: being able to identify, critically analyse translation problems, to research for and devise appropriate strategies for tackling these problems and to apply the principles of translation to the solution of these problems, to show creative thinking in the translation process and to self-reflect and grow as a translator.</td>
<td>Marking criteria professional standard based, and second and external markers used where appropriate.</td>
<td>No. However, small changes will be made in regard to professional ethics training and assignment variety and marking.</td>
<td>Effective monitoring of student progress throughout the semester and feedback has been given and communication made to at-risk students.</td>
<td>Same distribution. Smaller numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN821</td>
<td>J Fang</td>
<td>Students were assessed through an exam involving three different modes of interpreting together with submission of glossary, online discussion and a reflective essay. None of the students failed, and more than half of them</td>
<td>A mark sheet with detailed criteria was sent to the team for comments before the actual marking took place. All markers strictly follow the marking criteria as agreed</td>
<td>No unexpected results or experiences.</td>
<td>Students were encouraged to express their concerns by various means: emails, face-to-face consultations, blog discussions, etc, through which teachers can identify those students at academic risk and provide relevant support.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN822</td>
<td>J Cho</td>
<td>I have designed assessment tasks that are linked to the learning outcomes, so that performance on these tasks highlights strengths and weaknesses in relation to those outcomes. As assessment tasks comprised in-class performance, a mid-term exam and a final exam, students had opportunities to reflect on their learning progresses stage by stage, enabling them to put in place strategies to improve skills and knowledge. All students have successfully met the learning outcomes to the required standards for the grades awarded.</td>
<td>Students who receive D or HD in the final scores are recommended for NAATI accreditations and their final exam recordings are double checked by a 2nd marker, who is a NAATI marker, to ensure the 1st marker’s (internal Macquarie staff’s) judgment is correct.</td>
<td>Nothing unexpected. Overall, students showed a similar kind of strength to the previous years and I will continue to teach them in line with guidelines set by on the course outlines.</td>
<td>Because of the nature of the unit, as an interpreting unit, individual students have to perform during classes on a weekly basis. As teachers can assess students’ performance at all stage of class, they are able to identify any students at risk.</td>
<td>Includes KU students. Moderated by NAATI moderator. 1 Incomplete—Special case student. Incompletes can be held over in extreme cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN823</td>
<td>JL Kruger</td>
<td>This was a particularly motivated group of students who really</td>
<td>The translations were circulated among colleagues from the different language</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Continuous assessment</td>
<td>Students initially struggled but worked hard to meet learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN826</td>
<td>H Slatyer</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN834</td>
<td>W Lam</td>
<td>worked hard in a time-intensive course. The majority of students met the learning outcomes for the unit above the minimum requirement</td>
<td>streams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN826</td>
<td>H Slatyer</td>
<td>All students completed the 3 assessments at an acceptable level and therefore achieved the unit learning outcomes at the standard for the grades awarded. Learning outcomes are spread over the three assessments and students are supported and encouraged to develop reflective skills to enable them to critically evaluate their own work.</td>
<td>Sample of assessments are double marked. Final grades are checked and moderated with both staff members and an external marker.</td>
<td>No. This is the last offering of the unit on campus in the Master/PGDip of T &amp; I.</td>
<td>Tutorial sessions are used to identify at risk students. Staff work very closely with students throughout the semester.</td>
<td>Includes KU students. Similar distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN834</td>
<td>W Lam</td>
<td>The distribution of grades is in line with the general trend in previous years. Students were required to complete weekly translation assignments, group projects, a reflective essay and a final test to demonstrate the</td>
<td>Comparison of marking distributions.</td>
<td>No student results or experiences were unexpected.</td>
<td>Continuous assessment in the form of weekly assignments is employed to monitor the progress of students. Personal advice will be given to underperforming students to tackle their specific problems</td>
<td>Special case student. 2 students vanished without formally withdrawing from the course. They did the same in other units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN863</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Students have presented their understandings of the SI-related articles assigned to them across the whole semester. Presentations are delivered in various forms, some are delivered individually, and some collectively. Besides, they are also required to write a 1500 word essay, reflecting on their performances. In the essay, they are required to analyze their major problems based on the theoretical knowledge they have learned.</td>
<td>Assessment is made based on the three prescribed methods stipulated in the unit outline: reflective journal, presentation (both individual and collective) and participation in in-class discussion. No moderation took place.</td>
<td>No unexpected student results or experiences.</td>
<td>To provide more formative and summative feedback against the “skill development schedule”. Work together with individual students to diagnose the causes that prevent them from making progress, and encourage them to work collaboratively.</td>
<td>Grades not entered as convenor on sick leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN865</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>This unit is designed to develop students’ theoretical knowledge and practical skills in the field of business translation and interpreting by As this is a multilingual group that comprises Chinese, Japanese, and Korean students, practical skill components grounded in each language were marked by individual</td>
<td>No unexpected results or experiences were identified. The pattern of results was broadly similar to that of previous years.</td>
<td>As this unit is composed of lectures as well as language-specific tutorials, students have a lot of opportunities to practice translation/interpreting skills. Based on observations of class performance as well as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN868</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN870</td>
<td>I Inoue</td>
<td>exposing students to real-world experiences. This is achieved through tasks which require students to prepare and carry out simulated business translation and interpreting assignments. A variety of assessment tasks ranging from in-class assessment to simulated translation and interpreting assignments were introduced for that purpose. Students who passed the unit all met key learning outcomes at the appropriate levels.</td>
<td>tutors whereas all written assignments to demonstrate individual students’ knowledge base were marked by the unit convenor. To make sure that assessment by different language teachers was performed in a fair and equitable manner, all the teachers referred to NAATI marking standards on translation and interpreting (e.g. language usage, grammars, and techniques).</td>
<td>assessment of weekly individual translation/interpreting assignments, teachers are able to discern those who are at risk.</td>
<td>Early diagnostic assessment was introduced in the early week of this semester to ensure that those students at risk can be identified and address their learning needs.</td>
<td>A wide range of assessment tasks were implemented including an early-diagnostic quiz, a problem-based task and exams. With the problem-based task, an in-class activity using a similar format was used to familiarize students with this mode of learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN874</td>
<td>A Huang</td>
<td>The no. of students is higher than previous semesters resulting in a more diverse range of grade distributions.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No unexpected results noted.</td>
<td>Yes. 3 of the students were marked as incomplete as they did not meet the deadline of portfolio submission, however</td>
<td>There will be more requirements on the student’s to pass the unit, especially those who do not aim for Pass/Fail Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN877</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>the market place as well as to give theories, information and knowledge relevant to their practice. The students have attended the seminars and been placed in practicum opportunities accompanied by their reflective journal writing. and compilation of portfolios.</td>
<td>their portfolios are expected to be submitted in the coming weeks.</td>
<td>NAATI accreditations. And it is proposed that students will need to submit their journals in the mid-term so as to check the progress of their completion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Inoue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN878</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>As the outcomes for this unit are integrated into the material covered, student progress toward the outcomes of this unit are reflected in the final grades. Important simultaneous interpreting skills are taught in lectures.</td>
<td>Moderation consisted of discussions between the teaching staff as to how to benchmark grades and all teaching staff were provided with marking criteria and the final mark was compared with the other marks to check for consistency.</td>
<td>There were no unexpected experiences or results. The unit will continue to encourage students to be more proactive in self assessment, as students commented that listening to recordings of their own interpreting alerted them to their mistakes and showed them the validity of the comments given by lecturers /tutors on their</td>
<td>Students submit weekly preparation, glossary and study journal which are used to monitor student progress and identify students at academic risk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Miyashita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KU unit only Smaller cohort than usual. Similar distribution to 2012 than 2013. This semester the unit was held in Korea. (contact with tutors maintained through Skype). Next semester the unit will be held in Sydney.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Code</strong></td>
<td><strong>Enrolment</strong></td>
<td><strong>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAN880</strong>&lt;br&gt;J Fang/A Buzo</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Students were assessed through five different tasks including essay, test, assignment, blog discussion, and class performance. None of the students failed to pass, and more than half of them got C. The distribution of marks is within the normal range compared with the results in</td>
<td>Comparison of marking distributions among different assessment tasks took place before final grades were given.</td>
<td>No unexpected results or experience</td>
<td>Students were encouraged to express their concerns by various means: emails, face-to-face consultations, blog discussions, etc, through which teachers can identify those students at academic risk and provide relevant support.</td>
<td>Includes KU students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Code</strong></td>
<td><strong>Enrolment</strong></td>
<td><strong>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN881</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communications skills unit. This unit has come back to the department after 10 years in the English Language Centre. The paperwork is being done at present-to embed it in T &amp; I programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Buzo D Miyashita</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pass/Fail Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN882</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>I have designed assessment tasks that are linked to the learning outcomes, so that performance on these tasks highlights strengths and weaknesses in relation to those outcomes. As assessment tasks comprised in-class performance, a mid-term exam and a final exam, students had opportunities to reflect on their learning progresses stage by stage, enabling them to put in place strategies to improve skills and knowledge. All students have successfully met the learning outcomes to the required standards for the grades awarded.</td>
<td>As this unit includes Chinese and Korean students, each group was marked by individual lecturers with expertise in the field of interpreting. We referred to common marking rubrics in carrying out assessment and the results from both groups were similar to each other.</td>
<td>Overall, students showed a similar kind of strength to the previous years and I will continue to teach them in line with guidelines set by on the course outlines.</td>
<td>Due to the nature of the unit, students have to perform each week to demonstrate their interpreting skills. The teacher can thus identify any student at risk on the basis of the performance patterns of individual students. Apart from class observations, teachers are able to identify students at risk based on mid-term exam results as well.</td>
<td>Students from KU who have already completed diplomas and are already teachers. Excellent cohort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN883</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>This is a daunting unit to most students as it requires a different way of thinking to most of their other units. The all struggles initially, but the final reports indicate that the majority of students met the learning outcomes for the unit above the minimum requirement.</td>
<td>Co-Moderated</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Continuous assessment from proposal through literature review and in individual consultations.</td>
<td>Students are finding the research difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JL Kruger/ C.Woo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN884</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Apart from required in-class activities, students are encouraged to carry out extensive individual and group study activities to further consolidate skills and techniques as per learning outcomes in the unit outline. They are also guided to actively conduct self-reflection and peer review.</td>
<td>No moderation took place in the Assessment Tasks.</td>
<td>This is not the case with this particular cohort of students.</td>
<td>Targeted feedback was often provided to students individually, who are deemed in need of extra assistance in fulfilling the requirements for learning outcomes. Among other approaches, deliberate assignments for out-of-class study and group discussions were also adopted to ensure all students can meet the requirements with satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z Song</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN887</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>This elective unit comprised a small cohort with substantial</td>
<td>The main assessment tasks (presentation and essay) were moderated by the unit convenor</td>
<td>Although the students deserved these results for their performances against the given assessment tasks, there is scope</td>
<td>Strategies include: regular online interaction required (to keep students in the ‘conversation’), individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Bontempo/ D Goswell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN889</td>
<td></td>
<td>professional interpreting experience, and who were stronger academically than previous recent cohorts, hence their capacity to meet learning outcomes and achieve high grades overall. and program co-ordinator. The overall grades were moderated against results from the previous TRAN 887 cohort. to reduce the proportion of overall grade derived from online postings, and/or to tighten up the marking criteria for these tasks, so that they don’t advantage/skew student grades, compared with other program units.</td>
<td>follow up of missing assessment tasks, tight submission deadlines, opportunities at block teaching session to discuss progress with lecturer/s, encouraging students to make contact earlier rather than later re any difficulties they are having with their studies. Prompt responses to any questions or concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z Song</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>In-class activities have been designed into various modules, each of which would emphasize on one or more of the skills required at different stages, and students were required to not only carry out activities intensively in class, but also out of class following a cyclic process of practice – reflection – more practice – more reflection. Feedback was always given to students whenever and wherever the instructor deemed necessary, and besides feedback to exams were given in</td>
<td>No moderation took place in the Assessment Tasks</td>
<td>No unexpected student results or experiences</td>
<td>A learner-centered approach is used across the entire semester, i.e. observing how students made mistakes, helping students identify issues at stake and diagnose the causes. The common issues would be discussed in class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</td>
<td>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</td>
<td>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</td>
<td>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN895</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Students met the learning outcomes to varying degrees as reflected in grades allocated.</td>
<td>Interpreting role play assessment double marked. External markers used for final essay and language specific translations. Final grades moderated by both unit convenors with rankings agreed &amp; final adjustments to grades justified.</td>
<td>This was only the second iteration of the unit, and changes had been made to the content and assessment tasks based on feedback from the first offering. However this unit will only be offered once more (if at all) given the re-structuring of the T&amp;I Masters program.</td>
<td>Any students who did not submit work on time, or were regularly absent from class were followed up promptly to ensure they did not fall too far behind too. Students were regularly reminded to ask for extensions ahead of time, and to discuss any concerns or difficulties with either convenor. Also, as the assessments tasks were progressive, it was easy to monitor each student.</td>
<td>Special case student. 1 student who needs to hand in 1 essay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAN897</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Use both formative and summative feedbacks to show students where they are in terms of required skill development. Students are required to have different learning partners for peer review across the whole semester. They are encouraged to evaluate each other’s interpreting performances. Apart from providing feedback for individual students on a weekly basis, instructors are also</td>
<td>No moderation took place in the Assessment Tasks.</td>
<td>No unexpected student results or experiences.</td>
<td>To provide more formative and summative feedback against the “skill development schedule”. Work together with individual students to diagnose the causes that prevent them from making progress, and encourage them to work collectively and collaboratively.</td>
<td>D-are double assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Code</strong></td>
<td><strong>Enrolment</strong></td>
<td><strong>How have students met the learning outcomes of the unit?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What moderation took place in assessment tasks and final grading?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unexpected results or experiences? Any changes to the unit?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strategies to identify students at academic risk</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>required to immediately analyze the outcomes of the two exams and send their comments to all the students.</strong></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

189
### Faculty of Human Sciences
### Department of Psychology
### Examinations Results Summary Sheet - Semester 1, 2014

#### Undergraduate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>Comments on Meeting Outcomes</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Moderation</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Unexpected Results/ Experiences &amp; Changes in the Unit</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Strategies for Student at Academic Risk/ Student Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSYC104</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>Over 90% successfully completed all assessment tasks while 89% of students received a “Pass” grade or higher. Results were similar to those of the last two years.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A robust spreadsheet was developed which detailed the answers for each section of the essay &amp; the maximum marks which could be awarded. Each marker had their marking rubric double checked &amp; a percentage of their marked essays were double-marked.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A handful of students met with the markers to receive more feedback on the marks they received. This is a strategy that worked well and will be continued.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment results, tutorial attendance &amp; low tutorial engagement were monitored early in the session. Tutors met with students to ensure they were receiving the right level of support &amp; ensure they successfully complete the Unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 224</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>To pass this unit, students have had to demonstrate: competency in critical writing about a health issue; the ability to coherently present information to a class about their reading &amp; the ability to work directly with other students; a creative/innovative approach to dealing with a health-related concern through the development of a health advertisement, &amp; overall understanding of the broad content of the unit through exams.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Double marking of essays took place; samples of student work for all written pieces of work were circulated to all markers; &amp; marking distributions across markers were compared before finalising marks. Grades &amp; SNGs assigned to students were discussed with the other lecturer prior to finalisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Monitored classwork grades early in the semester &amp; the essay marks after they became available. Tutors were requested to alert Unit Chair of at-risk students so that they could be contacted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 234</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>Students who did exceptionally well were those who consistently</td>
<td>Essay: Comparison of marking distributions, consultation on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>Comments on Meeting Outcomes</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Unexpected Results/Experiences &amp; Changes in the Unit</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies for Student at Academic Risk/Student Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 246</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>demonstrated evidence of deep &amp; critical understanding of the learning outcomes. This was measured using psychometrically reliable &amp; valid instruments to measure learning. Higher performing students also demonstrated originality, insight &amp; critical evaluation in the written assessment task. Overall performance, was calibrated to the Macquarie University grading policy descriptors.</td>
<td>borderline assignments with unit chair &amp; double marking of a subset of assignments. <strong>Multiple Choice Items</strong>: New items were devised to replace those with poor distributions from 2013 &amp; to assess new lecture &amp; tutorial materials. Items that were retained were selected on the basis of item distributions from previous years. The natural overall distribution was very similar to previous years.</td>
<td>solely on the content of the slides to study for the exams. I have not seen any noticeable reduction in grades, which might be expected if students are relying solely on the slides. However, I intend to place less content on the slides next year to encourage student to listen &amp; engage with the lectures.</td>
<td>semester test. Students also receive individual feedback about performance; &amp; feedback from their tutors or the course chair. In terms of encouraging student retention, students participate in group activities in class that are designed to enhance engagement. Further, the main lecturing staff on the unit is experienced &amp; they reliably receive high TEDS ratings from the students. This makes the delivery of the material engaging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 247</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>Students showed scores on assessment tasks that were specifically designed to assess the achievement of learning outcomes.</td>
<td>Multiple choice answers, practical worksheets were marked objectively. Feedback SAQs all scored 1% for participation regardless of quality. Exam SAQs were moderated by comparing</td>
<td>No. N/A.</td>
<td>Several early assessment tasks allow students to monitor their own progress, their learning strategy &amp; performance. Advice on support services is given in the unit outline, which all students are instructed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>1 Comments on Meeting Outcomes</td>
<td>2 Moderation</td>
<td>3 Unexpected Results/ Experiences &amp; Changes in the Unit</td>
<td>4 Strategies for Student at Academic Risk/ Student Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY248</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Students were assessed by a number of different methods through the semester, with a combination of assessment tasks requiring a demonstration of a range of student skills &amp; depth of understanding.</td>
<td>Mark distributions were compared with previous offerings &amp; deemed consistent. Some assignments were double-marked to ensure consistency between markers, &amp; marking of assignments followed discussion between markers again to ensure consistency.</td>
<td>None experienced, distribution of final SNGs was very similar to previous years.</td>
<td>Throughout the semester, staff monitored completion of weekly online worksheets &amp; students were reminded &amp; encouraged in lectures. Tutorial staff checked in with students in weekly tutorials. Assignment feedback was provided mid-way through semester to allow for identification of any lack of understanding before the end of semester.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PSY 250| 67        | Students met the learning outcomes by: (1) demonstrating their understanding of the terms & language used to describe music in their analysis of their audio-visual creative project, (2) demonstrating how music & image might be used to affect meaning to viewers & how this meaning may vary between cultures & contexts; (3) Demonstrating their knowledge of music cognition & perception in the midterm test & the final exam. | • Assignments & exam essay questions were marked separately by 2 different markers. Unit Chair provided comments regarding how he might mark particular questions or assignment as well as comparison of marking (sample double marking).  
• Students had access to practice questions & previous assignments from past offerings of the course.  
• Final grades reflect the | No. | Students are encouraged to contact either the tutor or unit chair if there are any issues that they would like to raise. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>Comments on Meeting Outcomes</th>
<th>Weighted summation of all the other components. No additional changes were made.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSYC322</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>Weekly Quizzes &amp; Final Exam: students demonstrated an understanding of the theoretical basis of psychological testing &amp; its application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written Assignment: students demonstrated their ability to generate a brief psychological test &amp; to examine its psychometric properties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Session Exam: students demonstrated their ability to remember, understand &amp; apply statistical procedures to describe the psychometric properties of tests.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall, the required standards were met for all assessment tasks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC322</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>Weekly Quizzes &amp; Final Exam: marking was automated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Midsession Exam: marked by 2 markers who were provided by sample answers by the unit chair &amp; unit chair double marked a sample of each marker’s papers to ensure consistency. The markers also discussed any queries they had throughout the marking process with the unit chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written Report: marked by 3 markers using a detailed assessment rubric, which had been made available to students. Markers examined a sample paper marked by the unit chair prior to marking. The unit chair double-marked a sample of each marker’s papers early in the marking process to ensure consistency. Markers communicated with each other &amp; the unit chair via email to resolve issues about use of the rubric while marking. The unit chair double-marked all assignments that were judged to be at a Fail standard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance at lectures was, as usual, low. However, surprisingly, the number of unique viewers of the recording of the lecture via Echo was also low. Around 30% of students appear not to attend the lecture, nor to listen to the recording. A possible change will be to provide shorter online recordings for the core information in the unit that makes listening to the recordings, rather than relying on the slides alone, a more palatable option for students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students are provided early feedback on their performance in the unit in the form of weekly quiz results &amp; a midsession exam. The staff in the Faculty of Human Sciences student centre (Psychology Office) follow-up on students who miss assessment tasks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 337</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Self-directed learning via online unit; engagement in discussion board; critical thinking through assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A sample of assignments was double marked to produce consistency. A strict marking rubric was used &amp; was No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All students are in small class tutorials &amp; are encouraged to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments on Meeting Outcomes</td>
<td>Moderation</td>
<td>Unexpected Results/ Experiences &amp; Changes in the Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 338</td>
<td>Students have shown commitment to achieving the learning outcomes. Each of the 2 major assignments was Passed by nearly all students (95%). The written component of the final exam was Passed by nearly all students (93%) &amp; the multiple choice component was Passed by most students (70%). 82% of students Passed all of the written assessments in the unit (the two assignments and the written component of the final exam), although only 63% of students passed all assessments including the multiple-choice test. The final distribution seems similar to other years, perhaps a little higher in HDs &amp; lower in Distinctions.</td>
<td>provided to students ahead of time. No moderation of final grades except for a very minor adjustment to the top 50 students’ grades to create sufficient HDs &amp; Ds.</td>
<td>Most results &amp; experiences were similar to those experienced in previous years. As in 2013, there seem to have been fewer Fails than in previous years, which may suggest that the structure of the unit is now better suited to the needs of students at risk of failure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 339</td>
<td>A strict set of marking criteria was used for each piece of assessment. These were provided to the students showing them how the marking criteria were linked to the outcomes.</td>
<td>All markers for assessment tasks and the written exam response used a standard set of evaluation rubrics. For both assessment tasks, all markers begin by evaluating the same assignment and getting feedback on their evaluations. I assessed for significant, systematic differences between markers on each rubric criterion to adjust marks accordingly, so that students are not disadvantaged or advantaged by examiner severity/leniency bias. The final marks are reviewed by the Department Learning and Teaching Committee &amp; the Department as a whole.</td>
<td>Nothing unexpected has come to light so far. Of course, the qualitative TEDS comments are not available yet. If these assessments provide information about possible changes that could be made to the unit, these will be considered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>Comments on Meeting Outcomes</th>
<th>Moderation</th>
<th>Unexpected Results/ Experiences &amp; Changes in the Unit</th>
<th>Strategies for Student at Academic Risk/ Student Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>final grading there was input from the course chair &amp; all the tutors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 348</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>To perform well in the assessment tasks, students must display critical, analytical and integrative thinking, problem solving &amp; a capacity for research (self-control project).</td>
<td>Three experienced markers assessed the self-control reports, distributions were compared, &amp; a sample of reports were discussed &amp; shared.</td>
<td>More students achieved higher marks than in previous years, for no apparent reason, other than I noticed that more students (particularly those achieving the higher marks) made greater use of the iLearn discussion board to ask questions about aspects of the lectures they didn’t understand, whereas last year the students did not use it all. Rumour had it that they used a Facebook page instead that staff couldn’t access.</td>
<td>An early assessment task is given in which they outline the strategies they will be using in their main report. This task provides feedback as to whether or not they are on the right track &amp; advice is given if they are not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 349</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>The overwhelming majority of students attained the learning outcomes. Most of the fails for this unit were absent or withdrawn fails, indicating that the majority of students attained all learning outcomes.</td>
<td>The only assessment which required moderation &amp; comparison of grades was the written research report. The quizzes were all computer marked, although individual adjustments to marks were carried out by the unit chair when it was deemed that the ilearn system had given a student an erroneous mark. The final exam was all multiple choice &amp; required no moderation. No moderation of final grades for this unit was required.</td>
<td>No results were unexpected. The only unexpected student experience was disproportionate anxiety within the cohort regarding the weekly quizzes. This was unexpected as the previous unit chair reported that this did not seem to occur in previous offerings. I am considering reducing the weighting of the quizzes &amp; increasing the weighting of the written assignment for future years.</td>
<td>Weekly quizzes allow students to identify any topics they are struggling with, &amp; similarly for staff to identify any students who appear to be falling behind. Students are told they can email their tutor or the unit chair at any point if they are experiencing any problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 353</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>(a) The experience of verbal presentation of original material: Students have presented to their peers conceptual material assembled from historical &amp; contemporary theoretical sources to illustrate an</td>
<td>Take home assessments 10% of take home assessments were double marked by the seminar leaders &amp; by the course coordinators. Sample answers to questions at all levels (from fail to</td>
<td>We had to scale the results for the first time in this course. There was a 20% fail rate &amp; no high distinctions. We are thinking of changing the course structure so that attendance is required for tutorials, &amp; making</td>
<td>We have an early, low-risk assessment which is marked particularly gently for those who are the first to volunteer to present as they have had least input form the course material at that time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>we had to scale the results for the first time in this course. There was a 20% fail rate &amp; no high distinctions. We are thinking of changing the course structure so that attendance is required for tutorials, &amp; making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
everyday experience. They receive feedback on their presentational style, capacity to engage the audience & mastery of material under pressure. The written version is marked to minimize student anxiety about presentation.

(b) Critical discussion of readings: They have attended seminars & shared their views of historical & contemporary readings.

(c) Essay writing: they have developed a personal & critical stance on a topic of contemporary relevance, which requires them to write concisely & with a clear line of argument.

(d) Unseen exam: They have completed an unseen exam which assesses their skills across three modalities: multiple choice of a conceptual nature, short answers which assess their grasp of the range of issues presented to offer a good scope of understanding, & an essay question on a highly general topic which permits them to demonstrate what has been of most interest to them & around which they have read most deeply.

(high distinction) were offered to benchmark assessment standards across all seminar leaders. We then did a distribution of exam marks by seminar leader & scaled on marker down by two marks & one marker up by two marks to converge on the marker whose marks were consonant with the two course convenor’s standards.

Unseen exams
10% of the exams were double marked by seminar leaders & course co-ordinators. These were to check that assessment at the fail to high distinction level were consistent across markers. In addition to this systematic marking, double marking was applied to a further 10% of a random selection of scripts to ensure consistency of standards

We had an unexpected issue about essay word count whereby there was some ambiguity with the information given to a student. As a result, we lifted the overlength penalty on all students who had gone over the word limit [n=4]. And because this penalised students who had worked hard to stay within the word limit, we also added 1.5 marks to those students’ essay marks as well.

A multiple choice test is conducted in week 6. Students failing to attend this assessment are followed up by email from the Undergraduate Office. Similarly, any student absent for more than 2 weeks from

This course followed the assessment policy – 4 different types of assessment including a low risk self-assessment every 2 weeks on iLearn. Learning goals are structured so that students achieve a greater For the grant assignment, all tutors marked a randomly chosen submission & then met to discuss their marking strategies. Our marking distribution did not significantly deviate between

None so far. Changes will be reflected upon following receipt of student feedback.

A multiple choice test is conducted in week 6. Students failing to attend this assessment are followed up by email from the Undergraduate Office. Similarly, any student absent for more than 2 weeks from
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments on Meeting Outcomes</td>
<td>Moderation</td>
<td>Unexpected Results/ Experiences &amp; Changes in the Unit</td>
<td>Strategies for Student at Academic Risk/ Student Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>understanding of the neuroscience behind brain function &amp; can actively apply this knowledge to understanding the mechanisms of behavioural deficits &amp; mental illness. Hands-on practicals introduce students to advanced neuroimaging facilities at Macquarie. A grant writing assignment engages students in the practical &amp; logistical aspects of neuroscientific experimentation.</td>
<td>markers. No moderation of final grades took place.</td>
<td>practical classes is followed up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>Distribution (Comment)</td>
<td>Moderation</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences</td>
<td>Students at academic risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYP901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYP902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYP905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYP906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYP909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit code</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>Distribution (Comment)</td>
<td>Moderation Yes/No</td>
<td>Unexpected results or experiences</td>
<td>Students at academic risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYS803</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Students performed better this year attributed to differences in cohort and more specific marking criteria and requirements</td>
<td>Close monitoring of students enables staff to identify any at risk students who then meet with unit chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYS805</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Distribution eschewed to Cr. And P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Marks were lower than in previous years as a case discussion was introduced that presented students with an extra challenge. This case study will be reviewed for use in the future.</td>
<td>Close monitoring of students enables staff to identify any at risk students who then meet with unit chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYS832</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>No HDs, less Ds standard across Crs and Ps</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Results in line with marking criteria. Case study had very low marks, will be reviewed.</td>
<td>Close monitoring of students enables staff to identify any at risk students who then meet with unit chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYS833</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Distribution eschewed to Cr. And P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>More specific marking criteria</td>
<td>Close monitoring of students enables staff to identify any at risk students who then meet with unit chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYS834</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Higher percentage of Passes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>More specific marking criteria</td>
<td>Close monitoring of students enables staff to identify any at risk students who then meet with unit chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Close monitoring of students enables staff to identify any at risk students who then meet with unit chair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSYS837</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Not graded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYS838</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Not graded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYS841</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYS842</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not graded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ORGANISATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Code</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>Distribution (Comment)</th>
<th>Moderation (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Unexpected results or experiences</th>
<th>Students at academic risk</th>
<th>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSYO904</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Grades based on students ability across three assessments</td>
<td>Yes (see column 7)</td>
<td>Comparable to 2013 although significant changes in delivery of content implemented by L&amp;T</td>
<td>Students who performed poorly were encouraged to discuss their feedback with unit convenor. One on one meetings with chair were encouraged to discuss assessment content</td>
<td>Point 4 - Moderation Discussion with colleagues re student work standards, cross checked assessment marking to ensure on par with expectation of marking strictness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYO914</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lower HDs and higher CRs due to change in weighting of competency-based assessment from 2013</td>
<td>Yes (see column 7)</td>
<td>Fewer HDs than expected in Scale Development Report. This will be reviewed to improve results for 2015</td>
<td>Competency assessments are conducted in every class which enables the unit chair to evaluate which students are at risk, throughout the semester</td>
<td>Point 4 – Moderation Units SNGs and grades were reviewed by the program director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYO915</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Similar to previous years, with a slight increase in HDs</td>
<td>Yes (see column 7)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Students are asked for feedback on the course and checking with students regularly in class, including students who are unable to attend due to illness.</td>
<td>Point 4 – Moderation Moderation took place at regular markers meetings and sample templates distributed and presentations used to refine ideas for assessments so that feedback is timely and useful to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYO940</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>More HDs indicating higher level of competency</td>
<td>Yes (see column 7)</td>
<td>This year’s cohort appeared to be bi-modal. Students generally mature with high level of competency and students who came direct from undergrad. Additional support can be given to the latter cohort</td>
<td>Student who performed poorly in early assessment submitted additional work and had one on one meeting with unit chair prior to handing in 2nd assessment. Set up system for more experienced students to mentor those with no</td>
<td>Point 4 – Moderation Discussion with colleagues regarding student work standards, comparison of marking distributions with previous year, report and discussion with Industrial and Organisational psych staff meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Ungraded</td>
<td>Moderation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYO941</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ungraded</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (see column 7)</td>
<td>Regular feedback on the course during semester. Roll call maintained and follow up on students who are absent to check on their welfare before the next class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYO944</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Competency-based</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ungraded unit consistent with previous years</td>
<td>Staff work individually with students which enables the identification of students at risk and the development of appropriate remedial strategies. This unit involves workshops where material is discussed and students are given the opportunity to engage with the research process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Point 4 – Moderation
Moderation took place at regular markers meetings and sample templates distributed to students and a comparison of previous years competency level.

Point 6 – Students at risk
The organizational psychology staff meet once every 3 months to identify students at risk and an intervention strategy is developed and implemented.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Code</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>Distribution (Comment)</th>
<th>Moderation (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Unexpected results or experiences</th>
<th>Students at academic risk</th>
<th>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PSY 863   | 35        | Standard of work high and consistent with previous years | Yes (see column 7)  | New exam questions yielded high/low results and will be reviewed in 2015. Grade distribution returned closer to past results after a tightly clumped distribution for the last 2 years | Early exam indicated high academic level of student, no student scored less than a credit grade in the test | Point 4 Moderation
All marking undertaken by unit chair |
| PSY 904   | 21        | Mean mark lower than previous year due to focus of assessment criteria being on skills based and emphasis on critical reflection | Yes (see column 7)  | (see column 7) | Range of tasks to address specific learning outcomes for the unit. | Point 4 - Moderation
Students assessed on 3 different strategies to give students ample opportunity to demonstrate learning outcomes. Controversial area of skills assessed by 2 observers and a joint mark reached | |
| PSY 917   | 16        | Even distribution overall with stricter guidelines for assessment | Yes, see column 7   | Slightly higher than in previous years as explained in Point 3. | Students provide with guide for expectation for HD, however, students were no longer given an opportunity to re-submit if they were below par which results in a higher Credit distribution | Point 4 - Moderation
All assignments marked by unit convenor according to criteria which was clearly explained to students in advance. |
<p>| PSY 926   | 26        | | | | Grades not received. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSY 961</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No unexpected results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff make provision to have regular discussion with students and provide options for students who are in distress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 963</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades based on students ability across three assessments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marks comparable to last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One on one meeting with unit chair was encouraged to discuss assessment content. Students who performed poorly in early assessment were encouraged to discuss feedback with unit chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 967</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most grades between Ds and CRs</td>
<td>Yes, see column 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback at end of each class and &quot;Pose &amp; Pounce&quot; on random students to check understanding of material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 977</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority perform at D/HD standard as expected with the cohort due to strict entry requirements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, two students have not performed as well although they have passed the unit. Unit to be reviewed along with all clinical masters unis on planning day in early August, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The 3 assessments are spread across the semester. Variety of strategies used to address students at risk of role play, video role play from reputable CBT therapists in the field for specific CBT skills, feedback given by unit chair after students conduct role play with peers, discussion of readings in each seminar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 978</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar to previous years</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No unexpected results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No student was identified as at risk students via assessment given early in the session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Point 4 - Moderation**
Discussion with colleagues re student work standards, cross checked assessment marking to ensure on par with expectation of marking strictness

**Point 4 - Moderation**
Assessment tasks were marked to competencies and distributions compared to previous years

**Point 4 - Moderation**
Assignments reassessed to ensure all students were assessed at same level, evaluated distribution of raw marks to ensure they reflected students skills, double checked each student’s individual assessment before finalizing grade to reflect overall performance in CBT1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Code</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>Distribution (Comment)</th>
<th>Moderation (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Unexpected results or experiences</th>
<th>Students at academic risk</th>
<th>Comments on items 3, 4, 5 and 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSYN808</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Students in HD/D range</td>
<td>No, small group as unit changed to a 2nd year unit</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Spreading out of assessments throughout the semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYN840</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Although no HDs, more students in the D range similar to 2012 cohort</td>
<td>Yes (see column 7)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Individual feedback to students (verbal and written) in relation to each component</td>
<td>Point 4 – Moderation Comparison of the distribution of assessment and exam results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYN841</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Similar to previous years</td>
<td>Yes (see column 7)</td>
<td>None, distribution similar to previous years</td>
<td>Student progress actively monitored and students encouraged to see advice from unit convenor throughout the semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYN843</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Majority of students met minimum set of attributes to satisfy distinction standard</td>
<td>Yes (see column 7)</td>
<td>Reviewed previous assessment and changed one assessment from class presentation to essay which resulted in the scoring criteria to be less liberal with one student receiving a CR, the remainder Ds</td>
<td>Close monitoring of class participation late arrivals to lectures, missed lectures and achievements in assignments.</td>
<td>Point 4 – Moderation Examined the distribution of marks from previous years as well as student work from S1, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYN853</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Majority of students met minimum set of attributes to satisfy HD and D standard</td>
<td>Yes (see column 7)</td>
<td>Changes made in S1, 2013 in weighting of assessment resulted in similar distribution of grades this semester</td>
<td>Close monitoring of class participation late arrivals to lectures, missed lectures and achievements in assignments. Use of and interpretation of neuropsychological tests</td>
<td>Point 4 – Moderation Distribution of marks and previous student work from S1, 2013 examined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYN855</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYN857</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ungraded</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYN859</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ungraded</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit summary not received – but grades uploaded
RESULTING PROCESS
Student Administration

The purpose of this paper is to provide a Student Administration overview of the current finalisation of examination results process.

FOUR REPORTS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO THE CHECKING PROCESS IN FINALISATION OF EXAMINATION RESULTS.

THE PURPOSE AND SEQUENCE OF EACH REPORT IS SHOWN BELOW.

1. **Student Study Package Results Report (AMIS)**
   The Unit Convenor submits results to relevant Student Centre staff. Staff upload or data entry the results into AMIS and then run the Student Study Package Results Report for each unit for each Unit Convenor. The **Student Study Package Results Report** includes the student ID, Name and the Grades and the Mark supplied by the Unit Convenor. The Unit Convenor (examiner and co-examiner if relevant) receive these reports for their final check and sign off to authorise the results are correct. There is a place on these reports for the HOD to sign. These reports are used at Department Exam meetings if detail discussion is needed and then maintained as an audit trail of signed, uploaded and authorised detailed results.

2. **Unit Results Summary Report (AMIS)**
   Student centre staff run the **Unit Results Summary report** showing Grade Distribution, GPA Distribution, Graph and GPA Distribution and General Summary. This report is a high level summary of the distribution of the results across the Unit. This report is mainly used to inform the presentation at the Faculty Exam Meeting along with Report 4. described below. These reports in addition to Report 1, described above, may be used in Department exam meetings.

3. **Examination Results Entry Faculty Sign-Off Report (EXAMS SECTION)**
   There is an **Examination Results Entry Faculty Sign-Off Report** for each Unit. The HOD sign off and authorisation on this report enables the Executive Dean to sign certifying the results from the Faculty are correct and are ready to be certified.

4. **Report on Four questions for Faculty Learning & Teaching (FLTC)**
   In addition to the three reports described above this report comprised of four questions from the Associate Dean Learning & Teaching is completed by the Unit Convenor and provides information for the HOD, the Associate Dean Learning & Teaching and the Executive Dean and is used in the presentation of results at the Faculty Exam meeting. The Unit Convenors provide a copy of this report to the Associate Dean Learning & Teaching before the Faculty Exam Meeting.
UG ANOMALIES CHECKING PROCESS

ONLINE UG ANOMALIES COMMITTEE

Members from each Department
Chair: Student Administration Manager

Purpose

To enable the Dean to report on all examination results with the understanding “any result anomalies have been received or identified and have been resolved, or are in the process of being resolved”.

Process:

Reports distributed to meeting members are:

1. The report on "Students who could qualify for an award and have I or F grade" — Received from the Examinations Section.

2. Report from Tracker on the Students who Received Special Consideration during the exam period - Report prepared and run by Student Centre Staff.

3. Student Grades Across Units for possible anomalies cases e.g. grades not appearing consistent - Report developed by AMIS

Reports are emailed to the anomalies Committee members. Reports checked and action taken where relevant and if possible before Faculty updating privileges revoked on e.g. Semester 1, 2014 Thursday 17th July.

Reporting back to Committee members

Members email committee group on e.g. Semester 1, 2014 Thursday 17th July to report on the following items:

- Process used to identify/resolve all student situations
- Any student situations needing cross-departmental input
- Any particular difficult cases needed to be identified or requiring input
- Additional information to be conveyed to the Dean
CHANGE OF GRADE

Any change of Grade and reason for change needs to be entered by the Unit Convenor on a Change of Grade form. The change is signed by the Unit Convenor and the HOD. No changes are made at the Student Centre without this approval.

**Improvement:** The new Semester 2 (date tba) version of Tracker will have this process automated. Each Unit Convenor will have authorised access to an online form; will enter the grade and change of grade and reason. This will be routed to the HOD for approval (click checked) and then routed to the Student Centre to action the change on AMIS. Once this has been completed it will be checked off and the online form will be saved for auditing purposes.

COMMUNICATION

The following Four examples of the Student Centre Staff communication sent to Departments in preparation of the Semester 1, 2014 examination result process are included in the Appendix.

1. UG Psychology
2. UG & PG Education and IEC
3. UG & PG Linguistics
4. UG IEC

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- Student Study Package Report 1 P1 above is not always checked and signed. Future communication will assist by describing and strengthening the purpose of this report.
- Student Study Package Report sign off by the HOD - due to the number of these sheets in some Departments there may be a case for a one sheet sign off by the HOD to cover a list of unit study packages individually checked and signed by the Unit convenors.
- Results received on the last day before the Department meeting gives little time for Unit Convenor checking of Student Study Package Report.
- Communication student centre staff send to Departments varies. Future development of a package of information consistent for UG and PG.
- Anomalies online membership may be expanded to cover Post Graduate.
- Student Centre staff to provide a review of the process and will include their findings and recommendations.
APPENDIX

The following Four examples of the Student Centre Staff communication sent to Departments in preparation of the Semester 1, 2014 examination result process

1. UG PSYCHOLOGY

2014 SESSION 1 EXAMINATION RESULTS

GUIDELINES FOR UNDERGRADUATE UNIT CHAIRS

- As in the past, you need to submit your unit results on excel spreadsheet. A template will be sent to you containing the most recent enrolment list by Wednesday, June 18. Please make sure that your final spreadsheet contains just four columns: Student ID, Student Name, Mark (SNG) and Grade. In particular, please check that there are no formulas included. Straight forward data with Student Name in alphabetical order is what is required.

- Results must be submitted as WHOLE marks. Do not include half marks etc. as StudentOne won’t accept them.

- Please DO NOT enter grades (i.e. HD, D, Cr etc.) as StudentOne will convert SNGs to grades, except in the following 2 situations:

  o **FA (absent from exam)** – you must enter an SNG (based on whatever other work the student has completed) and you must ALSO enter a grade of FA. If you do not enter the grade, the system will automatically give the student “F” (Fail) grade. 

    *Eg*:

    | Student Id | Surname | Name | SNG | Grade |
    |------------|---------|------|-----|-------|
    | 30766789   | Smith   | John | 16  | FA    |
    | 30267654   | Jones   | Claire | 0  | FA    |
    | 30215678   | Robins  | Joanne | IS |       |

  o **I/IS** - If you wish to award an “I” (incomplete) or an “IS” (incomplete, sitting supplementary exam) then leave the mark column blank and enter either “I” or “IS” in the grade column.

- Submit undergraduate results to the FoHS Student Centre via email (psy_off@mq.edu.au) AS PER DATE SET IN THE SCHEDULE. If you are unable to meet the deadline, please notify Novy as soon as possible via email (novello.alday@mq.edu.au).
After your results have been loaded onto StudentOne, a document listing any errors will be created. It is possible that some consultation with unit chairs is necessary at this point. Please be available for this.

After results have been loaded, undergraduate unit chairs will be provided with a report listing all of the results, which you will be required to sign for accuracy and return to the FoHS Student Centre. You will also be provided with a report showing the distribution of grades for your information.

Finally, all undergraduate unit chairs no longer need to provide the names of the top three (3) students for prizes. These will be taken from the reports that will be generated from AMIS. However, you will still need to notify Novy if any of the students sitting the supplementary exam could be a potential prize winner so that we can delay nomination of the prize recipients for your unit.

If you have any queries please contact Anita Chang (ext 7964) or Novy Alday (ext 1034).

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2. UG & PG EDUCATION

Dear all,

RESULTS PROCEDURE FOR UG AND PG UNIT CONVENORS SEMESTER I, 2014

Results Files

Please find attached your exam file for mark entry. Please DO NOT use any other files that you may have been using during the semester to record marks.

Please enter the students' marks (SNG) into the Marks column of the excel file for the appropriate unit. You do not need to enter grades as we have a formula built into the grade column to automatically assign a grade based on the SNG. For a full list of grades and descriptors please refer to the University Grading Policy at http://www.mq.edu.au/policy/docs/grading/policy.html.

Fail grades/Interim grades

FW (Fail withdrawn) grade is entered by the system and will appear on your Excel sheet under the Grade column if a student has officially withdrawn from the unit after 28th April 2012. Please do not alter this. This grade does not have a mark allocated.

F (Fail) grade is assigned when a mark is between the range of 0-49

FA (Fail Absent) Assigned when the student has failed to attend a formal end-of-semester compulsory exam.
Enter a mark in the range 0-49 and amend the F to FA

I (Incomplete) Enter an I in the Grade column and leave the marks column blank.

IS (Incomplete Special/Supplementary Examination) Enter an IS in the Grade column and leave the marks column blank. Used when the student didn't attend the formal exam and has been granted a special or deferred exam.

Email your mark file to educ_grades@mq.edu.au.

Reports

The following two Reports will be emailed to you once the marks have been uploaded.
Student Study Package Results – a list of all results uploaded into Student 1 with the appropriate SNG mark and grade given to Unit Convenors for checking. Please check, sign and return to the School Office on the 8th Floor.

Unit Result Summary – a summary containing graphics of the distributions, percentages, past performances etc for the unit for you to use to write up your Convenor Report

Please check the Student Study Package Results report and review the Unit Result Summary. If there are any amendments to the results, you can either:
- email educ_grades@mq.edu.au; or
- clearly mark the changes on the printed report and scan it back to educ_grades@mq.edu.au.

For bulk changes (more than 10) resend your mark sheet with revised marks for a second upload.

A new report will be produced to be checked again and signed if correct. Please return your signed Student Study Package Result Sheet

Unit Convenor Report – Please complete the attached report and return to Owain/Chris/Nikki in the School Office on Level 8. This report will be used to report on your result in the Department meeting. A copy of this report will be provided to Mitch Parsell for his records.

HOD Report - A separate email with instructions to fill out the HOD Report on Google Drive will be forwarded to you in the next couple of days.

An electronic copy of all the Education Unit Result Summary data sheets for Semester 1 will be produced for the Department Examination Meeting. We will use this for our discussion rather than printing out hard copies.

THANK YOU ALL

3. UG & PG LINGUISTICS

EXAMINATION RESULTS TIMETABLE SEMESTER 1, 2014

Submit examination spreadsheets by 11:00 AM Mon 7th July

Undergrad results to: ruth.taulia@mq.edu.au

Postgrad results to: ling.postgrad@mq.edu.au

NOTE: Undergrad AND Postgrad grades must be entered into Student One so that the “Unit Result Summary Reports” can be produced for the Department Exam meeting.
Schedule of dates for the mid year (semester 1) 2014 examination session:

Examination period Monday 16 June – Friday 4 July 2014

Submit Examination spreadsheets by 11am Monday 7 July

Department Exam Results Meeting • Tuesday 8 July 12.00 noon in Seminar Room
  • (UG & PG unit convenors to attend)

Faculty Exam Results Meeting Wednesday 9 July 11.30 am-1.30 pm

Ling.postgrad closed out of exam results entry system from 3pm 10 July, back in Monday 14 July 9am

Cut off for results to go on web Wednesday 16 July 3pm

Academic Senate Special Meeting: Friday 18 July 9.30am

Exam results available to students via eStudent.: Friday 18 July

• All Unit Convenors will be provided with an Exam Results Spreadsheet by Ling Postgrad Office as soon as they become available.

• Unit convenors (not individual tutors) MUST submit final/examination results as a standard numerical grade (SNG) on the unit exam spreadsheets sent to all convenors. NOTE: The spreadsheets are taken from the Student One database and therefore match exactly the listing of students for exam entry.

• Please do not re-arrange the lists since any variations to the order of names could result in errors when marks are input to the system.

• Results must be submitted as whole marks – do not include any half marks or other decimal places!

• Undergraduate results must be submitted by email to ruth.taulia@mq.edu.au in the Faculty Student Centre. You will be provided with a report listing all of the results entered which you will be required to check for accuracy and sign and return to Ruth.
All Unit Convenors are required to submit a Results Summary for each one of their units. Completed results summaries should be sent electronically to Ling Postgrad Office as they are required for the Department Exam Meeting and these will also be forwarded to the Faculty for the Faculty exam meeting.

A Unit Result Summary Report for all UG and PG units (showing distribution of grades) will be printed from Student One prior to the Department Exam meeting.

All students whose final mark/grade is not entered into Student One prior to 3 pm Wednesday 16 July will automatically receive an incomplete grade for their 2014 1st-half year enrolled units.

Unless a student has provided documentary evidence of exceptional circumstances which prevented his/her completion of the work in that unit (via ask.mq.edu.au), incomplete grades must be resolved by the end of July 2014.

---

4. UG IEC

2014 SESSION 2 EXAMINATION RESULTS

GUIDELINES FOR UNDERGRADUATE UNIT CONVENERs

As is the normal practice, you need to supply your unit results on an Excel spread sheet that can be found in S:\HUS\Restrict\IEC\Results\2014\UNDERGRADUATE\SESSION 1. It is imperative that you use the spreadsheet provided.

There are instructions for grade entry on the spreadsheet. Please read and follow these instructions. In general, though,

- Results must be submitted as WHOLE marks. Do not include half marks etc as Student One won’t accept them.
- If copying marks from an Excel spreadsheet or gradebook, please do check that the student order on your spreadsheet is the same as that in the final grades spreadsheet – do not assume that it is!
- Do NOT enter grades (i.e., HD, D, Cr etc.) as Student One will convert SNGs to grades, except in the following situations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Type</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Leave Mark Column Blank - then I in the Mark Column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Only for those who did not sit the exam - Mark in Mark column AND FA in Grade Column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW</td>
<td>Leave Mark Column Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete Supplementary</td>
<td>Leave Mark Column Blank - then IS in Grade Column</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8
Once your grades are entered, please email IEC@mq.edu.au to let us know that the spreadsheet is complete. **The deadline for completion of the results is THURSDAY 3RD JULY.** As per previous years, we know that some with late exams or large numbers of assessments may have difficulty meeting this deadline. If this is the case, please notify IEC@mq.edu.au via email (cc Sheila).

**Results and distribution reports:** After results have been loaded, undergraduate unit conveners will be provided with a report listing all of the results. Please check this, sign for accuracy and return these to Rebecca in the IEC office. You will also be provided with a report showing the distribution of grades for your information.

**Unit Convener report:** Please complete this unit report and email it to IEC@mq.edu.au, cc to Sheila by **CLOSE OF BUSINESS, FRIDAY 4TH JULY.** Please keep in mind that:

- Details from the convener report need to be extracted for the Departmental report to be presented at the meeting on the following Tuesday and Faculty report, presenting on the Wednesday. **These reports more than a full working day to put together, hence the deadlines.**
- Please ensure that you are available on Monday 7TH, should there be the need to clarify any details. If you are working off campus on that day, please try to be contactable so that any required details can be clarified before the IEC results meeting on Tuesday 8TH JULY.

*If you have any queries please contact IEC@mq.edu.au or Sheila X9895.*
Faculty of Science Results Report July 2014
This report to Senate covers the final results for Session 1 2014.

Process
All marks are collated and assigned by unit convenors. Standardised Numerical Grades SNGs and final grades are based on these marks in accordance with University policy (particularly the assessment and examination policies).
The SNGs and grades are presented to Departmental Examination meetings. These were held in the period 7th July to 8th July. After review and approval at the Departmental meetings the results were forwarded to Science FSQC, which met on July 9th. At FSQC unit departmental reports, convenor reports and result distributions were considered. Particular consideration was given to the convenor reports to ensure that grades were awarded consistent with standards-based assessment. All unit results considered were recommended by FSQC at that meeting to Faculty Board. The Faculty Board met on July 10th. At that meeting the results were discussed and approved.
Further information has been requested from some unit convenors Departments, although for none of these units was there any reason to delay the results processing. As is the normal procedure all such requests will be followed up and the results reported to FSQC.
The Faculty is reviewing the results ratification process. Department processes, particular around the setting and administering of standards-based assessment are being documented and reviewed. HoDs, as part of their Departmental reports, submitted a summary of their Department’s process. These were considered at the FSQC marks meeting and copies were distributed to all Departments. Currently there is a lack of consistent practice across the Faculty. FSQC will be leading a discussion that will establish a Faculty-wide minimum acceptable practice.

General Issues
Student engagement remains a pressing issue. Problems with student engagement were highlighted in many convenor reports, across departments. It appears that this is having a significant detrimental effect on student results, with many convenors noting that lack of engagement was often correlated with poor performance. Lack of engagement being considered to correlate with lack of submission of assessment items, including assignments,
weekly assessment (where the latter are employed) and failure to attend the final examination (FA).

A further issue, highlighted in many reports from 100-level convenors and related to the issues of engagement, is transition. A number of convenors noted that some students are having difficulty transitioning from a secondary to a tertiary learning environment. The Faculty has applied for funds to develop resources that 100-level convenors will be able to use to address this issue and help students through the transition.

Student support services, were available, were heavily used and found to be highly valuable in retaining students. However these resources are stretched and not all demands could be met. Extra resources devoted to this area should assist in retaining students and increasing pass rates.

Certain units which, in the past, have demonstrated high fail rates showed marked improvement. This was due to revisions to unit content, presentation methods and targeted communication to at-risk students. There was also, in the case of MATH135, early identification of students that should be directed to other units, such as MATH 130. The accompanying diagram shows the results achieved.

While no disruptions occurred in the conduct of the final examinations or the processing of the results the short time available and the resulting load on staff involved should be noted. This also limits the oversight and review that can undertaken in this period.
ITEM 11.2: CURRICULUM STANDARDS FRAMEWORK COMMITTEE REPORT

Reports of the Curriculum Standards Framework Committee meetings held on 20 May and 18 June 2014 (including Academic Senate Program Structure Statement: Undergraduate Diploma Program).

For approval.
REPORT TO ACADEMIC SENATE
CURRICULUM STANDARDS FRAMEWORK COMMITTEE
MEETING OF 20 MAY 2014

ITEMS FOR NOTING

AQF Transition Issues
The Committee noted that AQF transition issues would be considered by CRIT.

2015 Curriculum Renewal – Stage 2
The Committee discussed the development of a framework for the Stage 2 Curriculum Renewal process. This included a Stage 2 Guidance Document, an exemplar designed with the student as the intended audience, and a sample curriculum mapping template.

The Committee determined that curriculum mapping will be an iterative task rather than a one off process, and initially mapping will be done at program threshold levels. The Committee determined that more detailed mapping of program learning outcomes to the level of units of assessment would be done in the future.

Recognition of Prior Learning
The Committee considered a draft Departmental RPL Plan User Guide and noted that a range of systems issues were being considered by the RPL Project Manager and would be considered at a future CSFC meeting.

The full minutes of CSFC can be accessed via http://senate.mq.edu.au/csfc/agendas.html

Professor Dominic Verity
CHAIR
ITEMS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

Framework for AQF Level 5 Diplomas
The Committee endorsed the draft Academic Program Structure Statement: Undergraduate Diploma Programs and resolved to recommend it for approval by Academic Senate.

2015 Curriculum Renewal – Stage 2
The Committee approved the Stage 2 Guidance Document, the standard statements pre-populated in Webforms and the Program Learning Outcomes Mapping Template.

Requirements for the Stage 2 Approval Process
The Committee approved the Stage 2 Guidance Document as standards and principles to be used by FSQCs in the Stage 2 program approval process.

The Committee determined that FSQCs will approve Stage 2 information, pending the establishment of Faculty Boards.

The Committee determined that FSQCs will be required to submit progress reports to ASQC for review and audit and that Associate Deans will report issues which are considered relevant to standards and principles for consideration and discussion at CSFC.

Recognition of Prior Learning
The Committee discussed the development of the draft Departmental RPL Plan User Guide and other relevant RPL documentation which will be circulated to Faculties.

Course Transfer
The Committee considered a draft paper on Course Transfer Criteria – Session One, 2015 and agreed that proposals for course transfer criteria for academic programs should be developed.

The next meeting of CSFC will be held on Wednesday, 16 July 2014. Agenda items are due 7 July 2014.

The full minutes of CSFC can be accessed via http://senate.mq.edu.au/csfc/agendas.html

Professor Dominic Verity
CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE PROGRAM STRUCTURE STATEMENT:
UNDERGRADUATE DIPLOMA PROGRAMS

1. Preamble
   1.1 Purpose and Scope
   This document outlines the structure of Macquarie University’s undergraduate diploma programs leading to the award of Undergraduate Diploma. The provisions of this document will apply to the approval of all new programs and to the revision of existing programs.

1.2 Definitions
   Definitions are consistent with the Macquarie University Glossary: www.my.edu.au/glossary

1.3 Requirements
   The requirements set out in this statement are established as minimum requirements and are consistent with the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF): www.aqf.edu.au. From January 2015, all programs leading to a Macquarie accredited qualification of AQF Level 5 Undergraduate Diploma, excepting those granted the explicit exemption of Academic Senate, will conform to the minimum requirements laid out here.

1.4 Reference points
   This statement should be read in conjunction with the University’s policy in regard to the Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) and Australian Qualifications Framework Second Edition January 2013. In particular, pages 38-40 of that document describe its provisions in regard to Undergraduate Diploma and pages 77-80 lay out its provisions in regard to the recognition of prior learning.

2. Principles of design for Macquarie University Undergraduate Diploma programs
   2.1 Overarching principles of design
   All of Macquarie’s academic programs are designed, structured and implemented according to an outcomes based model of educational practice. This places emphasis on the clear articulation of program and unit level learning outcomes, on their mapping to each other and to the University’s graduate capabilities, and on the assessment practices that objectively demonstrate each student’s attainment of those outcomes. Other factors, such as nominal required volumes of learning, play a secondary role and Academic Senate may consider their variation on the basis of compelling, academically defensible argument.

   The following specific principles of design apply to Macquarie University Undergraduate Diploma programs at AQF level 5:
   - Undergraduate Diplomas are not permitted to be pathway awards. Enrolments must be either concurrent with, or additional to a bachelor degree. Withdrawal from a concurrent bachelor program will result in automatic withdrawal from the diploma.
   - In order to offer any Undergraduate Diploma program a specific strategic rationale must be put forward which identifies what value the Undergraduate Diploma will

1 Available at: www.mq.edu.au/policy/docs/rpl/policy.pdf
bring to the concurrent Bachelor degree and the University. This must include evidence concerning how the learning outcomes of the diploma will complement the learning outcomes of the concurrent Bachelor program and add innate strategic value. This must also include evidence of a sufficient demand for the program.

- **Undergraduate Diplomas** must have AQF level 5 program learning outcomes with a one year Full Time study load of 24 credit points.
- The 24 credit points must be made up of undergraduate units from 100-400 level. A minimum of 12 credit points must be at 200 level or above.
- The structure of the Undergraduate Diploma should provide opportunities for students to progress through structured learning pathways with sequential progression mediated by unit pre-requisites. Ideally this could accommodate the possibility of students starting at different levels within the 100-400 levels depending on the student’s capabilities and interests.
- Program documentation will specify program learning outcomes (knowledge, skills and the application of knowledge and skills) that are appropriate to the qualification level and discipline, and align with the Macquarie University graduate capabilities and discipline standards. The Learning and Teaching Centre and the Associate Deans of Faculty can provide support in the development of program learning outcomes.
- Program documentation will specify the Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) options available to the program, including details on how this will be assessed, where applicable.

3. **Recognition of Prior Learning**

Macquarie University’s Recognition of Prior Learning Policy allows for the recognition of formal, non-formal and informal learning both for entry into and for credit towards programs of study. So it is possible for programs to recognise learning granted through work experience, training programs, industry accredited qualifications and so forth. The granting of RPL credit of this form may contribute materially to reducing the required volumes of learning for some students.

Programs wishing to recognise prior informal or non-formal learning should document how that learning will be assessed and how it will be shown to be equivalent to the attainment of the corresponding learning outcomes of that program. This assessment may be made on the basis of a variety of mechanisms including, but not restricted to, portfolios and e-portfolios, interview, challenge examination, essay assessment and so forth.

Further information in regard to general conditions and caps that apply to the granting of RPL may be found in the University’s RPL Policy.\(^3\)

---
\(^3\) Available at: www.mq.edu.au/policy/docs/rpl/policy.pdf
ITEM 11.3: HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT

Report of the Higher Degree Research Committee meeting held on 27 June 2014.

For noting.
A meeting of the Higher Degree Research Committee was held on Friday 27 June 2014 at 9:00am in the Council Room, Building E11A

A. MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

Professor Pretorius updated members on the development of the Research Strategic Framework Green Paper. A current draft has been produced from the weather report, festival of ideas and working groups including ADRs and FRMs. ADHDR and FHDRMs have already been consulted. After approval by the Executive and Council, the Green Paper will now be available on Friday 4th July to the Macquarie community. A feedback cover sheet and template are available; the deadline for university wide feedback is the end of July.

Professor Pretorius also updated members on the Macquarie/Hamburg/Fudan University workshop. Professor Pretorius is very pleased with the workshop and some early outcomes, such as the MRES exchange between Macquarie and Hamburg and the Cotutelle arrangements. Three institutions also committed to financial support for 2 way and 3 way research collaboration.

Professor Mansfield and Dr Pitcher briefed members on the current development of the Macquarie Research Integrity Framework. Any feedback should be sent to Dr Ben Pitcher as soon as possible.

Professor Mansfield tabled the MRES equivalence for Direct Entry to HDR document and members approved the document.

Professor Mansfield tabled MUSEQR 2013, MUSEQ-R Analysis and MUSEQ-R 2006-2013 scale average compared with National and Macquarie PREQ documents for members. Macquarie improved and performed well in a majority of aspects. Members were pleased with the results.

Professor Mansfield updated members on the issue of MRES examiner for PhD examination. Members agreed that in principle, MRES examiners are not encouraged as PhD examiners. However it will not be totally ruled out for certain disciplines.

Dr Yi updated members on current completion and commencement reports. All faculties are ahead of their completion target. 2014 is a transitional year for Macquarie PhD enrolments and enrolment has dropped as expected, however HDR enrolment including 2nd year MRES has increased.

Dr Yi also briefed members on the E-application project.

Dr Yi introduced currently development of the MRES exchange program. Five agreements (University of Potsdam, Hamburg University, University of Gottingen, University of Heidelberg and University of Tel Aviv) are all in place. The agreement for University of the Basque Country is currently under review. HDRO is working on setting up the codes and also drafting the templates and procedures and has projected early August for e-applications to be open.

Professor Lorne Cummings explained to members the increase in MRES entry requirements for FBE in 2015. Members approved the average GPA increase from 2.5 in 2014 to 2.8 from February 2015.

Ms Briggs updated members on the current restructuring of Macquarie International. Ms Briggs briefed members on the future planning and development of Macquarie International, including upcoming events and upcoming international trips.
Dr Yi briefed members on the new HDR scholarship for Indigenous Australians. The scholarships will cover MRES, MPHIL and PhD. Terms and conditions are available on the HDRO website.

Professor Reynolds inquired about the upcoming China Scholarship Council trip and Members discussed the event. Professor Pretorius advised that HDRO and Macquarie International will coordinate the CSC trip this year. Professor Pretorius will also email the Executive Deans regarding this matter.

**COMPLETION OF REQUIREMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Supervisor(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALAVI FARD, FARZAD</td>
<td>FOBE PHD</td>
<td>Principal: Associate Professor Tak Kuen Ken Siu, Associate: Dr Ryle Perera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis submitted</td>
<td>11 Dec 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis title:</td>
<td>Analysis of Pricing Financial Derivatives Under Regime-Switching Economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Recommended:</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Supervisor(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BARDY, FABRICE</td>
<td>FOHS PHD</td>
<td>Principal: Associate Professor Catherine McMahon, Associate: Dr Blake Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis submitted</td>
<td>19 Dec 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis title:</td>
<td>Cortical Auditory Evoked Responses to Rapidly Occurring Acoustic Stimuli using Least-Squares Deconvolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Recommended:</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Supervisor(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BARRETT, LOUISE</td>
<td>FOHS DPSYCH</td>
<td>Principal: Dr Jennifer Batchelor, Associate: Dr Susanne Meares, Adjunct: K. Metcalf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis submitted</td>
<td>14 Feb 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis title:</td>
<td>The Cognitive Corelates and Assessment of Prospective Memory Following Severe Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Recommended:</td>
<td>Doctor of Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Supervisor(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOX, PAMELA</td>
<td>FOS PHD</td>
<td>Principal: Dr Kristian Ruming, Associate: Professor Kevin McAneney, Adjunct: F. Thomalla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis submitted</td>
<td>22 Nov 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis title:</td>
<td>What Does ‘Shared Responsibility’ Mean for Flood Risk Management in Australia?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Recommended:</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Supervisor(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRAWN, GABRIELLE</td>
<td>FOHS DPSYCH</td>
<td>Principal: Dr Melanie Porter, Associate: Dr Saskia Kohnen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis submitted</td>
<td>02 Dec 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis title:</td>
<td>Adaptive Functioning and Functional Reading Skills in Williams syndrome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Recommended:</td>
<td>Doctor of Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Supervisor(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BURCHFIELD, RICHARD LEIGH</td>
<td>FOA PHD</td>
<td>Principal: Dr Malcolm Choat, Associate: Dr Jennifer Cromwell, Dr Trevor Evans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Thesis submitted for examination: 07 February 2014
Thesis title: Networks of the Theban Desert: social, economic, and religious interactions in Late Byzantine and Early Islamic Thebes
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

CAO, LEI FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Stuart Graham
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Peter Petocz, Dr Angelina Fong
Thesis submitted for examination: 06 February 2014
Thesis title: Non-invasive markers of autonomic regulation in response to normal daily activities in health and cardiovascular disease
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

CARREON, JONATHAN FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr John S. Knox
Associate Supervisor: -
Adjunct Supervisor: R. W. Todd
Thesis submitted for examination: 27 August 2013
Thesis title: Critical Discourse Analysis of a Private Hospital in Thailand: A Case Study of Bumrungrad International Hospital Website
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

CHAABAN, YOUMEN FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Robyn Molony
Associate Supervisor: Professor John Hedberg
Thesis submitted for examination: 23 December 2013
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

CHANG, LUN HSIEN FOS MPHIL
Principal Supervisor: Professor Kenneth Cheng
Associate Supervisor: Dr Andrew Barron
Adjunct Supervisor: S Fahrbach
Thesis submitted for examination: 3 April 2014
Thesis title: Behavioural Influences of Precocious Foraging Induced by Juvenile Hormone Analogue Methoprene on the Flight History and Short-Distance Navigation of Worker Honeybees (Apis mellifera)
Award Recommended: Master of Philosophy

CHONG, RAYMOND WEI WERN FOS MPHIL
Principal Supervisor: Prof Nicolle Packer
Associate Supervisor: Professor Paul Haynes
Thesis submitted for examination: 12 March 2014
Thesis title: Preparative Scale Release and Purification of N-linked Glycans Standards from Human Milk Glycoproteins
Award Recommended: Master of Philosophy

CHRISTOPHER, MIRANDA ALEISHA FOS MPHIL
Principal Supervisor: Professor Michael Gillings
Associate Supervisor: -
Thesis submitted for examination: 16 April 2014
Thesis title: Class 1 Integrons and Their Impact on the Mobility of Antibiotic Resistance in Clinical Environments
Award Recommended: Master of Philosophy

CLARK, DAVID ALAN
Principal Supervisor: Dr Mark Lackie
Associate Supervisor: Dr Richard Flood
Thesis title: Integrated magnetics: Contributions to improved processing and interpretation of magnetic gradient tensor data, new methods for source location and estimation of magnetisation, and predictive magnetic exploration models
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

CLAYDON, RICHARD JOHN
Principal Supervisor: Professor Richard Badham
Associate Supervisor: -
Thesis submitted for examination: 18 December 2013
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

COLYER, GWENDA CLAIRE
Principal Supervisor: Professor Richard Howitt
Associate Supervisor: Professor Robert Fagan
Thesis submitted for examination: 25 March 2014
Thesis title: The Best of Intentions: Mainstreaming, the Not-For-Profit Sector and Indigenous Australians
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

DANIEL, ELIZABETH LINDA MATHEW
Principal Supervisor: Dr Louise Brown
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Bridget Mabbutt
Thesis submitted for examination: 24 February 2014
Thesis title: Effect of a Single Disease-Linked Missense Mutation on the ‘Hinge’ of the CLIC2 Ion Channel Protein
Award Recommended: Master of Philosophy

DETERS, LISA JANE
Principal Supervisor: Professor Jacqueline Hayden
Associate Supervisor: Dr Katherine Cologon, Dr Emma Pearson
Thesis submitted for examination: 21 November 2013
Thesis title: Collective Caregiving: Reconceptualising the Role of Early Childhood Development in Emergencies
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

DUAN, YUWEN
Principal Supervisor: Professor Michael Withford
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Michael Steel, Dr Graham Marshall
Thesis submitted for examination: 16 December 2013
Thesis title: Femtosecond Laser Direct Written Near IR Waveguide Lasers
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

ELY-HARPER, KERREEN
Principal Supervisor: Professor Kathryn Millard
Associate Supervisor: Dr Maree Delofski
Thesis submitted for examination: 13 November 2013
Thesis title: Close to the Bone: Staging Family Memory on Film
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

EMAMI, SAREH SADAT  FOS  PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Josef Pieprzyk
Associate Supervisor: Dr Ron Steinfeld
Thesis submitted for examination: 05 December 2013
Thesis title: Security Analysis of Cryptographic Algorithms
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

FAN, KUN SOPHIA  FOBE  PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Xian Zhou
Associate Supervisor: Professor Tak Kuen Shiu, Professor RongMing Wang
Thesis submitted for examination: 30 January 2014
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

FERNANDEZ CORBATON, IVAN JESUS  FOS  PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Gabriel Molina-Terriza
Associate Supervisor: Professor Jason Twamley
Thesis title: Helicity and duality symmetry in light matter interactions: Theory and applications
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

FLANNERY, GREGORY  FOHS  PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Verna Rieschild
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Ilija Casule
Thesis submitted for examination: 24 July 2013
Thesis title: The New ‘You’
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

GORDON, CAMILLA  FOHS  PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Marina Papic
Associate Supervisor: Dr Wilhelmina Van Rooy, Associate Professor Joanne Mulligan, Dr Katherine Stewart
Thesis title: Learning Astronomy in the Year Prior to Formal Schooling: An Intervention Study
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

GRETH, ANDREAS  FOHS  PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Gaetan Burgio
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Bredan McMorran, Professor Simon Foote
Thesis submitted for examination: 25 March 2014
Thesis title: Investigation of a novel host-directed therapy for malaria through ENU mutagenesis
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

HEMSTROM, STIG CHRISTER  MGSM  PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Norma Harrison
Associate Supervisor: -
Thesis submitted for examination: 12 December 2013
Thesis title: Customer Integration and Operational Performance: The Influence of Learning Mechanisms in Third Party Logistics
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

HOCKING, DARSHAL JOHN FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Christopher Candlin
Associate Supervisor: Dr Alan Jones
Adjunct Supervisor: L Grant
Thesis submitted for examination: 11 March 2014
Thesis title: The Brief in Art and Design Education: A Multi-Perspectived and Mixed-Methodological Study
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

IRELAND, JILLIAN ROSEMARY FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Kerry-Ann O'Sullivan
Associate Supervisor: -
Adjunct Supervisor: S Duchesne
Thesis submitted for examination: 11 February 2014
Thesis title: Contestation over literary theories: English teachers as syllabus interpreters
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

JIANG, ZHOU FOBE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Paul Gollan
Associate Supervisor: Mr Gordon Brooks
Thesis submitted for examination: 18 February 2014
Thesis title: A Cross-Cultural Study of the Relationship between Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

KEOGH, BRENT GEORGE FOA PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Andrew B. Alter
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Mark Evans
Thesis submitted for examination: 07 February 2014
Thesis title: Analyzing World Music Discourse in Australia
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

KYDD, ERIN FOS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Culum Brown
Associate Supervisor: Dr Jane Williamson
Thesis submitted for examination: 08 January 2014
Thesis title: Life Skills Training in Hatchery Reared Fish
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

LUO, HUAIYU RICHARD FOA PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Nick Mansfield
Associate Supervisor: Dr Nicole Anderson
Adjunct Supervisor: Prof. Dean Ning YiZhong
Thesis submitted for examination: 19 December 2013
Thesis title: A Comparative Study of Western Structuralist Narrative Theory and Chinese Narrative Poetics of the Ming and Qing Dynasties
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy
LYSTAD, REIDAR  FOS   PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Petra Graham
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Peter Tuchin
Adjunct Supervisor: Dr Ros Poulos
Thesis title: Epidemiology of Sports Injuries in Olympic-Style Taekwondo
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

MASSEY, JESSICA  FOHS   DPSYCH
Principal Supervisor: Dr Susanne Mears
Associate Supervisor: Dr Jennifer Batchelor
Adjunct Supervisor: R Bryant
Thesis submitted for examination: 14 February 2014
Thesis title: The associations of psychological distress and pain with cognitive functioning in hospitalized individuals following mild traumatic brain injury
Award Recommended: Doctor of Psychology

MCGILL, KATHERINE  FOHS   DPSYCH
Principal Supervisor: Dr Carolyn Schniering
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Andrew Baillie
Adjunct Supervisor: P. Hazell
Thesis submitted for examination: 24 October 2013
Thesis title: An Examination of Predictors of Mental Health, Efficacy, and Dissemination of a Group Education Program for Carers of People with Depression
Award Recommended: Doctor of Psychology

MCSWIGGAN, SALLY ANN  FOHS   DPSYCH
Principal Supervisor: Dr Susanne Meares
Associate Supervisor: Dr Melanie Porter
Thesis submitted for examination: 05 September 2013
Thesis title: An Evaluation of the Content of Capacity Reports Written by Psychologists, Psychiatrists and Geriatricians for Adult Guardianship
Award Recommended: Doctor of Psychology

MOODIE, ANN-MAREE  MGSM   PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Robert Spillane
Associate Supervisor: -
Thesis submitted for examination: 18 December 2013
Thesis title: Being a Director: Independence and Conformity in Boardroom Decision-Making
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

MORAES, HENRIQUE THADEU BALTAR DE MEDEIR  FOS   PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Ewa Magdalena Goldys
Associate Supervisor: -
Thesis submitted for examination: 26 August 2013
Thesis title: Fluorescence Enhancement in the Vicinity of Metallic Nanostructures
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

MORRIS, THOMAS  FOHS   DPSYCH
Principal Supervisor: Dr Jennifer Batchelor
Associate Supervisor: -
Thesis submitted for examination: 7 February 2014
Award Recommended: Doctor of Psychology

MULLIN, AMANDA JANE FOHS DPSYCH
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Nickolai Titov
Associate Supervisor: Dr Blake Dear
Thesis submitted for examination: 14 February 2014
Thesis title: Transdiagnostic Internet-delivered Cognitive Behavioural Therapy for University Students with Anxiety and Depression
Award Recommended: Doctor of Psychology

MURALIDHARAN, SRIDEVI FOS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Paul Haynes
Associate Supervisor: Professor David Raftos
Thesis submitted for examination: 20 December 2013
Thesis title: Environmental Stress Proteomics - Investigating the Effects of Heavy Metal Pollution and Ocean Acidification in Agriculturally Important Marine Species
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

NAKIB, MUHAMMAD NASRULLAH FOA PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor M. Rafiqul Islam
Associate Supervisor: Dr Ruwanti Selvadurai, Associate Professor Shawkat Alam
Thesis submitted for examination: 04 February 2014
Thesis title: Regulating Foreign Direct Investment for Development: Bangladesh in Context
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

PATRICK, TIMOTHY RAOUl CHRISTOPHER FOA PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Stuart Piggin
Associate Supervisor: -
Thesis submitted for examination: 22 April 2014
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

REDMOND, WILLIAM JOHN FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Mark Connor
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Jennifer Cornish
Thesis submitted for examination: 14 February 2014
Thesis title: Characterization of Novel N-Acyl Neurotransmitter/Amino Acid Conjugates (NAAN) on CB1 and TRP Family Member Receptors
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

RICHARDSON, GILLIAN LISA FOHS MPHIL
Principal Supervisor: Dr Anil Keshava
Associate Supervisor: -
Adjunct Supervisor: M. Rickard
Thesis submitted for examination: 31 January 2014
Thesis title: The development of a Nursing Acuity Score for the care of postoperative patients undergoing elective colorectal resection
Award Recommended: Master of Philosophy

RONCOLATO, WENDY GAY FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Cathy McMahon
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Doris McIlwain
Thesis submitted for examination: 19 November 2013
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

ROYHAN, PRADIP FOA PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Shawkat Alam
Associate Supervisor: -
Thesis title: Environmental Requirements in International Trade under the World Trade Organization: Market Access Implications for Bangladesh
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

SANTOS, JERRAN FOS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Ben Herbert
Associate Supervisor: Professor Nicolle Packer
Adjunct Supervisor: M. Padula
Thesis submitted for examination: 14 October 2013
Thesis title: A Proteomic Investigation of Multilineage Differentiated Adult Adipose-derived Stem Cells
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

SARKER, MD. ABEED HOSSAIN FOS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Diego Molla-Aliod
Associate Supervisor: Dr Rolf Schwitter
Thesis title: Automatic Medical Text Summarisation to Support Evidence-Based Medicine
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

SAUNDERS, JAMES EDWARD JOHN FOS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Norman Pearson
Associate Supervisor: Professor Suzanne O’Reilly
Thesis submitted for examination: 21 August 2013
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

SCHMIDT, CAMILLE HAZEL MGSM PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr David Gallagher
Associate Supervisor: -
Thesis submitted for examination: 6 February 2014
Thesis title: Mutual fund investment strategies, styles, and performance
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

SCHULZ, STEFFEN FOS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Vijay Varadharajan
Associate Supervisor: Dr Natarajan Shankaran
Thesis submitted for examination: 07 November 2013
Thesis title: Trusted Channels and Roots of Trust in Distributed Embedded System
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

SIMPSON, SARAH JADE FOA PHD
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Principal Supervisor:  Dr Robert Sinnerbrink
Associate Supervisor:  Professor Kathryn Millard
Thesis submitted for examination:  06 December 2013
Thesis title:  The Film Script as Philosophy
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

SMITH, NICHOLA RAЕ  FOS  MPHIL
Principal Supervisor:  Dr Paul Hesse
Associate Supervisor:  Dr Kristie Fryirs
Thesis title:  Suspended Sediment Transport and the Implications on River Channel Breakdown: Northern Macquarie Marshes, NSW
Award Recommended:  Master of Philosophy

SNIDVONGS, KORNKIAT  FOHS  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Associate Professor Raymond Sacks
Associate Supervisor:  Dr Richard Harvey
Thesis submitted for examination:  03 May 2013
Thesis title:  Corticosteroid Nasal Irrigations After Endoscopic Sinus Surgery for Recalcitrant Chronic Rhinosinusitis
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

SRIRAM, PREMA  FOHS  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Professor Stuart Graham
Associate Supervisor:  Dr Alexander Klistorner
Adjunct Supervisor:  H. Arvind
Thesis submitted for examination:  06 January 2014
Thesis title:  Identification and Characterisation of Ganglion Cell Loss in Optic Neuropathies
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

SUN, KWAI YU VIVIAN  MGSM  DBA
Principal Supervisor:  Professor Richard Badham
Associate Supervisor:  -
Thesis submitted for examination:  18 December 2013
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Business Administration

SUZUKI, TAKASHI  FOHS  DAPPLING
Principal Supervisor:  Dr Peter Roger
Associate Supervisor:  Dr John Knox
Thesis submitted for examination:  02 July 2013
Thesis title:  Stories in Casual Conversation in English and Japanese: Genre, Evaluative Expressions and Pedagogical Implications
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Applied Linguistics

TAYLOR, LEE SIMONE  FOHS  DPSYCH
Principal Supervisor:  Professor Ron Rapee
Associate Supervisor:  Dr Lorna Peters
Adjunct Supervisor:  D. Hutchinson
Thesis submitted for examination:  05 August 2013
Thesis title:  Clinical substance abuse and dependence among women during pregnancy: Risk factors among women and the impact of infants postnataally
Award Recommended: Doctor of Psychology

TAYLOR, MAXWELL FRANCIS FOA PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Denise Meyerson
Associate Supervisor: Professor David Weisbrot
Thesis submitted for examination: 16 October 2013
Thesis title: Clinical Substance Abuse During Pregnancy: Risk Factors Among Women and the Impact for Infants Postnatally
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

THOMPSON, NICOLE FLORENCE FOA PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Jane Messer
Associate Supervisor: Dr Robyn McCallum
Thesis submitted for examination: 20 December 2013
Thesis title: Mint Tea and Atrocity: The Historical War Fiction of Michael Morpurgo, and Oranje, a novel
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

TOWNSEND, STEVEN REX FOA PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Malcolm Voyce
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Vijaya Nagarajan
Thesis submitted for examination: 16 December 2013
Thesis title: The Regulation of Auditor Ethical Behaviour in Australia – The Problem of the Conflict of Interest and Proposed Structural Reform
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

VIVEROS TAPIA, HECTOR MANUEL FOBE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Paul Gollan
Associate Supervisor: Professor Suzanne Benn
Thesis title: Stakeholders Interactions and Corporate Social Responsibility in the Mining Industry
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

VUOSKOSKI, PIRJO HANELLE FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr David Saltmarsh
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Ian Solomonides
Adjunct Supervisor: S. Poikela
Thesis title: Work-placement assessment as a lived-through educationally meaningful experience of the student: An application of the phenomenological descriptive approach
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

WEBB, JAMES FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Jennifer Batchelor
Associate Supervisor: Dr Susanne Meares
Thesis submitted for examination: 08 November 2013
Thesis title: Predictors of Effort Test Failure During Neuropsychological Evaluation in Cases of Traumatic Brain Injury
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

WHITE, GEMMA FOS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Culum Brown
Associate Supervisor: Dr Jane Williamson
Thesis submitted for examination:  24 January 2014
Thesis title:  Spatial Learning in Intertidal Gobies
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

ZEB, BASIT ALI  FOS  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Professor Karu Esselle
Associate Supervisor:  Dr Yuehe Ge
Adjunct Supervisor:  N. Nikolic
Thesis submitted for examination:  05 November 2013
Thesis title:  Multi-Frequency and Wideband Resonant Cavity Antennas with Novel Superstructures
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

ZHOU, LAN  FOS  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Professor Vijayaraghavan Varadharajan
Associate Supervisor:  Associate Professor Michael Hitchens
Adjunct Supervisor:  Y Mu
Thesis submitted for examination:  05 November 2013
Thesis title:  Cryptographic Role-based Access Control for Secure Data Storage in Cloud Systems
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

ZIEMINSKA, KATARZYNA  FOS  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Professor Mark Westoby
Associate Supervisor:  Dr Ian Wright
Thesis submitted for examination:  27 June 2013
Thesis title:  Anatomical variation in twig wood across Australian angiosperms
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

CONSIDERATION FOR VICE-CHANCELLOR’S COMMENDATION

COLYER, GWENDA CLAIRE  FOS  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Professor Richard Howitt
Associate Supervisor:  Professor Robert Fagan
Thesis submitted for examination:  25 March 2014
Thesis title:  The Best of Intentions: Mainstreaming, the Not-For-Profit Sector and Indigenous Australians

On 27 June 2014, the Higher Degree Research Committee recommended that Gwenda Claire Colyer’s PhD thesis be awarded.

The following comments were received from the examiners:

“This is an outstandingly good thesis, which uses the case of the Red Cross to illustrate how changed government policy in Indigenous Affairs is actually being implemented. It illustrates well the many shortcomings this policy of mainstreaming faces and, as its title suggests, how good intentions in non-profit organisations are insufficient without appropriate capacity.

The thesis is based on a strong foundation of theory and a sound understanding of the recent history of Indigenous policy; it required and obviously achieved sensitive, ethically informed and respectful fieldwork with the many participants; and it reveals some very important insights in this area of NFP engagement in Indigenous programs. It is extremely well structured and is written particularly clearly.

This thesis deserves publication and its findings need to be shared with the NFP sector and with government, but in a careful and respectful manner. The recommendations for further research are important and I hope that Claire will pursue some of them herself.”
“This was an excellent thesis that makes a thoughtful and insightful (if somewhat depressing) contribution to the field of indigenous and policy studies. I believe it clearly meets the criteria set for a PhD because its thorough and detailed examination of the Red Cross provides a useful case study for examining contemporary indigenous government relations and how non-profit agencies have become caught in the crossfire. It thus clearly makes an original contribution to knowledge. In addition, the PhD study was well-designed and, in its various facets, offers an appropriately broad view of the organisation and its engagement, enabling the candidate to answer the research questions established. Chapters Two and Three also illustrate a high level of critical analysis of the policy and funding context Chapters Four to Eight also offer very comprehensive research data that together support the arguments made by the candidate in the final conclusion Chapter. Overall, the thesis not only demonstrates an appropriate level of sensitivity to and understanding of indigenous issues but also the candidate’s superior ability to critically reflect upon, synthesise and articulate complex research findings. The candidate should certainly be commended for successfully completing what looks to have been an extremely challenging project!”

“This is an excellent thesis that reflects credit on Ms Colyer, her University and her Supervisors. I recommend that it be awarded a PhD without further amendment.

Ms Colyer writes very well - clearly and intelligently and without the overburden of jargon that makes reading some theses very onerous.

Ms Colyer has handled her task with sensitivity. She has told the truth in a manner that does not avoid some critical judgements about the difficulties that the Red Cross has faced but which is not offensively critical. This task has been conducted properly. If I were the CEO of the Red Cross, I could not object to Ms Colyer’s judgements. Thus this thesis exercise is a good example of what I would call, aka Wildavsky, “speaking truth to power”.

In sum, Ms Colyer has produced a very good thesis that deserves the immediate award of a PhD.”

Taking into account the examiners reports and the above comments, the committee noted that the thesis was of exceptional merit.

RESOLVED
That Gwenda Claire Colyer’s PhD thesis entitled “The Best of Intentions: Mainstreaming, the Not-For-Profit Sector and Indigenous Australians” be awarded a Vice-Chancellor’s Commendation.

FERNANDEZ CORBATON, IVAN JESUS FOS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Gabriel Molina-Terriza
Associate Supervisor: Professor Jason Twamley
Thesis title: Helicity and duality symmetry in light matter interactions: Theory and applications

On 27 June 2014, the Higher Degree Research Committee recommended that Ivan Jesus Fernandez Corbaton’s PhD thesis be awarded.

The following comments were received from the examiners:

The work is of a very high standard and is of much significance both from a fundamental point of view and for applications. The thesis covers a variety of applications which are studied from the point of view of symmetry, including topical issues such as transformation optics in meta-materials, optical activity and the orbital angular momentum of light. The investigations, methodology and the emerging results are highly original and compelling in the sophistication of execution and the clarity of presentation.

The thesis is very well written and flows very nicely with up-to-date numerous references and the figures are well presented with suitable captions.
It seems to me that the thesis exceeds by a large margin the minimum requirements for the award of the PhD degree, certainly by international standards, including my own University of York, UK. It thus deserves the award of the PhD degree and I am pleased to recommend that to the Higher Degree Research Committee at Macquarie University."

"The thesis under consideration is devoted to the detailed theoretical study of light-matter interaction with emphasis on the effects originating from the duality symmetry. The work covers very significant breadth of topics, interesting from the point of view of basic physics as well as for practical applications. It revisits the basic symmetries in electro-magnetism and applies the duality symmetry to some modern concepts of scattering by sub-wavelength particles. As such the work develops a powerful theoretical tool for solving scattering problems and demonstrates a technical contribution of the highest level. The thesis is based on 11 publications, six in peer-reviewed journals, one book chapter and three articles under review. I believe that the thesis is a benchmark for PhD theses, containing a large amount of educational material as well as technical results of high quality and originality. I am therefore happy to certify that the level of the material presented exceeds the standard expectations for a PhD thesis.

The thesis is clearly structured and logically presented. …Overall, this is an extremely good thesis, presenting a very significant body of new and important results. It deserves the degree of PhD at the highest level to be awarded."

"I am delighted to provide this report on the above PhD thesis. I have read through the thesis carefully and I find it to be well written, technically sound, scientifically interesting and novel, and quite frankly worthy of scientific publication as a book in addition to the journal publications that have come from the work. The work advances the theory of linear optical light matter interactions into quite a great degree in a direction that I think was quite unexpected by the optics community and I am particularly pleased to see that the theoretical work has already seen great confirmation in detailed experiments.

Particularly, although the electromagnetic field duality relations have been known for many years, there has been to my knowledge hitherto no real practical application of them in physical experiments and they had been viewed as something of a mathematical curiosity. Mr. Fernandez Corbaton has done a great job here lifting them out of something of a realm of obscurity and putting them to work in the study of the scattering of light particularly off and through nanosized objects smaller than the wavelengths. …Mr. Fernandez Corbaton has clearly identified these symmetries, re-evaluated the duality theory in the absence of charges, and extracted the helicity of the field as the correct conserved quantity in the experiments. This was no small feat and the work has been nicely developed in the thesis so that even persons unfamiliar with the duality transforms can follow the logic. The work has resulted in quite an astonishing large number of publications for a PhD student and the agreement with the experimental results is most pleasing.

It is my opinion that this research is really a breakthrough in our understanding of the coherent scattering of the optical field off of nano objects. The thesis was a delight to read and was well put together and very logically thought out from a pedagogical point of view. I seldom see PhD theses this good and put it in to 5% on the form. As I said the author should consider converting it into a textbook.

So in summary I rate the thesis as excellent and give my highest possible rating for the awarding of the diploma of PhD."

Taking into account the examiners reports and the above comments, the committee noted that the thesis was of exceptional merit.

RESOLVED
That Ivan Jesus Fernandez Corbaton’s PhD thesis entitled “Helicity and duality symmetry in light matter interactions: Theory and applications” be awarded a Vice-Chancellor’s Commendation.

HOCKING, DARRYL JOHN  FOHS   PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Professor Christopher Candlin
Associate Supervisor:  Dr Alan Jones
Adjunct Supervisor:  L Grant
Thesis submitted for examination:  11 March 2014
Thesis title: The Brief in Art and Design Education: A Multi-Perspectived and Mixed-Methodological Study

On 27 June 2014, the Higher Degree Research Committee recommended that Darryl John Hocking’s PhD thesis be awarded.

The following comments were received from the examiners:

“I am pleased to confirm at the outset that I consider this to be a most impressive piece of work which meets the criteria for the award of PhD as indicated in the university's documentation. The thesis is very well-organised, is original in both conception and execution and is distinctive in its contribution to knowledge. Very interesting findings are offered on the relationship between systems of language organisation, a range of integrated research methodologies and implications for our understanding of different ways of defining and measuring an area of language use that has not previously received systematic treatment in this way. The thesis is rich in theoretical discussion and in the integration of theory and practice; literature reviews are comprehensive and perceptively handled.

The thesis is very clearly written and structured, with regular and appropriately clear signalling of the arguments. Above all, the thesis is also very readable and there are throughout numerous, clear summaries, helping the reader's navigation of key ideas and methods. I also like the ways in which the candidate recognises limitations and reflects on such implications, though it would have been good to see more attention to future research directions in the final chapter.

I like the way in which there is a balanced approach to identification methods, combining more conventional tools of analysis with more original and innovative inter-subjective sampling.

Overall, I believe that the candidate is to be commended for having produced an original and distinctive thesis and in this respect the work does valuably push back frontiers in this field. Taken as a whole it is a very impressive achievement and contains research of a high quality. I enjoyed reading and learning from it and congratulations should also be given for very obviously well directed and supportive supervision. I see that the candidate has already published work in international contexts; I very much hope that he will feel encouraged to publish more along the many lines pursued in the thesis.”

“The thesis is a highly commendable original piece of work. The research has been meticulously designed and effectively conducted. It has excellently accomplished the intended research goals and bridged the gaps in research on a critical genre study of the brief in art and design education. The thesis makes a highly informative, illuminating and significant contribution to the research literature on the genre of the brief in art and design education, drawing upon conceptual and theoretical approaches, methodologies and analytical frameworks from a range of fields in Applied English Studies and professional communication and practice: critical discourse and genre analysis, corpus linguistics, conversation analysis, pragmatics, cognitive metaphor theory, Membership Categorisation Analysis, multimodal (inter)actional analysis, Systemic Functional Linguistics, ethnographic based discourse analysis, ethnomethodological analysis, discourse-historical analysis, content analysis, and case study.

The thesis is excellent in literature review and adequacy of references, accuracy and quality of results, and appropriateness of conclusions and implications. Each of the perspectives (semiotic resource, social action, participants and socio-historical) have been thoroughly examined from a number of well-justified methodological orientations and analytical tools. Each of the findings chapters (Chapters 4-9) is a high-quality stand-alone piece of research, examining the conceptual constructs of work, agency, motivation, exploration, ideas and identity. All the constructs are effectively integrated in addressing the research questions.

“The overall quality and standard of the thesis are exemplary. The thesis, in all aspects, attains the level expected of a PhD thesis. It is of eminently publishable quality.”

“This dissertation is a tour de force, in at least four respects.

a. Methodologically, because of the skilled deployment of a mixed-method approach which combines corpus-oriented and qualitative text analysis with participant-interviews and participant observation.

b. As an instance of discourse study, because of the combination - which is managed consecutively and simultaneously - of four perspectives (one could call them “lenses”) on the analytical themes which are
developed in detail in the "data chapters": semiotic resources, social action, participant perceptions and the socio-historical locatedness of discursive resources and practices
c. as a bibliographically informed piece of research with a most impressive and comprehensive reading list which draws on a wide range of academic and disciplinary contexts; and, finally,
d. as a written dissertation which flawlessly guides the reader through the research process.

One particular feature that I would like to single out is that DH's study comes pretty close to accomplishing an exhaustive understanding of what "discourse practice" is and entails. Let me congratulate the candidate on this excellent demonstration of his doctoral research abilities."

Taking into account the examiners reports and the above comments, the committee noted that the thesis was of exceptional merit.

RESOVED

OGEREAU, JULIEN MICHEL FOA PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Laurence Welborn
Associate Supervisor: Dr Peter Keegan, Dr Donald Barker
Thesis submitted for examination: 02 October 2013

On 27 June 2014, the Higher Degree Research Committee recommended that Julien Michel Ogereau’s PhD thesis be awarded.

The following comments were received from the examiners:

“This is an outstanding thesis which displays a depth and range of scholarship of the highest order. Tackling a difficult and controversial topic, it offers a thorough reconsideration of Paul’s financial relationship with the Philippian church based on primary research in the use of all the key terms in Phil 4.10-20, exploring and citing evidence from documentary sources (inscriptions and papyri) with a thoroughness and in a level of detail that has not, I believe, been attempted before. It is easy for New Testament scholars to get out of their depth rather quickly when dealing with such non-literary sources, but the candidate displays a mastery of this field that would make a well trained classicist proud. Time and again he deploys material from these sources that shows he understands well their historical and social context, and that is based not only on very thorough searches of the relevant databases but also close scrutiny of their scholarly publication and of a vast range of relevant classical scholarship. Each text has been carefully scrutinized for what it does or does not say, with levels of professionalism and care second to none. It is very rare for even an advanced New Testament scholar to display this degree of familiarity with the documentary material and I commend the candidate for his considerable achievement in this regard. As well as deploying new material, the thesis advances an original proposal regarding Paul’s relationship with the Philippian church…the success of this thesis is in advancing this thesis without most of the weaknesses associated with the proposals of his predecessors, and with a weight of evidence that had never been mustered before. The candidate’s own thesis is presented in full discussion with other alternatives throughout. It is comprehensive in its treatment of scholarship above and beyond the PhD level, and advances a new, consistently non-metaphorical reading of the financial terms in the key text in a way that has not been attempted before. As a result, it suggests a new, additional model for the financing of Paul’s mission which has not been properly considered hitherto. For all these reasons there is no doubt in my mind that this thesis should be awarded a PhD, with high commendation”

“The thesis is executed with care and precision, great attention to the nuance of arguments in secondary literature and with admirable attention to a wealth of primary data. The thesis herein argued is also consequential and represents a significant advance to human knowledge, which is the
primary test of a doctoral thesis. ....it is clear that this work more than meets the bar of a work that is acceptable in fulfilment of degree requirements for a Ph.D. Part one of the dissertation and its longest section (pp. 63-227), hence, is a detailed philological analysis of the key terms, δόμα, καρπός, ό λόγος δόσεως και λήμψεως, ἀπέχω, πληρόω, κοινωνία. Κοινωνός and related terms. The second part of the thesis then discusses in what sense the notion of societas can be understood. In the final chapter, Ogereau's thesis is articulated, according to which the commercial language is to be interpreted in its 'ordinary' commercial sense to mean that Paul in fact formed some kind of societas with the Philippians. Ogereau's thesis is a significant intervention in scholarship on Philippians and on the more general issue of the funding of Paul's activities. The thesis is articulated and defended in an exemplary fashion, with very careful attention to the history of scholarship, which is surveyed, analysed, and criticized carefully and fairly. One can even say that Ogereau displays an outstanding grasp, analysis and critique of scholarly literature on the topic. The philological analysis is exhaustive, competent, and compelling and displays exemplary competence in the use of epigraphical and papyrological as well as literary sources. The first and largest portion of the thesis move the study of Philippians far beyond the current state of research and underscore the importance of careful philological work on the language of early Christian documents. O's appendix is also a significant resource to researchers on Philippians, offering a rich set of primary texts essential to the interpretation of the letter.

"This is an excellent thesis. It has demonstrated an extremely competent handling of a complex range of primary and secondary material to establish that the reference to koinwni/a along with an aggregate of other key terms in Paul's letter to the Philippians should be understood in an economic framework rather than as a metaphorical reference to a 'spiritual community'. In the course of the unfolding of his argument, the candidate has addressed significant issues in the interpretation of the Epistle to the Philippians such as the macro-questions of the genre and literary unity of the letter not for their own sake but as having particular relevance to the interpretative line he wishes to present. Even so, the contributions here bear their own mark of original thought and judicious handling of the variety of coherent possibilities to be entertained. But the candidate was equally adept, possibly more so, in working with the array of resources across the ancient Mediterranean world, a capacity sorely missing from many of the Second Testament scholars with whom he interacted and who all too often convert the writings of the Second Testament into ideological reinforcements of later confessional positions. What this thesis demonstrates is the immense value to be gained by allowing Second Testament writings to be restored to the material world in which they arose. Accordingly I have no hesitation in affirming that the thesis makes a most significant contribution to scholarship. It is well-written, well-organised and, given the array of sources relied upon, remarkably free of mistakes. This only confirms the attention to detail that supports the larger argument presented."

Taking into account the examiners reports and the above comments, the committee noted that the thesis was of exceptional merit.

RESOLVED
That Julien Michel Ogereau's PhD thesis entitled “Paul's Koinwvnia with the Philippians: A Socio-Historical Investigation of a Pauline Economic Partnership” be awarded a Vice-Chancellor's Commendation.
ITEM 11.4: SENATE LEARNING AND TEACHING COMMITTEE REPORT

Report of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee meeting held on 16 June 2014.

For approval.
ITEMS FOR NOTING

New appointment to SLTC: Dr Mark Hancock, Faculty of Human Sciences, co-option of Ms Heather Tinsley from Macquarie Operations (MOPS).

“Unit Guides”, a new units program, was launched last week, replacing the “UNITS program”. A key improvement is responsiveness to use on mobile devices. The student facing site is accessible via http://unitguides.mq.edu.au/units and the staff facing site, iTeach, via http://www.mq.edu.au/iLearn/resources/iteach/index.htm.

The new Global Leadership Program will be introduced via a publicity campaign. Initial expressions of interest have been encouraging and applications are currently being received.

A number of teaching grants have been announced recently and a second round of announcements is to be provided shortly. An awards dinner will be hosted for all winners during L&T week.

The Attrition Retention Progression groups have met to discuss a range of strategies. Matters are proceeding according to the established timeframe and increasing communication across the 3 groups has been identified as an objective.

The Inherent Requirements working group has been formed and it was noted that for students enrolling at the University of Western Sydney there is now a published list on their website of their inherent requirements. The plan is to start by developing inherent requirements for professionally accredited programs.

The Student Discipline Rule procedures have been rewritten and final feedback has been requested on the language; once finalised a new discipline strategy will be implemented.

The LEAN methodology is to be implemented across the University, this project connects specifically with strategic priority number 7 from ‘Our University: A Framing of Futures’. The University Admissions processes are currently under review.

A working party has been formed to develop University wide protocols for the training and remuneration of students in such roles. The working party will be developed by the Associate Deans in conjunction with the PVC’s Office; Professor Young, Ms Heron and Dr Ambler have been tasked with developing a proposal for minimal standards moving forward.

Reports from the offices:

- Centre for open Education:
  - A 7 month trial of a dedicated phone system that utilises a ticketing system is underway. There are now 17 iLearn units that have access to a help button, connecting the student to the dedicated phone system for student support or to an on-line chat function. There are plans to expand this program for other iLearn units. The number of new processes and student support systems has broadened staff skillsets. The accelerated non award ‘next step’ program is one of 17 undergraduate degrees where high performing students achieving a prescribed GPA have the ability to transition from Session 2 instead of waiting the usual 12 month period.

- Learning and Teaching Centre:
  - Teche, the new Learning & Teaching blog, has a presence for all University Faculties and contains information regarding the upcoming Learning and Teaching week; a 3D learning technologies event has been scheduled for July, with further info available on Teche. A change proposal is to be developed to reshape the activities of the LTC.

- PACE:
  - PACE strategy plan is currently under development; a draft proposal will be available in July. The first draft PACE audit has been received; focus areas include integration of systems and management of notifications of country emergencies to students. A new Risk Management Committee has been established, chaired by Trudy De Vries.
Library:
  o Copyright implication seminars were held recently and further info is available on Teche. Feedback regarding the MultiSearch interface has resulted in system improvements. The Library website is currently being updated.

The Chair reported on the Learning and Teaching Planning Day held on 30 May 2014. Three principles were discussed: 1. Students are partners and co-producers of the University; 2. Learn more, Teach less and; 3. Design for Digital. “The MQ Connected Learning Community” was also proposed as a framework. There is a need for greater alignment with the University’s Research portfolio and an additional workshop has been tentatively scheduled for mid-July.

The next meeting of SLTC will be held on Monday 14 July 2014; agenda Items are due Thursday 3 July 2014.

The full minutes summarised in this report can be accessed via this link.

Professor Sherman Young
CHAIR
ITEM 12.2: RESEARCH INTEGRITY FRAMEWORK

Presentation to be made by Professor Colin Thomson.

For discussion.
ITEM 12.2: RESEARCH INTEGRITY FRAMEWORK

**Issue:** A working group chaired by the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity, has developed a Research Integrity Framework and The Macquarie University Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research.

Research in Australia must be compliant with the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research. It is expected that major research institutions in Australia have policies and procedures that implement the Code’s principles. In late 2013, the DVC (Research) commissioned consultants to help the university in developing policy and procedures. The Research Integrity Framework and The Macquarie University Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research are attached.

**The Macquarie Code:**

1. Spells out the key principles by which research will be undertaken at Macquarie (Part A), and
2. Outlines how breaches of the Code and cases of research misconduct will be dealt with at Macquarie (Part B).

*The Research Integrity Framework* aims to enact the University’s commitment to Integrity in *A Framing of Futures*, where Macquarie commits to always acting “ethically, equitably and for mutual benefit.” In avoiding a legalistic approach and encouraging the development of a university-wide culture of research integrity, it is aligned with the *Research Framework*’s goal to “adopt an educative and facilitative approach to research ethics.”

The Framework and Code have already been discussed at Executive Group, Research Strategy and Policy Committee and at the Higher Degree Research Committee. After Academic Senate feedback, it will go to the DVC (Research) for approval.

**Consultation Process:**

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

- Executive Group
- DVC (Research)
- DVC (Strategy and Planning)
- RSPC
- Office of the General Counsel
- Human Resources
- PVC (Learning and Teaching and Diversity)
- Head of Risk and Compliance
- HDRC
- Research Office (Ethics and Integrity and Contracts and Policy)
- Associate Deans (Research)
- Associate Deans (HDR)
- Dean HDR
- HDRO
- Chair of Academic Senate
- Learning and Teaching Centre
- Marketing
- MUCC
Recommendation: That the Academic Senate endorse the Research Integrity Framework and The Macquarie University Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research for adoption at the University.

Prepared by: Dr Benjamin Pitcher – ben.pitcher@mq.edu.au

For enquiries contact:
Dr Kandy White, Director, Research Ethics and Integrity
Karolyn.white@mq.edu.au
9850 7854
Research Integrity Framework

July 2014

Please provide any feedback to Dr Ben Pitcher by 1st August
Ben.Pitcher@mq.edu.au

This document was developed by Macquarie University Research Ethics and Integrity in partnership with Australasian Human Research Ethics Consultancy Services (AHRECS)
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Research Integrity at Macquarie University

1. Introduction

The *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (The Code)*\(^1\) (2007) outlines principles and practices to encourage and underpin responsible research conduct. This NHMRC/ARC/UA document has two sections: *Part A* which describes the responsibilities and required policies to support responsible research and *Part B* which deals with breaches of the code and frameworks for resolving allegations. Compliance with *The Code* is now a requirement of NHMRC/ARC funding.

The DVC(R) requested that the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity review Macquarie’s compliance with *The Code* in late 2013. The review found that Macquarie did not have all the requisite policies to be in compliance. After consultation with the Office of the General Counsel and the NHMRC, Macquarie University contracted Australasian Human Research Ethics Consultancy Services (AHRECS) to prepare a draft Research Integrity Framework, including policies and procedures to comply with both *Parts A & B of The Code*. Concurrently, MQ Research Ethics and Integrity benchmarked other Australian universities and international examples (e.g. U.S. Office of Research Integrity) to determine a best practice approach.

This document represents best practice in the sector and Professor Sakkie Pretorious, DVC(R), and the Research Integrity Framework Working Party\(^2\) extend their gratitude to AHRECS for their exemplary work in framing and crafting the Research Integrity Framework.

The Macquarie University Research Integrity Framework includes the:

- Genesis and explanation of the Framework;
- Recommendations by AHRECS for implementing the Framework;
- The *Macquarie University Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research*.

2. Macquarie University’s Research Integrity Approach

The research integrity challenges that Macquarie University faces are not unusual and are encountered by many Australian universities. This project offers a good opportunity to address institutional risk in a timely and constructive manner.

An initial review of the University’s existing arrangements suggests that in some important regards these arrangements do not comply with *The Code*. Addressing this situation is best approached in terms of research culture – specifically:

- The approach to research integrity should be based upon resources and professional development rather than rules and forms
- Institutional goals should link research integrity with research development and system performance

The University’s research integrity arrangements should offer a positive research experience, and therefore be:

- constructive in promoting good research

---


\(^2\) Dr K White, Prof C Mackenzie, Prof N Mansfield, Ms AM Heinrich, Mr N Crowley, Dr B Pitcher
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- effective and efficient in ensuring responsible conduct, in a way that is
- proportional to risks and sensitivities.

Disappointingly, many Australian universities have focused primarily upon risk management, bureaucratic systems and sanctions in order to compel researcher compliance with the national standards for research integrity.

AHRECS have argued such approaches can foster an adversarial culture – resistance, ill will and avoidance. Indeed, they are ultimately self-defeating because they tend to increase institutional risk by encouraging a research culture that regards research integrity with suspicion and the purview of central bureaucrats.

In light of the experience of other universities and the advice from AHRECS the proposed Research Integrity Framework aims to be facilitative of research, by providing researchers with resources and training, rather than focussing on rules and forms. This framework must be constructive, effective and importantly, proportional to risks. The framework should not be viewed as a box-ticking exercise of compliance, but rather underpinning and supporting a strong research culture. The Research Integrity Framework applies to all staff, students and visitors to the University who are involved in research. Parts of the framework will also be applicable to professional staff who support research, such as those who facilitate research funding with industry, government agencies and philanthropic sources.

3. Research Integrity Advisors

The Code requires the University to appoint a network of Research Integrity Advisors (RIAs)

“to advise a staff member who is unsure about a research conduct issue and may be considering whether to make an allegation.”

Confining the role of RIAs to advising about potential research misconduct can appear to reflect a risk management focus. In AHRECs view, a wider role is more likely to express the facilitative approach that is recommended.

The University should appoint a network of RIAs with research experience, wisdom, analytical skills, empathy, knowledge of the institution’s policy and management structure, and familiarity with the accepted practices in research. They will be the primary contact point for people within their respective faculties, so that advice can be tailored to specific disciplines.

RIAs will advise and assist in the development of training materials and strategies tailored to each Faculty and School, and in the delivery of training in conjunction with MQ Research Ethics and Integrity. RIAs will be asked to perform a small amount of record keeping, with the support of Research Ethics and Integrity, about the participation of staff and students in training and the details of any allegations. RIAs will receive training for their role from MQ Research Ethics and Integrity.

RIAs can also advise about questionable research practices and the process of making an allegation of a potential breach of the Code or research misconduct. However, the role of a RIA is separate to the any inquiry or review of potential research misconduct.
4. Training and Resources

A key element of a constructive implementation of the Australian Code is the centrally coordinated establishment of a suite of activities that build awareness and capacity building, that are discipline-relevant, can be tailored for specific audiences and are intended to present research integrity as a core component of quality research, not ‘just’ a central compliance issue. Possible different audience groups include:

- HDR candidates (at orientation and more detailed discussion later in their studies, e.g. at project confirmation)
- HDR supervisors (introductory sessions for new supervisors and ‘master classes’ for more experienced supervisors)
- Early career researchers
- Researchers new to the University
- More experienced researchers
- Postgraduate coursework and undergraduate students
- New research assistants and professional staff who will conduct research.

Professional development and training activities are most effective when focussed on the needs of a specific department or even methodological group (i.e. to a smaller audience using tailored material), a respected researcher is involved (e.g. the local Research Integrity Advisor introducing and closing the workshop and helping with the fielding of questions), and there is plenty of time for discussion and questions.

The University would be well served by investing in work in this area and by maintaining records about participation. Professional development and capacity building activities are not only a very valuable and sustainable way to resource reflective practice but can be a tangible demonstration of the practical adoption of The Code.

Copies and links to all research integrity information and resources should be placed on a single and easily located web page. This page should also include contact details of Research Integrity Advisors and Research Integrity staff (e.g. The Director, Research Ethics and Integrity). Benchmarking against Group of Eight universities has shown that best practice is to have research integrity information accessible within two clicks from the university homepage. In addition to providing for the needs of the University’s research community, such a web page allows external bodies (such as government bodies, research funding bodies and journalists) easy access to information about the University’s implementation of The Code.

5. About the Draft Code of Conduct

The draft Macquarie University Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research is divided into two sections, Parts A & B, to reflect the distinction in The Code between the principles and practices of responsible research conduct, and the process of resolving allegations of breaches or possible research misconduct.

On the advice of the NHMRC and AHRECS, the draft Code of Conduct has been benchmarked against the University of Melbourne, the University of New South Wales, University of Tasmania and the University of Sydney, as well as best practice standards recommended by AHRECS. To ensure compatibility with existing University procedures the draft provisions and procedures outlined in Part B of the Code of Conduct have been developed in consultation with AHRECS, Macquarie University Human Resources, the Higher Degree Research Office and the Research Integrity Working Party. The Working Party has consulted widely within the University during the development of this framework and Code of Conduct.
Once finalised, the Research Integrity Framework and the *Macquarie University Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research* should be supported with procedures and resource documents developed in conjunction with the faculties which give practical guidance in each key area. These resources should be tailored to specific disciplines.
# Recommendations

The following recommendations have been made by AHRECS and the Research Integrity Working Party. These recommendations represent practical strategies for the development and implementations of an effective and visible Research Integrity Framework. This list is an evolving document that will continue to be updated and added to as the project proceeds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Draft Timeline</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of the Research Integrity Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>That Macquarie University engages with Australasian Human Research Ethics Consultancy Services (AHRECS) to develop a best practice approach to research integrity.</td>
<td>Done</td>
<td>Early 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>That the University reviews existing policies to determine areas of need, and benchmarks against Australian universities and international examples to establish a best practice standard.</td>
<td>Done</td>
<td>Early 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>That the University establish a small Working Party to advise on the development and implementation of the Research Integrity Framework.</td>
<td>Done</td>
<td>Early 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>That the drafting of the Research Integrity Policy Part B be a collective task of the Research Office, Human Resources, Higher Degree Research Office and any other University organisational unit with relevant expertise, with every effort made to ensure the resulting policies interface seamlessly with existing arrangements, provide flexibility for the reviewing parties, are clear for complainants and respondents and are consistent with The Code.</td>
<td>Done</td>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>That the University adopt a timely and transparent process for dealing with allegations of research misconduct, including clear guidelines for dealing with the media in an open manner.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>That the University develops standardised recommendations for remedial actions that can be used by faculties when dealing with alleged breaches, in consultation with the faculties.</td>
<td>Still to do</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Draft Timeline</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>That Macquarie University appoints a network of</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Late 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>That Macquarie University develops a central database to maintain records of all allegations of breaches or research misconduct, and that appropriate statistics are reported to the DVC(R) from this database.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Late 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>That the University develops and maintains a register of conflicts of interest and associated procedures for making declarations, and make information from the register available when requested.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>That the University produces and maintains a web page that contains research integrity information, resources and links. The web page should be easily visible on the University site and be of a best practice standard.</td>
<td>Still to do</td>
<td>Late 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>That the University maintains records of the professional development of staff and HDR candidates.</td>
<td>Still to do</td>
<td>Late 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>That Macquarie University consider appointing a professional staff member in the Ethics and Integrity team with a designated role in the coordination of the University’s research integrity professional development and training, supporting Research Integrity Advisors, and record keeping.</td>
<td>Still to do</td>
<td>By late 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>That the University complete the development and implementation of the Research Data and Materials Management Policy.</td>
<td>Still to do</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>That any new policies or resources produced by the University (e.g. student handbooks), or revisions of existing material, cross-reference the Research Integrity Framework.</td>
<td>Still to do</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Training and Professional Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>That Macquarie University develops clear and practical institutional resource material (e.g. information booklets) providing guidance on each of the areas of <em>The Code</em>.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>Research Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>That online research integrity material and training (e.g. Epigeum’s Research Integrity Training module) is made available to HDR candidates and supervisors.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
<td>Research Office / LTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>That the University considers some form of accreditation in research integrity for HDR candidates and supervisors.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Late 2014</td>
<td>Research Office / HDRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>That the University engages AHRECS to provide initial training to Research Integrity Advisors and key staff.</td>
<td>Still to do</td>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
<td>Research Office / Faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>That research integrity is included in the induction activities for new research staff, including adjuncts and visiting researchers.</td>
<td>Still to do</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Research Office / HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>That the University regularly holds research integrity workshops tailored to specific disciplines.</td>
<td>Still to do</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Research Office / Faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>That research integrity should be included as a component of research methodology focused units at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels.</td>
<td>Still to do</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Research Office / Faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>That any research integrity professional development opportunities or requirements be incorporated into a wider University professional learning framework if or when one is established.</td>
<td>Still to do</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Purpose

The Macquarie University Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (The Macquarie Code) outlines standards of responsible and ethical conduct expected of all persons engaged in research under the auspices of Macquarie University.

The University has developed this Code to meet the standards set out in the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2007).

2. Scope

This document applies to all academic staff, professional staff, students, technical and other support staff as well as visiting academics and conjoint appointees, who are involved in research or the support of research.

The conduct of all Macquarie University research must adhere to The Macquarie Code irrespective of its funding source or whether it requires ethical review.
The Macquarie University Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research

If any of the questions below are answered in the affirmative a researcher should be considered to be conducting work under the auspices of Macquarie University, so is subject to the processes described in this document:

- Will the research activity/output be claimed for internal/external purposes through Macquarie University?
- Will the work be identified (e.g. to potential participants, sites and in any output) as being Macquarie University research?
- Are there any contracts/agreements associated with the work that will describe it as being under the auspices of Macquarie University?
- Are there any invoices or other payments associated with the work that will describe it as being under the auspices of Macquarie University?
- Is the work covered by Macquarie University’s insurance/indemnity?

3. Observance of the Code

Researchers and support staff must familiarise themselves with The Macquarie Code and ensure that its provisions are observed.

4. Failure to comply with this Code

Failure to adhere to The Macquarie Code or the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2007) may be a ground for disciplinary action (see Part B: Resolving Allegations of Breaches or Research Misconduct).

5. Reporting

All Macquarie University staff and students have an obligation to report any possible breaches of The Macquarie Code or the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2007), or possible research misconduct to the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity. The preparation and presentation of reports should follow The Macquarie Code, and include any advice received from a Research Integrity Advisor, as well as indicating if the individual wishes that their identity is protected. Reports should be made in writing.

6. Definitions

Breach A breach is defined in section 18.2.
Complainant  
For the purpose of this document, the complainant is a person who has made an allegation of possible research misconduct, a possible breach, or relating to biosafety or the ethical conduct of research.

Research  
Research involves original investigation undertaken in order to gain knowledge and contribute to the body of academic, clinical or professional understanding. It can occur in all faculties and disciplinary fields across the University, and includes research conducted in the governance, educational and service areas of the University.

Research Misconduct  
Research Misconduct is defined in section 18.1.

Respondent  
For the purpose of this document, the respondent is the researcher who is the subject of the allegation made by the complainant.

Part A: Principles and Practices to Encourage Responsible Research Conduct

7. Guiding Principles of Responsible Research

1. Researchers and support staff must, in all aspects of their research:

   a. conduct themselves ethically, with integrity and professionalism, in accordance with the principles of the Macquarie University Ethics Statement;
   
   b. observe fairness and equity;
   
   c. demonstrate intellectual honesty;
   
   d. declare and manage conflicts of interest or potential conflicts of interest effectively and transparently;
   
   e. ensure the safety and well being of those associated with research;
   
   f. show respect for human research participants, and comply with the ethical principles of integrity, respect, justice and beneficence. The National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007, updated March 2014) and Values and Ethics - Guidelines for Ethical Conduct in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Research (2003) set out principles for protecting human participants in research;
   
   g. show respect for the animals they use in research, in accordance with the Australian Code of Practice for the Care and Use of Animals for Scientific Purposes (2003);
   
   h. ensure the protection of people and the environment from risks resulting from research and release into the environment of genetically modified organisms. In achieving this researchers must comply with their responsibilities under the Gene Technology Act 2000 (Cth), the Gene Technology Regulations 2001 (Cth), and any relevant guidelines issued by the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator (http://www.ogtr.gov.au/);
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i. show respect for the environment and conduct their research so as to minimise adverse effects on the wider community and the environment;

j. appropriately acknowledge the role of others in research;

k. be responsible in the communication of research results, and

l. promote adherence to The Macquarie Code.

2. Research methods, results and outputs should be open to scrutiny and debate.

8. Special Responsibilities

1. Special Responsibilities for Integrity in Research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples.

   a. It is acknowledged that research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples spans many methodologies and disciplines. There are wide variations in the ways in which Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander individuals, communities or groups are involved in, or affected by, research to which The Macquarie Code applies. The Macquarie Code should be read in conjunction with Values and Ethics - Guidelines for Ethical Conduct in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Research (2003), the Guidelines for Ethical Research in Australian Indigenous Studies (2012) and Keeping research on track: a guide for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples about health research ethics (2006).

2. Consumer and community participation in research.

   a. Appropriate consumer involvement in research should be encouraged and facilitated by Macquarie University and its researchers. The Macquarie Code should be read in conjunction with the Statement on Consumer and Community Participation in Health and Medical Research (2002).

3. Researchers also have special responsibilities in research to other groups. The National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007, updated March 2014) provides guidelines for working with these groups, including:

   a. women who are pregnant and the human foetus;

   b. children and young people;

   c. people in dependent or unequal relationships;

   d. people highly dependent on medical care who may be unable to give consent;

   e. people with a cognitive impairment, an intellectual disability, or a mental illness;

   f. people who may be involved in illegal activities; and

   g. people in other countries.
9. Research Data, Materials and Records

1. Researchers must comply with the University’s Research Data and Materials Management Policy (in draft at the time of writing) and related policies that may be updated from time to time. This policy includes, but it is not limited to, the following requirements:

   a. data and records should be accurate, complete and in sufficient detail to enable verification of research results and to reflect what was communicated, decided or done;

   b. materials, as appropriate for the discipline and methodology – e.g. lab notes for chemical science work, audio recordings and samples for linguistics, field notes for anthropology must be retained to substantiate published claims and research results;

   c. hard and digital data must be recorded in a durable and retrievable form, be appropriately indexed and comply with relevant protocols;

   d. data must be retained intact for a period of at least five years from the date of any publication which is based upon the data or longer if:

      i. discussion of results continues;

      ii. there are regulatory or sponsor requirements; or

      iii. the data has historical or archival value.

   iv. Where multiple time periods may be applicable to a data set the longer time period applies.

   e. in the case of identified personal data, the consent obtained with regard to retention, confidentiality, access and reuse must be adhered to, and data must be retained and stored in accordance with any applicable approvals (e.g. ethics committee approvals). Confidential information must be kept in secure storage;

   f. where external service providers are used for a project and identified personal information is involved, the contract must include adequate safeguards for the security of the data and records and for notification of any breaches of their security;

   g. a research unit or department must establish procedures for the secure retention of data and must maintain a register of the data and records and their location; data and records will normally be kept in the department or unit where the research was conducted;

   h. subject to ethical, contractual and legal limitations, researchers are encouraged to make available to other researchers data, records and materials for wider use;

   i. data forming the basis of publications must be available for discussion with other researchers; where confidentiality provisions apply, where possible the data should be kept in a way that allows reference by third parties without breaching confidentiality; and

   j. when data are obtained from limited access databases, or via a contractual arrangement, written indication of the location of the original data, or key information
regarding the database from which it was obtained, must be retained by the research worker.

2. While all researchers are responsible for data and materials management, the Principal Investigator of a research project is responsible for ensuring that data and materials are managed correctly for that project.

10. Authorship

1. For a person to be recorded as an author of an output requires that he or she is directly involved in the creation by making substantial contributions through a combination of the following criteria:
   a. conceiving or designing the project
   b. analysing and interpreting the data on which it is based; or
   c. writing or critically revising the intellectual content in the output.

2. In addition to the criteria in section 10.1 all authors must give final agreement to the version to be submitted for publication and retain a record of that agreement.

3. A person who has made a significant contribution to the work underpinning a publication, but does not meet any of the above criteria, should not be listed as an author.

4. The right to authorship is not tied to position or profession; ghost, gift, or honorary authorship is unacceptable. Authorship should honestly reflect contribution to the work being published.

5. Acquisition of funding, the collection of data, general supervision of the research group, provision of technical assistance or materials do not, by themselves, justify authorship.

6. Any part of an article that is critical to its main conclusion must be the responsibility of at least one author.

7. An author’s role in a research output must be sufficient for that person to take public responsibility for at least that part of the output in that person’s area of expertise.

8. No person who is an author, consistent with this definition, may be excluded as an author without her/his express permission in writing.

9. When there is more than one co-author of a research output,
   a. one co-author (by agreement amongst the authors) should be nominated as executive or corresponding author for the purposes of administration and correspondence; and
   b. the authors should discuss and reach agreement on the order in which authors shall be listed.

10. Other persons who contributed to the work who are not authors should be named in the footnotes and/or in the Acknowledgements (where the publisher provides for this, and in a
manner consistent with the norms of the research field or discipline). An author must ensure
the work of cultural advisors, reference groups, research students, research assistants and
technical officers is recognised in a publication derived from research to which they have
made a contribution. Individuals and organisations providing access to facilities, samples or
reference collections must be fully acknowledged. Where individuals are acknowledged,
their approval should be sought.

11. Researchers and support staff must comply with authorship criteria appropriate to their
discipline, and/or according to the requirements of the journal their work is to be published
in. When work involves multiple disciplines it may be necessary to reconcile conflicting
requirements.

12. All staff and students must comply with the University’s Academic Honesty Policy. Staff and
students must act with integrity in the creation, development, application and use of ideas
and information. When the ideas or work of others are used, these ideas must be
appropriately and accurately cited or acknowledged.

13. Authorship requirements may vary according to discipline, journal requirements and funding
provisions. Researchers should be familiar with international best practice in their discipline,
for example ICMJE: Roles & Responsibilities.

11. Publication and Dissemination of Research Findings

1. There are many ways of disseminating research findings. Formal publication of the results of
research will usually take place in academic journals or books, but this is not always the case.
This section of The Macquarie Code applies to all forms of dissemination, including non-
refereed publications, such as web pages, and other media such as exhibitions or films, as
well as professional and institutional repositories.

2. Researchers must not deliberately include inaccurate or misleading information relating to
research activity in research outputs, curriculum vitae, grant applications, job applications or
public statements.

3. Researchers must ensure that published reports, statistics and public statements about
research activities and performance are complete, accurate and unambiguous. In the event
that a researcher becomes aware of unintentional misleading or inaccurate statements in
their work, they must attempt to correct the record as soon as possible.

4. Publication of more than one research output of the same type (e.g. papers, books,
multimedia presentations), or of different types with substantially similar content (e.g. a
paper and a book chapter), on the same set(s) or subset(s) of data is not acceptable, except
where each subsequent paper fully cross-references and acknowledges the earlier paper or
papers (for example, in a series of closely related work, or where a complete work grew out
of a preliminary publication and this is fully acknowledged).

5. Publication of the same material translated into different languages is acceptable provided
the original source is fully acknowledged.

6. The publication of substantially similar work in more than one location is discouraged. An
author who submits substantially similar work to more than one publisher must disclose this
to the publishers at the time of submission. Copyright must be carefully considered in these circumstances.

7. Researchers must ensure that they maintain the confidentiality of any information to which they have been given access on a confidential basis and that consent and/or removal of any identifiers or sensitive information is in place prior to publication.

8. Publications must include information on the sources of financial support for the research and must include a disclosure of any potential conflicts of interest. Financial sponsorship that carries an embargo on such naming of a sponsor should be avoided where possible, except with approval of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research).

9. Researchers should, where possible, make the results of their research publicly accessible. Researchers must comply with the University’s Open Access Policy.

10. Subject to any conditions imposed by the research sponsor, researchers should seek to communicate their research findings to a range of audiences, which may include the sponsor, professional organisations, peer researchers, policy makers and the community. Researchers may be interviewed by the media, invited to participate in debates, and approached by individuals for comment. Researchers should seek training in communicating with the media and the community.

11. When discussing the outcomes of a research project, special care should be taken to explain the status of the project — for example, whether it is still in progress or has been finalised.

12. To minimise misunderstanding about research outcomes, researchers should undertake to inform promptly those directly impacted by the research, including interested parties, before informing the popular media.

13. Confidentiality provisions to protect intellectual property rights may be agreed between Macquarie University and a sponsor of the research (see the University’s Intellectual Property Policy (Under revision at time of writing)). Researchers are nevertheless urged during negotiations to seek free publication of the results, regardless of whether they are seen as beneficial to the sponsor. Approval of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) must be obtained where such agreements limit free publication and discussion.

14. In the case of human research, potential participants in the research must be advised of any arrangements that might limit, delay or restrict the publication of the results prior to taking part in the research. Any of these arrangements must be disclosed to the Human Research Ethics Committee at the time of application and the disclosure to participants must follow the instructions of the committee.

15. The outcomes of research with a strong commercial element may have to be presented to a stock exchange or financial body before any public release.

16. Any restrictions on communications that have been agreed with the sponsor must be honoured.

17. Higher degree research candidates are required to submit a digital copy of their thesis so that it may be added to the Macquarie University Digital Thesis Collection and included in Macquarie University ResearchOnline. Candidates must follow the Digital Thesis Submission Guidelines. If a candidate anticipates that another entity, such as a publisher, may in the future hold a copyright interest in the thesis material, it is recommended that a moratorium
application be submitted to the Higher Degree Research Committee or a permission from the publisher for a copy to reside in Macquarie University ResearchOnline be requested. Restrictions must be approved by the Higher Degree Research Committee.

18. All staff must comply with the University’s Public Comment Policy and Social Media Guideline.

12. Supervision of Students Undertaking Research

1. Supervision of research HDR candidates must be carried out in accordance with the Higher Degree Research Supervision Policy and the Higher Degree Supervision Procedure.

2. The responsibilities of supervisors and students apply to the supervision and conduct of both undergraduate and postgraduate students at Macquarie University.

3. Supervisors must mentor their students with regard to the principles and requirements of The Macquarie Code and provide guidance in good research practice.

4. Supervisors must ensure the research methods and outcomes of research under their supervision are appropriate and valid.

5. Supervisors must ensure research trainees receive appropriate acknowledgement for their work, including both publication and intellectual property (see the University’s Intellectual Property Policy (Under revision at time of writing)).

6. It is the responsibility of supervisors to ensure that a research trainee’s project has all necessary ethical and biosafety approvals prior to commencing research. If there is doubt about the need for approval advice should be sought from MQ Research Ethics and Integrity.

7. It is the responsibility of supervisors to ensure that procedures and training are in place to manage the safety of a research trainee’s project.

8. It is the responsibility of the primary supervisor to ensure the candidate’s research data and materials are held with appropriate security and that a data and materials are retained within the University for at least five years, or longer if necessary (See section 9, Research Data, Materials and Records).


10. The appointment of independent thesis examiners should follow the guidelines set out in the Council of Deans and Directors of Graduate Studies in Australia (DDOGS) Conflict of Interest Guidelines.

11. The establishment of agreements for the supervision of cotutelle and joint degree PhD candidates, and the conduct of such collaborations, should observe the principles of the Singapore Statement on Research Integrity and the Montreal Statement on Research Integrity in Cross-Boundary Research Collaborations.
13. **Conflict of Interest**

1. Conflicts of interests occur when various personal, financial, political and academic concerns coexist and the potential exists for one interest to be illegitimately favoured over another that has equal or even greater legitimacy, in a way that might make other reasonable people feel misled or deceived. Research related conflicts of interest may apply to researchers and those who facilitate research funding with industry, philanthropic sources and government agencies.

2. Conflicts of interest in the research area are common and it is important that they are disclosed and dealt with properly. An individual researcher should therefore expect to be conflicted from time to time, and be ready to acknowledge the conflict and make disclosures as appropriate.

3. Examples of conflicts of interest in research include, but are not limited to, situations:
   
   a. where the research is sponsored by a related body;
   
   b. where the researcher or a related body may benefit, directly or indirectly, from any inappropriate dissemination of research results (including any delay in or restriction upon publication of such results);
   
   c. where the researcher or a related body may benefit, directly or indirectly, from the use of University resources;
   
   d. where the researcher conducts a clinical trial which is sponsored by any person or organisation with a significant interest in the results of the trial.
   
   e. where private benefits or significant personal or professional advantage are dependent on research outcomes.

   Note: A related body is any person or body with which the researcher has an affiliation or a financial involvement.

   A financial involvement includes a direct or indirect financial interest, provision of benefits (such as travel and accommodation) and provision of materials or facilities.

   An indirect financial interest is a financial interest or benefit derived by the researcher’s relatives, personal or business associates, or research students.

4. It is important to recognise that real or perceived opportunities to give preference to personal interests may routinely arise from competing obligations and can be other than financial.

5. The responsibility for managing a conflict of interest rests, in the first instance, with the individual. Researchers and those who facilitate research and research funding should assess their own situation to ascertain if a conflict of interest exists whenever there is potential for a perceived or actual conflict of interest.
6. All staff and students must make a full disclosure of a conflict of interest or of circumstances that might give rise to a perceived or potential conflict of interest as soon as reasonably practicable.

7. For the conduct of clinical trials, full disclosure must include the nature of the sponsorship and the relationships between the sponsor, trial participants and the clinical investigator.

8. Researchers have an obligation to disclose, at the point of proposing research (for example, in a grant application), any conflict of interest which has the potential to influence research and investigations, publication and media reports, grant applications, applications for appointment and promotion, or research commercialisation.

9. When a project requires ethical review, disclosure must also be made to the relevant ethics committee.

10. In the case of human research, disclosure may also need to be made to potential participants (and possibly any gatekeeper that controls access to that population). This should be determined by the relevant Human Research Ethics Committee.

11. In situations where a research project involves collaborating researchers, disclosure should be made to the other team members.

12. When publishing/reporting the results of a project, a disclosure should be included in the output and must at least be made to the relevant editor/publisher, and perhaps within the output itself.

13. Researchers must not make, or attempt to make, unlawful profits from their participation in, or knowledge of, research conducted at Macquarie University and must comply with Macquarie University's Staff Code of Conduct and/or Student Code of Conduct, whichever is applicable to the researcher.

14. Staff must comply with all provisions in the relevant Enterprise Agreement in relation to outside work (see the Academic Staff Agreement and/or the Professional Staff Agreement).

15. When deciding whether to accept sponsored research or contract research funding on behalf of the University, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) may seek information regarding disclosure and management of any conflict of interest that may result.

14. **Peer Review**

1. Peer review is the impartial and independent assessment of research by others working in the same or a related field.

2. Researchers in receipt of public funding have a responsibility to participate in the peer review process. Macquarie University encourages researchers to participate in peer review to provide public credibility to the reporting of research.

3. Researchers who are asked to participate in peer review should do so in an ethical, confidential and timely manner. Researchers should not agree to review any research for which they have a conflict of interest, or where the research is outside their area of expertise. In some circumstances, where there are limited numbers of potential reviewers with relevant expertise it may be unavoidable that a reviewer has some conflict of interest.
4. A conflict of interest must be disclosed to the person/organisation requesting the review either prior to accepting the request or as soon as the conflict of interest becomes apparent. The conflict of interest must then be taken into account.

5. Researchers whose research is being peer reviewed must not seek to influence the process or the outcomes.

6. Supervising researchers have a responsibility to assist trainee researchers in developing the necessary skills for peer review and understanding their obligation to participate.

15. Collaborative Research with Other Organisations

1. Macquarie University encourages collaborative research within and beyond the University, nationally and internationally.

2. Where an external research collaboration exists that requires a formal agreement, the agreement should cover:
   a. ownership of intellectual property (see the University’s Intellectual Property Policy (Under revision at time of writing));
   b. ownership, location and access to the data and materials;
   c. confidentiality;
   d. identification and management of conflicts of interest;
   e. protocols for the dissemination of research outputs;
   f. sharing of commercial returns, and
   g. responsibility for ethics and research safety.

3. Researchers should keep a record of all negotiations with collaborators and any arrangements that are made. This record may take the form of copies of relevant email correspondence.

4. Researchers involved in a collaborative research project must familiarise themselves, and comply, with the written agreement governing the collaboration and all policies and agreements affecting the project.

5. Researchers must disclose to their collaborators, as soon as possible, any actual or apparent conflicts of interest relating to any aspect of a collaborative project.

16. Research Integrity Advisors

1. Macquarie University will appoint a network of experienced researchers to act as Research Integrity Advisors.

2. Research Integrity Advisors are people with research experience, wisdom, analytical skills, empathy, knowledge of the institution’s policy and management structure, and familiarity with the accepted practices in research.
3. A sufficient number of Research Integrity Advisors will be appointed from across the University’s faculties so that advice may be tailored to specific disciplines.

4. Macquarie University staff and students may seek advice from any Research Integrity Advisor and are not limited to an advisor in a particular faculty. In some cases, meeting an advisor from another Faculty may be more appropriate.

5. Research Integrity Advisors can provide advice on good research practices, and the application of *The Macquarie Code*.

6. Research Integrity Advisors can provide advice about questionable research practices and the process of making an allegation of a possible breach or possible research misconduct.

7. If an allegation is made, a Research Integrity Advisor must declare their involvement as an advisor to the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity.

### 17. Additional Requirements

1. Researchers must comply with any relevant laws, or any regulations, special standards of work performance and ethical conduct imposed by the law or Macquarie University. These are deemed to be included in *The Macquarie Code* in its application to researchers at Macquarie University.

2. Where research procedures are of a kind requiring approval by a human research or animal ethics committee, institutional biosafety committee or by a safety or other validly constituted regulatory committee, research must not proceed without such prior approval. The conduct of that research must adhere to the terms of that approval.

3. Researchers should endeavour to safeguard the interests of all parties in relation to intellectual property in accordance with the University’s *Intellectual Property Policy* (Under revision at time of writing) and other guidelines as may be promulgated from time to time.

4. Every researcher should be provided with access to material on applicable institutional guidelines for the conduct of research, including those covering ethical requirements for human research and scientific work with animals, requirements for confidentiality, and occupational health and safety matters.

5. Academic staff must make a declaration as part of their annual reporting requirements that they have complied with the provisions of *The Macquarie Code*.

### Part B: Resolving Allegations of Breaches or Research Misconduct

#### 18. Definitions of Research Misconduct and a Breach

1. **Research misconduct** constitutes a failure to comply with *The Macquarie Code*, the *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2007)* or specific provisions of University policies governing the conduct of research by University researchers. Research misconduct includes intent and deliberation, recklessness or persistent negligence; and/or seriously deviates from accepted standards within the research and scholarly community for proposing, conducting or reporting research; and may have serious consequences.

   a. Examples of research misconduct include the following:
i. Fabrication of data or results;
ii. Falsification of data or results;
iii. Plagiarism of data, results, or written outputs;
iv. Redundant or duplicate publication of data, results, or written outputs;
v. Failure to declare or adequately manage risk to the safety of human participants, or the wellbeing of animals or the environment;
vi. Misleading ascription of authorship to a publication including listing authors without their permission, attributing work to people who did not contribute to the publication, omission of people eligible to be authors, lack of appropriate acknowledgement of work primarily produced by others;
vii. Failure to disclose conflicts of interest or cases where a conflict of interest might reasonably be perceived to exist;
viii. Falsification or misrepresentation to obtain funding;
ix. Wilfully conducting research without required ethics approval as required by the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans (2007 – updated March 2014) and the Australian Code of Practice for the Care and Use of Animals for Scientific Purposes (2013);
x. Wilfully conducting research that is not compliant with the Gene Technology Act 2000 (Cth), the Gene Technology Regulations 2001 (Cth), and any relevant guidelines issued by the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator; and
xi. Wilful concealment or facilitation of research misconduct by others.

b. Repeated or continuing breaches may constitute research misconduct. Where there has been previous counselling or specific direction, repeated or continuing breaches do constitute research misconduct.

c. Research misconduct does not include errors or differences in interpretation or judgment of data which are not dishonest, reckless or persistently negligent.

2. A Breach is an unintentional failure to comply with principles or specific provisions of University policies governing the conduct of research by University researchers. A breach does not include honest differences in the interpretation of data.

3. The definitions of research misconduct and breach in this document relate to the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2007) and do not influence or limit the definitions of similar concepts in other documents.

19. General Principles for Handling and Resolving Allegations

1. The handling of allegations of breaches of The Macquarie Code and/or the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2007) and of allegations of research misconduct at Macquarie University will be based upon the following principles:
a. Fair, transparent and policy-based. The arrangements for handling alleged breaches of the Australian Code and allegations of research misconduct are to be based upon the principles of procedural fairness, natural justice and transparency and follow institutional policies.

b. The conduct of formal inquiries of alleged research misconduct should complement the academic misconduct, student misconduct and staff misconduct processes, not replace or conflict with them.

c. Macquarie University is committed to the principle of natural justice (i.e. giving individuals the right to respond to specific allegations made against them). The University will not normally act on anonymous formal allegations lodged against individuals. However, anonymous allegations of research misconduct may be acted upon if they contain sufficient information to enable the assessment of the allegations and the credibility of the facts and evidence on which the complaint is based (i.e. without the need for further information from the source of the allegation).

d. Where an anonymous allegation is made the source of the allegation will not:
   i. be entitled to participate in the procedures set out in the framework.
   ii. receive notice of the status of the complaint or a report of the outcome of any inquiry or investigation conducted in respect of the complaint
   iii. be entitled to lodge an appeal against the procedure of the investigation

e. An anonymous allegation of a breach will not ordinarily initiate a formal review but, depending upon the specifics of the allegation, it may prompt professional development activities in the relevant area(s) or a review of processes.

f. In some cases a complainant (internal or external) may not wish to be identified as the source of an allegation or complaint. They may not wish the respondent, anyone involved in the review, or other third parties (e.g. the relevant head of the administrative unit) to know their identity. This might be because the complainant believes there will be recriminations if they are identified. If this is the case, everyone involved in the processing of the matter should, if possible, abide by the complainant’s wishes. It should however be explained to the complainant that:
   i. there may be practical limitations to this confidentiality (e.g. if a party seeks access to their identity through legal action);
   ii. removing any information that might enable the complainant to be identified by inference, might limit the effectiveness of the review of the allegations; and
   iii. issues of natural justice may necessitate revealing the identity of the complainant to the respondent.

g. When a possible breach relates to a dispute between two or more researchers and whenever possible and appropriate, the parties to an allegation should be encouraged to reach a mutually agreeable resolution based upon a collegiate and cooperative approach prior to lodging a formal allegation.
h. The processing of alleged breaches and allegations of research misconduct must be conducted in a timely fashion, in good faith and honestly.

i. Any person involved in the handling of an allegation or complaint, who believes they might be perceived to have a conflict of interest, must declare this to the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity so this can be appropriately addressed. If the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity has an actual or perceived conflict of interest it must be declared to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) so it can be addressed.

j. When appointing an inquiry panel to investigate alleged research misconduct, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) may draw upon suitably qualified people from both within Australia and internationally. In some instances international representation among panel members may be the most appropriate course of action to guarantee the independence of the inquiry panel.

k. The outcome of any formal inquiry must be reported to the parties making the allegation, to the respondent(s) and other stakeholders as appropriate.

l. The parties have the right to appeal against an inquiry into possible research misconduct on the basis of procedural matters (as defined in section 30). All appeals must be made in writing to the Chair, Academic Senate following the process set out in section 30. The parties also have the right to appeal to the Australian Research Integrity Committee in accordance with the Australian Research Integrity Committee Framework (2011).

m. The response to a breach should be proportional and aim to be remedial, focusing on professional development rather than punitive measures.

n. At all stages outlined in these processes, comprehensive records about all allegations, the processes followed and the outcome/resolution must be maintained by those conducting the mediation/inquiry. The originals must then be provided to the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity.

o. If at any time during the assessment of allegations or an inquiry, it becomes apparent that the allegation relates to a matter that should be dealt with under the Reporting Wrongdoing: Public Interest Disclosures Policy, the Reporting Wrongdoing: Public Interest Disclosures Procedure must be followed.

p. The University will not tolerate any reprisal action against staff who accurately and honestly report possible breaches or research misconduct. In assessing and dealing with reports of possible breaches or research misconduct, the University will consider the possibility of reprisal action and seek to minimise its occurrence. If a staff member is concerned about the possibility of reprisal action, they should raise the matter with the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity. Similarly, if any staff member is concerned that any action they need to take in the course of their role may be perceived to amount to reprisal action, they should consult the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity. Staff members who take detrimental action against an individual who accurately and honestly reports possible breaches or research misconduct may be disciplined by the University in accordance with relevant university policies and industrial instruments. Detrimental action means action causing, comprising or involving any of the following:

i. injury, damage or loss;

ii. intimidation or harassment;
iii. discrimination, disadvantage or adverse treatment in relation to employment;

iv. dismissal from, or prejudice in, employment; or

v. disciplinary proceedings.

q. Frivolous/vexatious/malicious allegations of either breaches or research misconduct will not be tolerated or investigated. Persons making such allegations may be the subject of disciplinary actions. In serious cases, or where the person is from outside Macquarie University, the matter may be referred to the police.

r. When investigating possible research misconduct in a cotutelle or joint degree PhD candidate research program, Macquarie University will endeavour to observe the principles of the OECD Global Science Forum, Investigating Research Misconduct Allegation in International Collaborative Research Projects, A Practical Guide (April 2009). However, any requirements of The Macquarie Code, or the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2007) are deemed to take precedence.

20. Receiving Allegations of a Breach or Possible Research Misconduct

1. Macquarie University does not limit the categories of persons who have standing to make an allegation.

2. A person considering making an allegation may discuss their concerns with a Research Integrity Advisor. The Research Integrity Advisor must explain that if they become aware of a possible breach or possible research misconduct the matter must be reported to the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity. As such initial discussion may be conducted in hypotheticals, the Research Integrity Advisor should explain to the person that it may not be possible to make an anonymous allegation. The Research Integrity Advisor may assist the person in preparing their allegation. The Research Integrity Advisor must declare to the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity, and if applicable the Executive Dean and/or the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research), their involvement as an Advisor.

3. Allegations of a possible breach or possible research misconduct may be received in writing, including email, by the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity.

4. The Director, Research Ethics and Integrity should make an assessment of whether the allegation:

   a. relates to a possible breach;
   
   b. relates to biosafety or the ethical conduct of research approved by a Macquarie University Ethics Committee;
   
   c. relates to possible research misconduct;
   
   d. relates to matters other than research;
   
   e. relates to a matter that should be dealt with under the Reporting Wrongdoing: Public Interest Disclosures Policy;
f. is frivolous, vexatious or mischievous; or

g. contains insufficient information, and more information is required in order to assess the nature of the allegation.

5. Where the assessment in section 20.4 concludes that the allegation relates to a possible breach, the process outlined in section 21 should be followed.

6. Where the assessment in section 20.4 concludes that the allegation relates to biosafety or the ethical conduct of research, the process outlined in section 22 should be followed.

7. Where the assessment in section 20.4 concludes that the allegation relates to possible research misconduct, the process outlined in section 23 should be followed.

8. Where the assessment in section 20.4 concludes that the allegation relates to matters other than research, the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity should refer the allegation to the appropriate department or office and inform the complainant about the status of their allegation. For example, matters of staff harassment or discrimination may be referred to Human Resources, matters of workplace safety may be referred to Health and Safety, or HDR candidate related matters may be referred to the Higher Degree Research Office.

9. Where the assessment in section 20.4 concludes that the allegation relates to a matter that should be dealt with under the Reporting Wrongdoing: Public Interest Disclosures Policy, the Reporting Wrongdoing: Public Interest Disclosures Procedure must be followed.

10. Where the assessment in section 20.4 concludes that the allegation is frivolous, vexatious or mischievous the allegation should be dismissed. The Director, Research Ethics and Integrity should notify the complainant that their allegation has been dismissed and outline the reasons for dismissal. If the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity forms the opinion that it is appropriate, the complainant should be referred to the appropriate university disciplinary process or the police.

11. Where the assessment in section 20.4 concludes that there is insufficient information to properly assess the nature of the allegation the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity should ask the complainant to provide further information. If the allegation has been made anonymously the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity may decide not to proceed with an investigation.

12. The Director, Research Ethics and Integrity should consider the suitability of briefing the Marketing Unit so that they are informed in the event of a media inquiry. Consideration should also be given to the suitability of briefing Human Resources.

21. Investigation and Resolution of a Possible Breach

1. Where an allegation relates to a possible breach, the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity should refer the allegation to the relevant Executive Dean in writing. If the respondent is not a member of a faculty, the allegation should be referred to the relevant Head of Office who assumes the role of the Executive Dean in this process.

2. In the event that the Executive Dean or Head of Office is party to the allegation, the matter should be referred to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research).
3. The Executive Dean may appoint a delegate to deal with the allegation in the first instance. If appointed, the delegate must declare any conflicts of interest, such as having provided advice, to either the complainant or the respondent, relating to the subject of the allegation. The delegate may be a staff member with suitable authority, knowledge and experience, such as an Associate Dean (Research), an Associate Dean (Higher Degree Research) or a Head of Department.

4. The delegate should review the evidence in the allegation and may seek further information from the complainant.

5. The delegate should make an assessment of the allegation, and may consult with the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity, to decide whether:
   a. there is a prima facie case for a possible breach; or
   b. that no breach has occurred.

6. Where the assessment in section 5 concludes that no breach has occurred, the delegate should inform both the complainant and respondent of their decision in writing. A copy of the decision should be forwarded to the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity.

7. Where the assessment in section 5 concludes that a possible breach has occurred:
   a. The delegate should write to the respondent outlining their view of the possible breach, then meet with the respondent to discuss the possible breach.
   b. At the meeting the respondent should be given a reasonable opportunity to respond to the details of the allegation, as well as an opportunity to provide a written response no later than five days following the meeting.
   c. Following the response the delegate will determine and advise the respondent if the view originally formed is still valid, and if so what improvements are required to prevent any further breaches. The delegate may seek advice to decide on suitable actions for improvement.
   d. Where reasonable, the respondent should be provided with training and/or professional development.
   e. The respondent will be given a reasonable period of time, not normally more than three months, to improve in those areas identified as being necessary.

8. The respondent is entitled to be accompanied to any meeting by a support person; however, there should not be legal representation. The respondent and their support person may withdraw to consult if required. The support person may participate in the meeting but may not answer for the respondent.

9. At the end of the period specified in section 7.e the delegate will meet with the respondent and review their performance. Following that review:
   a. where the delegate determines that the work of the respondent no longer constitutes a breach, it will be recorded and no further action will be taken. Copies of the decision will be provided to the respondent and to the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity; or
b. where the delegate determines that the work of the respondent continues to constitute a breach, the delegate will:
   i. make a report to the relevant Executive Dean within five working days of meeting with the respondent; and
   ii. provide a copy of the report to the respondent and to the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity.

10. If at any time during the process the Executive Dean or their delegate determines that all aspects of the respondent’s work no longer constitute a breach, the Executive Dean or their delegate will inform the respondent in writing that the breach has been resolved and no further action will be taken. A copy of the decision will be provided to the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity.

11. Where the delegate forwards a report to the Executive Dean, the respondent may provide a written response to the Executive Dean. Any response by the respondent must be provided within five working days of the respondent receiving the report specified in section 21.9.b.

12. The Executive Dean:
   a. will review the report and any response from the respondent;
   b. may seek further information from the respondent or the delegate regarding the report or the response from the respondent; and
   c. will, if requested by the respondent, seek input from up to three colleagues nominated by the respondent in the Faculty or Office in which the respondent works, and give them a reasonable opportunity to provide such input.

13. Having regard to the report and any further information obtained in the process referred to in section 21.12, the Executive Dean will either:
   a. refer the matter back to the delegate for a further review period, which, depending on the circumstances shall not normally be more than three months, with directions to which the delegate must comply before the matter is referred back to the Executive Dean to be dealt with under this sub clause; or
   b. determine that all aspects all aspects of the respondent’s work no longer constitute a breach and no further action will be taken. The Executive Dean will provide a report in writing to the respondent, the delegate and Director, Research Ethics and Integrity; or
   c. refer the matter to the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity as a case of possible research misconduct.

14. If at any time during the process outlined in section 21 the delegate or the Executive Dean forms the opinion that there is a prima facie case of possible research misconduct, or that there is a risk of corporate exposure, the matter should be referred to the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity.

15. The delegate, in consultation with the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity and/or the Executive Dean, should consider if, in order to reduce the likelihood of future breaches:
a. training for the department’s or faculty’s researchers is required; and/or
b. new or modified processes for the department or faculty are required.

22. **Investigation of an Allegation Relating to Biosafety or the Ethical Conduct of Research Approved by a Macquarie University Ethics Committee**

1. Where an allegation relates to biosafety or the ethical conduct of research approved by a Macquarie University Ethics Committee, the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity should refer the allegation to the chair of the appropriate committee in writing.

2. The Biosafety or Ethics Committee should conduct an inquiry into the matters raised in the allegation at the soonest practical time, in accordance with the terms of reference for that Committee.

3. The Committee inquiry may only make findings of fact in relation to the allegation. It may not determine if a breach or research misconduct has occurred.

4. The Committee inquiry should provide a written report to the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity.

23. **Investigation of Possible Research Misconduct**

1. Where an allegation relates to possible research misconduct, the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity should refer the allegation to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) in writing.

2. In the event that the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) is a party to the allegation, the Vice-Chancellor should appoint another person to follow the procedure outlined.

3. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) may consult with the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity, the Higher Degree Research Office and Human Resources when considering the most appropriate response to the allegation.

4. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) may respond to the allegation by:
   a. Advising the relevant Department or Faculty in an appropriate course of action and review process.
   b. Establishing an internal inquiry into the allegation.
   c. Establishing an external inquiry into the allegation.
   d. Determining that the allegation is frivolous, vexatious or mischievous.

5. Where the allegation of possible research misconduct relates to the conduct of a student or HDR candidate the matter should be dealt with via an internal inquiry unless other direction is given by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research).
6. The parties to the allegation should be notified promptly in writing of the course of action to be taken by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research). A copy of this correspondence should be forwarded to the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity.

7. If necessary, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) should take all appropriate actions to secure all relevant documents and evidence relating to the allegation.

8. The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research) should consider the need to notify relevant parties of the existence of allegations, and take appropriate actions. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) should consider the risk to the University, others associated with the research and any reporting obligations. A non-exhaustive list of potential relevant parties is included in section 29.

9. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) may notify the Director, Human Resources, of the course of action to be taken, and if appropriate provide any necessary information to Human Resources.

10. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) may notify the Director, Higher Degree Research Office of the course of action to be taken, and if appropriate provide any necessary information to the Higher Degree Research Office.

11. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) should consider briefing the Marketing Unit so that they are informed in the event of a media inquiry.

24. An Internal Institutional Research Misconduct Inquiry

1. If the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) determines that the allegations should be referred to an Internal Institutional Research Misconduct Inquiry (Internal Institutional RMI), s/he will appoint an Internal Institutional RMI in accordance with section 2. The Internal Institutional RMI will convene within 15 working days of its appointment.

2. The Internal Institutional RMI will comprise at least three persons, one of whom shall be appointed the Chair by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research). The panel will:
   a. consist of at least one member with knowledge and experience in the relevant field of research;
   b. consist of at least one member who is familiar with the responsible conduct of research;
   c. consist of at least one member who has experience on similar panels, or has relevant experience or expertise;
   d. be comprised of either, exclusively Macquarie University staff or a combination of Macquarie University staff and external members. It shall not however be exclusively external members;
   e. for HDR candidate matters, consist of the Director, Higher Degree Research Office and the Dean, Higher Degree Research and at least one other member;
f. where the matter relates to research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, include at least one member with relevant experience and knowledge of research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples; and

g. declare any relevant expert knowledge held by members of the panel to the respondent.

3. The terms of reference of the Internal Institutional RMI are to report on the facts relating to the alleged research misconduct and any mitigating circumstances raised by the respondent in their response to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research). The Internal Institutional RMI is to make a finding of fact to determine if there has been a failure to comply with The Macquarie Code.

4. During the proceedings of the inquiry the respondent is entitled to be accompanied to any meeting by a support person; however, there should not be legal representation. The respondent and their support person may withdraw to consult if required. The support person may participate in the meeting but may not answer for the respondent.

5. If, during the course of an inquiry, the Internal Institutional RMI discovers that the potential extent of the allegations are more serious than originally thought it should provide an interim report to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research). The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) may choose to disband the internal inquiry and establish an external inquiry.

6. The inquiry will follow the process set out in section 26.

25. An External Independent Research Misconduct Inquiry

1. If the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) determines that the allegations should be referred to an External Independent Research Misconduct Inquiry (External Independent RMI), s/he will appoint an External Independent RMI in accordance with section 2. The External Independent RMI will convene within 20 working days of its appointment.

2. The External Independent RMI will comprise at least three persons, one of whom shall be appointed the Chair by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research). The panel will:

   a. consist of at least one member who is legally qualified or has extensive experience as a member of a tribunal or similar body.

   b. consist of at least one member who has knowledge and research experience in a relevant, related field of research, but not directly in the research area of the allegations.

   c. where the matter relates to research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, include at least one member with relevant experience and knowledge of research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

   d. not include members who are employed by Macquarie University, have current or recent dealings with Macquarie University, or otherwise be subject to a reasonable perception of bias.

   e. declare any relevant expert knowledge held by members of the panel to the respondent. Experts in the research field should be called as witnesses to the inquiry, not as panel
members. This will allow the person to be questioned by both the panel and the respondent.

3. The terms of reference of the External Independent RMI are to report on the facts relating to the alleged research misconduct and any mitigating circumstances raised by the respondent in their response to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research). The External Independent RMI is to make a finding of fact to determine if there has been a failure to comply with The Macquarie Code.

4. The External Independent RMI should be assisted by a legally qualified person acting as ‘counsel assisting’. The role of counsel assisting is to prepare the material to be put to the inquiry and to question the witnesses on behalf of the panel. The counsel assisting is not a member of the inquiry panel but may provide the panel with legal advice during the hearing. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) may appoint a suitably qualified university staff member or an external person as counsel assisting. However, counsel assisting should not be the University General Counsel.

5. The respondent is entitled to engage their own legal representation during the inquiry.

6. The University may appoint a representative who may attend interviews conducted by the inquiry, but is not a member of the panel.

7. The respondent and the University’s representative may attend all interview conducted by the inquiry.

8. The inquiry panel may provide the respondent and the University’s representative with an opportunity to ask questions of interviewees whose interview they attend.

9. Whether the hearings of an External Independent RMI are open to the public or conducted in private should be determined by the panel itself on the basis of public interest. The panel has the responsibility to hear the views of all parties on this matter before such a decision is made.

10. The Inquiry will follow the process set out in section 26.

26. The Research Misconduct Inquiry Process

1. The inquiry will:

   a. allow the respondent a reasonable opportunity to attend an interview and provide him/her the opportunity to respond to the allegations;

   b. make all reasonable efforts to interview any person, and review any evidence, it thinks fit to establish the facts of the particular case;

   c. provide the respondent and the University with a reasonable opportunity to make submissions and present evidence to the inquiry;

   d. conduct the investigation as expeditiously as possible consistent with the requirements of this procedure;
e. take into account other material or information it believes is relevant to the case;

f. declare any conflicts of interest that may arise immediately to the panel and as soon as practical to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) in writing. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) should then consider the best course of action to manage the conflict of interest;

g. if it forms the opinion that a matter relates to a matter that should be dealt with under the Reporting Wrongdoing: Public Interest Disclosures Policy, follow the Reporting Wrongdoing: Public Interest Disclosures Procedure; and

h. keep a record of proceedings.

2. Prior to finalising their report the inquiry will provide the respondent with an opportunity to examine, comment upon and seek amendments to the inquiry’s draft report. The respondent shall be given a period of five days from receiving the draft report to provide comment. The report may be modified by agreement between the panel and the respondent, or the report may stand and be accompanied by any written rebuttal or observations the respondent may wish to make; and

3. Once finalised, the inquiry will provide a report of its findings and a copy of proceedings to the respondent, complainant and to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) within ten working days of completion of the proceedings. A copy should also be forwarded to the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity.

27. Subsequent Actions on Completion of an Inquiry

1. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) will review the findings of the inquiry panel and:
   a. advise the relevant Office, Department or Faculty in an appropriate course of action and review process;
   b. make a recommendation to the Higher Degree Research Office;
   c. make a recommendation to Human Resources to consider appropriate actions; or
   d. dismiss the original allegations on the grounds that there was no research misconduct.

2. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) will advise the respondent, complainant and the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity of his/her decision in 27.1 in writing.

3. The respondent, complainant or the University may appeal against the inquiry on the basis of procedural matters in writing to the Chair, Academic Senate following the procedures set out in section 30.

4. Where allegations are shown to be unfounded, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) should consider if there is a need to reinstate the good reputation of the accused researcher and their associates, and take appropriate action.
5. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research), in consultation with the Director, research Ethics and Integrity and/or the relevant Dean, should consider if, in order to reduce the likelihood of future breaches or research misconduct:
   a. training for the department’s or faculty’s researchers is required; and/or
   b. new or modified processes for the department or faculty are required.

6. The Director, Research Ethics and Integrity, should consider the need to notify relevant parties of the outcome of the inquiry process and take appropriate action. A non-exhaustive list of potential relevant parties is included in section 29.

28. Record Keeping

1. Records must be kept of all steps in this process.

2. Copies of all records must be provided to the Director, Research Ethics and Integrity in a timely manner.

3. The Director, Research Ethics and Integrity is responsible for maintaining a record of all alleged breach, ethical, biosafety and research misconduct processes.

4. The Director, Research Ethics and Integrity should consider making suitably redacted information available to the public via sources such as the University website.

29. Notification of Parties

1. The administration of the arrangements discussed above should be open, transparent, inclusive, timely and honest. Listed below are typical stakeholders who should be kept informed at various stages of the process. It may not be necessary, or indeed appropriate to always contact all of these parties, but it should be considered. This list is not exhaustive.

   a. All the members of the respondent research team (and supervisory team for HDR candidate research);
   b. The source of the complaint/allegation;
   c. The relevant Head of Department or Head of Office;
   d. The relevant Executive Dean;
   e. The funding body;
   f. The relevant ethics and/or biosafety committee;
   g. The site or the body with duty of care/governance responsibilities relevant to the research;
   h. Any clinical trials associated with the research;
i. The editor/contact for where the research outputs have been published/reported;

j. Any regulatory body with direct interest in the project/complaint; and

k. Any research participants directly affected by the dispute.

2. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) should consider the public interest when dealing with the media. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) may consult with the inquiry panel when preparing information for the media. If a statement is made to the media during an inquiry a similar statement should be made at the conclusion of the inquiry detailing the findings of the inquiry, whether or not the allegations were substantiated. These media releases should be made available on the University website.

30. Appeals

1. An appeal is valid only if it is made in accordance with these appeal procedures and demonstrates to the Chair, Academic Senate that the published *Investigation of Possible Research Misconduct* process was not followed in relation in the relevant case and that this failure had a material effect on the findings of the inquiry.

2. An appeal on the basis of procedural matters may be lodged following the receipt of the final report and proceedings from the inquiry at section 26.3.

3. An appeal may be lodged up to ten working days following the date of receiving the report and proceedings from the inquiry.

4. An appeal may be lodged by the respondent, the complainant or the University.

5. An appeal must detail in writing the reasons that may demonstrate that the inquiry failed to follow the procedures set down, that this failure had a material effect on the findings of the inquiry, and that, as a consequence, the inquiry should be reconvened.

6. Appeals must be lodged in writing to the Chair, Academic Senate.

7. The Chair, Academic Senate may:
   a. consider appeals against the *Investigation of Possible Research Misconduct* process;
   b. receive from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) the report and proceedings of the inquiry panel;
   c. request written statements from the applicant, Chair of the inquiry panel and any other person he/she considers relevant to the conduct of the appeals process;
   d. review all documentation submitted to the him/her;
   e. determine whether or not the University’s procedures were followed in each case;
   f. make a written determination to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research), giving reasons as to why the appeal is to be:
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i. dismissed; or

ii. upheld.

8. If the appeal is upheld the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) may either refer the case back to the original inquiry panel to be reheard, or establish a new inquiry panel to hear the case following the procedures in section 23.

9. The parties also have the right to appeal to the Australian Research Integrity Committee in accordance with the Australian Research Integrity Committee Framework (2011).
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Foreword – DVC Research

Our futures are unscripted; however, what is certain is that tomorrow is shaped by yesterday and today. Our individual and collective histories, our emerging new ideas enthused by the unquenchable inventiveness of the human spirit, and our present choices and actions will sculpt our future world that we will be leaving to the next generations. In a way, hindsight and foresight give us insight so that the past and the future are ever present.

Macquarie University has an enviable reputation for research excellence and achievement. While the extent of its achievements belie the University’s youthfulness, they are an accurate reflection of the agility and audacity we have shown over the first 50 years of our history. In a variety of fields, our researchers have led or contributed to world-leading research with world-changing impact. Despite the strength of our current research reputation and historic achievements, Macquarie’s research future depends upon our ability to adapt, modify and focus our research efforts. The Research Framework will call on us to pursue the ideal of World-Leading Research; World-Changing Impact.

The Research Framework will provide key objectives, goals, targets and supporting strategies designed to realise the research vision of the University, identified in A Framing of Futures as “an accelerating and impactful performance in discovery”. Although your feedback is welcomed on all aspects of the Green Paper, I am especially interested in securing your constructive thoughts, ideas and suggestions around the targets, the supporting strategies and the research Themes and Streams as currently framed.

This Green Paper is intended to spark your imagination and generate collegial discussion and I encourage all staff to engage with it and to provide input and feedback that will inform the development of the final Research Framework. To this end, please use this online template to send feedback to your Faculty’s Associate Deans: Research or their equivalents in ASAM and the MGSM. They will be able to address any questions you may have, and will consult with other Faculty stakeholders such as the Associate Deans: Higher Degree Research and Executive Deans, before collating Faculty-endorsed feedback for further consideration by the Working Group. Staff located outside of the University’s six academic units, should use the template to direct feedback to Tori Hocking in the office of the DVC: Research.

The last day to provide feedback is Thursday 31 July 2014.
Finally, I would like to acknowledge the tremendous efforts of the team responsible for the development of this Green Paper. The Working Group comprised: Associate Deans of Research (and their equivalents in ASAM and the MGSM); Faculty Research Managers; the Director of the Research Office; Dean and Associate Deans HDR; Faculty HDR Managers; the Director, Research Training and International Research Training Partnerships; the Director of Strategic Planning; and the Executive Officer: DVCRO.

I look forward to receiving your feedback and using it to shape a Research Framework we can all be proud of.

_Sakkie Pretorius_
_Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Research_
A Framing of Futures

Imagining what the future might hold can help us to engage with it, stretch our minds and dream of sheer possibility. Visualising and framing different futures in our minds allow us to better prepare for the disguised wonders and challenges when they are waiting over the far horizons, only to show up on our doorstep the next day.

Sometimes we patiently await tomorrow’s inventions and innovations to provide solutions to today’s urgent global challenges; other times the future trickles into our daily lives without warning or fanfare. Sometimes these innovations arrive unannounced and noisily on our doorsteps and disrupt our lives; other times the tectonic shifts caused by inventions are too large to bring into focus.

Macquarie University has always sought to be innovative and distinctive. A Framing of Futures provides the basis for our continued ascendant differentiation, specifically calling for “an accelerating and impactful performance in discovery”. The draft Macquarie Research Framework: World-Leading Research; World-Changing Impact, represents one of a series of Portfolio statements under development that will support the vision outlined in A Framing of Futures, by setting a clear strategic direction for the University to achieve its research ambitions over the next ten years.

It identifies five future-shaping priorities for multi-disciplinary research aligned with the national research agenda, major global challenges, and our areas of current and emerging research strength\(^1\). It also lists key objectives, goals, targets and supporting strategies to help us advance these priorities.

Although the draft Research Framework outlines a University-wide approach to achieving world-leading research with world-changing impact, it will, of course, be the talent and drive of our people in the Faculties, Departments and Offices that will truly determine our success.

Our Research Foundations

Research, and research-enriched teaching and learning, are what makes a university. Through its research, a university enacts its commitment to society. Almost all innovations in the world, from healthcare, education, law and psychology through primary industry, engineering and IT to economic policy and creative arts, have been moulded by university research. Research solves problems, extends horizons, advances technology and changes lives.

\(^1\) For the purposes of the Research Framework, areas of current and emerging research strength include: fields (ERA) rated ‘at or above world standard’; areas of concentrated excellence such as our ARC Centres of Excellence; and areas defined by the Faculties as fields in which Macquarie wishes to build research strength and described as the research themes and streams that support the Future-shaping Research Priorities (refer page 11)
50 Years of Research
Macquarie University has always been an ambitious and dynamic place to undertake research. As we celebrate our 50th anniversary in 2014, members of the Macquarie community can take pride in ground-breaking research achievements across a broad range of disciplines. In line with our anniversary celebrations, Macquarie will soon publish a book identifying our fifty most important contributions to research with world-changing impact. We can confidently say Macquarie’s research foundations are deep and provide a strong platform for accelerated growth and performance as we look toward our 60th year in 2024.

Our Current Research Performance
Many of our past research achievements put us in a strong position today:

- Macquarie has twenty-three researchers who have authored at least one research paper that is currently in the top 1% of cited papers in the world (ESI 2013) and four researchers who have recently been recognised as among the world’s “most influential scientific minds” (Thomson Reuters 2014).

- Macquarie is the host of, or has a major role in, five Australian Research Council Centres of Excellence. We participate in a further ten National Research Centres (including two Co-operative Research Centres) and have seventeen University Research Centres and ten Faculty Research Centres.

- With 85% of our broad fields of research rated ‘at or above world standard’ in ERA 2012, we are well positioned to have 95% rated at an equivalent standard by 2024. We will achieve this by continuing to build on our current and emerging areas of research strength and by increasingly directing our discovery toward national and global challenges of significance.

- Macquarie University has achieved a rating of 5 QS Stars, including the maximum rating in all of the eight major sub-categories (one of only five Australian Universities to achieve this).

- We are ranked 5th in Australia for collaboration in terms of the proportion of international collaborative publications (CWTS Leiden Ranking); and within the top 3 universities in Australia with regard to the number of peer reviewed publications produced per academic staff member.

- Our multi-disciplinary research focus has gained significant momentum and achieved great success in recent years following the establishment of Concentrations of Research Excellence. We expect the successful concentrations to be built upon as we align our discovery with the five foundational multi-disciplinary future-shaping research priorities, outlined on page 11.

- Macquarie has been highly innovative in research training: as the first university in Australia to establish a two-year research degree as the standard pathway to Higher
Degree Research, Macquarie is championing quality improvement in research training that is the envy of the Australian higher education sector. Macquarie is also the national leader in cotutelle and joint PhD study, adding an important international dimension to our HDR experience.

By all these measures, Macquarie is on track to becoming one of Australia’s leading research universities.

We are however, underperforming in terms of research income; in 2012 Macquarie was ranked 12th, 29th, 19th and 25th for Category 1, 2, 3 and 4 funding respectively and 20th for total research income. To facilitate investment in truly world-leading research performance with world-changing impact we must strive to triple our research income over the next ten years. Research funding is not only about numbers, however. Strong investment means our research can be more adventurous, more sustained and more impactful. With better levels of funding, research teams can be bigger, better equipped and more mobile. Funding means more opportunities for researchers, colleagues and students. It makes more possible.

**Macquarie’s Advantages**

Our location adjacent to Macquarie Park, a nationally significant research and business centre, specialising in the communications, medical research, pharmaceutical and IT&T sectors, affords us the opportunity to build effective and long term collaborations with business and industry including some of the world’s leading multinationals. Our proven ability to build unique research concentrations that bring together end-users, suppliers, policy makers, and basic and applied researchers is a competitive advantage we seek to maintain and further exploit.

Our research foundations are further strengthened by virtue of being the only Australian University to own its land. This affords us the advantage of being able to leverage the value of our land holdings to invest in capital whilst possessing the space on which to build new infrastructure.

We are also the only Australian University with its own hospital. Macquarie University Hospital and The Australian School of Advanced Medicine (ASAM) work together to conduct research into clinical best practice. Much of their research is based on the concept of ‘translational research’, a process of adapting scientific discoveries to practical improvements in patient care.

Finally, Macquarie hosts The Australian Hearing Hub, uniting researchers, educators, clinicians and innovators with expertise in audiology, speech pathology, cognitive and language sciences, psychology, nano-fabrication and engineering sciences. With the world-leading Cochlear organisation located on campus, the Australian Hearing Hub is well positioned to be a global leader in hearing related research.
The Changing Research Environment

The environment for research-intensive universities is increasingly challenging. The competition for the best talent and resources is global and fierce. Australia has emerged as a participant on the international stage of research intensive institutions. With Macquarie’s strong record of international collaboration in research and research training, we should now see ourselves on the international stage. We should look beyond comparing ourselves with other Australian universities. To improve, we need to see ourselves in relation to the best in the world – often universities with far longer histories of research excellence, extensive networks of alumni and investors, and far greater resources at their disposal. Many will be located in countries that are investing heavily in people and infrastructure for the sole purpose of developing higher education and research excellence.

Today, a large part of our research funding is cross-subsidised from teaching revenues. With increasing pressure on student fees, it is crucial that we secure alternative funding sources from industry, business, philanthropic sources or international schemes and partners.

Of course the same challenges are being faced by every Australian university and they will all be mobilising their strategies and resources towards targeting these alternative funding sources. For Macquarie to succeed in this increasingly competitive environment, it must optimise its natural opportunities such as the land it holds and its position within Macquarie Park, and create unique and differentiating opportunities that are outside the traditional mould for universities.

World-Leading Research; World-Changing Impact

Macquarie is already achieving a lot, but the drive of researchers is always to improve the quality and extend the influence of their work. We must accelerate world-leading research performance and continue to raise the standard of our research. All Macquarie researchers should aim to have their work recognised as at least ‘at or above world standard’ (ERA 3 or 4). Together we can increase the number of broad fields of research rated as ‘well above world standard’ (ERA 5). We must also attract and retain top performing staff, thus creating an inspiring and dynamic collegiate environment. We must diversify our funding sources and increase our research income three-fold in order to facilitate investment in the acceleration of our performance, thus expanding the scope and impact of our work.

We must prepare world-ready higher degree research candidates and continue to attract and retain candidates of the highest quality and potential. Our supervision must be outstanding, inspirational and unrivalled. We must embed our higher degree research candidates in areas of current and emerging strength and provide them with real-world engagement opportunities and personally enriching experiences. Our degrees should be internationally aligned and globally relevant.

We must become a world-recognised research collaborator of choice and engage strategically with local, national and international partnerships to complement and enhance our areas of current and emerging research strength. We must underpin our collaborations
with deep and authentic relationships, built on mutually beneficial and long-term engagement. We must pursue shared goals with end-users to show our commitment to solving society’s problems and improving lives. Our communication needs to be swift and our processes for managing both contracts and projects need to be streamlined, simple and focussed on outcomes.

We must deliver research with world-changing impact and align our discoveries with national and global challenges of significance. This will entail a strengthening of our basic research capability to drive discovery and underpin innovation, while also optimising the opportunities for inquiry across disciplines. We will foster an environment that values diverse forms of knowledge creation, application, and creative output. The pursuit of research that makes a significant and measurable contribution to national and international productivity and wellbeing needs to be relentless and is critical to our success as a research intensive university.

The University is on the threshold of a quantum leap in its research culture. Researchers should be looking for more and different opportunities, including widening our focus from largely Australian Competitive Grant funding to other forms of research income. We need to become better at identifying opportunities, facilitating collaborative engagement, and rewarding impactful discoveries. We need to ensure our operational plans are strongly aligned with, and directly connected to, our strategic endeavours, with clear KPIs, assigned accountabilities and robust performance monitoring and feedback.

The targets set out in this Research Framework are intentionally stretch, but realistic and achievable if we are prepared to step up and rise to the challenges. Failure to engage and change, in the context of our increasingly competitive, impact-driven and global research environment is simply not an option in Macquarie’s A Framing of Futures.

This Framework challenges Macquarie, by 2024 to: almost double our HDR commencements (to >900); triple our research income (to >$150M); more than double our HERDC Publications (to >5,000); and increase the percentage of broad fields of research rated ‘at or above world-standard’ from 85% to 95% (see Appendix A). Such results could see Macquarie ranked in Australia’s top 6 universities and among the top 150 world-wide.

Our end-goal is not to be amongst the highest ranked universities in Australia or the world, but if Macquarie succeeds in its aim to deliver world-leading research with world-changing impact, it is logical that top rankings will follow. Although we may face head-winds and unforeseen events along the journey, an unwavering commitment to this research ideal, will enable us to successfully navigate our course to international recognition for research excellence across a broad range of fields.
Purpose and Outline of the Research Framework

The Research Framework will be a broad, guiding ‘touchstone’ which aims to inform the development of Faculty and Department targets, plans and initiatives. The Framework is not prescriptive, it lays the groundwork for the University to build its research capacity and quality but will remain a ‘living’ and flexible document, able to be adapted as new opportunities and challenges arise.

Framework Architecture

The draft Framework comprises a cascading set of long-term key objectives; goals; targets; and supporting strategies designed to guide the development of KPIs for Executive Deans, Associate Deans, and Heads of Department.

Importantly, the Framework is designed to develop an inspiring and integrated set of overarching and multi-disciplinary, research priorities, focussed on shaping our academic and social future. A focussed set of research themes and streams will support these priorities by guiding and driving the ‘bottom-up’ development of strategically aligned research projects and programs.

Future-shaping Research Priorities

A broad cross-section of Macquarie researchers has worked to develop these five multi-disciplinary research priorities (see next page) together with the key objectives, goals and targets. They provide a focal point for multi-disciplinary research that is aligned with the national research agenda, global challenges of significance and our areas of current and emerging research strength.

Our desire is to focus our multi-disciplinary research effort on being the best in a select range of areas and to build scale, critical mass and a reputation that will further attract world-class researchers, collaborators and funding support. Macquarie’s research investment decisions will be heavily weighted towards these five Future-shaping Research Priorities.

The challenges faced by the world today are complex and interrelated and require bold thinking and the discovery and application of new knowledge. The complexity of the challenges requires sophisticated, holistic solutions that can only be achieved through the application of the combined expertise of a range of disciplines and multi-disciplinary teams. The development of world-changing applied research is only possible if it is sustained and underpinned by world-leading excellence in basic research.

Under the Research Framework, the University will continue to value, support and develop basic core disciplines from finance to philosophy and biology to education. We will harness this discipline-based, researcher-driven investigation and draw together its strengths around our future-shaping research priorities. A university can only build strong multi-disciplinary research if it has strong foundations across all disciplines.
The pursuit of multi-disciplinary research on the scale envisaged by this Research Framework is perhaps our greatest cultural change and challenge. Discipline depth and strength must co-exist with the emerging, accelerating and pervasive paradigm of multi-disciplinary research teams engaged on global challenges of significance.

The Research Framework’s five fundamental Future-shaping Research Priorities will be:

- **Healthy People**  
  Pioneering health, integrated healthcare and lifelong-learning for wellness in our ageing world
- **Resilient Societies**  
  Understanding cultures in our changing world and building ethical, just and inclusive communities
- **Prosperous Economies**  
  Strengthening economic productivity to promote prosperity in our diverse world
- **Secure Planet**  
  Sustaining our interdependent world and exploring our place in the universe
- **Innovative Technologies**  
  Advancing our interconnected world with frontier technologies, systems, designs and creative practice

A detailed overview of the Future-shaping Research Priorities, Research Themes and Streams is found at page 37.

**Our Key Research Objectives, Goals, Targets and Supporting Strategies**  
The diagram on the next page provides an overview of the key research objectives and specific goals underpinning the Macquarie Research Framework, together with the five future-shaping research priorities that guide the foundation multi-disciplinary research themes and streams.
Key Objective 1: Accelerate World-Leading Research Performance

Macquarie is fearlessly building its reputation as a world-leading, research intensive University. In order to accelerate world-leading research performance we need: top performing staff; world-leading research concentrations; expanding research investment; best practice systems and processes; and leading edge infrastructure.

Macquarie’s ability to attract and retain the very best researcher talent means having an outstanding value proposition that we can ‘live up to’ in practice, across the university. The research experience at Macquarie must be able to stand up against the very best experiences internationally if we are to attract and retain the best. We must establish a staffing profile in terms of the number of staff, their capability and capacity that can achieve our 2024 research targets.

Achieving a ‘step change’ in gender balance among our research community is fundamental to our ability to attract and retain top performing staff and must be part of our value proposition. Our policies, processes, opportunities and promotion guidelines need to facilitate the movement of women researchers through an academic career from early career researcher to Distinguished Professor or Laureate.

Accelerating world-leading research performance will require us to build on our current disciplinary areas of research strength and branch out boldly into targeted emerging areas of strength, whilst at the same time develop outstanding multi-disciplinary capability. The former will enable scale and reputation, whilst the latter will position us to address the grand and complex challenges of the world.

Building scale and attracting top performers will require growth in research investment. To facilitate world-leading research will require us to diversify our income sources and triple our income to $150m by 2024. While we are expecting an accelerated performance in medical and engineering research, and associated research income, we need to look beyond Category 1 funding sources for research income opportunities. This will include working closely with the Corporate Engagement and Advancement Portfolio to strengthen the philanthropic culture and practice across the university.

Macquarie must strive to continually improve its policies, processes and systems that support the pursuit of excellence and integrity in research and scholarship. This will entail investments in systems and technology to streamline and automate processes together with the continued development of a strong service oriented culture within our professional support teams.

Finally, with the scale of investment in buildings, infrastructure and equipment in neighbouring countries such as China far outstripping Australia’s, Macquarie needs to be smarter with its investments in space and equipment. Cutting edge equipment is costly and often beyond the ability of a researcher, a research group or even a University to fund. We need to collaborate on the investment, maintenance and usage of large pieces of equipment. Co-investment and shared usage, in addition to sharing costs, offers an array of opportunities for multi-disciplinary collaborations.
## KEY OBJECTIVE 1

Accelerate World-Leading Research Performance

## GOAL 1.1: Top-Performing Staff

*Increase the number and proportion of research-productive staff*

### TARGETS

| 1.1.1 | In the first instance, recruit 50 new Academic Level A-C over 2014-2016 into areas of research and/or teaching strength |
| 1.1.2 | Attract at least ten world-leading researchers and their teams (where the return on investment is clear) over a period of ten years |
| 1.1.3 | 100% of ‘Teaching and Research’ and ‘Research Only’ staff will be research productive |
| 1.1.4 | Achieve a ‘step change’ in gender balance among Academic staff across disciplines, roles and levels over the life of the ten year framework |

### Supporting Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Primary Accountability</th>
<th>Secondary Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish annual Faculty-specific research publication/output KPIs and associated action plans</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculties to submit business cases to secure new academics from the ‘VC’s academic investment pool’ for joint consideration by the DVCR and DVCA according to a specific criteria</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>DVC: R; DVC: A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculties to constantly scan world-leading research team opportunities and submit business cases to the DVCR for consideration</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>DVC: R; DVC: A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a new ‘research-productive’ standard in line with our aspirational 2024 research KPIs</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a long-term gender balance plan based on world’s best practice and link implementation to Faculty KPIs</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the University’s policies and processes governing eligibility of staff on short-term contracts to supervise HDR candidates and apply for competitive grant funding</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
<td>RO, HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to implement robust and effective induction processes for new researchers and research support staff</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Faculties, RO, HDRO, Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Early Career Researchers to publish early and effectively by providing support and advice about the scholarly communications landscape</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>RO, Library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## KEY OBJECTIVE 1

Accelerate World-Leading Research Performance

### GOAL 1.2: World-Leading Research Concentrations:

*Build on disciplinary areas of current and emerging research strength and enhance multi-disciplinary capability*

| TARGETS |  
|---------|--------------------------------------------------|
| **1.2.1** | 95% of our broad fields of research assessed under ERA as ‘at world-class level or above’ (with 50% at ERA 4 and 25% at ERA 5) |
| **1.2.2** | Achieve and maintain at least five Macquarie-led National Centres of Excellence or Research Programs (and participate in at least five national or international centres or programs) during the ten year research framework |
| **1.1.3** | Replicate the Australian Hearing Hub model (e.g., co-locating clinical services, industry, university researchers) in at least two multi-disciplinary areas during the life of the ten year framework |

### Supporting Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Strategies</th>
<th>Primary Accountability</th>
<th>Secondary Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculties to regularly identify National Centre of Excellence or Research Program leadership opportunities and submit internal funding proposals to secure planning support</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and seed-fund at least one research theme that has demonstrated the potential to be developed into a major research hub, along the lines of the Australian Hearing Hub</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KEY OBJECTIVE 1

Accelerate World-Leading Research Performance

GOAL 1.3: Growing Research Investment

Accelerate growth of external research income received to facilitate world-leading research

TARGETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.3.1</th>
<th>External research income of at least $150M by 2024, comprising:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cat. 1 &gt;$95 (e.g. ARC, NH&amp;MRC, RDC etc.);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cat. 2 &gt;$16m (e.g. State &amp; Local Gov’t. &amp; non-ACGR schemes etc.);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cat. 3 &gt;$37m (e.g. Grants &amp; contract research with Industry &amp; non Gov’t agencies; and donations, bequests and foundations); and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cat.4 &gt;$5m (e.g. Core-participant CRCs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supporting Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Accountability</th>
<th>Secondary Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish annual Faculty-specific external research income KPIs and associated action plans</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise the Internal Grant Scheme to align with the new external income targets</td>
<td>RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with Corporate Engagement and Advancement to create a Macquarie University Advancement Plan (including Alumni), to strengthen philanthropic culture and practice across the university and grow the University’s philanthropic revenue</td>
<td>DVC: CEA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## KEY OBJECTIVE 1

**Accelerate World-Leading Research Performance**

### GOAL 1.4: Pervasive Best Practice

*Continually improve policies, processes and systems that support the pursuit of excellence and integrity in research and scholarship*

### TARGETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4.1</td>
<td>Macquarie’s Research Integrity Framework will be aligned with best practice in the sector and will support and facilitate a pervasive ethical research culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.2</td>
<td>Macquarie will have a robust, accurate, accessible, up-to-date and integrated research data management and reporting system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.3</td>
<td>All core research administrative processes will be available on-line and will be automated and pre-populated where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.4</td>
<td>Continual improvement in researcher satisfaction with Offices in the DVC: Research Portfolio as measured by a biennial client satisfaction survey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supporting Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Primary Accountability</th>
<th>Secondary Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopt an educative and facilitative approach to research ethics and integrity, and appoint Research Integrity Advisors in each Faculty</td>
<td>Director, Research Ethics and Integrity Faculties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage the Business Process Improvement Initiative learnings and associated ‘lean thinking’ and apply this to core research support processes</td>
<td>RO, HDRO, Dean: HDR, OoC, Library DVC: R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake a comprehensive IT-enabling review to specify future core research support system requirements that guide future systems selection and implementation</td>
<td>Informatics DVC: R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a biennial on-line Research Portfolio client satisfaction survey</td>
<td>RO, HDRO, Dean: HDR, OoC DVC: R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KEY OBJECTIVE 1
Accelerate World-Leading Research Performance

GOAL 1.5: Leading Edge Infrastructure
Secure world-leading research infrastructure, facilities and equipment

TARGETS

1.5.1 Secure a state-of-the-art, purpose-built and iconic facility(s) in the areas of Science, Engineering and Biomedical Research during the first five years of the ten year framework

1.5.2 Upgrade, maintain and equip existing research facilities in all areas of research strength during the life of the ten year framework

1.5.3 Establish at least three ‘landmark’ infrastructure sharing collaborations during the life of the ten year framework

1.5.4 Lead at least two successful mega-infrastructure grants (NCRIS or equivalent) during the life of the ten year framework

1.5.5 Increase the number and value of successful ARC LIEF applications

Supporting Strategies

| Ensure that Macquarie’s capital plan prioritises and enables the development of the facilities sought | COO | DVC: R |
| Ensure that Macquarie’s capital and operational budgets provide for the appropriate upgrade and maintenance of existing research facilities | Property | COO, DVC: R |
| Faculties to identify the most critical infrastructure ‘gaps’ in areas of current and emerging research strength and: (i) constantly scan locally, nationally and globally for ‘landmark’ infrastructure sharing collaborations that possess a compelling business case for DVCR consideration; or (ii) explore with the DVCR the potential for mega-infrastructure grant potential; or (iii) explore with the DVCR the applicability and potential for ARC LIEF applications | Faculties | DVC: R |
**Key Objective 2: Prepare World-Ready Higher Degree Research Candidates**

In order to prepare truly world-ready research candidates we will: attract higher degree research candidates of the highest quality; provide unrivalled and inspirational supervision to each and every one of them; enable a transformative research experience; provide opportunities to engage with the real-world; offer internationally-aligned programs with global relevance; and support them with personally-enriching experiences and world-class support structures.

Macquarie has made great advances in its goal to provide a world-class HDR training experience with the introduction of the Master of Research. This has provided us with a decided edge in the Australian Higher Education Sector by being the only university in the country to require a 2-year research training program as the pathway to undertaking a PhD. This brings Macquarie into line with practices in Europe and North America and complements the structure of the Chinese undergraduate to HDR structure.

While this is one element of Macquarie University’s goal to produce world-ready Higher Degree Candidates, we propose to further enhance their experience at Macquarie by ensuring that most, if not all, candidates have the opportunity to be exposed to experiences external to the University. These may include student exchanges, undertaking a PhD under the cotutelle or joint PhD program, visiting the laboratories of international collaborators, being co-supervised by industry experts, attending presentations made by world-renowned researchers, or working with industry to solve real-world problems.

This Research Framework challenges us to improve on-time research candidate completions alongside increasing exposure to industry and international experiences. This can perhaps only be achieved if the Masters of Research and HDR programs are more purposefully and consciously seen as a truly integrated five year program.

To achieve the University’s ideal of world-leading research with world changing impact and to offer our higher degree research graduates the best possible experience, it is essential that we closely align our HDR cohort with our areas of current and emerging research strength. HDR candidates are the engine room of a University and a more conscious alignment of the University’s HDR cohort has the potential to significantly increase the University’s research outputs and impact.
KEY OBJECTIVE 2

Prepare World-Ready Higher Degree Research Candidates

GOAL 2.1: Attract Quality Candidates

Attract high-potential research candidates

TARGETS

| 2.1.1 | The proportion of successful HDR applicants achieving a scholarship rating of 4/5 or more increases annually |
| 2.1.2 | The percentage of Macquarie undergraduates transitioning to the Master of Research increases annually to an optimal level |
| 2.1.3 | At least 80% of those who achieve the highest results (>85%) in Year 2 of the Master of Research transition to a MQ PhD annually |
| 2.1.4 | Increase the number of highly ranked applicants receiving HDR scholarships in line with HDR load growth target |
| 2.1.5 | Increase the number of highly ranked applicants receiving scholarships from external sources |

Supporting Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Primary Accountability</th>
<th>Secondary Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish annual Faculty-specific external HDR Candidate load KPIs and associated action plans</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise the MQ scholarship scheme to more closely align scholarships to high quality candidates (i.e. consider establishing ‘Prestige’ scholarships)</td>
<td>HDRO</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise the scholarship rating criteria to better reflect the high performance of applicants from diverse fields</td>
<td>HDRO</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Marketing to strengthen the University’s strategies to attract high quality higher degree research candidates</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>HDRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage flexible offerings for the Master of Research</td>
<td>HDRO</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement two intake rounds annually for the Master of Research</td>
<td>HDRO</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish an articulation pathway into the Master of Research with external partners</td>
<td>HDRO</td>
<td>DVC: I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a consistent and regular monitoring mechanism to ensure early identification of ‘at risk’ candidates and provide support</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>HDRO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KEY OBJECTIVE 2

Prepare World-Ready Higher Degree Research Candidates

GOAL 2.2: Inspirational Supervision
Provide outstanding supervisory expertise and mentoring

TARGETS

2.2.1 Reduce higher degree research candidate attrition to less than 10% of annual commencements and reduce out of time completions to less than 5% of the cohort by 2018

2.2.2 Increase the proportion of theses that are ranked in the top 10% of HDR-level research worldwide as judged by examiners

2.2.3 Achieve continuous improvement in the scores from annual surveys of higher degree candidate experiences (eg: the external PREQ and the internal MQSEC-R) in relation to satisfaction with supervision

2.2.4 The number of supervisors on the Register increases annually, to meet projected HDR candidate load

2.2.5 The percentage of HDR candidates submitting theses by publication increases annually

Supporting Strategies

| Establish annual Faculty-specific HDR Candidate completion KPIs and associated action plans | Faculties | DVC: R |
| Expand supervision mentoring across the University in order to develop supervisory capacity and quality | Faculties | Human Resources |
| Revise the supervisor appointment policy to make better use of the range of supervisor categories | HDRO | DVC: R |
| Implement appropriate workload recognition that reflects the range of supervisor categories and situations (eg: cross-Faculty supervision) | Finance | DVC: R, DVC: A |
| Change the Faculty Funding Model to more accurately reflect the role of supervisors under all supervision models | Faculties | DVC: R, DVC: A |
| All eligible staff to maintain currency on the Macquarie University Supervisor Register (MQSR) | Faculties | HDRO |
| More effective use of confirmation of candidature and Annual Progress Reports by supervisors and Departments to evaluate progress towards achievement of on-time completions | Faculties | HDRO |
| Review and improve the Supervisor Enhancement Program | L&TC | Dean: HDR |
KEY OBJECTIVE 2

Prepare World-Ready Higher Degree Research Candidates

GOAL 2.3: Transformative Research Experience

Embed higher degree research candidates in areas of current and emerging strength

TARGETS

2.3.1 95% of higher degree research candidates embedded in areas of current and emerging strength

Supporting Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Primary Accountability</th>
<th>Secondary Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a program of workshops to encourage inter-disciplinary engagement among HDR candidates across the 5 years of the Master of Research and PhD</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>Dean: HDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate a proportion of scholarships to areas of current and emerging strength, which may include University and Faculty Research Centres and Centres of Excellence</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
<td>HDRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where possible align HDR candidate enrolment with a University or Faculty Research Centre or a Centre of Excellence</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>HDRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create opportunities for all higher degree research candidates to have exposure to areas and disciplines beyond their own discipline-specific field of research ensuring access to a critical mass of research productive staff and peers</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>Dean: HDR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## KEY OBJECTIVE 2

**Prepare World-Ready Higher Degree Research Candidates**

### GOAL 2.4: Real-World Engagement

*Provide opportunities for career-enhancing exposure to industry and the community*

### TARGETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4.1</th>
<th>At least one-third of our HDR candidates are actively involved with industry, government, community, or external research agencies (as indicated by projects, placements, industry publications or co-supervision arrangements)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2</td>
<td>Increase the percentage of research funding sourced from industry supported HDR scholarships, annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supporting Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Strategy</th>
<th>Primary Accountability</th>
<th>Secondary Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with the DVC: CEA and DVC: Academic to explore the potential of establishing a PACE style arrangement for MRes and HDR candidates</td>
<td>HDRO</td>
<td>DVC: CEA, DVC: A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and simplify the University’s policies and procedures around appointing external supervisors to supervisory panels</td>
<td>HDRO</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a program of workshops involving stakeholders from industry, government, community, or external research agencies for the purpose of developing career readiness for higher degree research candidates</td>
<td>Faculties, Dean: HDR</td>
<td>DVC: CEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish the position of Associate Dean: Engagement in each Faculty to facilitate external collaboration and entrepreneurship opportunities for higher degree research candidates</td>
<td>Executive, DVC: CEA</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KEY OBJECTIVE 2

Prepare World-Ready Higher Degree Research Candidates

GOAL 2.5: Global Champions
Provide internationally-aligned degrees with global relevance

TARGETS

2.5.1 Increase the percentage of higher degree research candidates having a recognised international experience annually (e.g., international exchanges, visits, visiting scholars at MQ, international conferences in Australia or overseas)

2.5.2 Increase the number of publications co-authored by higher degree research candidates and international colleagues

2.5.3 Increase the number of domestic higher degree research candidates undertaking a cotutelle or joint PhD program

Supporting Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Strategy</th>
<th>Primary Accountability</th>
<th>Secondary Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a Master of Research exchange program</td>
<td>HDRO</td>
<td>DVC: I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish the position of Associate Dean: International in each Faculty to facilitate international collaboration and mobility for higher degree research candidates</td>
<td>Executive, DVC: I</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of coursework student exchanges with international partners (on the basis that this will lead to an increase in the number of candidates undertaking outbound cotutelle arrangements)</td>
<td>DVC: A</td>
<td>DVC: I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align schemes such as OSP to encourage mobility of cotutelle and joint PhD supervisors</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>HDRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More effective use of higher degree research funding to facilitate international experiences for candidates</td>
<td>Faculties, HDRO</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KEY OBJECTIVE 2

Prepare World-Ready Higher Degree Research Candidates

GOAL 2.6: World-Class Support
*Provide personally-enriching experiences and enabling facilities, policies and processes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGETS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.6.1 Increase the percentage of HDR candidates participating in academic and career development programs annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.2 Increase the number of cotutelle and joint PhD candidates annually, as well as the percentage with recognised ‘Priority Partners’ (as identified in collaboration with the DVC: International)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.3 Increase the number of higher degree research candidate visits and exchanges with external partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.4 Continuous improvement in the scores from annual surveys of higher degree candidate experiences (eg: the external PREQ and the internal MQSEC-R) in relation to ‘overall satisfaction’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.5 Achieve annual improvements in turnaround times associated with administrative processes, particularly ‘application to offer’ and ‘thesis submission to completion’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supporting Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expand the scope of the HDR Learning Skills Program to foster real-world engagement and personal and career development</th>
<th>Dean: HDR</th>
<th>HDRO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streamline the University’s processes for international HDR candidate exchanges (eg: MRes exchanges, cotutelle and joint PhD programs)</td>
<td>HDRO</td>
<td>DCV: I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify opportunities for Macquarie University to participate in international consortia (eg: Idea Lab)</td>
<td>Faculties, Dean: HDR</td>
<td>DVC: R, DVC: CEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review administrative processes supporting MRes and HDR applications and thesis examination</td>
<td>HDRO</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review candidature management processes and policies, with a view to applying ‘lean thinking’ and improving the higher degree research candidate experience</td>
<td>Dean: HDR, HDRO</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the University’s implementation of, and compliance with, the space allocation model for higher degree research candidates</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>Dean: HDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise commonly used forms to achieve standardised, online, pre-populated documents that minimise duplication and streamline activity</td>
<td>HDRO</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Objective 3: Become a World-Recognised Research Collaborator of Choice

Macquarie's existing local, national and international partnerships have been largely underpinned by long-term relationships, trust, respect and the pursuit of mutual benefit. To maintain these existing relationships and truly become a world-recognised research collaborator of choice we must: more purposefully engage strategically; pursue deep and authentic collaborations; forge synergistic end-user partnerships; and facilitate efficient and effective partnerships through streamlined support processes.

We must take far greater advantage of the local Macquarie Park based industry participants and actively seek to understand how our current and emerging areas of research strength can derive mutual benefit. We must build on our National Research Centre positions of strength and more deliberately explore opportunities across industry and government where shared goals may exist. Internationally, we must focus our efforts around collaborators of real value and strength, building on existing partnerships and targeting new opportunities where long-term mutual benefit may be derived.

We must establish greater links with industry and undertake research that will be relevant to our industry partners. Macquarie must, however, continue to foster and value basic, blue-sky research on which applied research builds. Without the depth of research in the disciplines, we cannot hope to undertake high quality research across multiple disciplines. We must involve industry in the development of basic research earlier and more meaningfully in order to better recognise and advance opportunities to develop applications that otherwise may not have been thought of.
KEY OBJECTIVE 3

Become a World-Recognised Research Collaborator of Choice

GOAL 3.1: Strategic Engagement

Pursue local, national and international partnerships to complement and enhance areas of current and emerging research strength

TARGETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1.1</th>
<th>The number of formal, active and productive local partnerships linked to areas of current and emerging research strength increase annually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td>The number of formal, active and productive national partnerships linked to areas of current and emerging research strength increase annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3</td>
<td>The number of formal, active and productive international partnerships linked to areas of current and emerging research strength increase annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.4</td>
<td>Increase the number of publications co-authored with partners external to Macquarie University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.5</td>
<td>Increase the number of industry partners who are Adjuncts and supervise HDR candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.6</td>
<td>The value of consultancy income/contract research increases annually (based on an assessment of the top 15 new collaborations)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supporting Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Strategies</th>
<th>Primary Accountability</th>
<th>Secondary Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each Faculty to develop annual Strategic Engagement Plans, documenting their current (formal, active and productive) partnerships at a local, national and international level and outlining how these partnerships intend to be deepened and expanded in order to further complement current and emerging areas of research strength, for tabling and discussion with the DVC R</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>RO, DVC: R, DVC: CEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Faculty to annually nominate at least one new industry partner Adjunct, qualified and desirous of supervising HDR candidates in areas of current and emerging research strength</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>RO, DVC: R, DVC: CEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise the Internal Grant Scheme to align with an increasing focus on co-authorship with external partners</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide leading-edge information management infrastructure for areas of expertise and scholarly outputs that increases the exposure of Macquarie researchers to the potential collaborators, HDR candidates and the general public</td>
<td>Informatics</td>
<td>DVC: R, RO, Library, Faculties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## KEY OBJECTIVE 3

**Become a World-Recognised Research Collaborator of Choice**

### GOAL 3.2: Deep Authentic Collaborations

*Build mutually-beneficial, long-term engagement with institutional, national and international colleagues*

### TARGETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2.1</th>
<th>Increase the proportion of academic staff who co-author outputs with collaborators external to Macquarie University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>Increase the proportion of staff who are co-researchers on externally funded grant applications with collaborators external to Macquarie University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supporting Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Strategy</th>
<th>Primary Accountability</th>
<th>Secondary Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revise the Internal Grant Scheme to align with: (i) new co-authored publications with existing external collaborators; and (ii) new co-authored grant applications with existing external collaborators</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Faculty to regularly identify new target external collaborators that would clearly add medium to long-term value to Macquarie’s world-leading research; world-changing impact capacity and capability</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>DVC: R, DVC: CEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a framework that supports and encourages joint appointments between the University and industry</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>DVC: R, DVC: A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support outstanding academic staff and HDR candidates to submit competitive applications for Fellowships that support international mobility (eg: Endeavour, Rhodes, Humboldt, Fulbright)</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise OSP guidelines to encourage staff mobility and collaboration</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a template for MoUs that that includes an expectation of staff mobility from Macquarie University and the partner organisation</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
<td>DVC: I, Legal Counsel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KEY OBJECTIVE 3

Become a World-Recognised Research Collaborator of Choice

GOAL 3.3: Synergistic End-User Partnerships

Pursue shared goals with end-users to maximise delivery of solutions and return on investment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3.1</strong> Increase Cat 2 income by an average rate of 11% p.a. over the life of the ten year framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3.2</strong> Increase Cat 3 income by an average rate of 11% p.a. over the life of the ten year framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supporting Strategies**

| Collaborate with Corporate Engagement and Advancement to seek and secure strategically aligned corporate partnerships that offer the opportunity for synergistic research engagement. | DVC: CEA | DVC: R |
| Revise the Internal Grant Scheme to align with ‘proof of concept’ seed funding opportunities where a business case exists to accelerate potential end-user solutions | RO | DVC: R |
### KEY OBJECTIVE 3

**Become a World-Recognised Research Collaborator of Choice**

### GOAL 3.4: Streamlined Support

*Practice efficient and effective facilitation of research collaborations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGETS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.1</strong></td>
<td>We will halve our average contract turnaround time over the ten year life of the framework (based on an annual assessment of the top 15 new collaborations each year)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Strategies</th>
<th>Primary Accountability</th>
<th>Secondary Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undertake a targeted business process review, adopting ‘lean thinking’, of the core processes supporting collaborator contract development</td>
<td>RO, HDRO, Dean: HDR, OoC</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Objective 4: Deliver Research with World-Changing Impact

Multi-disciplinary research, essential to finding solutions to the challenges facing the world today and in the future, must be encouraged while recognising that our multi-disciplinary research can only be as strong as the fundamental, discipline-focussed research it draws from.

The vision for research at Macquarie emphasises above all our commitment to research excellence. Our research is shaped by many factors including the Australian Government’s Strategic Research Priorities, the nature of research funding, and the measures of research excellence. Most of our research, however, is discipline-based and is determined by the driving interests of individual researchers.

If we are going to engage in a more meaningful way with industry, we need to have in place resources and processes that will enhance and facilitate our ability to engage in a way that meets the needs of industry. We need to be highly visible, to have easily identifiable and navigable entry points, we need to be consistent and to build upon advances made. The end result will be an ever-increasing number of highly satisfied partners and more efficient, effective and streamlined processes.

To compete, prosper and to attract the funding that will enable world-leading research performance, we must strive to make a significant and measurable contribution to national and international productivity and well-being.
## KEY OBJECTIVE 4

### Deliver Research with World-Changing Impact

---

## GOAL 4.1: Discovery for Innovation
*Strengthen basic research capability to drive discovery and underpin innovation*

---

### TARGETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1</td>
<td>At least five ‘break-through’ discoveries recognised globally for their contribution to knowledge over the life of the framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2</td>
<td>At least five major patents, products, services or policy changes of global significance over the life of the framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Supporting Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Primary Accountability</th>
<th>Secondary Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculties to regularly identify the key research programs currently pursuing ‘break-through’ discoveries and/or seeking to contribute significantly to ‘break-through’ discoveries being achieved</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculties to regularly identify the key research programs where there is evidence of real potential for major patents, products, services or policy changes of global significance</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise the Internal Grant Scheme to align with research programs demonstrating evidence of real potential for major patents, products, services or policy changes of global significance</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the structure, responsibilities, targets and resourcing of the University’s Office of Commercialisation with a view to positioning Macquarie to transfer more discoveries to practical impacts</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a ‘Commercialisation pool’ of funding partially funded by the University’s share of proceeds from royalties and licenses to reinvest in the in the transfer of discoveries</td>
<td>Director: OoC</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GOAL 4.2: Multi-disciplinary Inquiry

*Optimise opportunities for inquiry across disciplines and organisational structures*

### TARGETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.2.1</th>
<th>95% of research activity assessed as directly linked to our future-shaping research priorities by the fifth year of the framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2</td>
<td>95% of research assessed as directly linked to areas of current and emerging research strength over the life of the ten year framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supporting Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Strategy</th>
<th>Primary Accountability</th>
<th>Secondary Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revise the Internal Grant Scheme to be strongly weighted toward multi-disciplinary inquiry associated with our future-shaping research priorities and their linked research themes and streams</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise the Internal Grant Scheme to align with current and emerging areas of research strength</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate and understand internal barriers to multi-disciplinary inquiry and develop policies, processes and mechanisms to reduce and remove barriers clearly impeding progress with multi-disciplinary research</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KEY OBJECTIVE 4

Deliver Research with World-Changing Impact

GOAL 4.3: Diversity of Impact

*Foster an environment that facilitates and values diverse forms of knowledge creation, application, and creative practice to benefit society*

TARGETS

| 4.3.1 | The development of an annual Macquarie Impact Report outlining the breadth and diversity of our research impact on society |

Supporting Strategies

| Regularly recognise and publicise the breadth and diversity of Macquarie’s research impact in internal (Research-Office sponsored) communications | Primary Accountability | Secondary Accountability |
|---|---|
| | RO | Faculties |
KEY OBJECTIVE 4

Deliver Research with World-Changing Impact

GOAL 4.4: Challenge-Focussed Research

Conduct research that addresses national and global challenges and delivers significant benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.4.1</strong> Unequivocal recognition of at least five major contributions over the life of the framework (for instance, in terms of: changing public perceptions; changing public policy; or ‘game-changing’ innovations)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Strategies</th>
<th>Primary Accountability</th>
<th>Secondary Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revise the Internal Grant Scheme to be strongly weighted toward our future-shaping research priorities and their associated research themes and streams</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a quarterly Future-shaping Research Priority seminar series to promote the research being undertaken around national and global challenges and/or delivering significant benefit</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominate an Executive Dean to sponsor each future-shaping research priority</td>
<td>VC</td>
<td>DVC: R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future-shaping Research Priorities

Our future-shaping research priorities have been identified as multi-disciplinary areas in which we either have, or wish to build, research capacity that aligns with the national research agenda and global challenges of significance. Research underpinning these multi-disciplinary and strategically aligned teams will be prioritised for resource allocation and investment.

Research aligned with our priorities, themes and streams will span our Departments and Faculties; have identified leadership; possess a mandate to collaborate both internally and externally; adapt to changing challenges; and will be measured by outputs and impact.

The research priorities are not prescriptive. Faculties and individual researchers will continue to pursue their own research interests, but in the context of opportunities to contribute to areas aligned with the national research agenda and global challenges of significance.

Macquarie’s research investment decisions will be heavily weighted towards these future-shaping research priorities, which are:

- **Healthy People**
  Pioneering health, integrated healthcare and lifelong-learning for wellness in our ageing world
- **Resilient Societies**
  Understanding cultures in our changing world and building ethical, just and inclusive communities
- **Prosperous Economies**
  Strengthening economic productivity to promote prosperity in our diverse world
- **Secure Planet**
  Sustaining our interdependent world and exploring our place in the universe
- **Innovative Technologies**
  Advancing our interconnected world with frontier technologies, systems, designs and creative practice

The University’s commitment to these research priorities is a commitment to impact, to making a difference and to measuring that effect. An overview of each follows:
Future-Shaping Research Priority 1: Healthy People
Pioneering health, integrated healthcare and lifelong learning for wellness in our ageing world

**Theme:**

**Pedagogies for Health and Life-long Learning**

**Description:**

Multi-disciplinary research teams investigate and design pedagogies that effectively engage and educate Australians across the life span. The theme unites researchers who develop and use technologies to create and deliver learning resources and/or interventions in fields as diverse as mental health, rehabilitation, business, mathematics, science, reading, speech and communication.

**Streams:**

- Pedagogies for Person-Centred Learning
- The Social Context of Learning
- The Impact of Education on Health and Wellbeing

**Theme:**

Health and Resilience

**Description:**

Multi-disciplinary research teams seek to identify the genetic, physiological, psychological, social and economic basis of human health and resilience in our complex world. The theme seeks to identify markers of poor emotional and physical health and to develop and evaluate targeted interventions to promote and sustain emotional and physical wellbeing across the life span. Researchers also seek to enhance the productivity and sustainability of health care systems to support national wellbeing and improve resource allocation.

**Streams:**

- Individual Factors in Human Resilience
- Interventions to Develop Human Resilience
- Social Dimensions of Health
- Workforce Wellbeing
- Economics of Health Care
- Ageing & Disability
Theme:

Predictive Medicine

Description:

Multi-disciplinary research teams explore and utilize current and future molecular diagnostic techniques to diagnose, predict outcome, choose appropriate therapy and follow progress of disease. The theme seeks to explore the use of molecular footprints as a more accessible and effective technique than reliance on cellular processes.

Streams:

- Biomarkers for Cancer Detection
- Infection and Immunity
- Neurological Disease
- Cardiovascular Disease and Treatments
- Surgical Innovations

Theme:

Sensory and Cognitive Processing

Description:

Multi-disciplinary research teams seek to understand the neural and cognitive mechanisms for interpreting the world around us. In understanding the mechanisms that underlie our sensations and perceptions, it becomes possible to develop strategies to improve the acquisition, interpretation, and response to environmental information for people whose capacity is either restricted or maladapted. This theme links these strategies to fundamental research identifying the structures and mechanisms that underpin normal, exceptional and disordered sensory processing with applied research.

Streams:

- Fundamentals of Sensation, Perception, Cognition and Action
- Impairments and Enhancements of Sensation, Perception, Cognition and Action
- Remediation of Deficits and Training for Enhancements of Capacities in Sensory, Perceptual, Cognitive and Motor Processing
Future-Shaping Research Priority 2: Resilient Societies
Understanding cultures in our changing world and building ethical, just and inclusive communities

**Theme:**

Societal Transformation

**Description:**

Multi-disciplinary research teams undertake analysis, measurement and critique of social, political, economic, religious and environmental change from ancient to contemporary societies. The theme seeks to understand the impact of transformation on societies at global, national and local levels whilst also exploring the impacts of societal transformation on people’s identities, intimate and family lives, and their perceptions of their place and role in society.

**Streams:**

- Migration, Mobility and Diversity
- Religions and Society
- Economic and Organisational Change
- Intimate Life and Lived Experience
- Cultural Transformations of Self and Mind
- Dynamics of Human Environment
Theme:
Language, Literacy and Communication
Description:
Multi-disciplinary research teams explore language acquisition, development, processing and use across contexts and cultures, enabling insight into the various ways in which people express, and learn to express, their meanings and intentions effectively, and informing the design of evidence-based strategies for education, training and clinical intervention. The theme also undertakes linguistic and historical research on ancient to contemporary languages, and the oral, written and material transmission and interpretation of cultural traditions. Researchers also investigate how people generate, interact and engage with creative writing and performance in contemporary environments, and research on changing media technologies and their social impact.

Streams:
- Language Acquisition and Disorders of Language
- Language and Literacies in Society
- Language, Literacy, Speech and Hearing
- Reading and spelling: processes, development, and disorders
- Language: Oral and Written Cultures
- Media and Performance Cultures
- Creative Practice

Theme:
Ethics, Governance and Justice
Description:
Multi-disciplinary research teams explore the normative and practical foundations of ethics, the law, governance and regulatory structures, including human rights regimes and other mechanisms of global governance, together with the impact of scientific, technological and environmental change on ethical and legal norms, practices and institutions. The theme also seeks to inform and analyse public and social policy, responsible business practices, and research that investigates how institutions can support the empowerment of disenfranchised individuals and social groups.

Streams
- Ethics in Theory and Practice
- Human Rights and Social Justice
- Governance, Institutions and Social Policy
**Future-Shaping Research Priority 3: Prosperous Economies**

Strengthening economic productivity to promote prosperity in our diverse world

**Theme:**

*Understanding the Role, Operation and Risks Involved Global Financial Systems*

**Description:**

Multi-disciplinary research teams explore how financial systems operate given their increasing importance in world affairs and geo-politics. With financial interdependence of economies, organisations and individuals presenting many social and economic challenges for the world’s governments and regulators, the theme explores ageing and superannuation, the operation of financial markets, corporate financial management, financial and systemic risk, and measurement. As financial systems are socially integrated, researchers explore the consideration of human factors in finance, financial decision making, and financial sustainability.

**Streams:**

- Risk and regulation in financial markets
- Mortality, insurance and superannuation
- Audit, measurement and governance
- Human factors in finance

---

**Theme:**

*How Australia can Ensure Organisations Sustainability Through Improved Productivity and Competitiveness*

**Description:**

Multi-disciplinary research teams explore the impact of technology, changing work patterns, new products and services, as well as increasing competition, and changing power structures as the global economy changes at an ever-increasing rate. The theme focuses upon Australia’s role in the dynamic socio-economic hub of Asia and a future in which Australia’s economic growth can thrive through sustained increases in national productivity to enhance Australian’s wellbeing.

**Streams:**

- Workforce Productivity
- Global Integration and Competitiveness
- An Ageing Workforce
Future-Shaping Research Priority 4: Secure Planet
Sustaining our interdependent world and exploring our place in the universe

Theme: Living in a Changing Environment

Description:
Multi-disciplinary research teams explore and understand the environment and parameterising biological, climatic, chemical and physical variation across space and time. With climate change among our greatest environmental, social and economic challenges, this theme seeks to manage risks, reduce vulnerability and promote resilience to its inevitable impacts on human and natural systems. This research is critically needed to inform management practices and provide the basis for effective decision-making.

Streams:
- Evolutionary Biology & Animal Behaviour
- Climate Change – Impact, Adaptation & Mitigation
- Environment Management & Environment Health
- Science communication
- Coupled Human-Nature Systems (CHANs)

Theme: Exploring Planet Earth and Beyond

Description:
Multi-disciplinary research teams with expertise in Astronomy & astrophysics, as well as in Earth and Planetary Sciences investigate the constitution and physical properties of rock and gas planets, concentrating on our own solar system, but with possible long-term applications to the rapidly growing and high-impact field of extra-solar system planets. The theme combines in-depth knowledge of the internal Earth with improved observations, modelling and simulations of other planets to design experiments on the internal structure, surfaces and habitability of other planets, as well as the possible states of the Earth in the deep past.

Streams:
- Planets & Stars
- Experimental Planetology
- Education and Cultural Planetology
Future-Shaping Research Priority 5: Innovative Technologies
Advancing our interconnected world with frontier technologies, systems, designs and creative practice

Theme:

Engineering Technologies for the 21st Century

Description:

Multi-disciplinary research teams seek to invent the technologies of tomorrow that will provide competitive advantages for our industry partners in a rapidly changing world. The theme explores technologies that will need to be ever more complex, integrated and smarter, whilst offering sustainable solutions including more energy and time efficient systems and processes.

Streams:

- Quantum Science & Technology
- Wireless & Photonic Technology
- Bio-engineering, nano-technologies & "Oomics"
- Smart, Safe, Small and Sustainable Systems
- Securing Water & Food quality in a changing environment
- Quantum Science & Technology

Theme:

Harnessing the Data Storm – Big Data: Acquisition, Analysis, Application and Assurance

Description:

Multi-disciplinary research teams explore massive scientific datasets, so-called “Big Data”, and the challenges these peta-byte data streams present to our ability to assimilate, analyse and scientifically evaluate such vast sources of diverse data across multiple research fields. The theme seeks to develop common solutions to generic data problems via a new Big Data support centre, offering high-impact opportunities for Macquarie and our collaborative partners.

Streams:

- Big fast data: data acquisition
- Data Science and analytics theory
- Big Data centre: analysis and application
- Cyber-Security
## Appendix A: Overview of the 2024 Key Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators and sub-indicators</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Higher Degrees by Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR Commencements</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>&gt;900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR Load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR Completions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERDC Research Income</td>
<td>$44m</td>
<td>$48m*</td>
<td>&gt;$150m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Category 1</td>
<td>$28m</td>
<td>$30m</td>
<td>&gt;$95m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Category 2</td>
<td>$4m</td>
<td>$5m</td>
<td>&gt;$16m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Category 3</td>
<td>$11m</td>
<td>$12m</td>
<td>&gt;$37m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Category 4</td>
<td>$1m</td>
<td>$1m</td>
<td>&gt;$5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Block Grant</td>
<td>$28m</td>
<td>$31m</td>
<td>&gt;$75m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Publications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERDC Research Publications</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>1,900*</td>
<td>&gt;5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citations (normalised impact)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ScImago</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWTS Leiden</td>
<td>1.20 (6th in Aust.)</td>
<td>1.30 (5th in Aust.)</td>
<td>1.35 (4th in Aust.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ERA Ratings</strong></td>
<td>ERA 2010</td>
<td>ERA 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERA 3, 4 and 5</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERA 4 and 5</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERA 5</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impactful Innovations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major breakthrough discoveries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major patents, products, services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Rankings</strong></td>
<td>2013 Aust.</td>
<td>2013 World</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARWU</td>
<td>8/9</td>
<td>200-300</td>
<td>Top 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWTS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>251-275</td>
<td>Top 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>Top 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QS +5 stars</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>Top 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Un-audited estimate

** Citations (normalised impact against World) – the average number of citations of the publications of university, normalised for field differences and publication year. An MNCS value of 1.3 means that the publications of a university are getting cited 30% above world average.
ITEM 12.4: HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH THESIS PREPARATION, SUBMISSION AND EXAMINATION POLICY

For approval.
### Higher Degree Research Thesis Preparation, Submission and Examination Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>To outline requirements for the preparation, submission and examination of higher degree research (HDR) theses at Macquarie University.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Overview | This policy covers the thesis component of the following degrees:  
- The Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) and all other doctorates by research  
- The Master of Philosophy (MPhil)  
- The Master of Research (MRes)  

The Doctor of Philosophy enables candidates to undertake extensive, independent research which forms a distinct contribution to the knowledge of a chosen subject, and which affords evidence of coherence and originality shown either by the discovery of new facts or by the exercise of independent critical power.  

The Master of Philosophy is awarded for research that demonstrates that a contribution has been made to knowledge in a particular field of study by presenting new facts or by demonstrating an independent critical ability to evaluate existing material in a new light.  

The Master of Research is partly awarded for a research project that critically responds to or reflects on current research in the relevant field by producing clearly justified empirical outcomes or analytical evaluations.  

Macquarie University requires HDR candidates to prepare a thesis in fulfillment of higher research degree requirements and for the thesis to undergo a process of external examination. Reports of the examination process are submitted in writing and reviewed by the Higher Degree Research Committee (HDRC). When all work on the thesis has been completed to the satisfaction of the HDRC and any compulsory coursework units have been satisfactorily completed, a recommendation is made to Academic Senate as to the award of the relevant degree.  

Where appropriate, the University encourages candidates to prepare a thesis by publication as this format provides an opportunity to add further value to the research student experience. A thesis by publication also provides an incentive for a timely completion, enhances employment prospects, improves publication outputs and strengthens the University's research rankings. |
**Scope**

This policy applies to all higher degree research candidates enrolled at Macquarie University, to all Principal, Acting, Associate, Co- and Adjunct Supervisors, other Macquarie academic and professional staff acting on behalf of these HDR candidates and to all examiners of Macquarie University HDR theses.

**Policy**

**THESIS PREPARATION**

As an HDR thesis embodies the results of research and investigation by a candidate enrolled in a higher research degree the University requires that

- a research degree make a contribution to knowledge and in the case of doctoral degrees, this contribution must be ‘distinct’
- at least half of the work done towards the degree must be undertaken while formally enrolled as an HDR candidate at Macquarie University
- Unless agreed under a formal Joint or Cotutelle enrolment contract, a candidate may not submit as the main content of the thesis any work or material which has been previously submitted for any degree successfully completed at Macquarie or elsewhere, but may incorporate that work or material in the thesis, if the candidate specifies the work or material which has been so incorporated
- The University recognises that theses or parts of theses may be presented in a variety of formats and media but will incorporate a written component situated in an academic discourse appropriate to the discipline area.

Theses may include relevant papers (including conference presentations) published, accepted, submitted or prepared for publication. These papers must

- form a coherent and integrated body of work,
- include a comprehensive and critical introduction and an integrative conclusion, and
- focus on a single project or set of related questions or propositions.

The thesis must

- be the candidate’s own work and any contribution by other people, including co-authors of papers, must be clearly stated in the thesis
- conform in length and in format to the requirements set and published by the Executive Dean of the Faculty in which the candidate is enrolled and allow for discipline variations, and
- be written in English and reach a satisfactory level of literary presentation.

Any requests from HDR candidates to submit a thesis or part thereof in...
a language other than English will require the approval of the HDRC as early in candidature as possible.

**THESIS SUBMISSION**

1. The Principal Supervisor must certify in writing that the thesis meets University preparation requirements.
2. A candidate may submit a thesis for examination against the advice of the Principal Supervisor, for consideration by HDRC.

**THESIS EXAMINATION**

Examiners are required to address the following criteria in their assessment of a Doctoral thesis:

- That it
  - forms a ‘distinct’ contribution to the knowledge of the subject area
  - affords evidence of originality through the discovery of new facts or by the exercise of independent critical power
  - is satisfactory as regards its literary presentation, and
  - contains a substantial amount of material suitable for publication.

Examiners are required to address the following criteria in the assessment of a research Master of Philosophy thesis:

- That it
  - makes a contribution to the knowledge of the subject area by the presentation of new facts and by demonstrating independent critical ability to evaluate existing material in a new light, and
  - is satisfactory as regards its literary presentation.

Examiners are required to address the following criteria in the assessment of a Master of Research thesis:

- That
  - it has adequately delineated the topic of concern by critically reflecting on current research in the relevant field;
  - the research undertaken produces empirical outcomes or analytical evaluations that are clearly justified and that respond to or reflect on the relevant literature; and
  - it is satisfactory as regards its literary presentation.

Thesis content will remain confidential during the examination period and the University reserves the right to request examiners to sign a Non Disclosure Agreement if required.

Examiners are required to report in writing to HDRC in an approved format indicating their assessment of the thesis.
In the case of Doctoral degrees or the Master of Philosophy, examiners may recommend to HDRC that a candidate undertake such oral, written or practical examination as they may specify. HDRC may determine that an oral examination be used to resolve concerns about the thesis. The HDR candidate is required to attend the oral examination.

**THESIS RE-EXAMINATION**

Only one submission for re-examination is permitted.

A candidate who does not re-submit a thesis for examination within the specified time will be deemed to have not satisfied requirements for the award of the degree.

**APPOINTMENT OF EXAMINERS**

The University requires that nomination and selection of HDR thesis examiners be based on the principle that candidates receive an impartial examination by high quality examiners in the field of research.

Examiners are appointed by the HDRC following advice and information provided by Faculties and in such a way as to preserve the right to anonymity.

The examiners must not have had any involvement in the preparation of the thesis, as a member of the supervisory panel or as an academic advisor for the candidate and must satisfy other University requirements such as those relating to conflict of interest.

Each Doctoral thesis will be examined by at least three examiners and each Masters thesis will be examined by at least two examiners. In exceptional circumstances, the HDRC may approve the examination of a doctoral thesis by two examiners.

An appointed examiner will be a national and/or international expert in the HDR thesis field, with an academic or research appointment in the field of research, relevant high quality research publications, and whose assessment will be respected nationally and internationally.

For Doctoral and Master of Philosophy degrees, examination panels are to include at least one international and one national examiner to maintain the international quality of Macquarie’s HDR awards and to ensure examination is consistent with national standards. There will be no more than one examiner from any single institution appointed.

At least two examiners of a Doctoral thesis and one examiner of a Masters thesis will have previous HDR thesis examination experience.

Examiners are not permitted to:

- be currently employed, nor within the last five years have been employed, by Macquarie University
- have graduated with a doctoral degree from Macquarie
University within the last ten years

- have been an HDR candidate under the supervision of any member of the supervising panel, either at Macquarie University or elsewhere
- have been co-authors or co-editors of publications nor collaborated in research with the candidate
- have been co-authors or co-editors of publications with any of the supervising panel within the last five years.

Exceptions to the examiner appointment requirements require a fully substantiated case attached to the Nomination of Examiners form for consideration by the HDRC.

**DEGREE AWARD RECOMMENDATION**

The HDRC will determine the examination result.. The determination will be finalised following a recommendation to HDRC by the Program and Examination Sub-Committee (PESC).

The PESC will

- review individual examination reports and the comments submitted about the examination reports by the Principal Supervisor
- consider the reports of all examiners in the light of the criteria for the award of the degree.

PESC will make a recommendation to HDRC for the award of a Vice-Chancellor’s Commendation for PhD and MPhil theses which are nominated by all examiners as being in the top 5% (or equivalent) of research at the level of the degree.

**THESIS FINALISATION**

A copy of the thesis approved by HDRC must be lodged with the Macquarie University Library.

**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).

---

**Contact Officer**  Dean Higher Degree Research  
**Date Approved**  draft 17 March 2014  
**Approval Authority**  Academic Senate  
**Date of Commencement**  tba  
**Amendment Dates**  n/a  
**Date for Next Review**  3 years after re-approval.  
**Related Documents**  Higher Degree Research Thesis Preparation,
| Submission and Examination Procedure
| Higher Degree Research Thesis by Publication Guideline,
| Higher Degree Research Thesis Re-Examination Guideline,
| Oral Examination Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies/Rules Superseded by this Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thesis Preparation, Submission and Examination Policy approved 16 November 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keywords</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thesis examination; thesis submission; thesis re-examination; examiner appointment; examiner approval; nomination of examiners; examination confidentiality; library copy; external examination; thesis by publication; thesis abstract; joint enrolment agreement; oral examination; Higher Degree Research Committee; Academic Senate; Program and Examination Subcommittee; Vice-Chancellor’s Commendation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Documents sourced from Policy Central (www.mq.edu.au/policy) take precedence over documents from other sources.
Complete Sections 1-6 and send together with the Word version of the draft Policy/Procedure/Schedule to policy@mq.edu.au. A Checklist is not required for a Guideline.

1. NAME OF POLICY / PROCEDURE / SCHEDULE
   One Checklist can be used for all documents.

2. Macquarie Memory File No.

| HDR Thesis Preparation, Submission and Examination Policy |

3. CONTACT OFFICER
   Indicate who can be contacted regarding this submission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Nick Mansfield</th>
<th>Ext: 8718</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position and Section: Dean HDR, DVC (R)’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. DEVELOPMENT / REVIEW SUMMARY

Identify what outcome is to be achieved with this new / revised policy, procedure or schedule (e.g. to meet a new / changed legislative or regulatory requirement; address a new strategic direction; to set out a decision-making framework for grading / employment process; identify responsibilities and actions related to expending money; regular 3 year review.)

The aim of this policy revision is to:
1. Include the examination of the new Masters of Research degree
2. Specify the relationship between the MRes and other HDR theses

If it is a new policy, explain, briefly, why the need has arisen

NA

Provide information about the research and analysis already undertaken to draft this document (as a minimum, identify the relevant legislation and existing policies that impact on this issue)

The key issue for this policy change is the examination of the new Masters of Research. The Council of Deans and Directors of Graduate Research (DDOGS) has recently drawn up national guidelines on HDR candidature, including examination. I have been involved in these discussions, which concluded that the national standard would be two external examiners for research masters.

The second issue is how an MRes thesis can be distinguished from a related HDR thesis. Macquarie has long had the provision that an HDR thesis may include material that is part of the project but not to be examined as part of the HDR thesis. Research online shows this is common practice amongst Australian Universities.

Complete items 5 and 6 on the next page
5. CONSULTATION
   a) Confirm the Office of General Counsel has been consulted
      Email confirmation from General Counsel (12/6/14) that the Policy is fine from a legal point of view.

   b) Describe the consultation undertaken, including the dates and names of all relevant committee, staff and student meetings where the submission was considered.
      Exam guidelines specifying marking criteria for the MRes were drawn up by a Working Party of Faculty MRes Directors and approved by HDRC on 21/2/14.
      This required changes to be made to the HDR Thesis Examination Policy to include the MRes. The Dean HDR and two Associate Deans re-drafted the Policy, which was circulated to faculty AD’s and MRes Directors. It was approved at the HDRC meeting on 21/3/14.

   c) Indicate how the expected impact of implementation (on resources, workloads, budget and time) has been considered.
      Organisation of MRes examination has already been considered by faculties in mounting the degree in 2014.

6. COMMUNICATION AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
   Indicate how the submission will be communicated to allow for implementation. Note that an MQ Announcement and publishing on Policy Central are assumed; information about additional communication strategies must be provided.
   The Policy will be circulated to AD’s HDR and faculty MRes Directors to department HDR and MRes Directors.
ITEM 12.5: ACADEMIC APPEALS – ACADEMIC APPEALS POLICY AND INTERIM PROCEDURE FOR MANAGING ACADEMIC APPEALS

For approval.
ITEM 12.5: ACADEMIC APPEALS – ACADEMIC APPEALS POLICY AND INTERIM PROCEDURES FOR MANAGING ACADEMIC APPEALS

Issue
The General Coursework Rule includes provisions for appeals relating to:

- Exclusion
- Re-Enrolment
- Discontinuation
- Enrolment in a unit for the third time
- Termination of candidature
- Recognition of RPL

*(General Coursework Rules, (13))*

Students can also appeal decisions relating to Disruptions to Study.

A Working Group of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee is developing an Academic Appeals Policy. This policy will address academic appeals relating to admission/readmission, enrolment and progression including exclusion and termination for coursework and research students. The Academic Appeals Policy will be presented to Academic Senate for consideration later this year. At this time a recommendation will be presented to Academic Senate on the formation of a single body to hear academic appeals.

**Recommendation 1**
That the terms of reference and membership of the committees which hear academic appeals for coursework students, the Ranking Committee, the Grading Appeals Committee and the Academic Appeals Committee be extended until 31 December 2014.

**Recommendation 2**
That appeals relating to Recognition of Prior Learning, Disruptions to Study and Enrolment in a unit for the third time, will be reviewed at the Faculty-level, followed with a review by a panel comprising the Chair of the Academic Appeals Committee, the Deputy Registrar and an Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching and/or Standards and Quality until the Academic Appeals Policy is approved.

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

- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar)
- PVC Learning and Teaching/Chair of Senate Learning and Teaching Committee
- Chair Rankings Committee/Chair of Academic Standards and Quality Committee
- Chair, Grading Appeals Committee
- Faculty of Business and Economics Representative on Academic Appeals Committee
- Director Campus Wellbeing
- Deputy-Registrar

Submitted by:

Professor Dominic Verity
Chair, Academic Senate
ITEM 12.6:  ACADEMIC APPEALS REPORT

For noting.
ITEM 12.6: REPORT ON ACADEMIC APPEALS – SESSION 3, MACQUARIE CITY CAMPUS 2013 AND POST GRADUATE

SESSION 3

As a result of Session 3 examinations (results of examinations were advised to students on 24 February 2014.)

56 students were excluded from enrolment in Session 3 pursuant to Undergraduate Rules (2013) 12 and 13.

The breakdown by exclusion type:
• 2 FOA students excluded for double failure of a prescribed Law unit (Rule 13(1)).
• 9 FOA students, 14 FOHS students, 11 FOS and 20 FBE students excluded for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress in a program of study (Rule 12(2)).

The Academic Appeals Committee considered the 21 student appeals against exclusion, pursuant to Undergraduate Rules (2013) to Rule 14 and determined that 21 students had their appeal disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for double failure of a prescribed Law unit, the appeal for student identified as 41818466 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42851300 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 31607497 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42187664 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42245753 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42252555 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42314038 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42447003 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42475422 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42507855 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42665477 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42723434 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42872960 was disallowed.
That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42883695 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42884918 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42885205 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42897467 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42924006 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42924553 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 43054633 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 41732251 was disallowed.

MACQUARIE CITY CAMPUS

As a result of MQC examinations (results of examinations were advised to students on 7 March 2014) 11 students were excluded from enrolment from MQC pursuant to Undergraduate Rules (2013) 12 and 13.

The breakdown by exclusion type:

• 4 FOA students and 7 FBE students excluded for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress in a program of study (Rule 12(2)).

The Academic Appeals Committee considered the 4 student appeals against exclusion, pursuant to Undergraduate Rules (2013) Rule 14 and determined that 4 students had their appeal disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42729114 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42238420 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42535298 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal against exclusion from enrolment for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42606810 was disallowed.
As a result of Faculty Postgraduate reviews at end year 2013, 19 Postgraduate students had their enrolment terminated due to Postgraduate Degree Rules 10.

The breakdown by Faculty:
• 1 FOA candidate, 1 FOHS candidate and 17 FBE candidates were terminated

The Academic Appeals Committee considered the 10 student appeals against exclusion, pursuant to PostGraduate Rule 10(5) and determined that 10 students had their appeal disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal termination of candidature for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42321379 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal termination of candidature for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42898102 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal termination of candidature for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42950465 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal termination of candidature for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 41789636 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal termination of candidature for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 41970918 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal termination of candidature for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 41988108 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal termination of candidature for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42375134 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal termination of candidature for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42634091 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal termination of candidature for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 42655773 was disallowed.

That following an Application for Academic Appeal termination of candidature for failing to meet the minimum rate of progress, the appeal for student identified as 43076440 was disallowed.

For noting.

Submitted by
Academic Appeals Committee
ITEM 12.7: VICE-CHANCELLOR’S COMMENDATIONS

For approval.
ITEM 12.7: VICE-CHANCELLOR’S COMMENDATIONS

NOMINATIONS FOR MASTER COURSEWORK CANDIDATES

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Student name</th>
<th>Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY OF ARTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42719518</td>
<td>MCGILLION, Michael</td>
<td>Master of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42894166</td>
<td>VITHANAGE, Gayan</td>
<td>Master of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42917816</td>
<td>HELLMUNDT, Christopher John</td>
<td>Master of Policy and Applied Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40331652</td>
<td>GIERHART, Hannah Louise</td>
<td>Master of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY OF HUMAN SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42362512</td>
<td>NOLAN, Megan Elise</td>
<td>Master of Communication Disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41909410</td>
<td>DHALIWAL, Lisa Jean</td>
<td>Master of Communication Disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30523311</td>
<td>COONEY, Anneliese Christa</td>
<td>Master of Social Health and Counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACQUARIE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42785855</td>
<td>SEN, Hilda Yee Woon</td>
<td>Master of Business Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Process: The Graduation Unit has reviewed the Potential VC Commendations report from AMIS and cross-checked with academic transcripts.

Recommendation: That the Vice-Chancellor’s Commendation be awarded to the 8 Master coursework graduands listed above.

Submitted by: Deidre Anderson, Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Students and Registrar

For enquiries contact: Ken Wong, Senior Graduation Officer, ken.wong@mq.edu.au x6189
ITEM 12.8: MACQUARIE FOUNDATION COMPLETIONS

For approval.
ITEM 12.8: MACQUARIE FOUNDATION PROGRAM COMPLETIONS

Issue: Approval for list of students from Macquarie City Campus who have completed the Foundation Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Given Name</th>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43371590</td>
<td>Jennifer Sadiq</td>
<td>CASI</td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Fast Track Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43360920</td>
<td>Yilin ZHANG</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Fast Track Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43499104</td>
<td>Nicole RIZK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Fast Track Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43442110</td>
<td>Chen GUO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Fast Track Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43512186</td>
<td>Alavi AMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Fast Track Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43480519</td>
<td>Yuet Kwan Crystal WOO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Fast Track Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43357792</td>
<td>Cheng In VONG</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Fast Track Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43242502</td>
<td>Jessica COOK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Fast Track Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43341403</td>
<td>Sherany DELGADO GOMEZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Fast Track Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43348653</td>
<td>Claudia AU</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Fast Track Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43442889</td>
<td>Amra SKENDEROVIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Fast Track Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43362079</td>
<td>Ge GE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Standard Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43404405</td>
<td>Zeliang LIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Standard Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43247008</td>
<td>Kai Yao JIANG</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Standard Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43249442</td>
<td>Chuya ZHANG</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Standard Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43373631</td>
<td>Zonglin WU</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Standard Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43414532</td>
<td>Tosha TSHINKOMA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Standard Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43346138</td>
<td>Chuyi XIA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Standard Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43172962</td>
<td>Liangyuan LI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Standard Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43236081</td>
<td>Chuanyu XU</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Standard Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42675294</td>
<td>Wei WEI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Standard Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43096778</td>
<td>Xinyuan HUANG</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie Foundation Program (Standard Program)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Process:
List of students who have been qualified from the Foundation Program in session 1, 2014 (IBT1, 2014), as provided and confirmed by Macquarie City Campus.

Recommendation: Approval of the 22 candidates who have satisfied the requirements for the Macquarie Foundation Program as stated.

Submitted by: Deidre Anderson, Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Students and Registrar

For enquiries contact: Ken Wong, Senior Graduation Officer, ken.wong@mq.edu.au x6189