ACADEMIC SENATE

A meeting of the Academic Senate will be held at 9.30 am on Tuesday 25 August 2015, in the Senate Room, Lincoln Building C8A, Level 3.

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

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

Members who are unable to attend the meeting are requested to send their apologies to Ms Amanda Phelps, University Committee Secretary (phone +61 2 9850 7316 or email senate@mq.edu.au).
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ITEM 3  MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING
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ACADEMIC SENATE – MINUTES

Minutes of a meeting of Academic Senate held on 2 June 2015 at 9.34 am in the Senate Room, Level 3, Lincoln Building.
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1. **APOLOGIES / WELCOME**

The Chair welcomed the following newly elected student representatives; Anna Glen (Undergraduate representative from the Faculty of Arts), Gabrielle Hardy (Undergraduate representative from the Faculty of Business and Economics), Jeremey Gunter (representative from the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences), Simon Populin (Undergraduate representative from the Faculty of Science and Engineering), Jinji Kong and Harry Dang (Postgraduate Coursework representatives) and Cheryl Ware (Higher Degree Research representative) to their first Academic Senate meeting. The Chair also welcomed a number of observers in attendance, including Susan Vickery, Tessa Green, Vanessa Todd, Dorian Minors, David Lin, Gillian Downie and Alexander Christou.

The Chair noted that apologies had been received from Professor Bruce Dowton, Professor Alex Frino, Professor Mark Gabbott (with Professor Anne Ross-Smith attending in his absence), Professor Jim Lee, Associate Professor Ian Solomonides and Professor Sherman Young.

2. **ARRANGEMENT OF AGENDA**

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

   No conflicts were recorded.

2.2 Adoption of Unstarred items

   The following additional items were starred for discussion:
   
   - Item 9.2 – Updated Terms of Reference
   - Item 10.6 – Bachelor of Science and related double degrees – Program Change

   **Resolution 15/51**

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

3. **MINUTES OF MEETING HELD 21 APRIL 2015**

   The Chair advised that the minutes of the 21 April 2015 Academic Senate meeting would be circulated for approval by flying minute.

4. **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

4.1 Academic Senate items requiring action

   The Chair noted that a number of these action items would be discussed during the course of the meeting. An update on the progress of arrangements for the University Medals Committee working party was provided and the Chair noted that a report from the working party would be provided to a subsequent meeting of Academic Senate.

4.2 Election of Chair and Deputy Chair of Academic Senate

   The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar) and Returning Officer advised that in accordance with the *Macquarie University By-Law Schedule 1 Procedures for an election*, on 19 May 2015 nominations were called for Chair and Deputy Chair of Academic Senate.

   As at the close of nominations, at 9am 2 June 2015, the following nominations were received:

   **Chair of Academic Senate**
   Candidate 1: Professor Dominic Verity
   Proposed by: Associate Professor David Coutts, Director, MQ Photonics Research Centre, Deputy Associate Dean Research, Faculty of Science and Engineering (Faculty Elected Member)

   **Deputy Chair of Academic Senate**
   Candidate 1: Professor Jacqueline Phillips
   Department of Biomedical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences
   Proposed by: Professor Dominic Verity
Candidate 2: Dr Wylie Bradford
Senior Lecturer, Department of Economics, Faculty of Business and Economics
Proposed by: Dr Yvonne Breyer, Director of Learning and Teaching, Faculty of Business and Economics
(Faculty Elected Member)

Chair of Academic Senate
As the number of nominees did not exceed the number of positions available an election will not be held.

Professor Verity is declared as elected as Chair of Academic Senate for a further two year term.

Deputy Chair of Academic Senate
As the number of nominees exceeded the number of positions available an election will be held. The
election will be conducted by electronic ballot in accordance with the Macquarie University By-Law
Schedule 1 Procedures for an election. Academic Senate members will receive additional information on
the election via email.

5. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR
The Chair referred members to the Report from the Chair within the Agenda papers.

Academic Senate noted the update.

6. STRATEGY AND POLICY

6.1 Review of Disruption to Studies Policy
The Manager of Student Connect briefed members on the key themes to have emerged during the review
of the Disruption to Studies Policy and on issues that had been identified with the application of the
associated Procedure. Members were referred to the specific recommendations presented to Academic
Senate (refer to item 6.1 within the Agenda papers).

Particular reference was made to the connection between Withdrawal Without Academic Penalty
(WWAP) and the Disruption to Studies Policy. Senate was informed that the working party was of the
view that granting of WWAP should be added as a possible outcome of a successful disruption
application.

There was general discussion amongst members with specific questions being raised relating to the
recommendation to accept medical certificates. A Faculty elected member from Business and Economics
questioned whether this undermined the original intent of the Policy and the need for a practitioner to
determine the impact of a disruption on a student’s ability to study. The Manager of Student Connect
responded that this was to prevent a duplication of processes when a student had a medical certificate
which contained all of the required information but is then referred to Campus Wellbeing to obtain a
Professional Authority Form (PAF). Members were advised that students would still be encouraged to
obtain a PAF.

A Faculty elected member from the Faculty of Arts raised specific issues relating to Supplementary Exams
and students submitting a disruption notification after sitting a Final Exam. While this issue was not
within the scope of the Working Group, the Manager of Student Connect indicated that this was a matter
that was currently under investigation. He called Academic Senate’s attention to the working party’s
recommendation of the introduction of a “fit to sit” statement, which students would have to sign before
sitting an exam. Students who were then subsequently taken ill could be required to report that fact to the
exam invigilator and would then be escorted to the campus medical service for assessment. Failure to
report in this way would then invalidate any subsequent disruption applications for that examination.

The Chair confirmed that the review of the Disruption to Study Policy was aligned with the development
of a Disability Policy to support and address students experiencing longer term disruptions.

The Chair invited comments from the elected student representatives and none were provided.

The Chair thanked the Working Group for their contribution.

Resolution 15/52
That Academic Senate refer the recommended amendments to the next meeting of the Senate
Learning and Teaching Committee for further discussion and consideration.

Action:
The Senate Learning and Teaching Committee to discuss and consider the recommendations of the
Disruption to Studies Working Group and to provide a progress update to the 25 August 2015 meeting of
Academic Senate.
6.2 ICAC Report and Response

The Deputy Registrar spoke to the response to the ICAC Report *Learning the hard way: managing corruption risks associated with international students and universities in NSW*. The Deputy Registrar advised Senate members of the process for drafting the response, which included input from the Chair of Academic Senate, Pro Vice-Chancellor Learning and Teaching, Head of Risk and Compliance and drew upon staff from the office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic, Macquarie International and Governance Services. Members were advised that the report had been presented to the Executive Group and will be presented to the Audit and Risk Committee of University Council on 18 June for consideration.

Dr Tracey Bretag joined the meeting at 11.00am.

The Chair thanked the Deputy Registrar for the paper and asked members to note some of the broader questions which have emerged: academic integrity; the need for granular data on progression of different cohorts; monitoring key indicators, including disruptions and academic misconduct; and the need for external moderation of academic standards and quality. Members were advised that many of the issues emerging relate to the development and monitoring of the University’s Academic Risk Register and as a consequence there would be items referred to Academic Standards and Quality Committee and Quality Enhancement Committee.

**Action:**

That Academic Senate refers relevant issues addressed within the ICAC report to QEC or ASQC.

6.3 MyMaster Recommendations to University Council

The Chair spoke to the recent news coverage relating to reports that the University had rescinded awards for students found guilty of submitting fraudulent assignments. He informed members that this had not yet occurred and advised of the correct process required to rescind an award.

The Chair spoke to the paper detailing the implications of Academic misconduct relating to MyMaster. Members were advised that the investigation and subsequent hearings by the University Discipline Committee (UDC), found that 36 students (of the 56 students taken to the UDC) were responsible for submitting a ‘ghost-written’ assessment. Each student found responsible has been awarded an F(0) fail grade for any unit in which any ‘ghost-written’ assessment was submitted.

The Chair advised that all students found guilty have been required to complete a specially designed Academic and Workplace Ethics (AWE) module as a condition for graduation and have been placed on probation for the remainder of their time at Macquarie. The application of F(0) fail grades resulted in 10 graduands being prevented from graduating as expected in the April 2015 ceremonies.

A further two 2014 Macquarie graduates were found responsible and each were given F(0) fail grades for units in which a ‘ghost-written’ assessment was submitted. As a result, these students no longer meet the academic requirements of Macquarie Degrees that they have been awarded.

There was general discussion from members as to the operational processes required for students to return testamurs and whether students were aware of the decision of the UDC. In addition, members discussed the option of suspending an award. Members were advised by the Deputy Registrar that the two individuals concerned had presented to the UDC and were aware of the decision. The Chair advised that there was no provision for suspending a degree and members were reminded that in light of registration requirements for medical, allied health and other accredited programs, suspending an award was not a viable option.

A Faculty elected member from Human Sciences questioned whether the students involved were repeat offenders and the Chair advised that those concerned had not appeared before the UDC previously. A Faculty elected member for Science and Engineering noted that none of the students were facing a permanent exclusion and had the option of returning to complete outstanding units and, ultimately, to graduate.

The Chair noted that the rescinding of a degree was not in itself a penalty applied for misconduct. Any rescission would be made simply on the grounds that these students had not yet met the academic standards required for the award of their degrees.

Jinji Kong attended the meeting from 11:11am.

The Chair reminded members that University Council had retained the authority for the conferral of a degree and as such any decision to rescind an award would be a decision of Council based on a recommendation from Academic Senate.

**Resolution 15/53**

*Academic Senate resolved to recommend to University Council that the Macquarie University degrees awarded in 2014 to students 42312434 and 42408407 be rescinded.*
Resolution 15/54
Academic Senate resolved to establish a working party (including a student member) to develop a set of principles to govern the rescission of degrees in future cases, which would address matters such as: limitation periods and matters of currency, threshold conditions that should be placed on rescission of a degree, rules to govern the conditions under which students might return to University to complete rescinded degrees, and conditions under which it might be reasonable to rescind with permanent exclusion.

Resolution 15/55
Academic Senate resolved to work with the General Counsel of the University to develop amendments to the General Coursework Rule, and other rules of University where appropriate, in order to clearly articulate University Council’s powers to rescind awarded degrees.

Action:
That Academic Senate establish a working party (including a student member) to develop a set of principles to govern the rescission of degrees in future cases and to work with the General Counsel to develop amendments to the relevant academic rules to clearly articulate University Council’s powers to rescind awarded degrees.

6.4 Student Academic Code of Conduct

The Chair spoke to the ongoing work which has been progressing to develop a Student Discipline Framework. This includes the Student Code of Conduct, implemented in 2014 and the Student Discipline Rule and Student Discipline Procedure to be implemented for Session 2, 2015. The Chair advised members that during the course of planning the implementation of the Student Discipline Procedure, the Academic Honesty Policy had been reviewed by the General Counsel which had resulted in the proposed Student Academic Code of Conduct. The Academic Code of Conduct demonstrates a closer alignment with both the Student Code of Conduct and the Student Discipline Framework while maintaining many of the key elements of the Academic Honesty Policy.

The Chair invited comments from members. The Acting Executive Dean, Business and Economics questioned whether the Faculty Hearing Committee was an additional committee to the Faculty Discipline Committee and was advised that the Faculty Hearing Committee is the revised name of the Faculty Discipline Committee within the new framework and not an additional committee.

A Faculty elected member from Business and Economics noted that hanging references still existed throughout the document and observed that it contained a circular reference to the term “Academic Misconduct” in item (g) of the section defining that term.

A Faculty elected member from Human Sciences observed that the proposed Code was a negative statement rather than a statement framing positive attributes that students were expected to uphold and there was general discussion regarding this point. The Chair acknowledged this as a valid point and advised members that development of an academic integrity framework would involve a statement outlining the expectations of behavior which would be framed in the affirmative in terms of expectations for student citizenship.

The Chair thanked members for their feedback and advised that the comments would be forwarded to the General Counsel to be addressed. Academic Senate granted the authority to approve the Academic Code of Conduct with the specified amendments to the Academic Senate Standing Committee. Following approval of the Code of Conduct, Academic Senate also granted the Academic Senate Standing Committee the authority to rescind the Academic Honesty Policy.

Action:
Comments on the Student Academic Code of Conduct to be forwarded to the General Counsel.

Professor Barbara Messerle departed the meeting at 11:23 am.

7. PRESENTATION TOPIC – ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

The Chair welcomed Dr Tracey Bretag, Senior Lecturer in the School of Management in the University of South Australia Business School, who gave a presentation on Academic Integrity: Threats and opportunities.

Ms Sonia Saddiqui, Macquarie University PhD student, also provided a presentation and handout to Academic Senate on the Academic Integrity Matters Ambassadors (AIMA) and provided background on this program. Senate members were advised that there are currently twenty five members of AIMA, four of whom were in attendance at the Senate meeting. Ms Saddiqui invited any comments from Senate members via email about this program.

The Chair commented that this topic would be discussed at future meetings of Academic Senate and acknowledged that this presentation is to be considered the first step in a process to develop a much clearer and more effective Academic Integrity framework (and associated programs) to govern all of the University’s academic programs. Dr Bretag has agreed to return later in the year to assist Academic
Senate in this vitally important work. It is likely that she will work intensively with a working group to develop these policy instruments and workshop best practice with a wide range of key stakeholders.

The Chair thanked Dr Tracey Bretag, Sonia Saddiqui and the student ambassadors in attendance.

8. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Members are requested to submit Questions on notice to the Chair two days in advance of the meeting.

Nil received.

9. GENERAL BUSINESS

9.1 Macquarie University College Update and Terms of Reference for the MUIC Subcommittee of ASQC

The Chair invited Jake Garman Director of the Macquarie University International College (MUIC) to provide an overview of the College to Senate. Members were advised that MUIC had been established to deliver a pathway of students into degree programs in light of the dissolution of the university’s relationship with SIBT and Navitas.

MUIC would deliver Macquarie University programs that would provide students with admission to Bachelor (from a Foundation program) and second year of Bachelor degree programs (from a Diploma program) in Engineering, Business, Accounting and Media. Members were advised that all MUIC programs have been approved by Academic Senate and have been developed by a group of Macquarie academic staff and Associate Deans from Faculties offering the relevant programs. MUIC will deliver a 4 term academic year initially trialing 6 week intensive blocks. While the first offering will commence in September, the main cohort will commence in 2016.

The Chair thanked the Director of MUIC for the overview and invited him to return to a future meeting to provide Academic Senate with additional details on the developments relating to the college.

The Chair spoke to the Terms of Reference for the subcommittee of ASQC which would provide academic governance and quality assurance for the MUIC academic offerings. There was discussion from members as to the role and function of the subcommittee and the membership.

Resolution 15/56

Academic Senate resolved to approve the Terms of Reference for the Macquarie University International College Subcommittee of ASQC.

Mr Jake Garman departed the meeting at 11:30am.

9.2 Updated Terms of Reference

Senate members reviewed the updated Terms of Reference for the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC), Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) and the Quality Enhancement Committee (QEC). The Chair explained that the Terms of Reference for these committees of Academic Senate had been reviewed together and in conjunction with the newly created Standing Orders of Committees of Academic Senate.

Senate members commented that the Terms of Reference did not specifically include the list of members of each of these committees as they had previously. The Chair commented that the Terms of Reference, which are to be read together with the Standing Orders of Committees of Academic Senate, only provide specifically for the types of members who are not to be included as part of the membership of each committee.

It was suggested that one option would be to include the specific type of membership information from the Standing Orders of Committees of Academic Senate into the Terms of Reference of each committee. Another option would be for all members to be specifically listed by name within the Terms of Reference.

The Chair confirmed that amended Terms of Reference, based on the suggestions of Senate members, would return to Academic Senate for consideration and approval. It was noted that conversations with Executive Deans regarding nominations for committee membership were ongoing.

Action:

That the Terms of Reference for SLTC, ASQC and QEC are amended in line with the suggestions of the Senate members and provided for further consideration and approval by Senate at a future meeting.

Professor Patrick McNeil and Professor Peter Nelson departed the meeting at 11:35am.

9.3 Disestablishment of Curriculum Standards Framework Committee (CSFC)

Resolution 15/57

Academic Senate resolved to:

(1) Approve the disestablishment of the Curriculum Standards Framework Committee;
9.4 Macquarie University Census Date (North Ryde – Session 1/Session 2 2016)

Neil Fraser, Director of Strategic Planning and Information, attended Academic Senate and spoke to the submitted paper seeking endorsement for a shift in 2016 census dates (to 26 March 2016 – Session 1 and 26 August 2016 – Session 2). Professor John Simons took the opportunity to highlight the significant amount of the work involved with this project.

Senate members were advised of the requirement to maintain compliance with ESOS requirements and were provided background for the reasoning behind the request for the amendment to the census date.

Members discussed the suggestion of a revised start date for Session 3, with the suggestion that Session 3 start at the beginning of each calendar year. A further suggestion was to consider decreasing the length of the session breaks.

The Chair commented on his discussions with student representative members and highlighted the impact of an amended census date on the scheduling of the early diagnostic assessment task, which students could use to determine whether they continue studying a particular unit or seek to withdraw prior to the census date.

**Resolution 15/58**

*Academic Senate endorses the proposed census dates for Macquarie University (North Ryde) and Sydney City Campus to be set on 26 March (Session 1) and 26 August (Session 2) for 2016-2018 with implementation to take effect from Session 1 2016.*

Academic Senate refers consideration of the implementation of the changes to the 2016 census dates to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee.

9.5 Election Results – Student Representatives to Academic Senate

Academic Senate noted the newly elected student representatives to Academic Senate.

9.6 Update: Animal Use for Scientific Purposes Policy

Professor Jacqueline Phillips spoke to the submitted paper, highlighting the change in name of the policy and providing background to the proposed changes to the policy.

Senate members were invited to request a copy of the draft Animal Use for Scientific Purposes Policy and provide any comments directly to Professor Lesley Hughes via email by Friday 12 June 2015.

An elected member from the Faculty of Arts sought clarification that the draft policy has been circulated and noted that there was not currently a member for the Faculty of Arts listed as part of the consultative group.

The Chair encouraged Senate members to become involved if they had any interest in this area.

Academic Senate noted the update.

9.7 Implementation of the Policy Framework Policy

**Resolution 15/59**

*Academic Senate noted the implementation of the Policy Framework Policy.*

10. ITEMS FOR APPROVAL FROM ASQC

10.1 Educational Leadership and Leading Teaching – New specialisations

**Resolution 15/60**

*Academic Senate approves the new specialisations Educational Leadership and Leading Teaching, effective 1 January 2016.*

10.2 Graduate Certificate of Applied Finance Post MappFin - New Award

**Resolution 15/61**

*Academic Senate approves the academic case for the Graduate Certificate of Applied Finance Post MappFin, effective 1 January 2016.*
10.3 Proposal to change Postgraduate Program Titles

**Resolution 15/62**
Academic Senate approves that the Graduate Certificate of Global Health and Development Studies and the Master of Global Health and Development Studies be renamed the Graduate Certificate of Development Studies and Global Health and the Master of Development Studies and Global Health respectively, effective from 1 January 2016.

10.4 New Major in English as a Foreign Language

**Resolution 15/63**
Academic Senate approves the academic case for the new Major in English as a Foreign Language, effective 1 January 2016.

10.5 Master of Accounting (ACCA Extension) – Name change

**Resolution 15/64**
Academic Senate approves that the Master of Accounting (ACCA Extension) be renamed to the Master of International Accounting, effective 1 January 2016.

10.6 Bachelor of Science and related double degrees – Program change

**Resolution 15/65**
Academic Senate approves the introduction of a Foundation requirement that is 3 credit points from the following units;
- MATH111 Quantitative Methods for Science (3)
- MATH132 Mathematics 1A (Advanced) (3)
- MATH135 Mathematics 1A (3)
- DMTH137 Discrete Mathematics 1 (3)
- STAT170 Introductory Statistics (3)
- STAT171 Statistical Data Analysis (3)

to apply to the following programs:
- Bachelor of Science
- Bachelor of Arts with the degree of Bachelor of Science
- Bachelor of Science with the degree of Bachelor of Education (Secondary)
- Bachelor of Science with the degree of Bachelor of Laws
- Bachelor of Science with the degree of Bachelor of Laws (With Honours)
- Bachelor of Actuarial Studies with the degree of Bachelor of Science
- Bachelor of Engineering with the degree of Bachelor of Science
- Bachelor of Engineering (With Honours) with the degree of Bachelor of Science

effective from 1 January 2016.

11. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

11.1 Academic Senate Standing Committee (ASSC)
Academic Senate noted the report of the meeting of 15 May 2015.

11.2 Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC)
Academic Senate noted the report of the meeting of 28 April 2015.

11.3 Curriculum Standards Framework Committee (CSFC)
Academic Senate noted the report of the meetings of 22 April and 20 May 2015.

11.4 Higher Degrees Research Committee (HDRC)
Academic Senate noted the report of the meetings of 24 April and 20 May 2015 resolved as recommended:

**Resolution 15/66**
That the 48 students included in the report of the Higher Degree Research Committee of 24 April and 20 May 2015 (listed at Item 11.4 of the 2 June 2015 Academic Senate Agenda) have satisfied the requirements of the awards stated.
Nominations for Vice-Chancellor's commendation

Resolution 15/67
That Merrina Anugraham's PhD thesis entitled “Membrane Protein Glycan Markers of Epithelial Ovarian Cancer: Discrimination of Serous Tumours of Ovary, Peritoneum and Tube” be awarded a Vice-Chancellor's Commendation.

Resolution 15/68
That Julien Cooper's PhD thesis entitled “Toponymy on the Periphery: placenames of the Eastern Desert, Red Sea and South Sinai in Egyptian Documents from the Early Dynastic until the end of the New Kingdom” be awarded a Vice-Chancellor's Commendation.

Resolution 15/69
That Katherine Emma Hurrell's PhD thesis entitled “Emotion Regulation in Children with Anxiety Disorders: The Role of Parent Factors” be awarded a Vice-Chancellor's Commendation.

Resolution 15/70
That Rosalind Lee Walsh's PhD thesis entitled “Catering the Needs of Intellectually Gifted Children in Early Childhood: Development and Evaluation of Questioning Strategies to Elicit Higher Order Thinking” be awarded a Vice-Chancellor's Commendation.

Resolution 15/71
That the ten students included in the Report of the Higher Degree Research Committee of 24 April and 20 May 2015 (listed at item 11.4 of the 2 June 2015 Academic Senate Agenda) have completed the requirements for the Master of Research.

11.5 Quality Enhancement Committee (QEC)
Academic Senate noted the report of the meeting of 14 May 2015.

11.6 Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC)
Academic Senate noted the report of the meetings of 13 April and 11 May 2015.

12. REPORTS FROM FACULTY BOARDS

12.1 Faculty of Business and Economics
The report of the Faculty of Business and Economics Faculty Board of 14 April 2015 was noted.

12.2 Faculty of Science and Engineering
The report of the Faculty of Science and Engineering Faculty Board of 4 May 2015 was noted.

13. OTHER BUSINESS
Nil.

14. CONSIDERATION OF CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

14.1 University Discipline Committee
The minutes of the University Discipline Committee meetings held on 8 April, 23 April and 6 May 2015 were tabled.

15. NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of Academic Senate will be held on Tuesday 14 July 2015.
Agenda Items are due by Friday 3 July 2015.
There being no further business the meeting was declared closed at 11:46 am.
ITEM 4.1  ACADEMIC SENATE ITEMS REQUIRING ACTION

For information.
**ITEM 4.1:** ACADEMIC SENATE ITEMS REQUIRING ACTION AS AT 25 AUGUST 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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>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>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>
<tr>
<td>18/07/14</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>The following action items were referred as a result of the issues raised by the Session 1 2014 Examination Reports from the Executive Deans: • Issues of lack of student engagement and attendance at lectures to be referred to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee. • Refer consideration of a consistent University approach to the late submission of assignments to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee. • Review of first session of the implementation of the new Disruption to Studies Policy to be referred to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee. • The managing of expectations for non ATAR entry English language requirements referred to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee. • The use of grade distributions in the University’s assessment practices to be referred for further clarification to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee. • Post Session 1 examination results analysis referred to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee for consideration. A report on its findings to be provided to Academic Senate and Faculties for action. • Senate Learning and Teaching Committee to consider examination reports and to identify possible policy responses to issues identified. • The Deputy Registrar to provide a statistical report on the application of the Withdrawal Without Academic Penalty rule and to provide an update on the progress of the process review.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/10/14</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>The Academic Senate to establish a Working Group to recommend criteria for the award of the University Medal and be provided criteria for members to consider before the end of 2014.</td>
<td>Ongoing. Update provided 2 June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Chair of Academic Senate to discuss ongoing Warawar representation on Academic Senate with the Executive Dean of Faculty of Arts. Academic Senate discussed and noted the question on notice. The Chair confirmed that he would respond directly to the authors of the letter.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/06/15</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>The Senate Learning and Teaching Committee to discuss and consider the recommendations of the Disruption to Studies Working Group and to provide a progress update to the 25 August 2015 meeting of Academic Senate.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/06/15</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>That Academic Senate refers relevant issues addressed within the ICAC report to QEC or ASQC.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Meeting</td>
<td>Item number</td>
<td>Action required</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/06/15</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>That Academic Senate establish a working party (including a student member) to develop a set of principles to govern the rescission of degrees in future cases and to work with the General Counsel to develop amendments to the relevant academic rules to clearly articulate University Council’s powers to rescind awarded degrees.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/06/15</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Comments on the Student Academic Code of Conduct to be forwarded to the General Counsel.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/06/15</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>That the Terms of Reference for SLTC, ASQC and QEC are amended in line with the suggestions of the Senate members and provided for further consideration and approval by Senate at a future meeting.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM 5 REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

For discussion.
Report from the Chair of Academic Senate
August 2015

Update: Academic Integrity Project

At the Senate meeting in June we welcomed academic integrity expert, Dr Tracey Bretag from the University of South Australia, who briefed Senators on the state of policy in this area, and on mechanisms to encourage student understanding and ownership of academic integrity principles and good practice.

I’m very pleased to report that Tracey has agreed to return to Macquarie on Thursday 19 and Friday 20 November to assist us in determining how we might embed a renewed culture of personal integrity and ethical good practice throughout all of our academic programs. Tracey will be joined by Dr Teddi Fishman, the Director of the International Centre for Academic Integrity (ICAI), based at Clemson University in the United States.

Prior to their arrival on campus, Senate Learning and Teaching Committee will establish a working party to begin scoping the details of this project, in particular the ways that Macquarie might encourage a strong and systemic appreciation of academic integrity principles and practice within its student body (and more broadly). This working group will seek representation from Faculties, the Library, and the HDR Office of Integrity to ensure that we can work towards a uniformed approach/campaign for all students.

The University of Sydney – Taskforce on Academic Misconduct

Last week The University of Sydney’s Taskforce on Academic Misconduct released its first report titled "An Approach to Minimising Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism at the University of Sydney". The report makes a number of recommendations on ways to prevent and detect academic dishonesty and misconduct among students including:

- Mandatory academic honesty education and an early focus on written communication skills be embedded into all undergraduate and postgraduate coursework award courses
- Explicit consideration of academic integrity issues in the design of the assessment tasks in each unit of study, through the use of a risk assessment matrix, to ensure that the opportunities for academic dishonesty are limited.
- Building an accessible, searchable and complete recordkeeping facility across the University. Effective recordkeeping is an essential part of ensuring that cases of repeated misconduct are detected and dealt with appropriately.
- Developing, within the Education Portfolio, a liaison and coordination point to support staff and students. This could be an office of educational integrity, which would champion academic integrity for coursework students in the University, support students and staff and track trends.
- Make changes to the University’s policies as appropriate to implement best practice prevention and detection.¹

The report has been included in the agenda papers for discussion and information. This report provides a particularly useful literature survey, and we should carefully consider its recommendations as we move forward on a renewal of our own academic integrity framework.

Member led business

At a meeting with the elected members of Senate last week, it was agreed that we should introduce a permanent standing item at all Academic Senate meetings which allows members to bring forward business for inclusion on the agenda. This was also one of the recommendations that emerged from the Academic Governance Workshops, which suggested that members should be supported to pro-actively bring forward items of business.

¹ An approach to minimising academic misconduct and plagiarism at the University of Sydney, p2.
This member led business item will be introduced at our next meeting scheduled in October. The elected members of Senate will meet regularly between meetings to strategise and discuss issues of concern and/or raise ideas for consideration. My hope is that this will remain an enabling mechanism for members to bring issues to the table and further motivate members to seek the views of their constituencies.

At this same meeting, many members commented upon a lack of training to undertake their role as an academic governor effectively. This is a broader issue that requires further exploration and action, and it is related to a broader process of community engagement in the role and purpose of Academic Governance. I have promised to have further discussions with Governance Services and Human Resources to determine what we might do to support a formal training program. It is my view that this should be provided not only to those that sit on Senate itself, but also to those who serve on its committees.

In the meantime, I have updated the Resources page on our Senate website to include a series of helpful links focussing on the nature of University governance, which I strongly encourage members peruse.

**TEQSA Registration**

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic’s office is undertaking work to prepare for TEQSA Reregistration in 2016. I am a member of the Steering Group, which is currently preparing information against the core assessment areas required for the application for renewal of registration, due in November 2015. Over the next six months, Senate will be briefed on progress and opportunities to contribute. I see the reregistration process as less about compliance, but rather, as a great opportunity for the University to reflect on current practices and identify areas for improvement.

**Committee update**

**Quality Enhancement Committee (QEC)**

At the last Senate meeting the new Terms of Reference for the QEC were approved. Following the approval, I have been meeting with Executive Deans to brief them on plans for the future of QEC, and the process of calling for nominations of membership. However, the next step in the re-establishment of the committee is to evaluate and revise the University’s quality enhancement framework and to establish new operating procedures both for the conduct of academic organisational reviews (of Departments and Faculties) and for the identification and reporting of academic risks. This, in turn, will enable us to identify and plan the business of QEC in a principled manner.

To provide us with the time to undertake this review, the next two QEC meetings have been cancelled. We will, however, continue to discharge our responsibilities to keep the review cycle moving via flying minute and incidental working party (where appropriate).

During the time between now and the QEC meeting scheduled for the 26th November, I will work with the Deputy Vice Chancellor Academic on drafting a revised quality framework, which will be distributed widely for consultation. We are also seeking some external assistance with this project, and considering the possibility of appointing an Chair to this committee who would be external to the University. My personal view is that an external Chair would bring much needed expertise and greatly enhance the independence of the work of this committee.

**Macquarie University International College Subcommittee of ASQC**

I’m very pleased to report that at its last meeting, the Standing Committee of Academic Senate approved Dr Catriona Lavermicocca from the Faculty of Business and Economics as the Chair of the MUIC Subcommittee of ASQC. MUIC is an important initiative and establishing a strong academic governance framework to support is development is a vital part of the process. Catriona
is a highly valued member of ASQC and is excited to begin the role. We are working with Jake Garman, the Director of MUIC to begin planning the subcommittee's activities.

**OLT Project: Student engagement in University decision-making and governance**

Dr Sally Varnham from UTS is leading an OLT funded project about enhancing the student experience by the development of a more systemic inclusion of student voice in decision-making and governance in Australian universities. Sally is the immediate past Chair of UTS' Academic Board and is an academic with the Faculty of Law.

I'm very pleased to be a member of the project's reference group as it works with universities to create good practice guides to assist in developing and enhancing student engagement. As you know, this is an issue that is close to my heart, so I look forward to contributing and potentially having Macquarie being involved in a pilot study to better enable genuine student engagement in governance matters.

**Learning and Teaching Week**

Macquarie's annual Learning and Teaching Week will take place on 14-17 September. As Senate members, I strongly encourage you all to attend, particularly for the launch of the Learning and Teaching White Paper on 14 September. A lot of hard work and effort is put into these events each year, and I believe we should be seen to be supporting all areas of the University’s activities. I would also ask that you circulate information about this event widely within your own networks.
ITEM 6.1 CONTEXT FOR CHANGE – LEARNING AND TEACHING STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK

For discussion.
ITEM 6.1 CONTEXT FOR CHANGE
DRAFT LEARNING AND TEACHING STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK:
WHITE PAPER

Issue
The Pro-Vice Chancellor Learning and Teaching commissioned Cathy Rytmeister, Lecturer, Academic Development (Evaluation; Leadership & Management) to prepare a background paper to articulate the context for change in learning and teaching.

This paper supports the strategies expressed in Learning and Teaching White Paper and aims to:

- Outline key global, sectoral and local trends in higher education
- Canvas the impact of current and proposed government policy and market trends on the organisation and structure of the Australian higher education sector
- Situate Macquarie University in relation to its key competitors and possible future sector-level developments
- Argue that a change in approach to curriculum and teaching is an avenue to maintain and enhance our distinctive and advantageous position in the sector.

Recommendation:
Consider and discuss the implications of the external environment articulated in the Context for Change Paper.

Submitted by: Professor Dominic Verity, Chair of Academic Senate

For enquiries contact:
Cathy Rytmeister, Lecturer, Academic Development (Evaluation; Leadership & Management) Ext: 9719
As Professor Simons states in his Foreword to the Learning and Teaching Green Paper, achievement of the goals proposed in that document are “not a small ambition” for the University. Fortunately, as Professor Simons also points out, a number of Macquarie’s historical and contemporary features render us well-placed to distinguish our University in the sector through the development of a Connected Learning Community.

There are certainly challenges and risks involved in setting out on this journey, both within the University and externally. The Commonwealth Government’s proposed changes to funding arrangements remain in the Federal Budget. Although unlikely to pass the current Senate, a Federal election could be held any time from September this year. If the proposed measures are implemented, we are likely to see intensified competition in the higher education market. Macquarie University needs to continue to build on its strengths as well as seek new ways to distinguish itself at local, national and global levels.

This background paper aims to support the general thrust of the Green Paper proposals by firstly, outlining key global, sectoral and local trends in higher education, secondly, canvassing the impact of current and proposed Government policy and market trends on the organisation and structure of the Australian higher education sector and thirdly, situating Macquarie University in relation to its key competitors and possible future sector-level developments. Finally, it argues that for Macquarie University, a change in approach to curriculum and teaching is the main avenue open to us if we are to maintain and enhance our distinctive and advantageous position in the sector.
The really big picture – global trends

There is general agreement amongst scholars of Higher Education that over the last quarter-century three major (and interrelated) trends have substantively impacted on HE systems and sectors:

**Massification** refers to the global phenomenon of increasing participation in higher education. The rate of massification varies but is observable to some extent in most nations. Higher education in a majority of OECD countries is now classed as mass (30-50% of age cohort enrolled) or high (>50% age cohort enrolled) participation (Marginson 2015; Beerkens-Soo & Vossensteyn 2009).

**Globalisation** has many dimensions. The aspects most relevant to developments in higher education are increased global mobility of information, finance and people, formalisation of regional trading blocs, removal of trade barriers and establishment of a range of free trade agreements. These aspects have enabled the establishment of global, national and local markets (Marginson 2004) in higher education.

**Marketisation** is the reorientation of higher education towards competitive markets on local, national, regional and global scales. This is largely the result of public policy underpinned by an assumption that market or quasi-market mechanisms are effective tools for the efficient regulation of HE (Meek 2000).

Other technological, social, cultural and political factors affecting higher education sectors (regional and national) include the rapid development, increasing availability and widespread use of information and communication technology and the rapid industrialisation of South-East Asian nations. The extent to which these factors and the “big three” global trends are causes or consequences of each other is arguable, but makes little difference to the dimensions of their observable impact on what is now the global “business” of higher education. Responses include:

- Reframing in public policy of the social and economic role and purpose of HE, from elite education and cultural maintenance through nation-building and social mobility to national economic advancement, global competitiveness and individual prosperity (Pick 2006, Boulton & Lucas 2008).
- Reduced public funding, largely replaced by increased student tuition fees. This trend is clear internationally, although by no means universal (e.g. Scandinavian countries maintain high levels of public funding as do some South American and Asian nations). (OECD 2014).
- Increased international mobility of students, global competition for students (including higher degree research students), academic staff (particularly researchers) and establishment of international partnerships between, and offshore “branches” of, universities.
- Increased emphasis on efficiency, effectiveness, quality and performance of higher education systems and institutions, accompanied by development of metrics, regulatory reporting, quality audits and standards for qualifications, institutional operations (including governance) and (in some disciplines) learning outcomes.¹
- The emergence, and growth in importance, of international ranking schemes for universities. Despite wide criticism of their methodologies and use, rankings inform and influence both national HE policy and institutional strategy as indicators of position in global, regional and local markets.
- Recognition and emerging economic importance of higher education as an “industry”, in particular, an import/export industry, and the commodification of higher education qualifications.

¹ While this has largely unfolded at the sectoral level (e.g. the Australian Qualifications Framework and Higher Education Standards), there are several cross-national examples, such as those produced by the OECD (e.g. the AHELO project), the European Higher Education Area (e.g. ENQA quality assurance standards and the Bologna Process), UNESCO (statements, guidelines) and international professional accreditation bodies such as the AACSB.
Understanding responses at sectoral and institutional levels

The impact of broad global trends and related shifts in public policy directions are felt at all levels of higher education, from macro (national/sectoral) and meso (institutional) to micro (institutional unit and individual). Institutional theory (DiMaggio & Powell 1983, Morphew & Huisman 2002) and the concept of institutional isomorphism also help in understanding the dynamics of the response at the sectoral and institutional levels. The twin impulses of *emulation* and *differentiation* operate simultaneously in shaping national policy and regulatory frameworks and the structure, identity and activities of the institutions within them (Sporn 2003, Van Vught 2007).

The various attempts at international standard-setting, harmonisation and benchmarking – all drivers of isomorphism or convergence – are offset by the pressures of the international market for students and staff, which demands a certain level of differentiation on the basis of sectoral and institutional quality. Even as nations seek to conform to standards and emulate the successes of perceived high-status and/or high-performing HE systems\(^2\), they are often also working to distinguish their sector from others on the basis of quality, outcomes, student experience and regulatory consistency, which in turn has driven the development of national systems of regulation in many HE sectors, including Australia’s\(^3\).

A level of structural diversity persists amongst national higher education sectors (especially in the mix of private/public provision, private/public funding and internal stratification on the basis of status, access and quality) due to local historical, cultural, social and economic factors. Nevertheless, echoes of, and responses to, global trends and developments can be found within sectors and at the institutional level as governments and institutions negotiate the complexity of challenges in the governance, management and sustainability of HE systems and institutions.

**Key impacts on Australian Higher Education**

Over the last three decades, Australia has seen a general public policy shift towards market-based “solutions” to the governance, regulation, performance assessment and funding of higher education (and other public services), strongly influenced by neoliberalism and New Public Management principles (Bargh, Scott & Smith 1996, Connell 2013, O’Byrne & Bond 2014, Ferlie, Musselini & Andresani 2008).

**The macro (sectoral) level**

The post-WWII modernisation of the Australian higher education sector is a fascinating story, but beyond the scope of this document. We fast forward through the capacity-building agenda of the 1940s and 50s, the establishment of recurrent Federal funding in the late 1950s\(^4\), formalisation of the binary system (universities and colleges)\(^5\) in the 1960s and the establishment of several new universities (of which Macquarie was one) to absorb increasing demand from the baby-boomer generation and the abolition of tuition fees by the Whitlam Government in 1974, to the major structural reforms of the late 1980s and early 1990s, often referred to (not always positively) as the “Dawkins revolution”\(^6\).

---


\(^3\) The 2000 MCEETYA Protocols for Higher Education Approval Processes stated that “The introduction of nationally agreed protocols for the recognition of universities is seen as particularly desirable to protect the standing of Australian universities nationally and internationally.” (JCHE, p2)

\(^4\) Recommended by the Murray Committee of Inquiry (1957).

\(^5\) Recommended by the Committee on the Future Development of Tertiary Education in Australia (the “Martin Committee”) (1964).

\(^6\) Named for John Dawkins, at the time Education Minister in the Hawke ALP Government.
The Dawkins reforms were part of a broad economic restructuring program that aimed to increase national productivity and competitiveness, reduce trade and financial protections and increase the nation’s exposure to global markets. They laid the foundations for subsequent higher education policy directions, creating the conditions for massification, growth in international student enrolments, increased reliance on market- and performance-based approaches to funding and the shift from public to private (principally household) funding sources.

The most visible structural change wrought by Dawkins was replacement of the binary system with a “Unified National System” (UNS) of universities. Probably the most controversial was the reintroduction of tuition fees, initially set at 20% of the average cost of provision (Sharrock 2013). This was somewhat cushioned by the establishment of the Higher Education Contribution Scheme (HECS), which provided deferred-repayment loans to cover the cost. Other aspects of the Dawkins reform program were, however, arguably more influential in reshaping the sector, its relationship with Government (Marginson 1997) and the nature of Australian universities as institutions. These include:

- Reframing of the post-war nation- and capacity-building role of higher education to that of providing for national advancement and competitiveness on the world stage.
- Establishment of eligibility conditions for inclusion as a university in the UNS (including size, diversity of teaching and research programs, financial viability and governance arrangements)
- Encouragement to universities to seek funding from sources other than Government, and the acceleration of private funding through tuition fees.
- From the mid-1980s, expansion of places for foreign students, followed by the entry of private English language teaching and pathway colleges targeting this market.
- Establishment of performance assessment and quality assurance processes and reporting requirements, initially through three annual “quality rounds” in which different aspects of university activities were examined and funding awarded on the basis of the outcomes (Massaro 2013).

These aspects of the reforms also gave Government a taste for intervention in universities through the setting of conditions, standards and reporting requirements, and for the use of funding to leverage desired outcomes – something every Australian Federal Governments has since embraced with some enthusiasm7. Increasingly, the Commonwealth has asserted responsibility for the governance and regulation of the sector, leaving the States with an almost (but not quite) inconsequential role. The remaining areas of significant State influence are responsibility for university enabling legislation (and hence their institutional governance arrangements) and financial audit.

The return to conservative rule in 1996 brought cuts to real levels of funding, from which the sector has never fully recovered. Tuition fees rose in 1997 and again in 2005, with universities allowed to add up to 25% to the basic HECS fee (most did so)8 and students able to add the difference to their HECS loans. From 2005, income-contingent loans were extended to cover tuition fees in non-CSP places, including PG coursework programs and degrees offered by private and non-university providers (Sharrock 2013).

---

7 Not all such outcomes were relevant to education – e.g. a proportion of Commonwealth funding from 2003-2007 was conditional on universities’ conformance to the Howard Government’s Higher Education Workplace Relations Requirements (HEWRRs) which included the requirement for universities to offer individual contracts to all staff.

8 With respect to raising tuition fees above the HECS minimum, Macquarie University was, on the grounds of equity, a very honourable exception, holding out against the sectoral trend for some years (although with hindsight this may have caused long-term financial disadvantaged to the University), until this position became impossible to maintain amidst falling Government funding and rising costs.
The ALP’s return to power in 2007 brought some respite from continued funding cuts and fee increases, and the removal of industrial and governance compliance conditions for funding. The Bradley Review of Higher Education (2008) recommended widening participation through removing caps on CSPs, along with a 10% increase in base funding per student. While caps on CSPs were removed from 2012, thereby exposing a greater proportion of university funding to market variation and uncertainty and increasing competition for domestic students, the 10% base funding increase was not forthcoming. By early 2013 the Government had once again proposed cuts to higher education funding. The ALP lost the Federal election later that year and these cuts were never implemented; however, they are still “on the books” as a budget saving under the current Government, as well as deregulation and increases in tuition fees.

The Australian sector today
In contrast to twenty-five years ago, the Australian higher education sector today, while remaining predominantly “public” (educating 93% of HE students) (DET 2014a) is characterised by:

- **Mass participation.** More than 35% of school-leavers enter university; in 2013, more than 1.3 million students were studying at Australian HE providers (an increase of 4.5% on 2012), including around 330 000 international students. International student numbers fell in the late 2000s due to the global financial crisis but have been on a recovery trajectory since 2012. (DET 2014a)

- **Increased regulation and reporting.** Regulatory reporting requirements have increased significantly in the name of accountability and “steering at a distance” (Marginson 1997, Vidovich 2002). Regulation is accomplished via a combination of legislation, market mechanisms, published performance metrics, standards-based audit (TEQSA), and in some cases, Ministerial discretion.

- **Relatively low level of public funding compared to other countries.** Down from just over 1% of GDP in 1995 to 0.7% in 2011 (OECD average 1.1%); down from 68% of university revenue in 1990 to around 49% in 2000 and currently estimated to be just over 40%.

- **High student fees and (as a consequence) graduate debt.** Domestic student fees amount to around 40% of the average cost of provision (Sharrock 2013), amongst the highest of all public higher education systems in the OECD (OECD 2014). As at June 2013, Australian graduates owed $30b, with an expectation that $7b will never be repaid (Norton & Cherastidtham 2014).

- **Advances in social inclusion.** Participation by low SES, rural and remote and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students has increased, although these groups remain under-represented overall and differentially represented in different institutions. In terms of social mobility the Australian sector is in the mid-range compared to other high participation systems (Marginson 2015, OECD 2014).

- **Casualisation of the academic workforce.** Academic casualisation at sectoral level is estimated to be around 26% of FTE teaching and research staff9 (derived from DET 2014b). The casual workforce is estimated to number 65 -70 000, the majority of whom aspire to an academic career (Gottschalk & McEachern 2010, Junor 2004). Insecure workers are estimated to perform 50-60% of HE teaching, and up to 80% in some disciplines (Harvey 2013). Since 2004, only two of every ten employees in the sector have had continuing positions (Kniest, 2015).

- **Increase in non-university higher education providers (NUHEPs).** Largely as a result of the 2005 extension of income-contingent loans to their students (Go8 2014), private NUHEPs have risen from 78 in 1999 to 106 in 2014, (excluding those owned by public universities) (Norton & Cherastidtham 2014). Public NUHEPs tend to be existing TAFE/VET providers offering HE programs.

---

9 Each FTE casual is estimated to correspond to between 4.5 and 5 actual staff members (head count).
• **Increased emphasis on international rankings.** Despite political rhetoric on the need for Australian universities to improve their global standing\(^{10}\), the sector is well-represented in world rankings. Between 10% and 20% of Australian universities are ranked in the top 100 (depending on the scheme), comparing favourably with the USA (about 1-2%) and UK (about 7-17%)\(^{11}\). The 2015 Universitas21 ranking of national sectors places Australia’s at 10\(^{th}\), but 18\(^{th}\) on resources. Adjusted for level of economic development, Australia ranks 13\(^{th}\) overall but 34\(^{th}\) for resources.

• **Stratification, competition and self-defined “university groups”.** Competition within the Australian market for students, staff and prestige is a smaller-scale replication of the global competition between national sectors. Institutions seek to both emulate the most prestigious institutions on status-related measures (such as research performance) and simultaneously distinguish themselves in the market on the basis of their programs, perceived strengths and strategic focus.

Status-seeking and influence-building behaviours include membership of one of the self-defined “university groups”, formed around similarities in mission, identity, history and status. Currently these are: Group of Eight (Go8), Innovative Research Universities (IRU), Australian Technology Network (ATN) and Regional Universities Network (RUN). Just under a third of public universities in the sector (including Macquarie) are not aligned with any group.

**Sectoral diversity in Australia**

Diversity within the sector (that is, between institutions) may be “simple” diversity, as envisaged by Dawkins (1989), in which different university types and missions cater for different needs, interests and/or geographical locations. Diversity may be programmatic (Van Vught 2009), with a particular focus chosen to align with a segment of the student market, a section of the labour market and/or a particular industry. Diversity, however, can also mean stratification on the basis of perceived prestige, exclusivity, quality and affordability. Research evidence indicates that sectors with lower public funding tend to move towards greater stratification and discrepancies in access across SES boundaries (Marginson 2015). This is potentially a pattern that the Australian sector is moving into with increased use of market-based mechanisms for funding, the uncapping of Commonwealth Supported Places (CSPs) in universities and the proposed deregulation of tuition fees.

Further, Davies & Zarifa (2012) report that in a context of growing demand, sectoral stratification on the basis of status indicators becomes more defined. Stratification on the basis of status or prestige poses major risks to social equity: Marginson (2015), citing Mettler’s (2014) work on inequality in the US sector, warns that in highly stratified sectors, higher education may become less a vehicle of social mobility than a reinforcer of existing social inequality. It also poses a challenge to institutions like Macquarie, sitting below the “top tier” institutions in terms of prestige, but above most “lower tier”, generally newer, universities and well above the lower-cost NUHEPs. Macquarie is well accustomed to competing strongly with both ends of the sector on the basis of perceived teaching quality, program offerings, research activity, learning environment and facilities and, more recently, opportunities for international and work-integrated learning experiences. However, in a context of deregulated fees, cuts to public funding and increased sectoral stratification, affordability and status may become the key determinants of students’ choices. To disrupt this discourse, and maintain and enhance its standing in the sector, Macquarie needs a narrative that emphasises the quality and intellectual challenge of the Macquarie student learning experience, its inclusiveness and its value in building life-long capability.


The meso (institutional) level

How do we frame and articulate institutional strategy in this mass participation system, increasingly reliant on domestic and international tuition fee revenue, on market-based mechanisms for a large proportion of its funding and on a largely itinerant workforce to perform its core educational activities, in a context of political uncertainty about fee deregulation, further substantial cuts to public funding and changes to the income-contingent loans scheme? We need to consider the positioning of Macquarie University in relation to the sector, with reference to our current strengths and potential areas of development and in the light of the very likely continuation of the public policy trends towards greater market orientation, ongoing expansion and the introduction of a new set of “price signals” to the student market, all pointing to increased competition and stratification within the sector.

In line with developments in the Australian higher education sector, our universities have experienced major changes in over the last twenty-five years, from composition of the student body and workforce profile to management structures and the balance of power between the three key nodes of institutional governance: governing body, Executive and academic board. Developments at institutional level as a result of big picture global trends, national policy directions, decreased public funding and the operation of increasingly competitive markets in higher education include:

- Less reliance on recurrent funding and increased reliance on market-dependent funding, mainly from student enrolments (domestic and international), intensifying competition for students.
- Increased offerings of programs, particularly coursework programs at postgraduate level (although several institutions have recently moved to reduce offerings, especially at undergraduate level).
- Internationalisation of the student body, particularly in urban and eastern state universities up to the late 2000s and the GFC, when numbers dropped significantly, followed by slow recovery to date.
- Adoption of new teaching technologies: online delivery via Learning Management Systems; blended learning; recording and podcasting of lectures; use of audiovisual technologies; use of social media.
- Changes in academic workforce profile: casualisation and an ageing permanent workforce.
- Professionalisation of general staff work and university administration (Szekeres, 2006), including professionalisation of academic management (Moodie 1995), and the emergence of the “blended professional” in academic, administrative and service areas (Whitchurch 2010).
- Increasing student-staff ratios and academic workloads and intensification of professional/ general staff work.
- Industrialisation of employment through the advent of enterprise bargaining and the formation of the NTEU as a national union representing both academic and professional/general staff.
- Increased institutional size, complexity and uncertainty with respect to funding, with growing focus on (and investment in) market-facing functions (recruitment, marketing) and financial management.
- Management and governance increasingly adopting commercial corporate models although not-for-profit sector governance and management models retain some influence. (Shattock 2002).
- Accrual of power and authority to Executive management, largely at the expense of academic power and authority as represented by collegial academic bodies and processes.

12 “Blended professionals” include highly qualified staff employed as general staff but often undertaking some aspects of academic work (e.g. educational designers/developers, some technical staff, project staff, research officers) and academics moving into managerial roles (Heads of Department, Deans, senior managers).
These changes appear to be here to stay, regardless of Federal election results, as both major parties’ policies promote market-based funding models and neither is showing any sign of abandoning their approach. This in turn means that however distasteful we might find a focus on “competition” to be, we need to accept that, in the foreseeable future, it will remain a key feature of the sector, and that competition for students will be of primary importance, since a majority of our funding depends on student enrolments. Therefore we need to be well-equipped for engagement in it, because if we can’t compete effectively for students, we simply won’t have the resources to continue to produce quality in what we do, be it teaching, research, community engagement or any other activity.

Macquarie in the “market”: where – and with whom – do we compete?

On what basis, and with whom, does Macquarie compete for students? Marginson (2004) has observed that “Globalisation and markets together are changing the competition for status goods (positional goods) in higher education.” (p175) There are many studies of why students choose a particular university (or at least express a preference for a particular university, whether they are successful in gaining admission or not). A range of both scholarly and market research studies have shown that, once students have decided their preference for a field of study, important factors in their choice of institution include: the institution’s reputation in relation to that field of study (which may encompass teaching quality, facilities, employment outcomes and research); its general reputation for good teaching; its learning environment (course design, flexibility, facilities); access to services and support and location. We also know that a student’s perception of the relative prestige of an institution is influential; this is important since, as noted above, the influence of prestige or status indicators is likely to increase in the context of continuing high demand and deregulation of fees.

Before considering Macquarie’s place in the sector and determining its key competitors, it is worth making a few points about general student recruitment factors in Australia. Firstly, for Australian universities, prestige largely derives from history and research reputation, the latter of which is in turn the major component of most international university ranking systems. On this basis, the Go8 constitutes the “top tier” with respect to status indicators in the Australian sector. Secondly, it appears that Australia’s ability as a sector to attract students from overseas depends more on the overall reputation of Australian higher education and the attractiveness of Australia as a destination (and possible future country of permanent residence) than on the research performance, reputation and attractiveness of individual institutions. Further, at institutional level, much recruitment (arguably too much) depends on the effectiveness of recruitment agents operating on the periphery of university control (NSW ICAC 2015) rather than the perceived or actual quality of the institution. We can perhaps conclude that the competition for international enrolments is not, in the main, an academic question. Rather, in many cases, it depends largely on the extent of institutional expenditure on (and perhaps effective oversight of) recruitment processes, price of tuition and cost of living. For many overseas students, neither research nor curriculum nor, arguably, prestige, determine university selection.

Thirdly, Australian domestic students appear to prefer to study locally: according to the 2011 census, 91% of students living in a capital city had been living in the same city five years earlier, and 86% of non-capital city students had not lived in a capital city five years earlier (ABS 2013). Surprisingly few students (9%) had moved to a capital city. While younger students (15-24 years old) were generally more mobile than older students (35% of younger students outside capital cities had moved there in the last five years), the assertion that Australian students tend to go to universities in the same general environment (city or region) in which they went to school is reasonable.
In conclusion, if we assume that, all other things being equal, most foreign students choose Australia and Sydney before considering the range of offers from different institutions, and that potential students already resident in Sydney will tend to stay here for tertiary study, this means that Macquarie is mainly competing both for students in the Sydney area and with other Sydney-based institutions. These are: the Go8 institutions, University of Sydney (USyd) and University of New South Wales (UNSW); University of Technology Sydney (UTS, ATN); Notre Dame University (NDU, private), Australian Catholic University (ACU) and University of Western Sydney (UWS), a number of interstate institutions with small operations in Sydney and a range of NUHEPs. Of these, only USyd, UNSW, UTS and UWS are serious competitors for Macquarie, given their size, location and range of programs. The Universities of Wollongong (UoW) and Newcastle (UoN) are also close enough to Sydney to pose some competition, being well-established, large universities (approximately 30 500 and 36 500 students respectively). They are similar to Macquarie in that they maintain both a research-focused strategy and comprehensive program offerings. Geographically and in terms of status, UoN is probably the closer competitor.

Macquarie in the Australian sector and the Sydney market

As noted earlier, the challenge for Macquarie is that it is “caught in the middle” of a stratifying market. In terms of status, staff and student profile it is neither at the top nor the bottom of the sector, although on some measures it more resembles lower status than high status universities.

Status/prestige: In status Macquarie is not quite able to match the “top tier” Go8 institutions (even if it threatens to outperform the lowest-ranking Go8 institutions in terms of research output and impact), while institutions such as UTS and Newcastle place pressure on the University from below with their research performance and ability to attract students. Macquarie usually ranks between 8th and 12th in Australia (most often 9th) on the various global ranking schemes, although its overall (global) ranks have fallen over the last ten years (see Appendix 1 for a summary of Macquarie’s rankings since 2011).

Staff: Based on DET figures, Macquarie’s academic staff profile includes 14% above Level C (only QUT and UNSW are higher on this measure; ANU, UoW and UC are similar) (DET 2014b). However, in 2013, Macquarie (with VU) had the 10th-highest level of casualisation, at 31% of teaching-only and teaching-and-research staff. Neither VU nor the universities with higher casualisation rates are institutions with which Macquarie would normally group itself (RMIT, Swinburne, QUT, USQ, USC, CUT, ACU, UTS and UWS). Apart from UTS and UWS, our competitors in Sydney and surrounds have substantially lower rates of casualisation (USyd 23%, UNSW 21%, UoN 26% and UoW 27%). Macquarie’s student-staff ratio (student load:FTE teaching + teaching and research staff) was 26.5 in 2013, the highest in NSW and seventh-highest in the sector (exceeded by FedU, RMIT, VU, CQU, ECU and CDU) (derived from DET 2014a,b).

Students: According to DET statistics, Macquarie is the 12th largest university in the sector in terms of student load, and the fourth largest in NSW (and Sydney) after USyd, UNSW and UWS. In 2013, Macquarie, with UNSW, had the 12th highest proportion of international students (DET 2014). Apart from general growth in numbers, Macquarie has not contributed substantially to widening disadvantaged groups’ participation in higher education, with its 2012 low SES intake at 8.3% being the fourth-lowest in the sector (ANU, UWA and UC) and only just lower than USyd (8.6%) (DET 2014a). Macquarie is also a fairly poor performer with respect to Indigenous enrolments. In 2013, only 0.6% of its students identified as Indigenous (DET 2014a), the 9th-lowest in the sector. Interestingly, 7 of the universities with lower Indigenous enrolment rates are in Victoria.
**Staying competitive**

For Macquarie, the uncapping of places has exacerbated the competition for students with the Go8 universities, as their decision to expand enrolments has seen aspirational students preference them ahead of Macquarie. It appears that popular programs at UTS may also have had an impact on the University’s “market share” of first preferences. Combined with slow recovery in international student numbers, Macquarie has had to enrol significantly more domestic students to compensate, and significantly more with lower ATARs (some much lower) than the published cut-offs. Anecdotal evidence from staff indicates that many of these students are struggling and in need of additional support. This in turn has resource implications if we are to retain students through to attainment.

Looking ahead to a stratifying, competitive and fee-deregulated sector, unless the Go8 institutions opt for a “retreat to quality” and substantially reduce their intakes, Macquarie will continue to face this challenge, since it is simply unable to compete for the status-conscious segment of the market (for whom price is not a significant deterrent). To ensure retention and distinctiveness from its non-Go8 competitors (price also being a status indicator), Macquarie will need to charge higher fees, but not so high as to deter the more price-conscious end of the market and drive them to its non-Go8 competitors.

There is an alternative, and that is to make a strong intervention with an alternative to status-seeking, price-conscious, consumerist decision-making market discourses. This in itself is “no small ambition”. Nevertheless, Macquarie has some distinctive features that means we are well-placed to make such an intervention, and to make it successfully. As a non-aligned university, Macquarie is not tied to any pre-conceived mould; indeed, it was founded with the express purpose of carving out a distinctive place in the Australian higher education sector. It was, and is, determinedly not an “establishment” university. Further, it aimed to provide educational opportunities to many groups who had not been able to access them before – in a stratifying system that is likely to challenge equity of access to, and social mobility through, higher education, it is vital that Macquarie reclaims that space.

The only viable option open to us to achieve this is through our curriculum. The integrated student learning experience in a *Connected Learning Community* that is envisaged in the Green Paper has the potential to not only establish a distinctive place for Macquarie but also to challenge the discourse about what it means to be educated at an advanced level in a modern, technology-rich society. A highly engaging, challenging and accessible student learning experience in the context of a *Connected Learning Community* can achieve this. Strong scaffolding of learning, collaborative, well-structured and aligned active learning activities and integrated assessment can effectively increase student engagement and hence learning (Gibbs 2010). A program-based approach, with *inclusive design* principles embedded from the curriculum planning stage, can address students’ prior educational disadvantage or lack of cultural capital, and contribute to maintaining the social mobility benefit of Australian higher education.

*We need to do this now:* our competitors are already moving in this direction, with UTS and UNSW investing heavily in staff and infrastructure to better enable technology-assisted and personalised learning, Sydney proposing sweeping changes to degree programs and UWS engaging high level staff to lead a student-centred, future-oriented and transformative educational approach. These institutions hold some advantages over Macquarie in terms of the factors that attract students: Sydney and UTS are highly accessible in their central Sydney locations; UWS has a geographically large and populous “natural constituency” and strong identification between the University and the Western Sydney communities it

---

13 See *Five Principles for Inclusive Design* – Paper prepared by T. Kerr, M. Grant and C. Rytmeister for the PVC(L&T), to support the development and promotion of Green Paper proposals.
was established to serve.\textsuperscript{14} UTS has a reputation for strong industry links, and was a pioneer of work-integrated learning, establishing so-called “sandwich” programs over thirty years ago, prior to becoming a university. In terms of programs, all are comprehensive universities with areas of strength recognised at national and international levels.

The Go8 institutions clearly hold the advantage in terms of status goods: UNSW and Sydney are both relatively wealthy and attract over 80% of donations to Sydney-based universities; Sydney has the added prestige of being Australia’s first university. They appear determined – and poised – to take full advantage of fee deregulation, adding to their capacity to maintain their position in the sector. Those who refer to Macquarie’s possible inclusion in a “Group of Nine” should keep in mind that the Go8 guards its “top tier” status jealously, and rarely misses an opportunity to emphasise its advantages in contrast to the rest of the sector\textsuperscript{15}. Macquarie may “snap at the heels” of the Go8 in the Australian rankings, but it will not be, and arguably should not aspire to be, a member of it, although we seek to emulate its successes in research.

In Macquarie’s favour, however, is its own history and its culture, which, despite the passing years, retains much that reflects the University’s history: a certain level of friendliness, informality, generosity and openness persists. Staff are generally committed to their work and genuinely interested in and supportive of students, and there is strong loyalty to colleagues without the exclusivity or tribalism found in some older institutions. Although now in its 51\textsuperscript{st} year and no longer classed as a “young” university, Macquarie still feels youthful. Also in Macquarie’s favour in creating a Connected Learning Community is the fact that it is essentially a single-campus institution (the City Campus being a relatively small operation with no key institutional staff based there).

Macquarie is now embedded in a population and employment growth area. The University currently draws school-leaver enrolments students from surrounding suburbs, including the North Shore, although the highest numbers come from north-western suburbs largely part of the Baulkham Hills Shire. Along with current residential developments in the Macquarie Park area and along main north-western road arteries, the extension of the north-west rail link from Chatswood via Macquarie University may well deliver a populous geographical “natural constituency” for Macquarie, similar to that of UWS. Building strong community connections in this area would advance this development. The University’s location in the heart of one of the fastest-growing employment areas in NSW is also advantageous in relation to building industry and employer connections. There are many opportunities for Macquarie to form productive relationships with employers for the purpose of knowledge transfer and in order to expand authentic learning opportunities for students. The University has made a substantial start with the PACE program, which currently has 1379 partners across 18 industry sectors, including public administration and safety (339 partners), rental, hiring and real estate services (239 partners) and education and training (136 partners) (a full list appears in Appendix 2).

\textsuperscript{14} UWS objects and functions include “particular regard to the needs and aspirations of residents of Greater Western Sydney” (University of Western Sydney Act 1997 S8(2)(a)).

\textsuperscript{15} For example, in the Go8 Policy Note Research Performance of Australian Universities (2012), a series of graphs showing that these 8 universities (20% of the sector) dominate research funding (from all sources), research output, research training and commercialisation of research to the tune of between 60% and 75% (depending on the individual metric used) is accompanied by the statement that the “qualitative difference between Go8 universities and the other universities leads to the question of the extent to which taxpayers funds are well spent by the Government’s continued investment in research in many other institutions.” (p10).
Summary

It appears that Macquarie is in good company in seeking further innovations in curriculum – but does that on its own make it imperative for us? The argument presented here is that it is certainly imperative, but not merely because “everyone else is doing it”. Macquarie is in a unique position in the sector, and particularly in the Sydney region, being neither one of the largest nor one of the smallest universities, effectively a single-campus institution, both research-focused and with a strong reputation for teaching quality, and of middle-to-upper status while locked out of the high prestige “top tier”. In an increasingly competitive and stratifying sector, whether exacerbated by fee deregulation or not, Macquarie risks being caught between the status-conscious and price-conscious poles of the market. Macquarie cannot and is unlikely to at any time in the foreseeable future, compete with the Group of Eight institutions on the basis of prestige, no matter how impressive our research.

In looking to our other competitors, it is clearly in Macquarie’s interests to keep entry standards as high as possible; however, if we do need to lower admission standards, this has implications for the level of support students will need in order to maintain the University’s exit standards. It would, therefore, be folly for Macquarie to lower fees to the same level as non-Go8 competitors, as this will not only lessen its capacity to provide the additional support needed to maintain exit standards but also be seen as a signifier of lower status. We don’t have the central location, vocational focus or reputation for strong industry links that UTS has, nor, as yet, a “natural” constituency similar to that of the Go8 (selective and private school leavers and high achievers from the public system) or UWS (Greater Western Sydney communities), although the north-west offers potential. Macquarie is unlikely to be able to increase tuition fees enough to allow a more academically selective intake and provide relief from high workloads and level of casualisation. We need to find another way to differentiate Macquarie in a market that is pulling students to both “ends” and in which we are firmly in the middle.

There are few options open to us: it is this reality of the need to attract students by maintaining high status on the one hand, while remaining affordable on the other, that makes a focus on student experience via both curriculum innovation and community connections vital to our success. If we offer a distinctive student experience linked with innovative approaches to learning, integrated assessment and real-world engagement, an experience that reawakens and excites students’ curiosity and creativity, and offers opportunities to collaborate, create and disseminate artefacts that demonstrate advanced analytical and critical thinking, then we will truly be offering students an experience that they will not obtain elsewhere. If we are successful, the medium to long term benefits will be significant. Good integrated assessment design potentially provides for a reduction in marking loads – and assessment tasks that are more interesting to mark. It also enables students to create artefacts over the course of their program that they can use in subsequent employment or in self-employment, and that might also become resources for future students in the program, as exemplars, teaching objects or source material. Students can be more effectively engaged through careful learning design, with staff doing fewer lectures in large lecture theatres and more hands-on, facilitative teaching with active learning groups.

This is the key goal of the Connected Learning Community proposed in the Green Paper. Of course, to do this effectively we will need to do it very well indeed, and that will require a great deal of collaboration, cooperation and trust between colleagues. It will require a high level of scaffolding and support for students which in turn requires strong design and planning at a whole-of-program and whole-of-discipline (or department) level. And of course, if we really want it to work, it will require both distributed and Executive leadership accompanied by investment in time, infrastructure and people.
Appendix 1

Macquarie University rankings.
The table below shows Macquarie’s global and Australian rankings over the last 4-5 years. On the Science-focused Leiden ranking Macquarie fares less well, as a comprehensive university in which much of our high-rated research is in the Humanities and Social Sciences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking scheme</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Global rank</th>
<th>Australian rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE World University Rankings</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>226-250</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>251-275</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>275-300</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>301-350</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QS World University Rankings</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>201-300</td>
<td>8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>201-300</td>
<td>8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>201-300</td>
<td>8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>201-300</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWTS Leiden Ranking</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>202 (impact)</td>
<td>4 (impact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>246 (collaboration)</td>
<td>11 (collaboration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>227 (impact)</td>
<td>7 (impact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>246 (collaboration)</td>
<td>12 (collaboration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>296 (impact)</td>
<td>12 (impact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>327 (collaboration)</td>
<td>19 (collaboration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015 size-independent</td>
<td>309 (impact)</td>
<td>14 (impact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>356 (collaboration)</td>
<td>21 (collaboration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015 size-dependent</td>
<td>387 (impact)</td>
<td>14 (impact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>428 (collaboration)</td>
<td>13 (collaboration)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1 Overtaken by University of Newcastle.
2 Behind the Go8, UTS, UoN and (in what appears to be an extraordinarily anomalous result considering other ranking scheme results) QUT, UniSA, UoW, CDU and Deakin.
3 In 2011-3 Macquarie and University of Adelaide were in the same band of rankings (201-300).
4 University of Adelaide moved into the 151-200 band of rankings.

Appendix 2

Pace partners by sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th># Partners</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th># Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Financial and Insurance Services</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rental, Hiring and Real Estate Services</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Professional, Scientific and Technical Services</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, Gas and Water Supply</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Administrative and Support Services</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Public Administration and Safety</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Education and Training</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Arts and Recreation Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport, Postal and Warehousing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Media and Telecommunications</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many thanks to Emily Whitehouse (PACE Office) for providing these figures.
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ITEM 6.2 LEARNING AND TEACHING STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK (WHITE PAPER)

For discussion.
ITEM 6.2 DRAFT LEARNING AND TEACHING STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK: WHITE PAPER

 Issue

A culture of transformative learning in a research-enriched environment is the number one strategic priority at Macquarie University. Together with the Macquarie Research Framework, the incoming Learning and Teaching Framework will provide the future directions for achieving this priority at our institution and as such, effectively contributing to our purpose, vision and values.

Given the strategic importance of this Framework, advanced consideration of corresponding academic governance matters are imperative. Ahead of a formal request for Senate approval of the final White Paper on 6 October 2015, it is important to enter into a focussed-session to consider the collective responsibility we share as academic leaders in enabling the successful implementation of this Framework.

Proactive forward planning will ensure that once the university endorses these strategic priorities, they are given appropriate priority in the agenda for Academic Senate over the next 5-year period.

Consultation Process

The draft Learning and Teaching Strategic Framework arises out of broad consultation over 12 months (2014-15). It reflects constructive feedback provided through over 50 meetings and 100 written responses from individuals, faculties, departments, professional offices, and students. The attached draft white paper incorporates this feedback and is further shaped by the Learning and Teaching Strategic Framework Reference Group.

This consultation phase is now complete, and we are moving to a staged approach to launching and implementing the Framework including:

- Senate consideration of the draft Framework, 25 August;
- Executive Group consideration of the draft Framework, 2 September;
- A soft-launch of the Framework as the opening event of Learning and Teaching Week on 14 September 2015, facilitated by Professor John Simons and Professor Sherman Young;
- A second soft-launch of the Framework at The Annual Conference on 24 September facilitated by Professor John Simons and Professor Sherman Young;
- Formal Senate approval of the final white paper content on 6 October;
- Published versions of the printed and online version made available to staff - This Week announcement: approximately 12 October.

Recommendation:
Consider and discuss the governance (and operational) implications of the targets and supporting strategies described in the draft Learning and Teaching Framework.

Operational Impact:

Vice-Chancellor
Academic Senate
Executive Group and portfolios – in particular:

- Faculties, Departments and Offices
- DVC Academic & PVC Learning and Teaching portfolios
- Governance and Policy Offices
- Strategy and Planning Office

Submitted by: Professor Sherman Young, Pro Vice-Chancellor Learning and Teaching.

For enquiries contact:
Laura Heron, Project Manager, Office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor Learning and Teaching. Ext: 1089

1 A Framing of Futures.
Preamble: A Changing University Context

Macquarie University was founded as an innovative university, engaged with its local community and providing distinctive opportunity and flexibility to students. We are known for our friendly, nurturing and welcoming environment and for a culture that cares about our students - their experience at university, and their success afterwards.

Fifty years later, our University has grown into a vibrant, internationally recognised research and teaching institution. Our alumni are globally successful, our research is world-class and all of our students are encouraged to follow their passions across a diverse range of interdisciplinary areas of study. By any measure, Macquarie is a success.

But in those fifty years, the role of universities has evolved. Of course, the modern university is still expected to provide excellent tertiary education opportunities - building on primary and secondary schooling - whilst simultaneously being centres for research, scholarship and engagement with the broader community. However, higher education for students is increasingly seen as an investment with a wide range of benefits, with better job prospects being a focus for many (Tomlinson, 2014; Norton, 2013). Today, universities must contribute to social progress by producing both new knowledge, and capable - employable - graduates.

The Australian experience sees the diversity of University activities largely funded by student load, contextualised in a global shift that has seen the emergence of three major forces - massification, marketisation and globalisation. These, in conjunction with improved communications technologies, have created a worldwide, competitive market for participation in higher education (Marginson 2015; Beerkens-Soo & Vossensteyn 2009).

In response to these changes, most Australian universities strive for both research excellence and quality teaching to attract students (Chalmers et al 2014). In addition, as the challenge of fee deregulation becomes increasingly apparent, Macquarie needs to distinguish itself to current and future students and staff, whilst ensuring that our institutional goals of service and engagement - across teaching and research - are maintained.

Breakout: Discover the possibilities

From our beginnings, we've nurtured the brightest minds to reach their full potential. Supported by world-leading academics, embedded transferrable skills and scaffolded practical experiences; students will graduate from Macquarie ready to lead and make a difference in the world. Macquarie students learn from practical application of knowledge in real-life organisations and environments.

This Learning and Teaching Framework is designed to respond to this context. By virtue of its pioneering culture, Macquarie is uniquely positioned to connect teaching, research and service along a student-focussed journey from admission, through engaging learning experiences and to work, and life, beyond.
We were founded on innovation, accessibility and flexibility and as a result we are an unusually open and diverse community of scholars, with key disciplinary strengths, yet open to transdisciplinary approaches. With our strategic location within Macquarie Park, a beautiful campus, community connections and strong digital engagement, we are uniquely positioned to connect our students with knowledge, skills and work and life experience to produce graduates fully equipped for the 21st century.

This Framework presents an opportunity for Macquarie to build its reputation around excellent student experiences and outcomes. Our connectedness is what differentiates us, and enables a distinctive positioning: Macquarie University, known for a learning experience that focuses on student engagement and outcomes through building a connected learning community. Importantly, this Framework specifically acknowledges our staff, and the need for ongoing support and professional development opportunities, rewards, and recognition that accurately reflect the diversity of their scholarly roles.
Vision: A transforming institution
Macquarie University will build an international reputation for offering engaging, innovative, and transformative learning experiences. We will be distinguished through collaborative and creative connections made between students, teachers, research and industry and community partners, and as a consequence, produce outstanding graduates.

Our Strategic Priorities:

1: Design connected, creative and innovative learning experiences for and with our students
We will offer a distinctive and transformative student experience based on engaging, authentic and accessible approaches to learning and teaching. The student experience will be active, blended and connected, combining the value of engaging face-to-face learning and the flexibility of integrated digital delivery with the learning that occurs outside the traditional classroom. It will connect students with a range of formal and informal active learning activities, across disciplines and into the workplace and broader community.

2: Develop the breadth and depth of our student and graduate capabilities
We will build a connected curriculum that provides opportunities for students to graduate with depth of disciplinary knowledge, combined with breadth of trans-disciplinary understanding and big-ideas thinking, transferrable skills and relevant real-world experience. This will meet multiple, yet aligned goals of producing inquisitive, ethical and empathetic engaged global citizens, work-ready graduates and disciplinary scholars. Students will engage in learning opportunities that will empower them with the necessary knowledge, skills and abilities to thrive in a rapidly evolving world – a world that requires perseverance, endeavour, creativity, innovation and a desire to make a difference.

3: A culture that fully supports colleagues in pursuit of excellence
We will build a culture that develops and rewards excellence within innovative and sustainable curriculum and delivery. Collaboration is a guiding principle and we will connect internally (through research and teaching) and externally (with academic, community and corporate partners) to develop and implement sustainable best practice that results in excellent outcomes for both students and staff.

We will realise these objectives through the creation of a Connected Learning Community (figure 1). By connecting our learning experiences, our curriculum and better connecting our students, staff and alumni with each other and the broader community, we can build the opportunities we require to meet our strategic priorities.
The Connected Learning Community:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connecting Strategies</th>
<th>Design connected, creative and innovative learning experiences for and with our students</th>
<th>Develop the breadth and depth of our student and graduate capabilities</th>
<th>Fully support colleagues in pursuit of excellence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Create a sense of belonging</td>
<td>• Program-based curriculum with coherent Program Learning Outcomes and Constructive Alignment</td>
<td>• Aligned Objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students are Partners and Co-creators in their Formal Learning</td>
<td>• Embedded Work and Life Skills through real world experience</td>
<td>• Shared Resources and Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrated Digital Experience</td>
<td>• Research and Enquiry-led Discipline Specific Program Content</td>
<td>• Build External Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Connecting Learning Activities</td>
<td>• Embedded Breadth and Context of Knowledge</td>
<td>• Development, Recognition and Reward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Indicators</th>
<th>Improved retention, progression and completion</th>
<th>Graduate employability and further study outcomes</th>
<th>Staff engagement and satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Student engagement and satisfaction</td>
<td>• External engagement and satisfaction</td>
<td>• Recognition of teaching excellence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local and global connections</td>
<td>• Alumni engagement and recommendation</td>
<td>• Increased innovation and collaborations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Success Indicators:
- Improved retention, progression and completion
- Student engagement and satisfaction
- Local and global connections

Design connected, creative and innovative learning experiences for and with our students:
- Create a sense of belonging
- Students are Partners and Co-creators in their Formal Learning
- Integrated Digital Experience
- Connecting Learning Activities

Develop the breadth and depth of our student and graduate capabilities:
- Program-based curriculum with coherent Program Learning Outcomes and Constructive Alignment
- Embedded Work and Life Skills through real world experience
- Research and Enquiry-led Discipline Specific Program Content
- Embedded Breadth and Context of Knowledge

Fully support colleagues in pursuit of excellence:
- Aligned Objectives
- Shared Resources and Activities
- Build External Partnerships
- Development, Recognition and Reward
## A CULTURE OF TRANSFORMATIVE LEARNING IN A RESEARCH-ENRICHED ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculties:</th>
<th>Research-enriched, future proof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine &amp; Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices:</td>
<td>Future-proofed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers and Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning and Teaching Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Open Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widening Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Design connected, creative, and innovative learning experiences for and with our students

Offer experiences, within formal settings and beyond, that change the lives of our students, support them in achieving their aspirations and provide an incubator for the next generation of leaders.

### 2. Develop the breadth and depth of our student and graduate capabilities

Expand PACE as a signature program that distinguishes this University.

### 3. Fully support colleagues in pursuit of excellence

Infuse cutting-edge technology into our learning environment to deliver world-class learning and teaching on campus and online.

Develop and lead teaching models that promote enquiry-driven learning and prepare students for productive professional and civic lives.

Imbue our academic and professional staff with a culture of transformative learning, expand their horizons and nurture their capabilities.

### Connected Learning Community: curriculum, experiences, people

Research-enriched, future proof
Our Strategic Priorities in Detail

1: Design connected, creative and innovative learning experiences for and with our students

We will offer a distinctive and transformative student experience based on engaging, authentic and accessible approaches to learning and teaching. The student experience will be active, blended and connected, combining the value of engaging face-to-face learning and the flexibility of integrated digital delivery with the learning that occurs outside the traditional classroom. It will connect students with a range of formal and informal active learning activities, across disciplines and into the workplace and broader community.

A Student’s Journey: Why Macquarie?

Finishing high school, Sarah will choose to study at Macquarie because she knows we will provide the knowledge, skills and experience that she needs to change her world. She is already familiar with Macquarie and its campus through an outreach program she completed with us during her HSC. Sarah knows that Macquarie understands that success at University and in life is not solely concerned with academic performance and values our commitment to service and engagement. Having already demonstrated her engagement with her broader community and began to develop her leadership skills she looks forward to further opportunities of this kind. Macquarie’s values resonate with Sarah’s aspirations for herself and her community.

A strong sense of belonging supported by connections with peers, teachers and disciplines is a key factor for student success\(^5\). We will provide learning opportunities for students that encourage cohort building, and enable the development of relationships both formally and informally\(^1\). We will support student-led activities that contribute to learning and enable a range of opportunities to connect to staff and the broader institution - through regular activities, events and rituals. We will develop and integrate opportunities for students to connect with each other and build trans-disciplinary and inter-cultural cohorts. We will enact our community on principles of social inclusion and accessibility, and enable connection to and a sense of belonging to the broader external community.

A Student’s Journey: Transition

Sarah’s transition to university will be simple, exciting and personal. She will be excited by the possibilities, but not daunted by complexity and we will make it easy for her to navigate her choices. We will connect her with other students and provide a range of formal and informal learning opportunities that will engage and excite her.

---

\(^1\) Global Leadership Program, Merit Scholars, Equity Scholars, Peer-Assisted Learning, LEAP Program etc.
Sarah will be formally welcomed as a member of Macquarie University at commencement. She will participate in a Faculty or program-based convocation that will inform her of our obligations to her and her obligations as a member of our community. At this event she will also have the opportunity to meet and connect with her teachers and her fellow students and introduced as a member of our community.

For those new to university, we will build structured programs that provide appropriate induction and progression and embed depth and breadth, whilst still allowing a contemporary approach to the traditional flexibility for which Macquarie is renowned. Choice and flexibility can be overwhelming however, and many students don’t have the cultural capital or instantly develop the independence needed to thrive. Rethinking and simplifying the first year experience will help by enabling the building of cohorts and the requisite skills and knowledge for future success. Students will have different needs and many need to accommodate work and family commitments - their preferred choice and flexibility might involve different timing, modes and intensity of offering. In all instances, by building an engaging path for students to travel, we will enable a sense of aspiration, progression and destination.

A Student’s Journey: Learning Experience

Sarah’s learning will be Active, Blended and Connected. She will be a partner in research-led learning through active engagement with enquiry and discovery. Through a fully integrated blend of digital and physical experiences, she will engage rigorously with the depth of disciplinary content in her program of choice, whilst experiencing the breadth of transdisciplinary and intercultural understanding. She is gaining the transferrable skills she needs to be employable in a rapidly changing world.

Sarah will connect her learning through transdisciplinary opportunities that will see her grappling with the big ideas - social, cultural and environmental challenges facing our world. She will take advantage of Macquarie’s international outward mobility opportunities to experience that world. Connecting her formal and informal learning with the world of work and/or her community, she will complete a PACE experience that will allow her to apply her knowledge in practical and creative ways.

Our learning is active. Learning is social and interactive and students are partners in their learning, which should be driven by active engagement with subject content and its methods of enquiry. We will design and facilitate properly structured, engaging, active learning experiences built around collaboration, discussion, negotiation and reflection. We will incorporate problem based activities, authentic tasks, direct and first hand experiences, simulations, games, and opportunities for students to present their work to others. Where appropriate, we will provide opportunities for students to be involved in the design of learning activities and ensure that the student voice is a part of all conversations around learning and teaching and its governance.
**Staff Breakout: What are students as partners?**

Traditional models of the relationship between students and teachers can be teacher-centric; with teachers as content transmitters, the Socratic questioner or discussion leader. But students bring their own abilities and knowledge and learn more from active learning opportunities. By understanding students as partners in their learning, we treat them as co-creators of knowledge and partners in collaboration.

At Harvard there has been a longstanding effort to get science and engineering students "right into the lab" even as early as the freshman year. At the University of Texas at Austin, the Freshman Research Experience places some 700 first-year STEM students, many of whom are “at-risk,” into mentored research experiences.

At both institutions, the students become part of the research process, learn how a lab works, and sometimes get a co-author credit on a paper. No one seems surprised by this, and faculty members rarely say, "well, an 18-year old isn't ready for the big real word of the lab."

[https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/higher-ed-beta/students-producers-students-partners](https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/higher-ed-beta/students-producers-students-partners)

[http://edeu.lincoln.ac.uk/student-as-producer/](http://edeu.lincoln.ac.uk/student-as-producer/)

[http://as.exeter.ac.uk/eqe/projects/change/](http://as.exeter.ac.uk/eqe/projects/change/)

**Our learning is Blended. Digital technologies** are the defining infrastructure of all knowledge industries; and must form the fundamental backbone of our learning environment. Most of our work and social interaction now happens in both online and face-to-face realms, and learning occurs in a naturally blended environment. We will integrate digital technologies by designing and utilising those that enable the most engaging learning and student-centric experiences.

We must understand student choices and preferences in order to articulate a scaffolded learning experience that embraces their multiple modes of engagement. The learning experience will traverse the blended digital and physical spaces as seamlessly as possible, with digital technologies providing an integrated approach to support the complete student journey - and the range of learning activities - online, offline, on campus and off campus.

In addition, digital technologies provide new possibilities for reinventing the student learning experience. In a global environment in which content is readily accessible, and there are new opportunities to collaborate and connect with students and partners, we will explore and adopt innovative approaches that contribute to the building of our connected learning community.
A student's journey: A seamless experience blending physical and digital

Sarah will have access to digital technologies that enable easy engagement with all aspects of her university experience. It will facilitate her transition, provide avenues for engaging learning and assessment, connect her with the Macquarie community and beyond and enable her to capture, reflect on and demonstrate her achievements to others, whilst facilitating the face to face engagements she desires.

Our learning is Connected. We will connect learning by building linkages between disciplines and developing deeper engagement with research, external partners and co-curricular activities. The formal curriculum can build on informal activities to support the broader learning outcomes of a program. These might be extra-curricular pursuits or learning achieved in other educational institutions or workplaces, and we should ensure that all learning which contributes to a student's progress is recognised. Importantly we will develop an approach which enables students to easily capture, record and reflect upon their diverse learning.

A student’s journey: Afterwards

Sarah’s journey will be transformational. When she graduates she will have the depth of disciplinary knowledge required for her chosen profession. She will have the breadth of a global, intercultural outlook, the ability to work with others and to make critical decisions. She will have had the experience of applying her learning in a workplace or community engagement - giving her the confidence, problem-solving and leadership skills she needs for life and career. She will be a creative and innovative thinker, eminently employable, or an entrepreneur or employer herself - and can tell her story to the world.

She will understand that her learning journey has only begun. And she will be connected with ready-made networks, established during her study - networks that she will continue to build and nurture as part of our connected learning community.

Key Goals in support of Priority one are:

- Create a sense of belonging
- Students are Partners and Co-creators in their Formal Learning
- Integrated Digital Experience
- Connecting Learning Activities
**Breakout: the undergraduate experience**

Macquarie actively engages with the complex issues that define the future of humanity. In addition to our contemporary approaches to delivering quality learning and teaching, students are supported to spread their wings through a number of unique programs.

Our extracurricular Global Leadership Program (GLP) engages students in global issues while developing their leadership and cross-cultural skills, and connecting them with inspiring thought leaders.

The PACE (Professional and Community Engagement) program gives all our undergraduate students the chance to enrich their classroom learning through participation in work and community environments both locally and internationally.

Our travel grant scheme – one of the most generous of any university in Australia – supports our students to experience global issues first-hand. Through interaction with societies across the world, they return emboldened with new perspectives and intercultural skills to apply to their study and their future careers.

And through studying subjects such as Big History – a unique way of understanding our universe, our world and our humanity – our students learn key knowledge from history that may unlock some of the critical challenges facing local and global communities today.

---

**Breakout: The postgraduate experience**

Our postgraduate coursework programs provide opportunities for students to further pursue their passions. We will have flexibility of entry through broad recognition of prior learning, as well as flexibility of offerings across delivery modes. We will provide structured opportunities to connect with academic staff, fellow students and alumni, and our location and industry integration provides students with direct connections to workplaces and the broader community.

Macquarie pioneered interdisciplinary study, and even as a postgraduate qualification focuses on a particular disciplinary area, students will have opportunities to engage more broadly, ensuring that they develop a global mindset and are able to tackle the big ideas.

Our extracurricular Global Leadership Program (GLP) is open to all Macquarie students and further develops leadership and cross-cultural skills through deep engagement with global issues.
2: Develop the breadth and depth of our student and graduate capabilities

We will build a connected curriculum that provides opportunities for students to graduate with depth of disciplinary knowledge, combined with breadth of trans-disciplinary understanding and big-ideas thinking, transferrable skills and relevant real-world experience. This will meet multiple, yet aligned goals of producing inquisitive and empathetic, ethical and engaged global citizens, work-ready graduates and disciplinary scholars. Students will engage in learning opportunities that will empower them with the necessary knowledge, skills and abilities to thrive in a rapidly evolving world – a world that requires perseverance, endeavour, creativity, innovation and a desire to make a difference.

We will develop a program-based approach to curriculum, organised to enhance coherence, quality and viability and to provide students with a sense of belonging to a cohort of learners. We will embed a program-based planning, development and review cycle that starts from the premise that all programs have clearly articulated program learning outcomes, to which their constituent units contribute directly. Additionally, those programs and units must be viable and sustainable within the available resources. Program development and review will be team-based, with participants drawn from disciplines, and educational development areas. Teams will be encouraged to innovate, drawing on best practice and motivated by excellent student experience and outcomes. They will be informed by students, industry and community advisory groups and subject to processes of peer review on a regular basis.

**Staff Breakout: Program-based curriculum**

Macquarie’s approach to curriculum has tended to focus on delivery of units of study - which can result in an overwhelming number of unit offerings (currently over 800 units available* at 100 level alone). Our program-based approach will require Faculties to take a strategic approach to curriculum planning, to balance resources, market position and academic requirements. It gives us the opportunity to focus on student experience and program level outcomes, whilst ensuring that our offerings do not stretch our resources beyond capacity. It is envisaged that a commitment to program-based curriculum will see a streamlining of offerings.

*although only 300 of these were taught in 2014*
To effectively build this capacity, our curriculum development will prioritise graduate outcomes within available resources, and our approach to program planning, development and renewal will be rigorous, regular and will result in a more streamlined and focussed range of unit and program offerings.

A program-based approach enables the **embedding of work and life skills**. We will build on our already strong curricula and extra-curricula offerings to enable students to develop the skills, creativity, attitudes and values that will sustain them in these endeavours. This includes scaffolded and supported work-integrated learning, as well as opportunities for learning for employability and entrepreneurship embedded throughout curricula. Importantly, we will expand our Professional and Community Engagement (PACE) program to make an internship opportunity available to students in all of our undergraduate programs.

### Staff Breakout: Employability: knowledge, skills and PACE

Our graduates will have disciplinary knowledge, transferable skills and experience. Disciplinary content will be central to curriculum, and working with industry and career advisors, we can embed learning activities that address transferrable skills (communication, creativity, collaboration, initiative, resilience) as well as specific career ready abilities. Crucially, a PACE experience will ensure that content and skills will be applied in a workplace or community. PACE currently has 1,300 external partners and over 6,000 students will undertake a PACE experience in 2015 alone. Our goal is to enhance and expand PACE to ensure that students are able to undertake the PACE experience that is most relevant to their desired post-university pathway. The evidence of PACE to date has been extremely positive, with students, staff and partners understanding its value. By taking a holistic approach to breadth, depth and experience, our graduates are not just immediately employable, but fully equipped for whatever future they choose.

There can be a tendency to conflate ‘employment outcomes’ with ‘employability’. In response to this, Macquarie will build on Yorke’s definition of employability: ‘a set of achievements – skills, understandings and personal attributes – that make graduates more likely to gain employment and be successful in their chosen occupations, which benefits themselves, the workforce, the community and the economy’.

Employability is therefore, a suite of transferable skills, attributes and capabilities that prepare a graduate for life and work in a fluid, complex global environment. Much more than training for a specific vocation, employability encompasses the capacity to remain employable and to contend with a variety of employment opportunities. It also includes the capacity to create and sustain work, suggesting potential for entrepreneurship and an ability to be creative, innovative and self-motivated. All programs will include experiential and work-integrated learning, with an internship opportunity available to students in all undergraduate programs.
**Staff Breakout: Why entrepreneurship?**

The world of work in the 21st century is dramatically different. It’s no longer expected that a graduate will enter a career and remain in that career, let alone that job, for their entire working life. Rather, graduates are much more likely to work in many different jobs, across many different fields. Some may never be an employee in the traditional sense, instead parlaying their abilities into creating their own employment opportunities for themselves and others. Either way, innovation, creativity, resilience and the drive to make and take opportunities are becoming essential skills. Even those who find themselves in a more traditional career will have to grapple with what some are calling ‘intrapreneurship’, the ability to remake their workplaces and institutions to face the challenges of a rapidly changing world.

Universities are also distinguished by their engagement with research and the connected curriculum is built upon **research and enquiry-led discipline-specific content**. Enquiry-based learning is one of our strategic priorities and we will develop and embed teaching models and practices that support this. All students need to engage in the process of acquiring and creating knowledge, to understand how it is produced and to critique it as required.

We will bring teaching and research together within the curriculum through program-based teaching which is informed by research, through integration of disciplinary research into courses (Research-enhanced teaching); and by providing opportunities for students to participate in and conduct research, learn about research, develop skills of research and enquiry and contribute to the university’s research effort (Research-based learning). Collectively, these efforts will provide opportunities for students to participate in and conduct research, learn about research, develop skills of research and enquiry and contribute to the university’s research effort.

**Staff Breakout: Research thinking;**

In AHIS110, an Ancient History unit in the Faculty of Arts, students are introduced to a research project very early. They are each assigned a Roman and tasked with creating a submission from a range of ancient sources (literary and epigraphical). Students must discover specific details about ‘their Roman’, and compile an appropriate dossier on their subject. As well as building ancient history research skills, the student work can make a contribution to published research in *The Macquarie Dictionary of Roman Biography*. 
Importantly, we will **ensure breadth and context of knowledge** and our students will engage with the big ideas and challenges facing the world. Higher education has the civic purpose and goal of producing ethical and engaged global citizens - and ensuring academic integrity. In a connected curriculum, individual learning activities will inevitably contribute to a number of graduate outcomes but ensuring breadth and context as well as depth is an essential part of the transformational learning experience.

The connected curriculum will ensure that there are embedded understandings of key literacies – not just with respect to transferrable skills but around internationalization and inter-cultural considerations, sustainability and Indigenous perspectives. Providing opportunities where learners are personally challenged can, and often does, provoke meaningful life changes. As well, irrespective of what path students choose to take in their career upon graduation, they will be living and working in a culturally diverse setting.

**Staff Breakout: Embedded Understandings**

Other understandings (such as intercultural and Indigenous) are critical to establish a true global outlook. Developing relevant cross-cultural literacies, our graduates will be empowered to properly engage across the diverse relationships that any professions will demand.

The challenges of the 21st century are best met by ensuring that students engage with big ideas; and acquire the tools to connect knowledge across disciplines. To support this, we will review the People and Planet criteria in a way that builds on existing principles but extends them to include aspirations around connectivity, transdisciplinarity and engaging with big ideas. It is expected that only purpose-built units that meet those strict criteria will be offered in a revamped People/Planet scheme.

**Staff Breakout: Reviewing People and Planet**

People and Planet units should take a transdisciplinary approach to one of the core research themes of: healthy people, resilient societies, prosperous economies, secure planet and innovative technologies. By connecting knowledge across the disciplines in these key themes, these units give students the opportunity to engage with big ideas and contextualise their learning.

**Key Goals** in support of Priority two are:

- Program-based curriculum with coherent Program Learning Outcomes and Constructive Alignment
- Embedded Work and Life Skills through real world experience
- Research and Enquiry-led Discipline Specific Program Content
- Embedded Breadth and Context of Knowledge
3: A Culture that fully supports colleagues in pursuit of excellence

We will build a culture that develops and rewards excellence within innovative and sustainable curriculum and delivery. Collaboration is a guiding principle and we will connect internally (through research and teaching) and externally (with academic, community and corporate partners) to develop and implement sustainable best practice that results in excellent outcomes for both students and staff.

An academic’s journey: The Macquarie aspiration

Dr Lee joins Macquarie in 2020. She has been attracted to a career at Macquarie because of the emphasis we place on scholarly learning and teaching being at the heart of our educational mission. She is impressed by how Macquarie balances scholarship across research, teaching and service. Colleagues have told her how we combine our research passion with the understanding that scholarship involves the integration, application and sharing of our knowledge and skills (Boyer 1990). She sees that through our teaching, Macquarie academics are collaborative by nature, secure in their position and continually learning.

Dr Lee’s teaching is Active, Blended and Connected. She collects, curates and connects knowledge drawn from leading edge research - both hers and others. She works with students as partners in collective learning, drawing on that knowledge to create active experiences that engage, excite and encourage students to explore their potentials. Dr Lee is supported to design and teach in a blended learning environment that combines the best facets of both digital and physical opportunities. She builds connections across the university, and across the world that enable her students to achieve the desired outcomes.

Dr Lee’s Approach is collaborative and connected. She teaches in teams with other colleagues both at Macquarie and elsewhere and produces excellent student outcomes from her use of the best resources. Her own learning through educational and professional development opportunities is ongoing and properly supported. She has the opportunity to engage with the scholarship of learning and teaching, and to learn from community or industry engagement in her field, and is rewarded and recognised for her professional development through promotion opportunities, awards and grants.

Dr Lee values working in a learning-centered institution. She knows Macquarie’s goals for quality teaching practice include contemporary approaches to curriculum; flexible design and delivery; research-enhanced learning and teaching; student engagement and support for learning; recognising and rewarding excellence; promoting diversity, equity and international awareness.

Dr Lee is a scholar in a vibrant and connected learning community with students, colleagues and external partners.
There are numerous stakeholder groups, and individuals within our University with diverse aims and motivations. This Framework argues strenuously for building an open and transparent culture that builds on the collegial nature of Macquarie and aligns our efforts towards common goals in learning, teaching, research and community engagement. In order to do so, we need to ensure that the resource allocation, design and delivery of our teaching is motivated by student outcomes and understand that by working together towards common objectives, we can ensure the quality of the student experience.

Connectivity is key so that we can have knowledge of and understand the breadth of teaching activity that occurs across the university. A critical aspect of connecting is the use of shared resources. We will reduce effort by sharing our own work and adapting the work of others where appropriate. We will build partnerships nationally and internationally, with: future employers looking for the best graduates, community groups that can mutually benefit from involvement in our programs, alumni who would like to contribute to or benefit from a teaching activity at Macquarie, or external academic or government partners who may have aligned interests.

**An academic’s journey: A Learning Commons: What might digital content sharing look like?**

Dr Lee works with Macquarie’s learning commons which draws together all of the institution’s learning resources and makes them available to anyone within the Connected Learning Community.

Dr Lee shares some of the foundational digital learning objects she has created for her discipline in the commons. She has adopted a gamification approach that was earlier trialled by a colleague in another Faculty and has now been made available to all colleagues through the commons. She utilises a quantitative methods module that was designed for colleagues in another Faculty. Throught the commons, she has permitted students from another Faculty to virtually ‘audit’ the content of an offering she teaches with colleagues. Some of the content she developed with her colleagues is made available to corporate partner and discussions are now underway for the development of an assessed short course.

Additionally, recognising her student’s need for intercultural literacy Dr Lee joined with colleagues in her program, Faculty and Macquarie International to develop a short four week online course offered on OUA’s Open2Study platform. Students who completed the course were granted a badge of achievement contributing to the demonstration of a learning outcome in several MQ units of study.

Engagement with the commons has enhanced the quality of Dr Lee’s teaching but also saved many hours of development time that she dedicates to her current research project.
Whilst much external collaboration activity will be built around the development of a range of placement and other connected learning opportunities, Macquarie will connect its community members by providing collaborative virtual and physical spaces, resources and support including access to short courses and events. The opportunity exists to build key linkages for learning, teaching and research activities, whilst offering community (including our alumni) and corporate partners the benefit of full engagement with the University’s core activities.

We will **develop, recognise and reward** teaching excellence. We will provide avenues for continuous development aligned to professional standards and promotions criteria with opportunities for staff to engage in a variety of activities that may also lead to and support external professional recognition. The introduction of a teaching-excellence pathway will enable the proper development of teaching-focused positions and promotion to the highest levels.

---

### An academic’s journey: Continuous Professional Development

Dr Lee’s continuing professional development is secure through her participation in the Macquarie Higher Education Academy. Inspired by the British *Higher Education Academy*, the Macquarie Academy provides Dr Lee with a structured framework for her to engage in the scholarship of learning and teaching, enables clear promotion criteria to be established and articulates international recognition via fellowships. She also participates in PACE for staff, building bridges to industry and community partners in her field.

---

We will strive to minimise our dependence on sessional staff, whilst ensuring that special attention is paid to the organization of professional development and support for sessional staff. Faculties will build on best practice in the support of sessional staff, in the provision of contextualised professional learning, and in the monitoring of the impact on student retention and the enhancement of learning and teaching, including reporting on these issues at the Faculty level.

### An Academic Journey: What is BLASST?

Tim is a HDR student who is a sessional staff member in one of the unit’s taught by Dr Lee and her colleagues. Tim plays an important role in the unit and whilst Macquarie’s aspiration is to minimise our reliance on sessional contracts, it’s essential to provide Tim and other sessional staff with appropriate support for their professional development. BLASST (Benchmarking Leadership and Standards for Sessional Teaching), a federally funded project through the Office of Learning and Teaching enables the support he needs. Involving four universities, and led by Macquarie academics, it provides a framework and interactive tools for ensuring best practice and the proper support and development of sessional staff.

---

**Key Goals** in support of Priority three are:

- Aligned Objectives
- Shared Resources and Activities
- Build External Partnerships
- Development, Recognition and Reward
Appendix 1: Our goals, targets and supporting strategies

Strategic Priority 1: Design connected, creative and innovative learning experiences for and with our students

We will offer a distinctive and transformative student experience based on engaging, authentic and accessible approaches to learning and teaching. The student experience will be active, blended and connected, combining the value of engaging face-to-face learning and the flexibility of integrated digital delivery with the learning that occurs outside the traditional classroom. It will connect students with a range of formal and informal active learning activities, across disciplines and into the workplace and broader community.

Goal 1.1 Create a sense of belonging

Targets:
1. By 2017, Macquarie students will experience a sense of belonging via a coherent, integrated and holistic pathway from recruitment to graduation and beyond - this will be articulated through digital and physical learning experiences built around identified cohorts and marked with significant milestones (e.g. a matriculation/induction ceremony at commencement)
2. By 2017, an aligned cross-institutional and structured approach to all student support and delivery, built for appropriate cohorts (e.g. undergraduate, postgraduate, first years, mature aged etc.)
3. By 2018, improved retention and progression trends

Supporting Strategies:

- Ensure increased commonality - embedded induction, and appropriate assessment - in first year programs of study at undergraduate level, and first session programs of study at postgraduate level (PVC LT, PVC SR, Faculties)
- Develop visual maps of student journeys (UG, PG, International etc) that incorporate student experiences, and that can be used by staff to align student-targeted communications and marketing efforts (PVC LT, DVC SR, Group Marketing)
- Develop holistic approach to progression and retention including whole-of-institution use of appropriate analytics
- Develop systems to enable students to create an enduring record or portfolio of achievement and capability (LTC, IT, DVC SR, Library)
- Increase early engagement (e.g. KickStart) and build upon orientation and transition activities (PVC LT, DVC SR, Faculties, Offices)
- Review academic year to identify possibilities for greater timetable and program flexibility, allowing students to better connect the various aspects of their lives (Faculties, DVC A, MI)
- Work with students to develop a learning navigation tool that can be used as a reference point for orientation beyond O-Week (PVC LT, DVC SR, Marketing)
• Establish an Academic Partnerships and Pathways Office to ensure alignment in effort, rapid adoption of best practices, timely, consistent and quality student transition experiences (DVC/A, PACE, COE, MI)

• Introduction of a converged service model for student support including clarification of front-line roles and responsibilities and subsequent provision of effective, appropriate and timely support and advice (and systems-based records for these transactions) for all students (DVC SR, DVC A, PVC LT, Faculties, Library)

• Establish aligned and structured approaches to academic student support, including the exploration of practical methods to implement discipline specific first year support, e.g. PASS Programming, or a personal tutor approach for first year students (DCV SR, PVC LT, Faculties, Library, Students)

• Develop and support regular academic connections, events and activities for staff and students to encourage cohort building (DVC SR, PACE, MI, Offices)

Goal 1.2 Engage Students as Partners and Co-creators in their formal learning

Targets:

1.2 Students are Partners and Co-creators in their formal learning
1. By 2017 clearly identifiable expectations for collaborative and active learning promoted through assignments and projects throughout curricula
2. By 2017 consistent institutional approach and support for student led peer assisted study sessions (PASS), building connections between undergraduate and postgraduate cohorts
3. By 2017 systematic student involvement in program development and review, including grant and award schemes
4. By 2018 all programs designed to encourage the formation of learning communities involving staff and students (assessment feedback sessions, theme-based internal conferences, lunchbox ideas exchange sessions, screenings, videoconferencing Q&A with partners, research seminars etc.)

Supporting Strategies

• Program redesign and review criteria to emphasise active learning approaches and include opportunities for students and staff to collaborate on research, teaching or engagement activities (DVC A, DVC R, Students)

• Establish spaces and regular fora for undergraduate students, postgraduate students and teachers to discuss teaching (e.g. Teche Showcase, Teche Events) (PVC LT, Faculties, Library)

• Establish student run Learning Centre, using informal learning spaces (MUSE) for coordinated peer assisted study sessions (PASS).

• Alignment and revision of policy to ensure best practice and allocation of resources across student support roles e.g. PASS, Coaching, Mentoring (Senate, Faculties, PVC LT, PVC SR, Learning Skills)

• Greater student involvement in academic governance including representation on all learning and teaching committees (DVC A, Senate, Faculties, Students)
• Student involvement in program review, development and accreditation processes (PVC LT, Faculties, Senate, Students)
• Student-led evaluations of academic and support programs and student nominated learning and teaching awards (PVC LT, Strategic Planning)
• Training and support for students involved in representative roles (DVC A)

Goal 1.3 Create an integrated learning experience that seamlessly blends digital and physical environments

Targets:
1. By 2017, endorse a roadmap for the development of spaces and technologies
   a. that prioritises collaboration and connection;
   b. is designed to enable active, blended learning across the continuum from fully face-to-face to fully online offerings;
   c. embraces principles of universal access;
   d. includes a review of all key learning technologies and;
   e. plans for admission-to-alumni student-centric systems covering all aspects of the student experience.
2. By 2017, building on the technologies and spaces roadmap, refine Macquarie’s blended learning implementation towards a seamless integration of delivery modes (online and on campus) for maximum flexibility for all students, including the identification of strategic opportunities for online only delivery (eg around existing duplicated content, common literacies etc)
3. By 2017, develop technologies and governance to enable easy sharing of digital resources from both internal and external sources: A Learning Commons
4. By 2017, implement integrated learning analytics approach to support student retention, progression and success
5. By 2017, establish structured “innovation to implementation” pathway for learning technologies with a range of incentives, infrastructure, development and support resources
6. By 2017, an individual-led approach to technology adoption for staff and students (Choose your own and Mobile Devices, platform independence) to inform technology decisions including equipping physical spaces (eg reducing the requirement for physical computer labs except where specialist solutions are required)
7. By 2018, use of online technologies for assessment (submission and implementation, including examinations), except where inappropriate due to nature of the task
8. By 2020, online technologies will be used for the delivery of content, freeing up face to face time for active learning

Supporting Strategies
• Develop institutional five-year learning technologies and spaces/audio-visual resources roadmap (PVC LT, SLTC, IT, LTC, COE, Property, Library, Faculties)
• Review Macquarie’s learning technologies platform (currently iLearn) to incorporate the latest developments in service provision (PVC LT, DVC SR, IT, COO)
• Continue developing blended environments balancing digital and physical environments and further pilot and extend use of digital possibilities (e.g. flipped
classroom, simulations, games, fully online and off campus courses, mobile devices, online assessment, increased flexibility in timing and delivery modes) (Faculties, DVC SR, LTC)

- Develop staged approach for implementing integrated resource sharing centred around a 'Learning Commons', initially by making all iLearn content visible to all staff (with appropriate permissions) to enable shared development and learning (PVC LT, LTC);
- Explore funding, structures and partnership options for building a Learning Innovation Centre - including a community of practice - to work on, for example, new approaches to learning and teaching, including the involvement of students (PVC LT).
- Provide appropriate learning technologies support, training and development for staff and students (DVC SR, PVC LT, LTC, COE, Library)
- Cease funding traditional student (computer) labs (PVC LT, IT, Faculties, Library, Property, Students) and develop BYOD-approaches with appropriate student support (eg for those who don’t possess their own computers)

Goal 1.4 Connect Learning Activities

Targets:
1. By 2017 systems to enable the formal recognition of appropriate learning achieved through extra-curricular activities developed and implemented (eg student portfolios)
2. By 2017 Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) schedules for each program to include informal learning
3. By 2020 all programs to identify non-formal learning opportunities

Supporting Strategies
- Program design processes to include consideration of co-curricular and extracurricular opportunities (PVC LT, DVC SR, Faculties, Senate, Library, Students, Offices)
- Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) schedules developed (Faculties, Senate) to include future proofing (eg accredited MOOCs etc)
- An annual cross-institutional, co-curricular ‘Week’ designed to promote new connections between students and their studies (PVC LT, Faculties, Campus Life)
- Articulate connections and build shared responsibility for selected Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) (Faculties, DVC A, Senate)
- Develop systems to enable students to create an enduring record or portfolio of achievement and capability (PVC LT, LTC, IT, DVC SR)
Strategic Priority 2: Develop the breadth and depth of our student and graduate capabilities

We will build a connected curriculum that provides opportunities for students to graduate with depth of disciplinary knowledge, combined with breadth of trans-disciplinary understanding and big-ideas thinking, transferrable skills and relevant real-world experience. This will meet multiple, yet aligned goals of producing inquisitive and empathetic, ethical and engaged global citizens, work-ready graduates and disciplinary scholars. Students will engage in learning opportunities that will empower them with the necessary knowledge, skills and abilities to thrive in a rapidly evolving world – a world that requires perseverance, endeavour, creativity, innovation and a desire to make a difference.

Goal 2.1 Program-based curriculum with coherent Program Learning Outcomes and Constructive Alignment

Targets
1. By 2016, review our graduate capabilities statement and policy
2. By 2016, Establish a cycle of program review and redevelopment utilising team-based, program-centric design thinking approaches by 2016, with all programs engaged in the cycle by 2020.
3. By 2016, formalise statements for responsibilities, incentives and accountabilities for the roles of Heads of Department, Program Directors and Unit Convenors in learning and teaching
4. By 2017, provide revised policies, procedures, supporting structures and resources for the curriculum development, review and reaccreditation cycle encouraging ongoing reflection using analytics, peer review, and other evidence, the sharing of practice and resources, and the support of innovation in learning and teaching.

Supporting Strategies
- Develop, agree and implement a curriculum standards framework, protocols and systems for program development – including:
  a. viability criteria for programs and units;
  b. program-based, authentic and aligned assessment processes;
  c. RPL schedules;
  d. recruitment and enhancement plans etc. (PVC LT, Senate, COO)
- Work with faculties to embed learning and teaching curriculum, resource and load planning into annual planning cycles (PVC LT, Faculties, HR)
- Build cross-institutional program design teams and processes to implement program development, review and innovation cycle (PVC LT, LTC, Faculties, Library, Offices)
- Develop integrated approaches to program evaluation that includes student and peer feedback, reflection, learning analytics and ongoing professional learning (PVC LT, LTC, Senate, Faculties)
● Establish regular curriculum design and celebratory events for Faculties and Departments (PVC LT, LTC, Faculties, Students, Library, Offices)
● Develop program level approaches to timetabling and organisation of units (PVC LT, Faculties, Property)
● Explore the development of an appropriate and viable program option for those students who wish to construct their own, more flexible ‘independent studies’ program (DVC A, Faculties, Senate)

**Goal 2.2 Embedded Work and Life Skills**

**Targets:**

1. By 2017 all program development to include Industry and/or Community Advisors
2. By 2020 at least one assessment task per program to have the involvement of relevant external partners in its design or implementation
3. By 2018 employability and entrepreneurship awareness, knowledge and skills will be embedded in all undergraduate and postgraduate curricula
4. By 2018, design and establish an incubator to enable students to partner with other members of the university community to progress their entrepreneurial projects
5. By 2025 students in any undergraduate program will have the opportunity to complete an internship (staged implementation beginning 2016)
6. Improved metrics for evaluation of employability beyond GDS through greater engagement with Alumni, Research, and PACE partners.

**Supporting Strategies**

● Develop whole of institution approach to academic integrity to ensure graduate ethics and integrity - as well as confirm reputation of Macquarie qualifications
● Build relationships with new and existing PACE partners (including major employers, industry and community partners) and establish regular collaborative events, including program design support (DVC CEA, DVC A, DVC I)
● Establish collaboration spaces for formal and informal engagement with partners and students (DVC CEA, DVC A, DVC R, IT, Property)
● Program review criteria to include key employability and entrepreneurship content and skills in curricula (Faculties, Careers, LTC, students)
● Build on PACE including:
  ○ Extend and enhance existing Professional and Community Engagement approaches
  ○ Enabling students in all undergraduate programs to have the opportunity of an internship (PVC LT, PACE, Careers, DVC CEA, Faculties)
  ○ Defining new models for delivery and positioning (eg Co-op, strategies for International students)
● Establish tracking and reporting process that meet government, executive and other agency requirements (PVC LT, PACE, COO, Alumni, MI)
Goal 2.3 Research and enquiry-led discipline specific program content

We will prepare all of our students for the complex and challenging decisions they are likely to encounter throughout their lives. Enquiry-based learning is one of the strategic priorities of the university and we will develop and embed teaching models and practices that support this. All students need to engage in the process of acquiring and creating knowledge, to understand how it is produced and to critique it as required.

Targets:

Research and enquiry-led discipline specific program content

1. By 2018, enquiry-based experiences included in all undergraduate and postgraduate coursework programs
2. By 2018, embed a broad based culture of enquiry and knowledge creation into teaching approaches, including research as an essential component of all coursework program design criteria
3. By 2018, provide opportunities and incentives (e.g. credit points for students, funding for staff) for coursework students to engage with the university’s leading researchers
4. By 2018, develop an academic program for targeted high school students who wish to pursue higher degree research and embed specific activities and assessment as appropriate
5. By 2019, increase number of undergraduate students articulating into Higher Degree Research programs

Supporting Strategies

- Ensure opportunities for student involvement in research projects and in internal and external research events, including increasing contact opportunities between our academic research and all coursework students. This may involve crowdsourcing student involvement in research projects (DVC R, Faculties, students)
- Establish systems, support and professional development for sharing research knowledge and research-enhanced teaching practices across the community (seminars/learning commons) (DVC R, DVC A, PVC LT, Marketing, Faculties, LTC)
- Encourage the development and inclusion of research-appropriate assessment tasks throughout the curriculum, with a view to enabling future MRes and higher degree research (HDR) study (Dean HDR, Faculties, students)
- Define, scope, identify and extend research opportunities (e.g. Macquarie Matrix) for undergraduate students (PVC LT, Dean HDR, Faculties, Students, Library, PACE)
- Establish professional development opportunities for research-led teaching (DVC R, DVC A, PVC LT, LTC, HR)
- Development of an award for enquiry-led teaching to showcase the best practice of staff and student experiences of integrated teaching and research (DVC R, DVC A)
- Funding of MQ research centres to be boosted by $25,000 if centres can demonstrate involvement in undergraduate research programs (DVC-R)
Goal 2.4 Embedded Breadth and Connection of Knowledge

Targets

1. For 2017, a review of People and Planet criteria and implementation to align with Research themes, engage with ‘Big Ideas’ and connect knowledge across disciplines. Students will be required to undertake two such units, with Big History being one of the two.
2. By 2018 contextually relevant themes across sustainability, internationalization, intercultural considerations and Indigenous understandings embedded in all programs.
3. By 2018 at least one 300 level (or above) interdisciplinary project in every Faculty.
4. By 2018 enable every undergraduate and postgraduate student to have access to an intercultural or international experience.

Supporting Strategies

● Establish links with Cross-Faculty groups aligned with research themes to develop People and Planet approach (ADs LT, ADs R, DVC A, PVC LT & DVC R)
● Ensure program design teams include key consultants in relation to: sustainability, internationalisation, Indigenous strategies and their inclusion in in program development (DVC A, PVC LT, DVC I, Offices)
● Expand Study Abroad and PACE International Offerings (MI, PACE, Students)
● Further develop intercultural offerings (Faculties, Offices, Students)
● Establish regular interdisciplinary activities and events (Faculties, MI, Marketing, Students, Offices)

---

2 An Indigenous Strategic Framework will be released in 2015 and outline in more detail opportunities for engagement and collaboration.
3 Experiences may vary depending on work and personal commitments, but are not limited to: exchange, local placement, study remotely / abroad, language units, PACE International, short courses, student group activities, engagement in GLP, LEAP and MI programming.
Strategic Priority 3: A culture that Fully supports colleagues in pursuit of excellence

We will build a culture that develops and rewards excellence within innovative and sustainable curriculum and delivery. Collaboration is a guiding principle and we will connect internally (through research and teaching) and externally (with academic, community and corporate partners) to develop and implement sustainable best practice that results in excellent outcomes for both students and staff.

Goal 3.1 Aligned University Objectives

Targets:
1. Align Learning and Teaching priorities with other MQ internal frameworks: Research, HDR, S&R, CEA, MI, Library, Property, IT, Indigenous, HR, Sustainability, Social Inclusion etc (ongoing)
2. Lead strategies that balance financial and academic priorities (ongoing)
3. Recognise academic and professional workforce planning needs and provide appropriate support and professional development opportunities (ongoing)

Supporting Strategies
- Establish relationships with key internal stakeholders to ensure alignment with other internal frameworks (DVC A and other stakeholders)
- Examine the University’s resourcing framework to address perverse incentives and to encourage focus on student outcomes and engagement rather than internal competition and tensions (DVC A, COO, Faculties)
- Define formal responsibilities, incentives and accountabilities for roles of Head of Department, Program Director and Unit Convenors (DVC A, Exec Deans, HR)
- Run workshops to connect L&T and Research frameworks with Exec Deans, HoDs and Heads of Offices (DVC A, PVC LT)
- Develop communities of practice around different aspects of L&T practice, scholarship and leadership, to support innovators and assist collective and individual reflective practice, sharing of ideas and dissemination of effective practices (PVC LT)
- Establish a professional development framework for teaching at Macquarie? (DVC A, PVC LT, HR, LTC).

Goal 3.2 Shared Resources and Activities

Targets:
1. By 2017, increase interdisciplinary collaboration at a program and subsequent unit level
2. By 2017, at least one core content area with shared online resources
3. By 2017, at least one example per Faculty of shared online content with partner universities both locally and internationally
4. By 2018, an open policy on MQ intellectual property which encourages sharing and innovation
5. By 2020, at least one collaborative teaching activity with partner universities in each Faculty
Supporting Strategies
- Establish regular internal collaboration events focusing on learning and teaching (PVC LT, Faculties, LTC, Students)
- Support the expansion of connected, interdisciplinary program design (such as Big History, People and Planet units) as a conduit for collaboration
- Provide support for collaborative teaching initiatives, such as the integration and curation of Learning Commons resources (PVC LT, LTC)
- Identify core content areas (e.g. research methodologies) which may benefit from shared accessibility and work to develop resources (DVC A, Faculties, Library, LTC)
- Explore opportunities for collaborative programs with international partner universities (PVC LT, PACE, MI)
- Explore opportunities for resource sharing and curation with international partner universities and other networks including Open Educational Resources (OER) e.g.’s BEST or Khan Academy⁴ (PVC LT, Faculties, MI)

Goal 3.3 Build external partnerships

Targets:
- By 2017, all program development teams to include at least one Industry or Community Advisor
- By 2017, at least one annual institution-wide learning and teaching event to encourage interdisciplinary and partner connections.
- By 2017, at least one regular L&T event involving external partners in each Faculty (e.g. hackathons, student work presentation and judging)
- By 2020, Macquarie’s Learning Commons to enable resource sharing for all members of the Macquarie Community
- By 2020, a range of appropriate short courses available for our community and corporate partners

Supporting Strategies
- Program annual timetable of events to facilitate collaboration with external partners (PVC LT, PACE, Faculties, Library, Students, LTC)
- Establish collaboration spaces (physical and virtual) for formal and informal engagement with partners (DVC CEA, DVC A, DVC R, IT, LTC)
- Facilitate regular collaborative learning activities (e.g. hackathons, business pitches, simulations/hypotheticals) (PVC LT, Faculties, Students)
- Explore and develop entrepreneurship activities and opportunities (PVC LT, Faculties, students)
- Identify, design and offer short courses, including professional development, for our community and corporate partners (DVC A, DVC SR, Access, HR, Alumni, LTC)

⁴ http://crln.acrl.org/content/73/6/334.full
Goal 3.4 Development, Recognition and Reward

Targets:
1. By 2016, professional learning and development requirements for all new staff
2. By 2017, recast academic titles to Fellow or Scholar / Assistant Professor(?) not Lecturer
3. By 2017, an embedded culture of professional development with formal pathways for learning, recognition, reward, and career development (e.g. promotion) for all staff, including sessionals (e.g. BLASST)
4. Establish professional development opportunities for research-led teaching
5. By 2017, increased engagement in, and success with, teaching awards and grants both internal and external
6. By 2017, regular opportunities for cross-institutional recognition of and engagement with learning and teaching e.g. Learning and Teaching Week
7. By 2018, increased opportunities for industry placements, secondments and ‘sabbaticals’
8. By 2018, required workplace instruments align with White Paper directions

Supporting Strategies

- Align learning and teaching priorities with recruitment, recognition and reward processes (PVC LT, HR)
- Develop sessional staff policy to establish pathway for development and support of sessional staff whilst minimising reliance on them
- Strengthen induction and on-going support programs for new and existing staff to incorporate learning and teaching development including mandatory Foundations in Learning and Teaching (FiLT) program for new staff (HR, LTC)
- Review and align academic promotion criteria for learning and teaching (DVC A, Senate)
- Establish a continuing professional development (CPD) framework for quality teaching, and provide the time, space and recognition for CPD (DVC A, Faculties, LTC, HR)
- Develop and promote an online Showcase (Teche Blog) of Learning and Teaching Achievements (PVC LT, LTC, Marketing)
- Review programming of Learning and Teaching Week with a view to diversify and strategically align activities, and improve attendance by key academic staff HOD’s etc. (DVC A, PVC LT, LTC, Facilities, Offices)
- Revise MQ Learning and Teaching awards and grants to ensure alignment with the White Paper and support for external opportunities (PVC LT, Senate, LTC, Students)
- Something about peer review
Note: Bibliography, Glossary and Implementation details to come
ITEM 6.3  THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY’S TASKFORCE ON ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

For presentation and discussion.
ITEM 6.3 THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY’S TASKFORCE ON ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Issue:
In April, The University of Sydney announced the establishment of a Taskforce, chaired by its Vice-Chancellor, to “consider new methods for detecting plagiarism and other misconduct, changing assessment methods to minimise opportunities for students to engage in misconduct, and ways to build the University’s culture by making students partners and champions of academic values and the fostering of academic integrity.”

Last week this Taskforce on Academic Misconduct released its first report titled “An Approach to Minimising Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism at the University of Sydney”.

Senate members are referred to this report, which makes a series of recommendations about ways to prevent and detect academic dishonesty and misconduct among students at the University of Sydney.

At the Senate meeting, we will spend time discussing the report’s findings and recommendations. It provides pointers to available literature, useful statistical data about the experience of academic integrity issues at the University of Sydney and a number of remediation recommendations. These are findings that we might use to inform the ongoing development of our own approach to this matter.

Recommendation: For presentation and discussion

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

For enquiries contact: Ainslee Harvey, Academic Senate Project Officer (ainslee.harvey@mq.edu.au)
An Approach to Minimising Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism at the University of Sydney

Part 1. Prevention and Detection

Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce
Executive Summary

The following report is the result of the Taskforce Working Party’s investigations into ways to prevent and detect academic dishonesty and misconduct among students at the University of Sydney. A second report focusing on other topics, including staff training, remediation, sanctions, and issues unique to research students, is planned for the 2 September meeting of the Taskforce and some preliminary ideas for this report are outlined here.

The Working Party undertook a number of investigations during May and June 2015, including interviews with representatives from each of the University’s 16 faculties.

Academic dishonesty is most effectively addressed through the application of both education strategies and detection measures (Owens and White 2013). A significant amount of upheld cases across the University are classed as ‘negligent’ plagiarism (about 53% in 2014), cases where students seem not to understand the correct ways to cite and reference material that is not their own. Addressing this issue is core business for the University and must be part of every student’s experience.

Recommendation 1 is that mandatory academic honesty education and an early focus on written communication skills be embedded into all undergraduate and postgraduate coursework award courses should. A small number of existing online modules, targeted to rigorous tertiary education, could be adopted, endorsed and promoted for use across the University. Each Faculty or School must also give consideration to what students need to know within the context of their specific discipline and take the time to provide material that is consistent with University policy but tailored to their requirements, and these should be embedded in every first year course.

Recommendation 2 is that for each unit of study, consideration should be given to the academic integrity of the assessment tasks to ensure that they limit the opportunities for academic dishonesty. The Taskforce recognises that, due to the diversity of disciplines and assessment types within the University, this cannot be done through a one-size-fits-all solution. Using similarity-detection software such as Turnitin should be a basic line of defence for all written assignments. However, it is only effective for certain types of academic dishonesty and there are some examples of good and relevant assessment tasks across the University where the use of Turnitin would not be sensible. It is therefore appropriate to develop guidelines on best-practice assessments that assure academic integrity, and to ask that each unit of study coordinator take responsibility for reviewing the academic integrity risk of their unit. This should in turn be recorded at the Faculty or School level through such measures as, for example, a formal plan for each unit, a faculty assessment matrix or statements integrated into the unit approval template.

Recommendation 3 is to provide an accessible, searchable and complete recordkeeping facility across the University. Effective recordkeeping is an essential part of ensuring that cases of repeated misconduct are detected and dealt with appropriately. Tracking and reporting on occurrences across the University can also support research into questions such as why academic misconduct takes place and which students are most at risk. This report suggests an existing faculty-based tool for modification and university-wide implementation.

Recommendation 4 is to develop within the Education Portfolio a liaison and coordination point to support staff and students. This could be an office of educational integrity which would champion academic integrity for coursework students in the University, support students and staff and track trends. The office would provide a single point of contact at the University for matters relating to academic misconduct in coursework and allow the University community to seek authoritative information on policy and procedures and best practice prevention and detection strategies.

Recommendation 5 is to make changes to the University’s policies as appropriate to implement best practice prevention and detection. These changes are suggested as a result of policy inconsistencies raised in faculty discussions; to support the other recommendations made in this report, and to suggest policy improvements.
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Recommendations

The following recommendations are made in-principle, with acknowledgement that implementation will necessarily see some of the detail evolve.

1. Education

Approaches to delivering academic honesty and information about the University’s relevant policies vary widely among faculties. There is a need for more consistency across the University, and to ensure students engage with the material and understand their responsibilities early in their studies.

- Academic honesty education oriented towards rigorous tertiary study should be embedded in the first year curriculum with at least one tutorial or lecture session in a first year unit of every course (undergraduate and postgraduate) given over to training in academic honesty matters specific to that discipline, such that each student receives this training. These should ideally be integrated with an online component.
- The University should introduce a small number of endorsed university-wide academic honesty education modules and require students to complete these. Online best-practice modules managed through the learning management system are currently in use in Science and Business (Attachment 1) and these should be adapted, endorsed and promoted for use in other faculties (see section 2.1).
- There should be early focus in every curriculum on written communication skills. Students should complete an early assignment that is scaffolded and teaches referencing, proper paraphrasing, and other appropriate techniques for their discipline, with appropriate feedback.
- Consistent information on University policy should be quickly and easily available to staff and students.

2. Assessment

Assessment and curriculum design form a key part of prevention strategies. A global review of our assessment strategy is an implicit part of the Education Strategy paper. The recommendations here are intended to complement that review and should be implemented so as to align with the University’s strategic direction in education. Ensuring the academic integrity of a unit of study can best be done through using assessment techniques that are authentic and difficult to cheat. Section 2.3 explores this issue in more detail and outlines some best-practice assessment types.

- Each unit of study should specifically and formally address how academic integrity will be assured and this should be documented at each point of approval by the Faculty. Assurance of academic integrity for existing units of study should be done through ongoing review or through a School or Faculty stocktake. Such assurance may take the form of a formal plan for each unit, a faculty assessment matrix, or statements integrated into the unit-approval template. Assurance of academic integrity must canvas the range of possible breaches, including plagiarism, ghost-writing, receiving or passing on inappropriate knowledge of examinations, inappropriate collusion and other forms of academic dishonesty. Unit of study coordinators should have responsibility for continuously reviewing the academic integrity risk within the unit as part of the ongoing review of the unit. Faculties should ensure that processes exist at the faculty level for review of academic integrity as part of the ongoing review and approval of new and amended units of study.
- The Academic Board should be asked to consider policy requiring each faculty to develop assessment guidelines that give consideration to the degree of risk inherent in each assessment type used within that faculty. Guidelines on best-practice assessment to assure academic integrity should be developed, and these should be maintained by the office of educational integrity within the Education Portfolio (see recommendation 4).
- Review of assessment practices and policy undertaken by faculties and as part of the Education Strategy should include formal consideration of assurance of academic integrity (including top-down approaches working across the curriculum such as capstone assessments of learning outcomes and graduate qualities) along with broader issues such as the number of assessments across the curriculum.
3. **Recordkeeping**

Essential to the ability to deal appropriately with cases of academic dishonesty and misconduct is more consistent recordkeeping and a searchable recordkeeping system. The records kept should be for notifications, investigations, findings, and, if appropriate, appeals and appeal outcomes that can assist in detecting cases of repeated dishonesty and misconduct. Improved and automated reporting capability will also assist in detecting and addressing trends while further reducing faculty workloads.

- Use a simple recordkeeping technology that reduces workload for academics but ensures all records are kept centrally. An example of a best practice system already used in the University is in section 2.5.
- Provide an accessible, searchable database to allow staff to check quickly and easily for previous offences. Ideas for how to develop such a system are in section 2.5.

4. **Coordination and Support**

There is a clear need for the University to provide a clear point of contact and support for staff and students in matters related to coursework academic integrity (including Honours theses and other theses completed as part of coursework programs). It is recommended that a liaison point and responsibility centre in the form of an office of educational integrity be established and managed within the Education Portfolio. This would liaise with and complement the Office of Research Integrity, though would be lighter in terms of resources and budgetary implications. Through this office or liaison point, the Education Portfolio would:

- Champion and promote academic integrity for coursework students in the University.
- Serve as a point of contact and coordination for matters concerning academic integrity.
- Lead the development and implementation across the University of practices promoting academic integrity.
- Provide academic and relevant professional staff with professional learning and support relevant to academic integrity.
- Support the development and use of learning resources and learning experiences for students that promote academic integrity, including the University-endorsed online education modules mentioned in Recommendation 1.
- Monitor trends within the University and the higher education sector relevant to academic integrity and use these to inform the development of educational materials, policies, and so forth.

More detail on this office is in section 2.6.

5. **Policy Changes**

A number of changes to University policies will be necessary to address the current situation and to enact the recommendations made above. Among those to be considered are:

- Allow Nominated Academics to send students they believe committed only minor negligent plagiarism to further education courses and require appropriate follow-up (such as assignment resubmission) without a meeting if the student so chooses (such cases would still be reported through the online record system).
- Consider whether the distinction between negligent and dishonest plagiarism is useful in all cases when education is provided and mandatory; student ignorance is no defence under other policies, and the code of conduct requires them to be aware of all policies pertaining to them.
- Consider whether Recycling should remain part of the current academic dishonesty policy, for coursework students.
- Consider whether students should have a duty to report dishonesty behavior.
- Change the Coursework policy to require Turnitin to be used for all appropriate written assignments.
- Change the Teaching and Learning Policy to require integrity assurance measures to be part of assessments for each unit of study.
- Develop a set of guidelines on proofreading and editing for coursework, comparable to those for Higher Degrees by Research.
- Provide improved guidelines on educationally beneficial cooperation vs. collusion.
• Ensure the intention of the policy around the appointment and identification of Nominated Academics within each faculty is clear.
• Review examinations policy and procedures.

These policy changes are further explained in section 2.7.

Implications
The recommendations suggested here have a number of clear implications.

Reputation
Improving detection, even through as simple a measure as requiring Turnitin in those units where written assignments are used, along with improved record keeping is likely to result in a significant apparent increase in reported cases. Statistics from the Business School show a rise of 120% in notifications following the introduction of mandatory Turnitin use (from 2% of student instances in 2009 to 4% in 2010). Based on the current numbers reported to the Academic Board, this could mean a rise across the University to as many as 5000-6000 notifications per year, noting that this number includes many cases that will be minor and dealt with through education. The rise in cases could be much less than this, however. A comparison with first year Science units in which Turnitin was used showed a much lower rate of incidence (see section 1.1). This may be the result of a difference in the standards applied, or in the nature of the assignments, but it may also indicate some difference in the rate of occurrence by faculty (Attachment 2).

Such a rise is likely to be relatively short-lived. Examples of cases where prevention and detection practices have been improved, such as in the Business School or in Psychology, show that rates of occurrence can be brought down and kept low long-term by sustained effort. In Psychology, rates are now so low as to be unable to be significantly reduced again (Owens and White, 2013). There is, however, a risk that improving detection of one type of dishonesty will result in the rise in occurrence of a different type (eg. plagiarism may be replaced by ghost writing), and for this reason education, cultural change, and assessment practices all must be addressed.

The Business School also provides evidence that efforts to reduce academic dishonesty can result in significant reputational enhancement for the University. The Working Party was told that employer feedback prior to the introduction of the current academic honesty regime was that graduates were not able to write. After the current measures were put in place one employer’s feedback was that “only University of Sydney graduates are able to write”.

Resourcing
• Resourcing implications for Nominated Academics (time to deal with a potential rise in cases) and for faculty administrative support staff.
• Time for unit of study coordinators to review their assessment methods and any improvements necessary.
• Resourcing implications for the Education Portfolio in providing coordination and support.
• Changes to structure of some first year units.
• Training time for all staff on policy, tools such as Turnitin, etc.
• Computing resources including data storage and designer time to create recordkeeping workflows or adjust online modules.
• Provision for education on academic honesty and detection work in the teaching and marking staff workload allocations and in remuneration for sessional staff.
• Office of General Counsel time to review and revise policies.
Next Report

The Working Party will bring to the Taskforce a second report at its 2 September meeting. That report will cover the following topics. Some ideas for further investigation within these topic areas are outlined below. Feedback on these is welcomed by the Taskforce.

Staff Training

• Ensure coordinated staff training is offered in dishonesty and misconduct policies and procedures and detection (including Turnitin use).
• Nominated Academics are appropriately identified within faculties and receive training in policies, procedures, but also in resilience and interpersonal skills to assist with interview/counseling processes.
• Nominated Academics to review and agree on a framework for decision-making guidance to provide consistency and fairness across penalties by reference to example cases.
• Nominated Academics to agree criteria for referral of cases by examiners to ensure consistency across the University.
• Ensure part-time and casual staff are supported and fully trained.

Research Students

• Ensure a record is kept of Honours theses.
• Introduce Turnitin for thesis work prior to Faculty signoff to submit for marking.
• Ensure consistent penalties are applied across the University when dishonesty and misconduct is encountered in research theses.
• Ensure research students have easy access to information on policies that apply to them.
• Ensure coordinated staff training for supervisors in dishonesty and misconduct policies as they apply to research students.

Remediation

• Evaluate current remediation courses offered by ITL and the Business School with a view to broadening use across the University

Sanctions

• Review role of OGC to review faculty investigations, and consider final scrutiny of the case by the DVC-E (or Registrar?) and streamline cases where the facts are clear, in concert with policy clarifications.
• Use a filter mechanism so that the only cases that reach the Vice-Chancellor for decision are those with major penalties such as exclusions, suspensions or expulsions.
• Review the ‘suspended suspension’ as a penalty.
• Consider the use of a ‘Fail due to dishonesty’ grade that would appear on the student transcript.

Culture and Communication

• Ensure the loop is closed between OGC, the Registrar, and referring faculties so that staff understand the reasoning behind the final decisions in cases, and the implications of the findings for future cases.
• Promote (internally) suitably de-identified details of cases that have been identified and dealt with by the University, including the penalties applied.
• Consider ways to encourage a culture in which students are supportive of efforts to ensure academic honesty within the University and more likely to report dishonesty when they observe it.
• Hold a University-wide debate on acceptable assistance.
• Ensure staff are motivated and supported to detect, report, and remediate academic dishonesty.
• Develop recommendations on strategic approaches to audit and sustaining high levels of academic integrity to be taken forward by the Education Portfolio.

• Consider the use and effectiveness of honour pledges for students, including a requirement to inform.
1. Current State

There is widespread media interest in stories related to academic dishonesty and misconduct, and this interest appears to have increased of late. Several cases involving the University of Sydney have been the focus of media stories. Whether this is related to an actual rise in incidence of dishonesty is difficult to discern (see section 1.1).

The literature on the reasons why students plagiarise is extensive. As McGrail and McGrail (2015) noted, a particularly contentious area is the issue of intentionality. McCabe and Trevino (1993), as cited in McGrail and McGrail (2015), linked the occurrence of academic dishonesty with understanding of policy, perceptions of being caught, severity of sanctions and perceptions of the behaviour and attitudes of other students. Other studies have examined the influence of student perception of the seriousness of different types of academic dishonesty and differences based on gender and socio-economic status. Notwithstanding the recent focus on technologically-enabled dishonesty, academic dishonesty is an old problem.

Spiller and Crown (as cited in Molnar 2015) were unable to find a statistically significant trend in student cheating in studies dating back to the 1900s. Nevertheless, there is certainly a perception that academic dishonesty is now more common than it was at some point in the past, and that this may be related to wider cultural changes regarding changing attitudes to intellectual property; internet-driven technologies or markets that increase the ease and availability of tools with which to engage in dishonest behavior, or market changes within higher education. In contrast to this perception, Molnar (2015), in a study of 1800 students at both a small college and a large university in the US, showed that student acceptance of academically dishonest behavior had decreased over the period 2005-2013.

At the moment, both academic dishonesty and academic misconduct are dealt with under the same policy, using academic penalties unless the behaviour fits the definition of misconduct in the University of Sydney By-Law. The Working Party has described the most common types of academic dishonesty reported in section 3. Attachment 3 describes academic dishonesty and plagiarism in more detail and gives an overview of the external provider environment.

1.1 Trends

The Academic Standards and Policy Committee of the Academic Board requires faculties to report the total number of notifications of potential academic dishonesty and plagiarism, the total number of findings and their category (negligent/dishonest plagiarism, academic dishonesty), and the total number of allegations referred to the Registrar. Table 1 shows the trend in these reports over the period from 2010 – 2014.

In general, the number of cases across the University is consistent over this time period, both in the numbers of notifications, the total number of findings, and the number of allegations referred to the Registrar. Across undergraduate and postgraduate enrolments the numbers are also fairly constant, with about 500-600 postgraduate notifications per year and between 800 – 950 undergraduate notifications (Attachment 4). There are considerable inconsistencies in these data, however, that make it difficult to rely on these numbers. The Academic Board has not always received reports from each faculty and has often had to ask for the data to be reviewed. In addition, there are vastly different faculty practices in reporting, in recordkeeping, in detection, and in findings, which make it difficult to rely on this data as a complete picture of occurrence at the University. The categories reported are also consistent with current University policy, but, as staff members pointed out when speaking with the Working Party, there are cases that do not comfortably fit into these categories and so where the faculties choose to classify them may vary.
Table 1. Numbers of notifications of academic dishonesty and plagiarism reported to the Academic Board by all faculties of the University.

At the University level, the Academic Board data is all that is available to understand the trends. The Business School, however, has been collecting detailed data on cases of academic dishonesty and plagiarism since 2006, and serves as a useful case study to understand what might be occurring across the University.

For example, the rate of occurrence of academic dishonesty and plagiarism among the international vs domestic student cohort is impossible to discern at the University level, as student status is not commonly recorded in the incident case file. The Business School, however, has been keeping a record of this, and reports a very small difference in the rate of notifications made for international vs domestic students (Table 2). This difference is statistically significant, but it may be a result of the very high numbers of students involved. Attachment 5 describes incidence rates across the Business School in more detail.

Table 2: Business School notifications for international and domestic students from 2006 – 2014. Note that the unit is ‘student instances’ which describes the number of unit of study enrollments rather than simply the number of students, with the rationale that each unit provides an opportunity for a student to engage in academic dishonesty and plagiarism and multiple allegations may be made against the same student.
The significant rise in notifications within the Business School which can be seen in Table 2 accompanies the introduction of compulsory Turnitin in all units, which occurred in 2010. Table 3 shows the number of notifications and notifications per student instances for each year. ‘Student instance’ is a measure of the number of unit of study enrollments – so one student enrolled in eight units would be counted as eight student instances. This is used as the denominator rather than student numbers as each student may have multiple notifications in a single year. The notification rate in Business seems to vary between 1.5 – 3% annually. In 2014, the number of findings was 2% of student enrolments.

While Turnitin is not mandatory in the Science Faculty, there are units of study within Science that have also introduced and are using Turnitin. Tellingly, those units of study that do not use Turnitin, reported no notifications of dishonesty, while those with Turnitin reported a rate of 0.6%. Comparing equivalent first year units of study between Business and Science that use Turnitin, there remains a much lower rate of notifications within Science for the period from 2012-2014, with Science averaging around 0.5% while Business averages 4% (Attachment 2). This may indicate a real difference in the rate of occurrence of dishonesty within Science, either as a result of a difference in student cohorts or a difference in the prevention strategies employed. This may, however, also be a result of different reporting standards in the relevant faculties.

The Working Party considers that there is clear, and clearly significant, underreporting and under detection at the University. The literature reports widely divergent figures on the percentages of students who engage in academic dishonesty depending on the definition used. The Academic Integrity Research Project found that between a quarter and a half of undergraduate students reported instances of plagiarism observed by them (McCabe 2005). Estimating the effect of addressing this problem on the numbers reported to the Academic Board is complicated. It could be the case that the numbers in Business reflect the real rate of occurrence University wide, in which case the number of notifications should rise to 5000-6000 per year. If the numbers for Science are more reflective of the level expected, then the number of cases expected could be closer to 2500.

Business also provides some information on what might happen once an effective regime of education and detection practices is in place (Table 4). There are a relatively high number of cases where two notifications are made against one student, but these are likely to result from concurrent notifications, where two incidents occur at the same time and these are both treated as ‘first offences’. Even including these, multiple notifications are very low, especially as a percentage of student instances (Attachment 6).

Across the University, there were 102 cases referred to the Registrar, and referred to OGC during the period 2009-2014 (Attachment 7). Note that these figures include those sent to the Registrar for
special consideration fraud (false medical certificates etc., see section 3.3). Of these, approximately equal numbers are international and domestic students. This year, 44 cases have been referred before the end of semester one, while the total referred in both semesters last year was 46, indicating a spike in misconduct cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of notifications for the same student</th>
<th>Number of Business School notifications</th>
<th>% of Business School cases</th>
<th>% student instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only 1 notification</td>
<td>3995</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple notifications for the same student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 notifications</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 notifications</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 notifications</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 notifications</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 notifications</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total notifications 2007-2014</td>
<td>5778</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Recidivism rates by student instances. The number of multiple notifications for an individual student in the Business School 2007 – 2014.

1.2 Policy

The University’s Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy outlines the process to be used across the University.

- An examiner who suspects academic dishonesty or plagiarism must report this to a Nominated Academic in the relevant faculty.
- The Nominated Academic must consult with the examiner to formulate a clear expression of the alleged conduct, and to form a view of whether the conduct would, if proven, constitute negligent or dishonest plagiarism, or some other form of academic misconduct.
- If the Nominated Academic forms the view that there is a matter for concern: the student is informed in writing of the concern, invited to a meeting with the Nominated Academic, informed that they may bring a representative, and provided with supporting documentation.
- The Nominated Academic may then make a finding and decide the appropriate action to be taken, informing the student, the examiner, and making a record of the decision and any counseling undertaken.
- If the Nominated Academic makes a preliminary finding of that the conduct would, if proven, be sufficiently serious to constitute misconduct under Chapter 8 of the University of Sydney By-Law, it is referred to the Registrar to be investigated in accordance with that Chapter.

1.3 How it works in practice

The Working Party interviewed representatives from each of the University’s faculties to discover how the current policy is implemented and the view of staff as to its efficacy. In doing so, significant variation in application of the policy was discovered. In summary:

- There is not always a single ‘Nominated Academic’ to whom notifications are made. In larger faculties, this can be because of workload – it is sensible to spread the role across a number of people with a single person giving oversight to the group. In others, however, the role appears to be interpreted as part of the work of a unit of study coordinator or similar. Given the intent of the policy is to ensure that oversight of a faculty’s cases is maintained, to provide consistency in application, the latter interpretation is problematic.
- In some faculties, a step is inserted between notification and interview. This is usually because the Nominated Academic forms the view that the conduct represents minor negligent plagiarism, and refers the student directly to further compulsory education, offering them an interview only if the student wishes to contest the finding. Faculties who do this report that very few students choose to proceed to interview, and, where recidivism rates can be determined, these are low.
• While in some faculties, the Nominated Academic is given workload relief to deal with the time demands of the role, this is lacking in others. There is also great variation in the administrative support afforded to staff, whether the examiner or Nominated Academic, which affects detection and reporting practice.

• Recordkeeping is highly variable. Some faculties use online forms that report to TRIM folders, while others store records only on individual staff members’ computers or even on paper files. Cases handled at faculty level, are reported by some faculties to Student Affairs for recordkeeping and some faculties check for repeat cases with Student Affairs, while others do not. Many struggle to assemble the annual report to the Academic Board.

• There is a general reluctance to refer cases to the Registrar, usually as a result of anecdotal reports of long turn-around times and results of investigations which staff do not understand and have found discouraging.

• While the use of a single Nominated Academic is to assist in providing consistency of application of the policy within faculties, there is no similar way to calibrate application across faculties. Often when speaking to the Working Party, staff noted parts of the policy they were unsure of, or expressed interest in hearing how the policy was being applied in other areas of the University.

1.4 Education and information

Across the University, a variety of different educational materials have been developed to assist student learning and to prevent non-intentional cases of academic dishonesty. Almost all faculties provide information on the policy to students in some manner, usually through unit of study outlines and the website. Most also give some form of introduction to academic integrity and the University policies in either orientation or early lecture programs. Many also refer students to the online module on the library website, and some even require students to present their certificate of completion from that module – though the Working Party also heard that there is a ‘black market’ in this certificate among students; it can be bought to cheat the requirement.

The effectiveness of education programs was reported anecdotally to the Working Party by staff who have introduced them, particularly in the Business School, the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASS) and the Faculty of Science. In the Faculty of Science case, this is also part of a longitudinal study on plagiarism reduction techniques that has been published by Owens and White (2013) and is ongoing.

FASS reported that since the introduction of their module on paraphrasing, the cases that now occur are almost all dishonest plagiarism, and very few cases of negligent plagiarism are being reported to the Nominated Academic.

A lot of faculties referred to their web information and the Working Party undertook a brief survey of information on this topic available through the University’s public website. This survey found that each faculty has approximately 2-3 pages covering related content, with additional content from the Library and Student Affairs. Google searches revealed old pages that are not accessible via the websites menus but are still visible to students and others. There is a broad range of often inconsistent information and instructions that can require students to initiate several additional action steps to view the information. Broken web links, obsolete policies, confusing and contradictory information and guidelines for both students and staff were all found.

1.5 Turnitin

The University has had Turnitin available and a policy regarding its use since 2012. The current policy allows for Deans to decide whether to require that similarity detecting software, approved by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), is used in all units of study within the faculty.

The Working Party investigated the current level of usage of Turnitin across the University. In consultations, the Working Party often heard that faculties had recently made the decision to move to compulsory usage of Turnitin for all written assignments, usually to be introduced in second semester 2015 or in 2016. Many faculties currently require its use in large first year units only, or only in those
units where significant written work is submitted. For example, the Conservatorium requires Turnitin to be used for Music History units but does not require it in other subjects.

In the University, Blackboard is used to interface with Turnitin, so to use Turnitin, a unit of study must have a Blackboard site and use online submission of assignments. For Semester 1 2015, there were 1268 Blackboard sites across the University that had content available. Approximately 3500 units of study were offered in that semester, which would mean about 36% of units of study had Blackboard sites. The number of Blackboard sites does not fully correlate to the units of study offered, however, as some faculties, such as Dentistry, use one Blackboard site for multiple units of study. The number of Blackboard sites counted in this analysis also does not include the bulk of the Business School as that faculty’s Blackboard sites work on a different server. A majority (63%) of Blackboard sites are using some form of online assignment submission, and of those, about half (29%) are using Turnitin (Attachment 8). Noting the limitations in the data, this means about 10% of units of study offered in Semester 1 2015 used Turnitin.

To use the Turnitin tool within Blackboard requires faculties to move to online submissions for written assignments. The Working Party often heard of cases where faculties, were still using hardcopy submission, though sometimes, such as the Sydney Nursing School, this is in combination with online submission, so that Turnitin checking can occur. Matching of online submissions to the written assignment is not routinely undertaken, however, raising the possibility that the assignment with a clear Turnitin report is not the same as the hardcopy assignment marked. Other faculties, such as Engineering and IT or schools such as Mathematics, continue to use substantially paper-based submission. There are broader issues here too, regarding the security of the assignment ‘box’ to which the submission is made, which, at least in the case of Engineering, is not closely controlled.

The School of Mathematics made a submission to the Taskforce arguing that hardcopy submission is necessary to retain within the discipline, and arguing against any blanket imposition of Turnitin as a result. Engineering and IT was similarly concerned as to how such a requirement would work in practice and Science and Medicine noted the use of assessment types such as lab reports and case notes that they did not feel would be amenable to Turnitin analyses. Some of these concerns appear based on an outdated understanding of the capabilities of the Turnitin tool and clearly require further staff training in the use of the tool, while others are valid concerns related to the nature of the discipline and its appropriate assessment. The approach considered by the Working Party (section 2.1 and 2.3) should allow faculties and disciplines to assess for themselves cases where Turnitin is really not appropriate and consider how else they may assure the academic integrity of their assessment tasks.

1.6 Recordkeeping
What is currently missing from the recordkeeping done in the University is consistency of practice across faculties. There is also no way to search for previous cases, not only within faculties, where reliance on staff memories is often used, but also across faculties, or to search for cases that have gone to the Registrar. While TRIM may be available, many staff report that they do not have time to manually search TRIM, where such a search is not simple. Most records, in any event, do not seem to reach TRIM.

The Working Party heard a great variety of recordkeeping practices across the University. For most faculties, records are kept on the Nominated Academic’s computer: this was the case in Veterinary Science, the Faculty of Education and Social Work, and many others. Some faculties have developed their own centralised recordkeeping function with access for the Nominated Academic and relevant Associate Dean, such as the Sydney Nursing School. Some, such as Law, ensure the appropriate letters are recorded on the student file, keep their own local records and have an aspiration to keep a TRIM file but have not been able to due to workload.

FASS, however, has developed a solution, outlined below, which utilises TRIM to provide swift and easy online reporting for staff and clear and simple decision points for the Nominated Academic, while all the time recording relevant details to TRIM in the background. This system has been in place for 18 months and handled 230 cases so far with no issues. While it does not, as yet, automate searching or reporting functions, these could be developed and integrated with some ease, as discussed below (section 2.5).
Separately, for cases referred to the Registrar, the Student Affairs Unit keeps track of these in a Filemaker system, which has not been linked to TRIM. Once a case is concluded, the final decision is placed on the student file manually by staff.

2. Detailed Proposals

More information on the recommendations proposed is outlined here. Many of these proposals arose in the course of the investigation, as the Working Party discovered examples of best practice already at work in the University.

2.1 Education

A majority (53% in 2014) of the upheld cases reported to the Academic Board are classed as negligent plagiarism, indicating that students have been careless, ill-informed or confused about how to cite the work of others’ and have failed to develop an authorial voice. Previous studies have shown the effectiveness of online learning modules in reducing cases of plagiarism (eg. Du Pre 2009 in Owens and White, 2013) and the Working Party also heard from FASS that since the introduction of their learning module on paraphrasing cases of negligent plagiarism had dropped to almost nil.

The study by Owens and White (2013) carried out in first year psychology units at the University of Sydney, further demonstrated the effectiveness of educational intervention in reducing rates of plagiarism. This was demonstrated firstly through a significant reduction in cases following the introduction of both detection software and an education module, and through a second significant reduction in cases following the introduction of a writing mastery quiz. Importantly, these authors also demonstrated that this major reduction in cases during first year led to a subsequent drop in cases in later years.

The most effective approach to education in this area appears to be multi-pronged.

- Firstly, academic integrity education must be embedded in the courses that students undertake, rather than provided in addition to course material. Simply providing students with links to the policy is not enough to ensure engagement with the material has occurred and for this reason a lecture and/or tutorial should be devoted to this topic in every first year (undergraduate and postgraduate) course. This also provides an opportunity for the information to be tailored to any unique disciplinary practice and requirements.

- Secondly, students should be required to complete a compulsory task, such as an online module, that tests their understanding of the concepts presented. This does not have to form a component of the grade for that unit (could be a compulsory component worth zero marks), but it should present a mandatory barrier to continuing at the University. The issue of ensuring the module is complete should ideally be managed through the learning management system.

Three well-organised cases of online training and testing material were found and assessed by the Working Party, and it is recommended that the Taskforce consider using these as a basis to create material that can be rolled out across the University (see Attachment 1).

- Finally, students should work with their instructor to develop their first assignment in a ‘scaffolded’ fashion, with feedback on drafts as they apply the techniques of paraphrasing, citation and referencing. This could be a minor in-class assessment task or part of a larger assignment as appropriate.

The materials used in Psychology were reviewed by the Working Party along with the other units available across the University (Attachment 1). While interactivity in the modules is important, too much video was found to result in material being skipped, and text-based material was more likely to be engaged with. The difficulty of the test and the score required to pass were also important, and the Psychology unit test is strongest in this regard, with impossible to guess questions and a high pass mark required, forcing students to engage with the material. The Business module is unique in its automatic reporting which means that students who do not complete the module will automatically receive a fail
in their units of study. This negates the ability to purchase certificates through a ‘black market’ and reduces the workload for staff.

To provide consistent, University-wide information, the refresh of the University website provides an opportunity to remove the multiple pages on academic dishonesty and misconduct and establish a single-point-of-truth web resource, potentially hosted by the Education Portfolio. When the student intranet is developed, this structure should be maintained within that environment. In addition to information about the University’s policies on academic dishonesty and misconduct, information on proper research and writing practices, time management, expectations for behavior and what to do when students do run out of time, are sick or find themselves struggling would assist in lowering incidence rates.

2.2 Turnitin

Turnitin should be used as a matter of course for all written assessments completed by students and the process for managing the checking of Turnitin reports needs management and planning for large units. Its use should also be considered for honours and coursework masters theses as well as those by higher degree research students (Report 2 will explore this issue). Once fully trained in the current capabilities of Turnitin, each faculty’s Nominated Academic should provide advice to the Teaching Committee or its equivalent within each faculty as to the appropriateness of any exception to this requirement.

To use Turnitin will require the use of a Blackboard site and online submission. Using Turnitin well requires a number of additional practices to be in place and the lessons learned by the Business School during the roll-out of compulsory Turnitin across that faculty are informative (Attachment 9). In brief, staff training in the use of Turnitin is essential, particularly in how to interpret the similarity report produced by the software. Under no circumstances should the ‘percentage match’ be used for decision making or to provide a ‘cut-off’ score. This is for three reasons: the percentage is highly dependent on the length of the assignment submitted; it does not adequately account for false positives; and it counts short phrases scattered throughout the piece in a similar manner to a short block of text, when these should be treated very differently. The rankings of the reports, however, uses a more sophisticated algorithm and thus is informative, but only if the settings of the program are left at default.

Once fully trained, staff should find checking the similarity reports generated by Turnitin a relatively speedy task. Due to the training involved and the need for consistency, the person who reviews the reports for a large unit should be the same and the time required for this role can be balanced by reducing the marking load for this staff member. It is also preferable, for these reasons, that this task be given to a permanent staff member, rather than a casual – the unit of study coordinator is likely to be the ideal candidate for this role. The Business School has also found it necessary to check staff use of Turnitin (Attachment 9) and this could be undertaken by the Nominated Academic for each faculty, on an annual basis.

If the staff member checking the Turnitin reports detects a problem, this should be reported ideally via a simple online form (section 2.5). At this stage, the Turnitin report and the problem report will be sent to an administrative staff member who can prepare these for the Nominated Academic to review. If, on review, the Nominated Academic finds a problem, the policy process described in section 1.2 can begin. Note that it is important that each faculty has resourcing to provide a trained and dedicated administrative staff member to support this process.

2.3 Assessments

The Taskforce requested that a literature review be conducted investigating what is known about the impact of assessment policy on the occurrence of academic misconduct. This was undertaken by personnel within the Education portfolio and is at Attachment 10.

There is little available evidence of a direct interaction between assessment policies and misconduct incidence, however, several studies have emphasised the need to maximise student engagement with assessment tasks. There is also an increasing focus within the literature on assessment design-based prevention, rather than detection. In general, this focuses on designing assessments that draw on student
personal experiences, on individualised assignments, and on what we here term 'scaffolded' assignments that are built over a period of time in close consultation with a teacher (Attachment 10).

Examples of assessments that appeared to be best-practice in relation to assuring academic integrity were heard by the Working Party. In some units, students at the University complete a project over the course of a semester, such as a design, a composition or a piece of research, with multiple points of contact with and feedback from their teacher. This means that the staff member can be fairly certain the submitted work accurately reflects the student’s knowledge and understanding. Even a single cycle of submission, feedback and re-submission has substantial learning benefits and should be relatively easy to implement. Peer feedback can also be useful, and the quality of the feedback itself can be assessed if so desired.

Where research projects and written tasks are used, ensuring these are varied from semester to semester assists in combating recycling of previous students' work. More widespread use of Turnitin would also assist in detecting and discouraging this practice.

Professional faculties also often use internships, clinical placements and other situations where students are individually supervised and observed. These are very good ways to ensure that the student in question can demonstrate the skills that they are required to learn. For many of the professional faculties, failure in clinical skills, whether demonstrated via an exam or via placements, will automatically trigger a failure in the unit of study whether or not other areas have apparently been performed well. This further ensures the criticality of demonstrating key skills to the granting of a qualification and thus assures academic integrity. This ‘authentic’ assessment approach can be broadened to other areas of the University as appropriate.

Finally, ensuring that students can apply the skills they have learnt to an unseen problem is an excellent way of assuring the academic integrity of a unit of study. The Working Party heard from a number of faculties who considered that, while they had some difficulty in assuring the semester-long work undertaken by their students, the final exam they required the students to pass would ensure that only those who truly understood the content could complete the unit. To be effective, this exam must be administered according to best practice as outlined below, and it must also form a true barrier – that is, like the clinical exams or placements, a certain grade in the exam must be required, rather than allowing a student to pass the unit based entirely on performance in earlier, un-assured, pieces of assessment. This grade does not have to be a pass – there are some units where the level of difficulty is such that the appropriate barrier mark will be lower.

There are a number of other assessment forms that discourage participation in academic dishonesty. Regular, automated, low stakes formative feedback assists the learning process while also removing incentives to cheat. In addition, these tasks could provide useful diagnostic tools with which to judge a student’s authentic voice and capabilities in the case of a suspect piece of work being identified. ‘Design’ tasks, oral assessments and assessments where students are asked to identify key questions or issues, rather than simply to write, are all more creative approaches to assessment that are more difficult to cheat. An overall reduction in the use of summative assessment is also likely to lower the stakes for students and reduce incentives.

The above are all examples of best practice in assessment design-based prevention of academic dishonesty. They are provided as an initial sketch towards the development of best practice guidelines to assure the academic integrity of assessment tasks that the office of educational integrity could maintain to assist staff.

Unit of study coordinators should be required to review and assess the academic integrity risk within their unit of study. Such an assessment should also be recorded by the School or the Faculty at the point of review or through a stocktake and could take the form of a formal plan for each unit, a faculty assessment matrix, or statements integrated into the unit approval template. This should cover the range of possible breaches (see section 3) which could be updated by reference to a current-state list also maintained by the office of educational integrity. The working party considered what an academic integrity assurance plan that assessed the robustness of the assessment tasks within a unit of study might look like, and an example is at Attachment 12.
What this approach does not address is the broader curriculum design question of the volume of assessment experienced by coursework students and what impact, if any, this may have on the incidence of academic misconduct and plagiarism. This issue is, however, part of a much broader conversation about workload, curriculum design and assessment for learning. As such, the Taskforce may wish to ensure that the education strategy discussion currently underway give due consideration to this question at a whole-of-university level. This could include considering top-down approaches to assuring academic integrity across the curriculum, such as through capstone assessments of learning outcomes and graduate qualities.

2.4 Exams

Best practice in exams can vary by the type of exam to be undertaken. There are some basic principles, however, that will apply regardless of the type of exam. To be effective as an academic assurance measure, the exam must a) be conducted under effective invigilation with adequate separation of students and b) contain genuinely unseen material. The identity of the student must also be verified. Whether or not an exam is open or closed book, or what format the exam may take must be adjusted as relevant to discipline. In discussing the subject of exams with faculties across the University, the Working Party noted a strong willingness among staff to use this method of assessment in most disciplines. Some noted that a final exam may not make up a large proportion of the final mark for various reasons but did not see an issue with requiring completion of the exam to a set standard as a barrier to completion of the unit. For example, the College of the Arts did not think a large weighting for a written task in the studio units was appropriate, but did think that requiring students to contextualize their work while under invigilation could be valid.

Effective invigilation is key and practices in this vary across the University, from that provided by the Examinations Unit to that undertaken by staff in faculty-run exams and that done by clinical educators. The venues for examinations matter, as these affect sight-lines for students in the exams and simple measures such as scrambling multiple choice answers between candidates can make any such cheating not only easy to detect but also unrewarding (Attachment 13). Sorted seating where students completing different exams sit together is another easy solution to in-room cheating.

An awareness of the technologies readily available to students that enable cheating and measures to combat these must also be part of invigilation. This includes considering ways to block internet signals, requiring personal electronic devices to be handed in for the duration of the exam, providing pens and calculators rather than allowing students to bring their own, and so forth. Assuring student identity could be done using technological solutions such as biometric scanners, but there are low-tech solutions available as well: staff could attend the exam and determine for themselves that their students are present.

Ideally, genuinely unseen material must be used to examine students. This means creating new exams every time, as recycling of exam questions, even from within a large question bank, is problematic for the reasons outlined above. There are in some disciplines, however, valid academic reasons for considering allowing students to study a number of problems prior to an exam, and asking them to reproduce one or more of these under exam conditions. Staff should also no longer assume any exam can be kept confidential; there were many instances cited to the Working Party of supposedly confidential exams available on the internet.

In clinical exams where students demonstrate a skill under invigilation, rigorous invigilation is required. One faculty in particular discussed instances of cheating within these that they have become aware of and believe they have addressed by tightening invigilation guidelines. Where students must undergo the clinical exam in serial, difficulty arises when an unseen portion is introduced. It would be best, therefore, to restrict this type of exam to demonstrating skills, or otherwise be able to vary the unseen portion for each student cohort.
2.5 Recordkeeping

The recordkeeping system in use by FASS provides an example of what best-practice recordkeeping across the University could look like. At present, there is a TRIM workflow in place where:

- The reporting examiner uses a simple online form to report a suspected case.
- The online form opens a TRIM file in the background and begins recording relevant actions taken.
- The system sends the case to an administrative staff member who checks the evidence submitted and prepares the case for review by the Nominated Academic.
- The Nominated Academic is emailed the case for review and enters his or her preliminary findings via email. This then triggers further appropriate steps in the chain, such as sending an email back to the examiner with a finding of minor issues requiring education, or:
- If the finding is such that the student will be asked to an interview, the system prepares the notification letter based on the selections made by the Nominated Academic and sends the letter to the student.
- The Nominated Academic records the outcomes of the interview in an email the system sends, and this triggers further steps, including sending to the registrar if appropriate, and keeping the reporting examiner informed.
- The TRIM file is complete and has been maintained without any of the academic staff needing to interact directly with TRIM.

Material provided by the Recordkeeping Unit that demonstrates the workflow above, along with sample emails is at Attachment 14. The Working Party has been advised that rolling out this system University wide could take as little as a month, with minimum staff training required.

What this system currently lacks is a way to search the files created to check for recidivism. The University is in need of a way for all faculties to be able to search the files created by others, and for these to link with the files created in the Registrar’s office in the case of a referral there. The Working Party has heard that such a system should be possible to create within TRIM, in a similar fashion to the above, so that it will require minimal training or effort on the part of staff. To link with the Registrar’s office, the Filemaker system used could also be connected to TRIM.

TRIM is also capable of generating reports on the data collected, such that reporting to the Academic Board on the number of cases will no longer need to be done manually by faculties, and these data could be further interrogated for informative trends (Attachment 13).

The current system is such that notifications, investigations and findings are all recorded in TRIM. Where an outcome letter is sent to a student, this is also recorded on the student file. The TRIM record allows for previous notifications and investigations to be searched and reviewed, regardless of whether a finding that would be recorded on the student file has been made. Further investigation is necessary to consider how appeal and appeal outcomes records should be kept, but some integration with this system would likely be of use.

It will also be necessary to consider what time period TRIM records should be kept for, as at present, destruction of records regarding cases that are not subsequently referred to the Registrar’s office for action takes place after two years, though the metadata is retained indefinitely. There is a good case to be made that these records be kept for at least the duration of a students’ time at University, if not longer, and the Taskforce may wish to consider whether to recommend an extension of retention time for these cases. As any outcome letters are recorded on the student file, they will be kept for six years post-graduation. For students entering some professions, such as Law, a longer retention period may in fact be necessary as the University can be asked to support claims made by former students as to their record at any point during their career.

2.6 Coordination and Support

A common feature of the Working Party’s discussion with the Nominated Academics from each faculty was the lack of support that these staff felt in interpreting the policy, determining appropriate
penalties, understanding best practice prevention and detection techniques and so forth. The Working Party’s discussions also often resulted in information sharing across the University, where staff discovered that a problem they had been facing on their own had been elegantly solved in another area in a manner that was entirely transferrable. Sometimes, due to poor lines of communication, staff had been working with outdated versions of policy, impressions of processes created from incidents that took place decades ago, or had understood an interpretation from OGC on an individual case as constituting a kind of ‘case law’ that changed their application of the policy.

There is student confusion, too. From Law, the Working Party heard that a student representative had brought to the Faculty’s attention an ‘essay help’ site advertising its services. Because the advertisements were in lecture halls, elevators and chalked outside the building, students were confused as to whether such services were allowed and endorsed by the Faculty. In addition, in the time since the last Taskforce meeting a number of cases of suspected ghost writing and solicitation by ghost writers have come to the attention of University staff and students, who have no clear place to send such information for action by the University.

The Working Party considers that these, and other examples, provide a clear case for the creation of a liaison point and centre of responsibility within the Education Portfolio, termed the office of educational integrity and focused on coursework (including Honours theses and other theses completed as part of coursework degrees). This would liaise with and complement the existing Office of Research Integrity and have carriage of policy in this area. It would lead the development and implementation of practices promoting academic integrity, by: providing training and support to Nominated Academics, convening a ‘community of practice’ across the University to share novel solutions and information, and maintaining high quality educational materials that could be used in every faculty. It would also provide a single point of contact on academic honesty matters for staff and students, and maintain expertise in the types of misconduct and the external provider environment.

Important, too, is leading a University-wide conversation on academic integrity. The Working Party heard from one Nominated Academic who felt that within her faculty, there was a perception that subtleties in the debate, for example over legitimate artistic uses of others’ work, were being lost. Acknowledging this view and working with those staff who hold it to discuss what academic dishonesty might look like within these disciplines is an important part of engaging staff on this issue and students should be part of this conversation as well. Report 2 will explore creating a culture within the University of academic honesty, and it is likely that the office will lead this work.

Finally, as this report shows, there are potentially interesting differences in the occurrence and type of misconduct across the student cohort which are unable to be addressed with current University data. Once an improved recordkeeping and reporting function is in place, these data should improve, which would allow the office to undertake research on this question, as well as to evaluate different prevention and detection strategies to underpin its work on best practice.

The office need not have significant budget or other resource implications and could be established by assigning the relevant responsibilities to an appropriate officer within the Education Portfolio. As the changes made by the Taskforce and its work develop, consideration could then be given to whether any more is needed in terms of more permanent resourcing and structure. Once established, it may, for example, be sensible to consider centralising recordkeeping and some coordination and education tasks.

2.7 Policy changes
In discussions with Nominated Academics, the Working Party heard of a number of instances where staff had adjusted the procedures slightly. Most strikingly, at least four different faculties had come to the conclusion that there was a class of offence that was minor but indicated a need for further education, and could be evaluated on the evidence alone, such that an interview with the student was unnecessary from the academic’s point of view. These faculties had developed a method whereby the student was offered an interview, as required under the policy, but it was emphasised that this was optional and the student could choose simply to complete an addition educational unit. The Working
Party agrees that this is a sensible approach and considers that the policy should be modified to clearly include this option.

Some concern was heard by the Working Party that the current policy does not separate the person in the faculty who prepares the case from the person who decides the case at the faculty level.

There were also some points of apparent inconsistency within University policies more broadly that were raised with the Working Party. At present, the current policy allows a defence of negligent plagiarism, which essentially argues that the student was not aware of the policy. At the same time, under the Student Code of Conduct, students are required to be aware of all policies pertaining to them, and ignorance of other policies is not an acceptable reason for breaching them. The Academic Board may wish to consider how to resolve this apparent inconsistency.

The extent of proofreading and editing by third parties that is currently allowable is also an area of policy inconsistency. At present, the policies are silent on how this is to be addressed for coursework students, but the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Policy and its procedures does address this. Clear guidance should also be provided to both staff and students as to what is expected in this area for coursework.

If the Taskforce makes any of the recommendations suggested by the Working Party, there are further policy changes that will need to be made, such as adjusting the Coursework Policy to require Turnitin to be used for all written assignments in the University and changing the Teaching and Learning Policy to require integrity assurance plans for each unit of study.

3. Types of Academic Dishonesty

3.1 Plagiarism and ghost writing

For text-based assignments, the major forms of academic dishonesty observed fall into the categories of plagiarism, collusion, recycling and ghost writing. Most of the cases of academic dishonesty reported across the University fall into this category, whether copied from published material, other students, recycled or bought. There are also a minor number of instances of discipline-specific forms of academic dishonesty – such as the insertion of a pre-prepared tooth into a simulation exam in Dentistry.

Plagiarism is divided by the current policy into negligent and dishonest plagiarism. These are defined by that policy as:

Negligent plagiarism: “innocently, recklessly or carelessly presenting another person’s work as one’s own work without appropriate acknowledgement of the source”

Dishonest plagiarism: “knowingly presenting another person’s work as one’s own work without appropriate acknowledgement of the source”

Collusion and recycling are not straightforward to deal with under the current policy. It is difficult to make a finding of ‘negligent’ plagiarism for collusion or recycling, yet for minor issues, it may not be appropriate to apply a ‘dishonest plagiarism’ or academic dishonesty finding and the more serious penalties that this would attract. Some professional faculties, such as Law, are particularly loathe to make findings of ‘dishonest’ plagiarism as a record of this finding during a student’s degree has serious implications for their admission to practice.

In addition, current penalties that faculties can apply are designed for situations where the student committing the offence is enrolled in the relevant unit of study. In some cases, however, students have stolen copies of exams or dishonestly colluded with students for units they are not enrolled in, and failing them in that unit is therefore not a relevant, or even possible, penalty.

Ghost writing, where a person who is not the student completes the assignment and the work is then submitted as the students’ own, is an old problem, but new technology has enabled a rapid growth. It has always been possible for students to source papers or other assignment types from others, such as family members, friends and so forth. The rise of the sharing economy, facilitated by the internet, has provided both easy access to strangers willing to complete student assignments for pay, and has dropped the price for such services, as accessing workers in developing economies is made easier. There are large numbers of various types of websites that can be classified as ‘paper mills’, ‘swap sites’, ‘freelancing sites’, and so forth (Attachment 3).

Service and quality of ghost writing can vary quite widely, but it is possible to buy unique work that will not raise alarms on Turnitin or other similarity matching software. Sites may advise, or students may know, to check and change the work before submission to more accurately match the students’ voice. Back-translation programs on the internet are sometimes used to scramble the voice of the original author for this purpose. Some sites will provide full-service for scaffolded assignments, and others even offer a full PhD service, taking the student’s data and providing drafts at regular intervals, incorporating supervisor feedback until ultimately a thesis is produced (see, for example: www.fairpriceessays.com). Clearly, ghost writing is much more difficult to detect than simple “copy/paste” academic dishonesty.

The Working Party heard that of the cases where ghost writing has been identified across the University, these are detected due to unoriginality of the ghost-written essay, an academic’s suspicion that the work did not reflect the student’s usual style of writing or level of understanding, or because of ‘whistleblowers’, sometimes including ghost writers who were not paid. Nominated academics struggle to produce evidence of ghost writing, though the Working Party did hear of cases where experts in linguistics were retained to provide an analysis of the students’ previous work compared to the suspect assignment. Clearly, it would be extremely resource intensive to rollout such a solution University-wide. There are, however, a number of companies, including Turnitin, who are working on an algorithm to undertake such syntax analysis. In the absence of clear evidence of ghost writing, the Working Party considers that such determinations could rely on academic judgments, which are subject to review by the Student Appeals Body on appeal. Changes to assessments outlined earlier in this report (sections 2.3, 2.4) are recommended to tackle the problem of ghost writing.

3.2 Exam cheating

Exam cheating has also been facilitated by the internet and the rise of portable personal devices, particularly smartphones with photographic and internet browsing capabilities. Social media facilitates students disseminating stolen exam papers or questions rapidly, and there have been several recent cases of this across the University. Computer security breaches where exams can be stolen are also not uncommon, and any exam that is not changed constantly should be assumed to be in the public domain. In addition, exams done under less than ideal conditions are highly vulnerable to simple forms of cheating. Invigilation must be rigorous, devices confiscated, and some way to deal with the situation of students using toilet breaks to search the internet for answers must be found. An increase in students using impersonators to complete exams is being seen internationally, and while biometric identification forms can be used, there are also ways to cheat these (eg. fingerprint film) already in common use. The problem of cheating in exams is not trivial – a study on multiple choice exams within the University revealed an average level of cheating of about 5% (Attachment 12).

3.3 Other forms of fraud and dishonesty

When speaking with faculties about academic dishonesty, the Working Party heard much concern about other forms of fraud. These were often in the category of fraudulent medical certificates and other ways to exploit special consideration policies. This can occur in relation to any assessment task, but a large area of concern for faculty is in relation to exams, particularly where students who have attended an exam subsequently claim illness and apply to re-sit the exam at a later date. Where the medical certificate has indeed been issued by a medical professional in good faith, there is little that can be done, even if the staff member suspects fraud. There are also cases where such certificates are
faked or even sold. The Working Party considers that the current review of special consideration will need to deal with these concerns separately to the Taskforce’s work.

Data fabrication is another form of dishonesty that can be very hard to detect and mostly applies in the case of Research Students, so this will be addressed in the Working Party’s second report to the Taskforce.

4. Methods

Work to date undertaken by the Working Party has included:

- Preparation of a literature review on best practice;
- Reviews of: web information in the University; best practice prevention of exam cheating; analysis of business school data and those provided by other faculties;
- Consultations with the Dean’s nominee from each of the University’s faculties and with key personnel within the Registrar’s office and in Records.

The Working Party’s members are listed below and its Terms of Reference are at Attachment 13.
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Attachment 1 – Education Modules Review

Across the University of Sydney there are four major modules teaching academic honesty. These are:

- Library and Write Site
- FASS – combination library material and Faculty created material
- Science – Faculty / School created material
- Business – Faculty created material

Mention has also been made of the external module “Avoiding Plagiarism” which is marked by Epigeum. Epigeum is the external marketing wing of Imperial College London whose task is to market and sell products developed by ICL to other universities. Epigeum’s “Avoiding Plagiarism” has been included in this review.

Key parameters varied across the modules. The internal University of Sydney modules were all developed to be undertaken in 20 – 30 minutes. They are additional add-ons to in Faculty embedded teaching. The Epigeum product is designed to take a student over an hour to undertake. The Epigeum product is designed as a standalone product where no other teaching is occurring.

The suite of products – information, embedded teaching in units, remedial teaching and the module – are best in the Business School suite. The Business School has general information and large numbers of workshops available to assist students. Embedded teaching in each first year unit with dedicated tutorials and sections of each assignment on referencing and honesty ensure that students are scaffolded in their learning and know it is important since it is part of actual units taught. Remedial workshops are offered twice a week for those students who still have not mastered the skills needed and a diagnostic test detects students with serious problems who undertake a free extra unit dedicated to writing and academic honesty. The other University of Sydney modules are supported to less extent than the Business School module. Often it is an individual UOS Coordinator who does something so that there is patchy coverage for students. The Write Site had interesting activities but stood alone. The Epigeum product has no suite attached. The Learning Centre offers remedial workshops but these are quickly filled since there are not enough of them offered.

Proof of completion varied. The Library, FASS and Science modules requires a student to complete the module, collect a certificate of completion and then send that certificate to Unit of Study Coordinators as proof that the student undertook the module. The Business School module and the Epigeum module collect and store which students have completed the module and which students have not completed the module. The Epigeum module does nothing more than store and report completions. The Business School module stores and reports completion but also automatically integrates with the marks system so that a student who does not undertake the module receives a fail in all units undertaken.

Multimedia quality varies across the modules. The Library and FASS modules are rich in video content, drag and drop visuals and other multimedia. The Epigeum module is very multimedia oriented with video, cartoons and well as text. The Business and Science modules are text based. They cover a lot of material in a text based format but other than the tests do not employ multimedia.

Interactivity is constant across the modules. Each requires the reader to carry out tasks. Multimedia and interactivity are considered important for engaging students. As such those modules with higher multimedia content may be perceived as more interesting and so students are likely to carry them out. The modules were carried out and tested by two research assistants aged under 22 and myself, aged over 40. Those with too much multimedia were found by all 3 testers to result in reduced learning since the video was simply skipped through. Where the module was short, all text based readings and activities were carried out.

Each module is completed by a test. The standard - or how difficult – the test was perceived to be varied greatly. The Library modules only had activities but not test. The FASS module test was the easiest with all testers gaining 100%. The Epigeum test was only observed but it was similar in standard to the FASS test. The Business and Science tests were difficult to undertake and required all
materials given to be read and understood in order to pass the test. The Science test was the hardest due to the type of questions and the format of those questions.

- The modules – and suites – developed within University of Sydney are more than adequate for use. The Epigeum product is simply an externally developed product of what has already been developed within University of Sydney.
- The suite of products in use in the Business School should serve as the model for developing a suite of items that any Faculty can use.
  - The Orientation Sessions should be taken over by the Learning Centre or other entity and offered in sufficient repetitions that all interested students can attend.
  - The embedded learning in lectures, fixed tutorial on academic honesty and scaffolding into actual assignments can be adopted from the Business School module – or the Science or FASS instances.
  - The remedial twice weekly workshops need to be taken over and centrally run in sufficient numbers that any student referred can access them.
  - The diagnostic test and additional unit should remain a Faculty decision since the teaching and focus will vary according to the learning and assessments in each Faculty.
- Decisions need to be made about the goal and key achievements of the module. Similarly, how long should the module take a student, how often should the student need to undertake the module etc. Once these decisions are made, the existing modules can be combined so that there is an online module that is common across all Faculties. If there is budget, a small working party can work with a learning designer to add more interactivity and the correct amount of multimedia.
- The module test should be based on the Science test in both format and also standard required to be achieved.
- Automatic collection and reporting of who has completed the module must be a feature of what is developed. In this respect the Business School model can be used across the University. Whether the Business School's add-on which links to marks and potential fails should be used across the University is a matter for policy.
Attachment 2 – Science/Business Incidence Comparison

The Business School has been keeping detailed records since 2004. The Faculty of Science has made available records between 2012 and 2014. These data have been combined into the spreadsheet attached.

Faculty of Science and School of Business shows notifications by student enrolments/instances.

Table 1: Total notifications from Science and Business as function student instances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Science figures are significantly lower than Business School equivalent figures. The Science figures remain ambiguous – is there non reporting or underreporting which explains the lower figures or are Business students as a cohort worse than Science students?

Units within the Faculty of Science that used TII across 2012 – 2014 reported 0.58% notifications. Units that did not use TII reported 0% notifications. There would appear to be underreporting where TII is not in use, and also some underreporting where TII is in use.

By careful selection, there are a group of units within Faculty of Science and the Business School where there is full use of TII and they have been checked and those units are reporting notifications. These units are equivalent and are listed in the attached spreadsheet. Focus has been placed on first year units to keep the sample equivalent.

Table 2: Total notifications from selected units using TII and reporting notifications as function student instances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>4.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
<td>4.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 compares Faculty of Science and Business School units that are checked and are confirmed as using TII and reporting notifications. Underreporting units have been excluded. The Business School has far higher rates of detected notifications than does the Faculty of Science. There are two explanations for this difference:

1. Business Students, as a cohort, engage in far more academic dishonesty than Science students.
2. There is a difference in the standard used when a report is looked at and the decision that there is a problem in regards to academic honesty is made. The Business school has set a standard that anything more than a minor breach that could be corrected by an annotation in the margin must be reported. It is not known what standard the Faculty of Science is using. If Science is using a different standard, then different rates of notifications will be reported. If different standards are being used, there is no possibility of comparing across Faculties or indeed the ability to combine any data.

There is still a large amount of work that needs to be undertaken before anything predictive – or even a report of what is happening at present - can be undertaken. It is possible to undertake these investigations but access to check has not been given.
**Attachment 3 – Academic Dishonesty Types and External Providers**

A review of academic problems, external providers, and what our students take from them. This review does not cover general misconduct issues or professional misconduct issues.

**Overview: Major conduct and countermeasure**
There are a number of behaviours that the university currently considers as academic dishonesty and plagiarism.

**Academic dishonesty types and possible countermeasures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic dishonesty instance</th>
<th>Countermeasure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghost writing – submitting work written by someone else as your own work</td>
<td>Compulsory invigilated test or exam. Student must pass the invigilated assessment in order to pass the unit. All assessments submitted into text matching software. If the ghost writer is not producing completely original work, the assessment may have been provided to more than one person or made available online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghost writing websites, forums, Facebook etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auction websites</td>
<td>To locate a ghost writer there are auction sites where someone needing an essay places their request and they then receive bids for how much it will cost to write. These auction sites can be audited and are already automatically trawled. Different assignments for each student will allow identification of who is seeking to have their essay ghost written. Except for the foolish who use their real email, trawling the auction sites allows identification of which questions and which unit of study the student comes from. Which particular student within the unit is impossible to detect. A different assignment for each student allows the trawling to identify the exact student seeking to find a ghost writer. Automated programs can watermark and create different assignments for each student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonators – someone other than the student attends and completes an in person assessment e.g. exam</td>
<td>Enhanced exam invigilation techniques. If all that is being used is comparing photo card with student, then invigilators must be trained and actually check. Better technology exists such that fingerprint scanners can be used to check identity for each student faster than checking photo cards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A form of in person ghost writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swap site – submitting work written by someone else as your own work</td>
<td>Do not reuse questions, ever. Swap sites are only effective if questions are reused across semesters. All assessments must be submitted into text matching software. This will catch the reuse. Use text matching software that access the swap sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reused work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student to student copying (within the unit)</td>
<td>All assessments submitted into text matching software. Use text matching software that checks the pool of submitted assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student to student copying (across semesters)</td>
<td>All assessments submitted into text matching software. Use text matching software that checks both the pool of submitted assignments and externally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling – student submitting own work a</td>
<td>All assessments submitted into text matching software. Use text matching software that checks the pool of submitted assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second time software. Use text matching software that checks both the pool of submitted assignments and externally.</td>
<td>Using text matching software that checks both the pool of submitted assignments and externally is effective in detecting plagiarism. This method is particularly useful as it can identify materials that are not plagiaryd but are similar or identical to those reported in other works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism – taking someone else’s work and pretending work undertaken by self.</td>
<td>Plagiarism involves copying words or ideas without attribution and work typically taken from the internet or books. Use text matching software that picks up materials from internet and books if reported in other works. Very effective in detection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable collaboration – More than one person working on an individual piece of work</td>
<td>Unacceptable collaboration involves working together on an individual piece of work. Education on the bounds of legitimate cooperation is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable editing – a person other than the student significantly modifying or adding to the content or meaning</td>
<td>Unacceptable editing involves significant modifications or additions to the content or meaning. Improved guidelines on acceptable assistance are needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabrication of attendance, achievement of required skills, observation of procedures</td>
<td>Fabrication of attendance involves creating fictitious attendance records. Better monitoring of attendance at the time of participation etc. is necessary. Audits of log books after the event can be helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabrication of reflections / experiences</td>
<td>All assessments submitted into text matching software. Use text matching software that checks both the pool of submitted assignments and externally. (When students make up reflections or experiences, they need to base what they make up on something – typically previously submitted work).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabrication of data – intentionally falsifying results which are reported in, or relied on for the purposes of, a piece of assessable work</td>
<td>Fabrication of data involves intentionally falsifying results that are reported in or relied on for the purposes of a piece of assessable work. Perceptive marking and or perceptive supervision. The only way this is detected is either repeating the experiment or task and finding it cannot be replicated or having perceptive and constant supervision so that jumps in data are noticed. Replicating the experiment is a costly measure within the marking sphere but is possible. Detailed supervision is more possible but difficult in large labs or across large numbers of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraudulent documents – submitting a fraudulent doctors certificate in an application for special consideration or a fraudulent transcript or certificate for admission</td>
<td>Fraudulent documents involve submitting fraudulent documents. Access to the original document is needed to see alterations. Receipt of scanned documents reduces ability to check. Centralisation and auditing of authenticity of certificates. Centralisation allows a central pool and greater knowledge of what an authentic certificate looks like. Resources to audit and check authenticity on an appropriate scale will detect this activity easily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited materials brought into an exam room</td>
<td>Prohibited materials involve bringing unauthorized materials into exam rooms. Careful and perceptive invigilation will detect anyone with not permitted materials in exams rooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmable or internet enabled devices</td>
<td>Programmable or internet enabled devices remain a problem. Exams Office should have a store and only Exams Office issued calculators can be used. The current practice of leaving it to UOS Coordinators is not working and students are bringing in programmable and indeed internet enabled devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing confidential exams Prior to first use of the exam</td>
<td>Stealing confidential exams involves stealing exams before they are first used. Clearly misconduct. Requires catching the student with the confidential materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying and distribution of confidential exams</td>
<td>Copying and distribution of confidential exams involves copying and distributing exams. Anecdotal evidence reports that students use these methods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and tests
After first use of the exam

miniature cameras to copy confidential exams and then distribute them. Other form syndicates and each remember a section for later transcription. Students undertake this activity on the assumption that exam and test questions will be reused. Where academics reuse exam questions, students within the grapevine have an advantage since they know the content of the exam before the exam.

New exams and tests should be written for each assessment instance. Confidential exams need to be treated as non-confidential after first use.

Assisting dishonesty – providing material or information to another person with knowledge that these materials or information may be used improperly. This includes both deliberate and inadvertent actions.

Grey area. Is giving another student the answers assisting dishonesty? Improved guidelines and institution wide debate on acceptable assistance.

External providers
Many external providers exist to help students with their coursework. Websites range from those providing legitimate study help to share sites and writing services.

Sharing previous assessments or engaging someone to complete an assessment can be a breach of the current Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy however not all the services available from external providers are necessarily problematic e.g. sharing notes, offering tutoring services or posting on forums.

The sites can be open access, free with sign up, free once you donate a paper, or require payment. Many writing services allow free previews of some papers and require payment to access the full database with higher quality papers. Most share sites and writing services do have a small disclaimer which states that the material is for research purposes only. The table below outlines the types of services available to students.

External providers, the services provided, and examples of websites where these services are available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Service provided</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study help</td>
<td>Study aids or tutoring services</td>
<td>• Spoonfeedme.com.au provides video tutorials for specific units of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• StudentVIP.com.au provides a textbook exchange and tutoring from current and past students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• OneClass.com allows students to share lecture, tutorial and revision notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forums and social media</td>
<td>Current and former students can post and answer questions</td>
<td>• Bored of Studies.org provides forums by university and faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Whirlpool.net.au has a number of forum threads on misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Gumtree Australia allows members to post ads offering or requesting services, including ghost writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Facebook has been highlighted in recent media coverage for profiles advertising ghost writing services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share sites</td>
<td>Notes or completed assessments from</td>
<td>• Scribd.com provides online access to books and documents including student notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
previous students

- Slideshare.net allows sharing of PowerPoint presentation slides
- Brainia.com provides access to free papers after sharing one of your own
- s2scmmunity.com.au online resources include exam study notes and assignments
- Thinkswap.com provides access to free notes and papers after sharing one of your own for credit
- Studymode.com browse notes and assignments

Writing services

- Custom papers, essay mills, ghost writing
- Bestessays.com.au advertises essay-writing services from professional writers
- Delegateyourassignment.com advertises assignment writing services

An additional category which is potentially a problem but has not been looked at in detail is proofreading and editing services. The University’s Learning Centre offers some brief guidance for students looking for someone to proof-read or edit their assessment including that “there is no objection to a friend helping you with editing and proofreading, but this kind of assistance should not break the rules on academic honesty… by significantly modifying or adding to the content or meaning of your work” (Learning Centre website, accessed 24/6/2015, [http://sydney.edu.au/stuserv/learning_centre/help/grammar/gr_editUni.shtml](http://sydney.edu.au/stuserv/learning_centre/help/grammar/gr_editUni.shtml)).

The screenshots below highlight external websites that provide academically problematic services. Where possible screenshots were taken to highlight material relevant to University of Sydney courses.

**Study help sites**

- Spoonfeedme.com.au
- StudentVIP.com.au
- OneClass.com
STUDENTVIP AT UNIV. OF SYDNEY

StudentVIP members only.
You're invited!

JOIN BY FACEBOOK
We never auto-post
JOIN BY EMAIL
Good ol' fashioned

Main campus Change campus
56,106 members at Univ. of Sydney

StudentVIP at Univ. of Sydney

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>56,106 StudentVIP members</th>
<th>6,979 subjects, 1479 subject ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10,544 international students</td>
<td>23,825 cheap textbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,969 first year students</td>
<td>322 textbooks in the last 30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,428 females</td>
<td>53,445 tutor requests, 306 tutors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,678 males</td>
<td>1 great campus map app</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


OneClass

Search by school, course, professor or keywords
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Documents

Forums

- BoredofStudies.org
- Whirlpool.net.au
- Gumtree.com.au


Share sites

- Scribd.com
- Slideshare.net
- Brainia.com

Writing services/essay mills

- Bestessays.com.au
- Delegateyourassignment.com

Why Choose Bestessays.com.au?

1. Courteous Australian students are satisfied with our professional writing services
2. Custom written essays, original term papers, and professional research help
3. Educated, professional writers with proven experience writing academic papers
4. Valuable savings - our discount savings program saves you time and money
5. Our customer service is available 24/7 - when you need help, we are here for you
6. 100% privacy guaranteed - your private information is strictly confidential
7. Free revisions on any academic paper until you are fully satisfied with your order
8. Free title page, contents page, reference page, and proper formatting


Information relevant to assessment in University of Sydney courses

These sites were found by searching for material relevant to University of Sydney or specific units of study. Teaching staff with specific knowledge of the course content and assessments would be able to do a much more thorough search of material that may be problematic for their unit of study.

A search of study help and paper swap sites shows that information relevant to courses in all faculties is available online. Some sites allow you to browse the material by university, so you can easily access material relevant to a specific unit of study. Material available includes course notes, completed assessments and past exam papers which are outside the University’s official past paper repositories.

In the case of written assignments, if the original assessment is from a unit which uses Turnitin, it may be possible to detect students who use this material in their own assessments. However, if the original assessment was not run through Turnitin, it will be very difficult to detect students who submit this as their own work.

For every website found in English, there are even more in languages other than English that could not be accessed.

Websites with assessments available online

Examples of University of Sydney assessments available online

The two tables below highlight a range of University of Sydney assessment material which was available online as at 15th June 2015. This includes various assessment types across all faculties, including the text of an oral presentation given in French.

Examples of University of Sydney assessments (excluding exams) available online.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Assessment type (notes, assignment, exam)</th>
<th>Assessment name</th>
<th>Date of assessment/date uploaded</th>
<th>Can identify student?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>AGEC2103</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Assignment 1</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>ECOP2001</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Major essay</td>
<td>Sem 1, 2005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>FRNC1631</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Oral presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>GCST1601</td>
<td>Exam</td>
<td>Take home exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>GCST1602</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Final essay</td>
<td>Sem 2, 2012</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>GOVT1105</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Major essay</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>GOVT1105</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>HSTY2628</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Proposal &amp; annotated bibliography</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>PHIL1010</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Critical Essay</td>
<td>Sem 2, 2012</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>SCLG2604</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Authoethnography</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>WRIT1000</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Sentence task</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>ACCT3011</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Group assignment</td>
<td>Sem 1, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>BUSS1001</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>ABC2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>BUSS1020</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Major assignment</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>FINC3017</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>CAPM essay</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>INFS1000</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Article annotations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>MKTG3120</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Blog 1</td>
<td>Sem 1, 2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>EDUF1018</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Essay 1</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>CIVL3205</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>All assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>ELEC2104</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Lab report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>ENGG1061</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Group EWB challenge report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>BACH1145</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Module 1 assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>HSBH1006</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Power point presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>LAWS1015</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer School 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>LAWS2011</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Group assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>IMMU3102</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>PCOL3021</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Beta Blockers Report</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>PHAR1812</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Group assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>MBLG1001</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>DNA electrophoresis report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sem 2, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinkswap.com</td>
<td>PSYC3011</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Blocking experiment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studymode.com</td>
<td>FINC5001</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sep 18, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studymode.com</td>
<td>CLAW1001</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 2, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of University of Sydney exams available online

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Assessment type (notes, assignment, exam)</th>
<th>Assessment name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Attachment 4 – Academic Board Data

The following figures draw on the data reported annually to the Academic Board by faculties, via the Academic Standards and Policy Committee. Faculties are asked to report on: the numbers of cases, the penalties applied, how the notifications were handled, the steps taken by the faculty to promote compliance with the education strategies, which units mandate Turnitin use, and how data on these cases is collected and stored.

![Reports to Academic Board, All Faculties](image1)

**Figure 1.** Number of cases reported to the Academic Board, from 2010 – 2014.

![Findings/student enrolments (%)](image2)

**Figure 2.** Number of findings as a percentage of student enrolments, by faculty.
Figures 1 and 2 include data from the Business School on findings, and those notifications that were dealt with educationally.

Figures 3 and 4 only include data from the Business School on findings. It does not include notifications dealt with educationally.
Attachment 5 – Business School Incidence

The Business School has been recording data notifications relating to academic dishonesty and plagiarism since 2004. The Business School started a systematic program of education and detection of plagiarism in 2007. This report will report only 2007 – 2014 data.

A separate spreadsheet records all data and shows the breakdown of these cases by various categories, including the number of cases for domestic students compared to international students, the number of cases for undergraduate and postgraduate students, home Discipline and other divisions.

The data set is based on the number of notifications made against Business School students, or the instances of reported plagiarism and has been compared to total student instances. Student instances refers to the instances where students are able to engage in academic dishonesty. For example, if a student undertook 8 units of study in a year, they are counted 8 times. Please note: As the data below is based on the number of notifications made against Business School students it therefore includes cases where the matter was dealt with educationally, an informal warning was given, or after investigation no academic issues were found and so no action was taken.

Incidence of notifications of academic dishonesty and plagiarism

![Graph 1: Number of notifications made for students enrolled in Business School units from 2006-2014](image)

The Business School has been recording the number of notifications of academic dishonesty and plagiarism against students enrolled in a Business School unit since 2004. The University only holds data for student enrolment numbers from 2006 so incidence rates can only be calculated from 2006 onwards.

In 2007, the Business School commenced a formal program of embedded education teaching students about academic honesty and how not to engage in plagiarism or academic dishonesty. Teaching occurred in first year units with an entire tutorial in all core/compulsory first year units on academic honesty and referencing and writing. This teaching was then scaffolded through all assignments in every first year unit with specific further training and feedback on the basis of
submitted work. Significant resources are made available to students within each unit of study as well as on external facing sites. Additional teaching occurs in orientation and transition settings, twice weekly remedial workshops available on a drop in basis and a compulsory online module on academic honesty and good writing. A diagnostic assessment identifies students with very poor writing or referencing abilities and these students are offered an additional unit of study. This unit is a zero credit point free unit of study dedicated to writing support. It mirrors the core first year unit of study and allows in depth extended teaching of the core writing and analytic skills taught in the first year unit.

At the same time, the Business School commenced a project such that all assignments were submitted electronically into a text matching software – Turnitin. The project started as a trial in 2007 and was in use in all units of study across the Business School by 2010.

Graph 1 records both the number of notifications and also the incidence of notifications detected between 2006 and 2014. The raw number of notifications appears high (over 1000 in 2012 for instance) but these numbers must be taken in context with the very high number of students within the Business School. Across 2007 – 2014, the Business School recorded a total of 1.7% of total student instances or 3.7% of students having had notifications of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made against them in Business School units.

There is a steady increase in notifications detected between 2006 until 2012 but after that there is a significant decrease in the incidence of notifications of academic dishonesty. A combination of intense embedded education combined with visible and active detection of incidences of academic dishonesty has reduced the incidence of detected notifications from 2.93% of student instances to 1.65% of student instances.

**Comparison of notifications of academic dishonesty and plagiarism against Business School students across different categories of student**

The Business School recorded both the notification but also additional details allowing a comparison of incidence rates across different categories of students.

A comparison of incidence rates between admission status – that is local student or international student – shows that the difference in the incidence rate of notifications of academic dishonesty and plagiarism between local and international students, though small, is statistically significant, although this is still under review. This has been consistent across all years in which the Business School has recorded data.

The notifications represent 0.92% of total domestic student instances from 2006-2014 and 1.5% of total international student instances from 2006-2014 having had notifications of plagiarism or academic dishonesty in Business School units. This compares with a rate of 1.7% of total student instances.
A comparison of incidence rates between degree status – that is undergraduate student or postgraduate student – shows that there is no discernible difference in the incidence rate of notifications of academic dishonesty and plagiarism between local and international students. There is no consistent trend in the comparison between undergraduate and postgraduate students.

The notifications represent 1.15% of total undergraduate student instances from 2006-2014 and 1.39% of total postgraduate student instances from 2006-2014 having had notifications of plagiarism or academic dishonesty in Business School units. This compares with a rate of 1.7% of total student instances.

Incidence rates tracked back to major studied showed no discernible trends. Differences in assessment regimes and training levels in detection mean that the data does not disclose any meaningful information.
Attachment 6 – Business School Recidivism

The Business School has been recording data on students who have notifications of academic dishonesty and plagiarism made against them since 2004. The Business School started a systematic program of education and detection of plagiarism in 2007. This report will report only 2007 – 2014 data.

The Business School data on students who have notifications of academic dishonesty and plagiarism made against them has been used to check for recidivism rates, specifically the number of times each individual student who has a notifiable case has had a previous or concurrent cases within the Business School. Students who have previously received a written warning or had an notification made that was dealt with educationally have been individually informed of what is expected of them, undergone specific remedial education that was tested and warned about the consequences of any further breaches of the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy & Procedures. Students who have a second or subsequent notification may therefore receive a more serious penalty or may be referred to the Registrar if the nominated academic considers the conduct is sufficiently serious to potentially constitute student misconduct.

The data below is based on the number of notifications for students in Business School units, or the instances of plagiarism. Student instances refers to the instances where students are able to engage in academic dishonesty. For example, if a student undertook 8 units of study in a year, they are counted 8 times. A student refers to a unique SID. If a student undertook 8 units in a year, they are counted as one student.

Please note: As the data below is based on the number of notifications it therefore includes cases where the matter was dealt with educationally, an informal warning was given, or after investigation no academic issues were found and so no action was taken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of notifications for the same student</th>
<th>Number of Business School notifications</th>
<th>% of Business School cases</th>
<th>% student instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only 1 notification</td>
<td>3995</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple notifications for the same student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 notifications</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 notifications</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 notifications</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 notifications</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 notifications</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total notifications 2007-2014</td>
<td>5778</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recidivism rates by student instances – The number of times multiple notifications were made for an individual student in the Business School 2007 - 2014.

The Business School recorded 5778 total notifications between 2007 and 2014. This represents 1.7% of total student instances or 3.7% of students from 2007-2014 having had notifications of plagiarism or academic dishonesty made for Business School units.

Multiple notifications against an individual student account for 0.5% of student instances between 2007 and 2014. This percentage includes those students who had two notifications but both were in fact first times through the system (see following paragraph). Multiple notifications for students who
had undergone remedial education and received formal warning accounts for 0.12% of student instances.

The high number of cases where two notifications were made for one student is likely to be caused by concurrent notifications. Concurrent notifications occur where a student has more than one notification at the same time, often in different units of study with assessments due around the same time. The Business School deals with these cases as being separate notifications at the same level e.g. a second first notification, because the student will not have had the opportunity to change their behaviour. Both assessments will have been submitted before the student underwent any remedial education or received any counselling or warnings.

Repeat notifications, in the sense of repeated behaviour by a student who has been fully educated and warned about the consequences of repeated behaviour is therefore best counted from those instances where there are three or more notifications.

An analysis of the types of academic honesty that occurred within the repeated notifications was carried out. Instances of three notifications and four notifications tend to include an instance of a concurrent notification and a different form of academic honesty. There may have been concurrent plagiarisms, and an instance of recycling an assignment from a previous semester. Or, concurrent plagiarisms, an instance of recycling a previously submitted assignment and an instance of collusion in an individual assignment. Instances of three notifications and most of the four notifications tended to be different breaches within the academic dishonesty sphere.

Instances of five or six notifications being made against an individual student involved repeated behaviour by the student in respect of previously warned behaviour and breach of academic honesty. (There was 1 student with 6 notifications and 7 students with 5 notifications.) Any high repeat rate is noted and tracked by the Business School. In the large majority of cases, the student was facing medical or personal crises and was wrongly trying to handle the issue through less than desirable methods. All students were given the assistance required. Around a quarter of the very high repeat rates, however, had no explaining factor other than the student chose to consciously repeat the behaviour.
Attachment 7 – OGC/Student Affairs Centre Data

Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Academic Misconduct</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Dishonesty**</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This does not include students whose candidature was terminated due to ‘disqualifying circumstances’, defined in clause 101 of the University of Sydney Coursework Policy 2014 as:

(a) the student, or someone acting on the student’s behalf, made a material misrepresentation in applying for admission to an award course;
(b) the student failed to disclose to the University a fact or circumstance material to its decision to admit the person to an award course; or
(c) the student was admitted to an award course on the basis of a degree, diploma or certificate obtained wholly or partly by fraud, academic misconduct or other dishonesty.

** This includes all forms of academic dishonesty other than plagiarism and fraud.
Attachment 8 - Turnitin Metrics and Faculty Use

Turnitin Use by Unit of Study in the University LMS

The table below shows the number of Blackboard assignments versus Turnitin assignments that have been made available in each unit of study, referred to as “courses” in the software. Note that the Business School uses a different server on which most of its Blackboard sites are housed, thus is not available for analysis by these metrics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distinct Courses</th>
<th>% of Courses Using Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Total All Course Item Types *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Sub-Total Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinct Courses</td>
<td>Sub-Total Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Design and Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Business School)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Information Technologies</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law (Sydney Law School)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (Sydney Medical School)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No SIS College Mapped</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (Sydney Nursing School)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney College of the Arts</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-wide</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Semester 1 2015 - Percentage and number of units of study using the Turnitin.
Interpreting Table 1.

1. The first column (Turnitin) shows the number of unit of study websites that have used the Turnitin tool.
2. The second column (Assignment) shows the number of unit of study websites that have used the Blackboard assignment tool.
   Note that some UoS websites appear to have used both Turnitin and the Blackboard assignment tool.
   Each Blackboard website may be used by one or more UoS, this is especially the case in Dentistry.
3. The third column (Content) shows the total number of websites per faculty that have content, usually 100%.
4. The fourth column (Sub-Total Assessment) shows the distinct number of websites that use either Blackboard assignments or Turnitin, e.g. Dentistry has 2 websites using Turnitin, and 1 using assignment, the sub-total assessment figure is 2 meaning that one of the websites is using both Turnitin and the assignment tool.
5. The fifth column (Sub-Total All Course Item Types) shows the distinct total number of active Blackboard sites per faculty.
   Note this figure is about 110 websites lower than what we know to be in Blackboard, this may be because the websites level of activity falls below a threshold (there are a number of websites with 5 or less students). We are working with Blackboard to explain this discrepancy as well as eliminating the “No SIS College Mapped figure”.
6. The sixth column (Turnitin) shows the percentage of websites using Turnitin.
7. The seventh column (Assignment) shows the percentage of websites using the Blackboard Assignment tool.
8. The eight column (Content) shows the percentage of websites using content.
9. The ninth column (Sub-Total Assessment) shows the percentage of websites using either Turnitin or Assignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distinct Courses or Item</th>
<th>% courses using item out of total courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT BlackBoard</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School BlackBoard</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Semester 1 2015 Percentage and number of units of study using TII
ICT figures are for rest of university. Business School figures are units of study within Business School Blackboard
Attachment 9 – Business School Lessons Learned on Turnitin Introduction

Mandating compulsory use of text matching software for all assignments across the University will be a multistep process and will involve significant cultural change. The Business School has undertaken this change and so experiences from within the Business School could assist a university wide process. Information from the 2014 ASPC reports provides a snapshot of current Turnitin use across all faculties.

Every unit of study must have a functional teaching web site

Before any opportunity to submit electronically, there must be somewhere to submit to. Every unit of study must have a functional teaching web site. The Business School requires every unit of study to have a functioning teaching web site. A roughly two year process from around 2004 to 2006 saw every unit of study operating a functional teaching web site.

Teaching staff underwent training in opening and creating a Blackboard (BB) web site. Training was in house and provided by Business School eLearning staff. Every staff member underwent local training. Further at desk support is offered.

While all academic staff are trained in building teaching web sites, a large amount of the set up and common loading of information into teaching websites is undertaken at a Faculty level through the use of templates and automatic loading of information. This significantly reduces the amount of work any individual academic must undertake. [Templates etc. are in use in Business BB. The situation may not be the same in ICT BB.]

Students were trained in navigating through the BB teaching sites when teaching websites were first used. This training is no longer being carried out beyond familiarity with where the websites are located and where key features will be found. Students are now fully familiar with websites and teaching websites.

Electronic submission of assignments

The Business School moved from every assignment being submitted in paper format to every assignment being electronically submitted within two years 2007 - 2009 – specifically at the end of 4 semesters all assignments were being submitted electronically.

Academic staff underwent training in how to build the link such that students can submit their assessment.

Students needed to undergo training in the electronic submission process. There was a training implemented for all current students. Ongoing training to each new first year cohort is provided. Students have not had any difficulty in receiving this training. They often express there is no need for training since they already know how to attach a file. Students were surveyed through the change process as to their perceptions of paper and electronic submission. Students were overwhelmingly in favour of electronic submission. There has been no student who wanted to continue needing to be on campus to submit work when there is an alternative.

Electronic submission of assignments into a text matching software

The Business School mandated that every assignment that could be checked by Turnitin (TII) had to be submitted into TII. At first this was only word based assignments. As TII increased its capabilities, assignments with characters and mathematics were able to be submitted. TII can now accept all file formats and content so every assignment, no matter content, is able to be submitted into TII. Very little additional training was needed. The process to create a link for an electronic submission is the same as the process for creating a link to submit electronically through a text matching software TII. Creating a submission link for an electronic assignment requires clicking on a drop down list of assessment types. That same link contains the creation of the link through text matching. [Note – this has been set up within Business BB. ICT BB may be more complex.]
Collection / printing of electronically submitted assignments
Within the Business School administrative staff print electronically submitted assignments. The Business School has developed spooling tools that ensure that every assignment is counted and printed and nothing is accidentally lost. Fixed file naming protocols taught to students means that assignments can be alphabetised or otherwise ordered before printing so that assignments are printed in fixed order to allow for later data entry of marks. Training is also given in bulk collection and download of electronically submitted assignments if an academic chooses to print themselves.

Checking of text matching reports
Checking reports, even for a large unit does not take more than an hour. It is an academic decision as to whether there is a problem. This is undertaken by each marker or unit coordinator. In some units every marker will check the report for the assignments they are marking. In other units, one marker is assigned to check all reports and then marking load is taken on by the other markers. Where casual markers are employed, additional time and pay is allocated to cover checking the reports.

Online marking
There is no requirement to mark online within the Business School. If an academic wishes to mark the paper assignment, administrative staff print the assignment and the academic marks it in the normal course.

Online marking is close to 40% usage across the Business School. This has been a word of mouth viral spread. The online marking tools are so sophisticated and easy to use that staff do not go back to inefficient paper marking once they have test online marking. (Students seems to prefer online marking since feedback is more detailed and timely).

Processes followed if a potential problem is found within an assignment
Where a potential problem is found in an assignment, all the marker or unit of study coordinator needs to do is send an email with the SID, unit code and assignment name to the Academic Honesty Office within the Business School. All subsequent work to collect the assignment, mark up a sample assignment showing problems, preliminary decisions, letters to students onwards are undertaken by the Academic Honesty Office.

The Business School centralised all functions following the markers detection of a potential problem in an assignment. The Academic Honesty Office is fully trained in all matters. They are quicker and far more efficient than the typical academic – certainly in collecting the evidence needed before any
preliminary decisions can be made. They also know exactly what to do regarding notifications, timelines etc. far better than the typical academic who might only deal with this task once a semester.

The Business School centralised all functions subsequent to the markers detection of a potential problem since academic staff reported it was too much work for them to undertake. They were willing and understood the need to check each assignment but the follow through work was too much for them and better undertaken by a trained specialist.

Voluntary compliance within the Business School towards checking plagiarism and using Turnitin. While the Business School has mandated the use of text matching software for all assignments, that does not mean that it is fully used. The Business school checks for usage rates and the follows through with additional training for staff. The process is a constant and ongoing one.

### Overall Business School - by UOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TII Checked - All units</th>
<th>TII Checked - exclude developing units</th>
<th>TII not checked - All units</th>
<th>TII not Checked - exclude specials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 sem 2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 sem 1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 sem 2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 sem 1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 sem 2</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 sem 1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 sem 2</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Business School units where there was correct and incorrect use of text matching software.*

Table 1 records the number of units that fully used text matching software and the number of units that did not use text matching software. Units and programs that are under development educationally have a longer timeframe to be fully compliant with text matching software use. Excluding this developmental areas, the Business School has achieved up to 85% full compliance in all units. 15% of units, however, still did not comply.
Of those assignments not checked, what occurred (by UOS)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No assignments</th>
<th>Link to TII not set up</th>
<th>TII set up but did not check report</th>
<th>Wrongly setting up TII report</th>
<th>Not handling drafts correctly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 sem 2 &amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 sem 1 &amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 sem 2 &amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 sem 1 &amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 sem 2 &amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 sem 1 &amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 sem 2 &amp; intensives etc.</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Business School units that did not fully comply with the requirement to use text matching software.

Graph 1: Business School units that did not fully comply with the requirement to use text matching software.

Non-compliance and other issues
The Business School has tracked which units have not complied with the requirement that all assignments are checked using TII. Possible reasons for this are outlined in Table 3.
Table 3: Situations where there would be no referrals for plagiarism or academic dishonesty in units where use of Turnitin is mandated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TII set up for assessment submission, uses correct settings and originality reports are checked correctly but there are no issues. That is, no students engaged in plagiarism or other academically dishonest behaviour.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Students not engaging in problem behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments NOT capable of being checked by text-matching software e.g. excel spreadsheet assignments from accounting</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Other checking methods should be used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments ARE capable of being checked by text-matching software but were not due to format of assignment e.g. telling students to present orally without handing in written report. This section also include first year maths and statistics where handwritten non digital assignments are used since students do not yet know how to use math notation to hand in electronically.</td>
<td>Non-compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TII not set up for assessment submission</td>
<td>Non-compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TII set up for assessment submission but uses optional settings incorrectly e.g. not set to produce originality report, or originality report excludes matches over 5%, excludes quotes, etc.</td>
<td>Non-compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TII set up for assessment submission and uses correct settings, but TII reports are not checked</td>
<td>Non-compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TII set up for assessment submission and uses correct settings, TII reports are checked but the examiner does not understand the originality report</td>
<td>Education of examiner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TII set up for assessment submission and uses correct settings, TII reports are checked but the examiner does not refer an assessment with issues</td>
<td>Non-compliance; Education of examiner</td>
<td>Non-compliance: if deliberate OR if resource issue; Education of examiner: if examiner does not understand the criteria for referral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate hard copy and TII submission</td>
<td>Non-compliance</td>
<td>Non-compliance where paper copy is marked as it is possible for students to submit different electronic version to avoid TII detection (can be avoided by use of tools to bulk download and print)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical or TII failure</td>
<td>Technical issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Situations where there would be no referrals for plagiarism or academic dishonesty in units where use of Turnitin is mandated

Common non-compliance issues in the Business School

- **No assignment:** There has been a slight but steady increase in units that do not have an assignment and instead have another test or exam. This may have been for educational reasons but the change was quite sudden following the requirement that all assignments undergo text matching software.

- **No link is created for the student to submit the assignment into.** If the link is not created there will never be text matching and so no report generated. In these units, paper based assignments are collected. This is a very small number of units and is getting smaller each semester. This decrease is being driven by students. They do not want to be submitting paper based assignments and so tend to report and protest against any unit that suggests the practice.

- **The assignment is submitted electronically and undergoes text matching but the text matching report is not looked at and so no detections are made.** Within the Business School this had been stable for a while at around 15% of units. Not reading or acting on reports has recently increased within the Business School. Active measures to ensure staff have the capacity and training to read the reports are underway.

- **Miss-setting the TII report settings such that no detections are shown.** The text matching software allow tweaking of settings in an attempt to reduce false positives. There is some intentional misuse of these settings such that every assignment shows 0% matches and so the academic need not check the reports. For instance, setting the match parameter to exclude matches under 20% means that the academic has directed the text matching software to only report on matches that are larger than 20% of the entire document in a continuous unbroken string. Except for the most gross plagiarism this does not occur and so every assignment is shown with absolutely no text matches when, if set correctly, it would have shown actionable matches. Active measures to ensure staff have the capacity and training to set up reports are underway.
Current use of Turnitin across all faculties

The annual reports to ASPC require faculties to list the units of study in which TII use has been mandated. Table 4 below collates the data from the 2014 ASPC reports, providing a comparison of TII use across all faculties. Data has also been obtained from the Business School and the faculty of Science on the breakdown of notifications by unit of study for 2014.

Only three faculties currently mandate TII use across all units of study. In Business and Science notifications were made in approximately 25% of units using TII in 2014 (23% in Science and 25% in Business). This suggests that mandating use of TII does not always result in notifications of plagiarism or academic dishonesty. Most students do not engage in plagiarism or academic dishonesty, therefore there will be no notifications made in those units. Other reasons for no notifications were outlined in Table 3. Please note that information is not available on the compliance levels for each faculty and it is not currently known if each faculty uses the same criteria for referral. Without this information it is difficult to compare across faculties.

Table 4: Number of units using Turnitin in 2014, and the number of those units where notifications of plagiarism or academic dishonesty were made, where known. The number of units in faculty is based on Sydney Student data and in the Business School the actual number of units run is less than indicated. Therefore the number of units in other faculties may also be incorrect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th># units in faculty</th>
<th># units mandated TII from ASPC report</th>
<th># of those units where allegations made</th>
<th># units not using TII where allegations made</th>
<th># allegations</th>
<th>Units mandated TII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AGEN1001 compulsory unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FASS</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>Not disclosed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Not disclosed, 23 units mandated in 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>TII mandated in all units - see list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TII mandated in all units in Faculty of Dentistry programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and IT</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TII mandated in all units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>Not disclosed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not disclosed, no units mandated in 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and midwifery</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>See list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All undergraduate Critical Studies units of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCM</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MCGYxxxx and MUSCxxxx - see list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Science</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>See list</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Number of units using Turnitin in 2014, and the number of those units where notifications of plagiarism or academic dishonesty were made, where known. The number of units in faculty is based on Sydney Student data and in the Business School the actual number of units run is less than indicated. Therefore the number of units in other faculties may also be incorrect.

Tables 5 and 6 below provide the full list of units known to be using TII in 2014 and the number of notifications per unit where known.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th># of units using TII</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th># of units using TII</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th># of units using TII</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th># of units using TII</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th># of units using TII</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th># of units using TII</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th># of units using TII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3 CEMS6003</td>
<td>FINC2011</td>
<td>5 INFS3004</td>
<td>FINC2012</td>
<td>4 INFS2004</td>
<td>FINC2013</td>
<td>1 MIBS6004</td>
<td>FINC2014</td>
<td>1 MIBS6006</td>
<td>FINC2015</td>
<td>8 MIBS6006</td>
<td>FINC2016</td>
<td>1 MIBS6006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>8 CEMS6005</td>
<td>FINC3001</td>
<td>3 INFS3020</td>
<td>FINC3011</td>
<td>2 MIBS6003</td>
<td>FINC3012</td>
<td>1 MIBS6004</td>
<td>FINC3013</td>
<td>9 MIBS6004</td>
<td>FINC3014</td>
<td>4 MIBS6004</td>
<td>FINC3015</td>
<td>1 MIBS6004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td>FINC3001</td>
<td></td>
<td>FINC3011</td>
<td></td>
<td>FINC3012</td>
<td></td>
<td>FINC3013</td>
<td></td>
<td>FINC3014</td>
<td></td>
<td>FINC3015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>(357 units using TII)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(74 units using TII)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(383 units using TII)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(53 units using TII)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(56 units using TII)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5:** List of units in Business and Science using Turnitin in 2014, including the number of notifications per unit
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AERO4260</td>
<td>Tii BACH1165</td>
<td>NURS1002</td>
<td>PHAR1811</td>
<td>VETS4233</td>
<td>MCGY1000 HRTD6908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AERO3260</td>
<td>Tii BACH1424</td>
<td>NURS3012</td>
<td>PHAR1821</td>
<td>ANSC1301</td>
<td>MCGY1001 ANTH6265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AERO3560</td>
<td>Tii BACH3941</td>
<td>NURS5008</td>
<td>PHAR2821</td>
<td>AVBS4016</td>
<td>MCGY1002 ECOPI101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AERO4660</td>
<td>Tii CSCOS5026</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHAR4814</td>
<td>AVBS4017</td>
<td>MCGY1003 ECOPI602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARES5210</td>
<td>Tii CSCOS5032</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHAR4815</td>
<td></td>
<td>MCGY1008 GOVT1101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMMIE5100</td>
<td>Tii EXSS2024</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHAR4824</td>
<td></td>
<td>MCGY1009 GOVT2225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP2007</td>
<td>Tii EXSS3051</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHAR4826</td>
<td></td>
<td>MCGY1020 GOVT244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP2026</td>
<td>Tii HSBI0005</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHAR4830</td>
<td></td>
<td>MCGY1601 GOVT2603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG5103</td>
<td>Tii HSBI0009</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHAR4831</td>
<td></td>
<td>MCGY1602 GOVT2617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEC1601</td>
<td>Tii HSBI0003</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHAR5005</td>
<td></td>
<td>MCGY2004 GOVT611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFO2140</td>
<td>Tii HSBI0004</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHAR5512</td>
<td></td>
<td>MCGY2005 GOVT614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFO2315</td>
<td>Tii HSBI0005</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHAR5513</td>
<td></td>
<td>MCGY2011 SGLG2606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFO1105</td>
<td>Tii HSBI0016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MCGY2018 SGLG2608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFO1905</td>
<td>Tii HSBI0019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MCGY2019 SGLG2624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFO4992</td>
<td>Tii MHTYS201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MCGY2603 SGLG2629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS2140</td>
<td>Tii MRS5001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MCGY2604 SLS5001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICO5661</td>
<td>Tii MRS5010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MCGY2611 ECMT3110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRK1702</td>
<td>Tii MRS5023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MCGY2612 ECON1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFO1103</td>
<td>MOSS MRTY1037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MCGY2613 ECO5302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFO1105</td>
<td>MOSS MRTY1099</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MCGY2614 ECO5303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFO3105</td>
<td>MOSS MRTY1010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP2007</td>
<td>MOSS MRTY5024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP2007</td>
<td>MOSS MRTY5039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFO2120</td>
<td>Watermarking MRTY5040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFO2230</td>
<td>Watermarking MRTY5041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP3102</td>
<td>Watermarking MRTY5042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP3949</td>
<td>Watermarking MRTY5043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: List of units in other faculties using Turnitin in 2014
1.0 Introduction
An overview of the enormous amount of literature on the causes and prevention of academic misconduct and plagiarism reveals some disagreement on the effectiveness of individual approaches, but broad agreement that a range of approaches is needed. This is referred to as a holistic approach, as summarised by Macdonald & Carroll (2006). In this review we will include some literature on the individual approaches, but emphasise throughout the consistent call for a holistic strategy.

The review concentrates on information from recent conferences, from recent peer reviewed literature and, importantly, from an extensive study undertaken at this University over 5 years by Caleb Owens and colleagues in the School of Psychology and reported in Australian Journal of Psychology in 2013. It also includes a brief analysis of the match between current university policy and this literature.

The review is structured as requested, focusing on two questions – on prevention strategies, focusing on education of students (2.0 and 3.0) and on assessment and reporting policy (4.0) – but as noted above, responses are likely to be most effective when they are combined. An example is the use of policy on assessment design as a key pro-active measure in plagiarism prevention (section 4.0). Most Australian universities now provide information to both staff and students, based on the holistic conclusions from this literature. For example Melbourne University suggest the following four plagiarism minimisation strategies, with the first three being pro-active and the fourth reactive:

1. A collaborative effort to recognise and counter plagiarism at every level from policy, through faculty/division and school/department procedures, to individual staff practices;
2. Thoroughly educating students about the expected conventions for authorship and the appropriate use and acknowledgment of all forms of intellectual material;
3. Designing approaches to assessment that minimise the possibility for students to submit plagiarised material, while not reducing the quality and rigour of assessment requirements;
4. Installing highly visible procedures for monitoring and detecting cheating, including appropriate punishment and re-education measures. [University of Melbourne, CSHE website]

To some extent the rise of plagiarism and academic misconduct has accompanied the rise of assessment for learning, and related shift away from what was once the main purpose of assessment – the judgement of learning achievement. A considerable reduction in academic misconduct and in plagiarism (effectively to zero) could be achieved by a reversion to totally invigilated, closed-book, judgement-oriented assessments. However this is not a recommended approach in any of the current literature and Carless (2015) in his book on Excellence in University Assessment argues strongly for more assessment for learning, and the effective use of this approach to reduce plagiarism.

2.0 Effective prevention strategies

What is known about effective prevention strategies including whether different strategies are effective in different subject areas or different types of study (ie: coursework vs. research training, undergraduate vs. postgraduate, clinical vs. theoretical etc.)?

A great deal of the literature on plagiarism has been generated by Plagiarism Advice, an organisation started by the UK-based Joint Information Systems Committee in 2004. It lists TurnItIn first among its International Partners. They run a biennial conference:

http://www.plagiarismadvice.org/research-papers/category/conference-proceedings

A key statement from their website re-iterates the need for a multi-dimensional approach and sums up the dilemmas and challenge for an institution thus:

Addressing student plagiarism and implementing policies and procedures in this area is undoubtedly a challenge for any institution. Whilst providing a robust framework for dealing with potential instances of malpractice any guidance should also represent an empowering and positive journey towards academic integrity for students. The importance of transparency in developing institutional guidelines and procedures in addressing plagiarism is paramount in order to prevent any accusations of unfair treatment or bias from students.
In many ways developing this framework is a process of change management and key to success is developing policies and procedures with buy-in from stakeholders from all areas of the institution. Teaching staff should also be included in any discussions so as to ensure that they know what is expected of them as part of the wider assessment process and how their individual teaching practice aligns with the policy.

Given that learning remains one aim of assessment, there is no tool, policy or procedure that will completely eliminate plagiarism from any institution, even when assessment is redesigned to minimise the chance of copying (assessment policy will be discussed in more detail in Section 4 below). Wherever students have the ability to purchase material for submission or to copy from other texts, some will choose to do that; moral positions on plagiarism are not generally helpful in its prevention (Katins, 2013). Effort can be focused on detection, which may reduce the incidence. But the best results (i.e. the lowest detectable plagiarism in student work) come from “a multilayered, evidence-based, longitudinal strategy". (Owens & White, 2013, p. 16).

There are several different motivations for plagiarism, but the attitude of the Institution has been shown to be significant in a student’s decision to plagiarise (i.e. the fear of getting caught may deter some) (Bennett, 2005)). However, moving beyond simple detection, there seems to be general agreement that the best strategies are local ones, involving the inclusion of information management, good writing practice and development of authorial voice into all first-year subjects (Onens & Anderson, 2014; Owens & White, 2013). A comprehensive institution-wide program, focussed on local staff training and support, provision of good student resources and central supply of software, can be successful in changing institutional culture regarding plagiarism as demonstrated by Pickard (2004) in her study of University College Northampton (UCN). This is an institution with 500 academic staff and approximately 10,000 students, providing a wide range of undergraduate, postgraduate and research degrees and a policy of actively widening participation from students who had not previously considered higher education. The study is interesting because it showed that students and staff had differing understandings of plagiarism, and also that staff often avoided the University’s procedures for dealing with plagiarising students. The study led to several initiatives (online modules for students, face-to face training for staff, streamlining of policy) and these was reported in a JISC compilation in 2010 (JISC Academic Integrity Service, 2010) as having improved both student understanding and staff compliance.

Institutional-level strategies for student education and detection reported in all of the literature can be summarised as combinations of the following:

- training and support for local strategies
- provision of detection software and training in its use
- and perhaps most difficult but also most effective, support for information management teaching, especially for first-year students.

Boden and Holloway (2004) summarise the teaching implications of academic integrity polices thus: Teaching students about plagiarism is more than teaching them the difference between right and wrong, between collusion and collaboration or between cheating and good academic practice. A really effective anti-plagiarism programme needs to address the main causes of plagiarism by teaching students about information management. (p. 5)

2.1 Local-level programs

Owens and White (2013) suggest that a sophisticated approach to plagiarism prevention is necessary within an institution:

Because of the complex nature of plagiarism, the various types of plagiarism, and diverse motivations to plagiarise ... no single strategy is likely to be completely successful in reducing student plagiarism rates. More specifically, the literature suggests that a one-size-fits-all approach to plagiarism reduction is ineffective (Park, 2004), and what is needed is a multilayered, evidence-based, longitudinal strategy (p. 16).

The desirable outcomes of local programs suggested by Owens & White might be:

- students understand the principles and practice of referencing
- students develop their authorial voice
An interesting discipline-specific use of TurnItIn is reported in an Arts College (McKie, 2014). In this institution students were given access to TurnItIn to “develop a better understanding of what plagiarism looks like, the importance of paraphrasing and why they need to reference their sources.” It increased students’ understanding of their own writing processes and their responsibility as academic writers.

3.0 Systems for limitation of plagiarism

What sorts of systems are needed and how do these differ from those the University currently has in place?

NB: Any detection system requires students to submit online – this is not presently mandatory at The University of Sydney.

Plagiarism detection softwares (Sydney University presently supports TurnItIn) are necessary but not transparent. There are different ways to use them, each of which teaches students different things (Owens & White, 2013).

Owens and White (2013) report an extensive study (5 years and over 14,000 students) following the development of their writing program in 1st year psychology. They tried these things (in order):

- deterrent use of detection software (not very effective on its own).
- an in-class writing exercise with online constructive feedback module, made from student writing examples (helped with paraphrasing skills).
- online mastery quiz to teach technical aspects of referencing and citing in discipline.
- a writing tutorial that used in self-directed learning to facilitate the development of critical analysis skills and development of authorial voice.

In their view, the cumulative effect of these interventions has been successful to the extent that their plagiarism problems in very large (sometimes more than 2000) first-year classes dropped to ‘negligible’ by 2011, measured with the same free plagiarism software, WCopyfind, over five years (this study was conducted before the University undertook support of TurnItIn). When they began the study (2007) they were detecting up to 2.5% of written assignments as containing copied work, either from other students or from published sources.

What changes might be feasible within the scope of this Taskforce and what might need to be referred to further work?

- TurnItIn could be incorporated into all assessment practice. All faculties have agreed to its use, but anecdotally many staff members are still unsure how they could or should use it in their own marking. (And not all UoS have LMS sites, and not all assessments are submitted online.)
- All UoS LMS sites could include a link to on-line educational resources that assist students to understand what plagiarism is and how to avoid it. These already exist on university servers, for example:
  - the iResearch module in the University library http://www.library.usyd.edu.au/skills/elearning/learn/referencing/index.php can be easily incorporated into UoS – results can appear in the LMS grade centre or the student can download a certificate of completion
  - the WriteSite at http://writesite.elearn.usyd.edu.au/m2/m2u1/index.htm describes the types of sources used in academic writing, gives reasons for using them and explains why it is important to reference them
  - Resources from the Learning Centre such as http://sydney.edu.au/stuserv/documents/learning_centre/plag.pdf give information on successfully avoiding plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty.
- Faculties could be supported to develop writing tutorials incorporating plagiarism detection and thus prevention for first-year students, with or without online feedback (see Owens & White, 2013).
- First year UoS could be selected to ensure that all students encounter a Unit in which assessment tasks are scaffolded to allow development of the skills of paraphrasing and
citation. For example the first assessment task might require students to compare the ideas presented in two journal articles on a topic relevant to a subsequent larger assessment task. The marking rubric for this task contains explicit reference to these skills. (This is the basis of the study conducted by Owens and White.)

- The University could develop technical capability for detection of plagiarism within higher degree by research theses and policy on its use.

An OLT project, the Exemplary Academic Integrity Project (EAIP), identified “five core elements of policy for ‘exemplary academic integrity’: access, approach, responsibility, detail and support” (Exemplary Academic Integrity Project (EAIP), 2013). They developed a ‘toolkit’ for institutions who wish to develop policies for academic integrity. There is as yet no publication on the use of this tool, although there are descriptions of some projects in train in the proceedings of the 6th Asia Pacific Forum on Educational Integrity (2013) at http://web.science.mq.edu.au/conferences/6apcei/Proceedings/6APCEI_Proceedings.pdf. However, compliance with policy at an institution is not always easy to ensure; one study indicated that staff may be more inclined to follow local practice than institutional policy (DeMaio, Dixon, Dunworth, & Yeo, 2013).

The final paragraph from Owens and White (2013) brings the focus back to the best outcome for the student:

> While is it difficult to disentangle the independent contribution of each of our strategies, we believe that this multifaceted approach to reducing rates of plagiarism has been a success precisely because it captures all students at all levels of ability and attitude. On the one hand, deterrence strategies are an essential component because educational strategies in isolation will not affect students who are committed to cheating. On the other hand, an educational approach to both writing and referencing is essential for those students who genuinely have little understanding of referencing rules. As we face an increasing threat of plagiarism from better technology, we should use technology to create interesting and engaging resources to assist our students to become better writers (p. 20).

3.1 A note on cheating in examinations

Cheating in paper exams (in MCQs, which offer the possibility of students copying the placing of their answers quite easily from desk to desk) has been studied intensively in some institutions over decades (e.g. a large study at McGill over more than 20 years reported by Harpp (2008)). Gareth Denyer (SMB) has published on a novel, fairly low-tech solution that he and a colleague used to ensure that paper quizzes in science showed random patterns of correct answers (Denyer & Hancock, 2006). There is a lot of literature on technical issues associated with online exams and take-home exams. However, technology moves on, and there should no longer be major issue with on-campus online exams at Sydney University as we now have the facility to use a lock-down browser for exams being done on campus computers to prevent students browsing for answers. (This has been used by some languages units.) Blackboard provides the facility to randomize multiple-choice questions in quite complex ways to reduce copying of answers. What the university does lack is very large computer labs to use for exams.

Additionally, there are emerging biometric or other technological approaches designed to ensure that students doing exams off campus are who they say they are – measuring users’ keystrokes for example. Medicine has recently piloted one of these and is reporting on this to the Academic Board shortly. There are also a number of third-party proctoring services for online examinations. It will be important for the University to monitor and, where appropriate, test and utilize such developments to ensure effective approaches to the minimization of cheating.

4.0 Assessment Policy

What is known about the impact of assessment policy on the occurrence of academic misconduct; what strategies are effective in different subject areas or different types of study; what sorts of systems are needed and how do these differ from those the University currently has in place;
what changes might be made within the scope of this Taskforce; what might need to be referred for further work?

Direct empirical evidence of an effect of policy on the occurrence of misconduct and plagiarism is difficult to find. Glendinning (2014) makes references to articles by Bretag et al. (2011) on a preliminary analysis of the academic integrity policies at Australian universities, by East (2009) on a lack of alignment between policy and practice in language learning, and by Tennant and Duggan (2008) on the recorded incidence of student plagiarism and the penalties applied in the UK, but none of the three are currently accessible. While not involving a study of impact, in her own report on policy and practice in the European Union Glendinning (2014) concluded:

The findings confirmed that HEIs in many parts of Europe had poorly defined policies and systems for assurance of academic integrity. In some countries and institutions where policies were in place, there was little evidence of monitoring and review. … Perhaps the greatest impediments to progress in academic integrity across the EU are the lack of consensus over what constitutes plagiarism, differences in academic standards, expectations of academic tutors and educational priorities. (pp17-18)

As noted in Sections 2 and 3, there is evidence that piecemeal, uncoordinated approaches may not be effective, and growing support for holistic responses in which the complexity of the issue is acknowledged.

Considerable recent research is shifting in focus from detection-based studies to prevention based on assessment design. A need for the shift was described by Youmans (2011) in his study of Californian students, in which he concluded:

In short, the instructional techniques and the use of the Turnitin.com system failed to prevent plagiarism to the satisfaction of the researcher. Instead, this study showed that the amount of plagiarism that instructors can expect may depend on the type of writing assignment that students are required to complete. [Youmans, p.758]

A strong case for a holistic approach involving detection and with more emphasis on design is provided by Macdonald and Carroll (2006) and the abstract of their paper is produced here in full.

Recent years have seen a growing awareness of the incidence of plagiarism, though the response has largely been to focus on deterrence through detection and punishment. However, student plagiarism is a much more complex issue than suggested by a one-solution response and this paper argues for a more holistic institutional approach that recognises the need for a shared responsibility between the student, staff and institution, supported by external quality agencies. Case studies from three institutions are used to illustrate possible triggers for adopting a holistic approach. The paper presents a checklist for identifying the absence of a holistic approach to dealing with student plagiarism and concludes that a key aspect is to adopt assessment-led solutions which focus on using low stakes, formative (as distinct from high stakes, summative) assessment. (p.233)

One of the cases they describe is from Newcastle University in Australia. The other two are from the UK. In addition to illustrating through case studies how assessment reviews have been triggered and conducted, their main point is about the shift away from high stakes assessment that encourages plagiarism or conduct in which students take risks in attempting those high stakes events. This view has been adopted widely and developed further in recent reports that articulate the sort of assessment design that might be envisaged.

Carless (2015) concludes his short section on plagiarism by describing some of the engaging assessment tasks that are likely to act in ways that discourage cheating or plagiarism. He emphasises the use of tasks involving “students in working towards divergent rather than convergent goals, through the use of individualised negotiated assignments, or assignments that draw on personal experience or require evidence of it” (p.20) that might look different in differing disciplines. For example a case
study in first year History involves the use of fieldwork reports (30% of the UoS assessment) and One Sentence Responses (15%) in which students in each lecture write a short note connecting what they are studying to their personal experiences. They might be asked to describe the essential qualities of a good museum, or say which is more valuable — history in books or history in the movies (p.74). In first year Law the use of Reflective Media Diaries (20%) requires students to "identify and analyse a range of events related to torts reported in the print media" (p91). It involves a regular and deepening analysis throughout the semester and provides sufficient choice for the student to explore their own interests.

The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences already encourage the design of plagiarism “unfriendly” assessment in a set of plagiarism reduction strategies:

8. Design tasks which work against the possibility of plagiarism. For instance stagger due dates to prevent students from being overwhelmed with assignment demands. Request brief annotations with list of references, submission of essay plans and research notes, or ask for transcripts if interviews are part of the assignment. [Step 8; Le Masurier, 2010, p.7]

However, the focus of the Carless suggestion goes beyond the FASS strategies by also asking for the topic and nature of the assessment to be included in the assessment design.

Carroll & Appleton (2001) prepared the ground for the design-based approach in a Plagiarism Good Practice Guide that builds on Carroll’s earlier work. Their suggestions include: Removing easy cheating options that appear in the use of the same sorts of questions each year; creating a context in which rewards for engagement are valued over detection and punishment; using assessment that integrates theory or principles with personal experience; create tasks that go beyond the requirement to collect-describe-present information to the inclusion of an analysis or evaluation; design assessment tasks with multiple solutions or that create artifacts to capture individual effort. The adoption of these sorts of suggestions may need to be seen as staff development work involving all academic teaching staff.

**What changes might be made within the scope of this Taskforce**

The AMP Taskforce may see this as a good opportunity to initiate the joint investigation of three aspects related to assessment that are currently topical in the university — 1) this issue of academic misconduct and plagiarism, 2) encouraging a shift to assessment for learning and, 3) the perceived workload for staff and students of some of the current approaches. The investigation might ask: What is currently known about the nature of the assessment tasks used across the university? To what extent are these tasks considered to lead to encouragement of plagiarism, assessment for learning and unreasonable workloads?

At the very least, and more immediately, the Taskforce may wish to consider two policy aspects highlighted in the recent literature. The first is the adequacy of the current University policy. The second is the extent to which policy is being implemented.

Given the evidence emerging from the literature on the need for a holistic approach that includes the importance of assessment design, the current assessment policy of The University of Sydney may be incomplete. The assessment policy, now Part 14 of the Coursework Policy 2014, does not include any specific reference to misconduct or plagiarism. The policy also only indirectly encourages good assessment design, in requiring assessment tasks to foster enquiry-based learning (Principle 1 (3)) and to be authentic (Principle 3 (1)). While the literature is clear in noting that these are elements that help prevent plagiarism, they will not be effective if that purpose of the design is not articulated. Links between assessment design and academic misconduct could be considered for inclusion in the policy.

The Assessment Procedures 2011 include only one mention of misconduct and plagiarism (Section 6 (4)) with a reference to the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy:

(4) Students must be informed of the style of academic referencing required and given opportunities to practice and gain feedback on academic writing and relevant scholarly conventions in the course discipline, in accordance with the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy 2012.
This refers only to the idea of educating students about the issues. In terms of the holistic framework, the Procedures include nothing on the important area of assessment design.

Specific reference to assessment design is provided in the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy in Section 4.2.2 (d) in terms of not encouraging plagiarism rather than in terms of designs that help prevent plagiarism, and the principles described to foster academic honesty in 4.2.3 are vague in only referring to the inclusion of discipline or subject specific examples where appropriate (4.2.3 (b)).

4.2.2 (d) Assessment which encourages demonstrated academic achievement, including academic integrity. Assessment should encourage scholarship, creativity and originality in ways consistent with research enriched learning. It should not encourage or pressure students to plagiarise or to engage in other forms of academic dishonesty.

Amendment of the policies/procedures would provide a stronger basis for action. However, a potentially bigger issue is in the implementation of the policy, as noted in the following examples from the literature and in one case of local practice.

Plagiarism and academic misconduct prevention approaches consistently make reference to the education of students about inappropriate practice and the need to have a consistent and transparent policy approach (see for example Carroll and Appleton (2001); University of Melbourne). Recent research reports into the application of this approach suggest that it is in the interpretation and enactment of the policies that shortcomings occur and that prevention opportunities are lost.

Glendinning (2014) in her review of the prevalence of policy in higher education across Europe reports that while many institutions had policies in place not all these policies were enforced or applied consistently (p16). Gullifer and Tyson (2014) in a study in one Australian institution report:

An invitation to complete a survey examining students' understanding of the institutional policy on academic integrity was sent to all domestic students enrolled at an Australian university. A total of 3405 students completed the survey. The data were examined by year of study, faculty, and whether the students were studying on campus or by distance education. Findings indicate that only half of the participants had read the policy on plagiarism and that confusion regarding what behaviour constitutes plagiarism was evident. The implications of these findings are that a systematic educative approach to academic integrity is warranted. [p. 1202]

The University of Sydney assessment policy Principle 2 (3) requires that procedures exist to ensure that all staff involved in teaching a unit of study share a common understanding of assessment practice. Yet cases have been encountered where students are not given the assignment until a week or two before it is due, thus increasing the risk that students will not have time to do it as well as they would like, and might consequently be under pressure to find shortcuts. This variation in approach is not consistent with the policy, and the consequences, such as time available being a factor in misconduct, was also noted by Youmans (2011):

One of the four students who was caught and punished for plagiarizing did state that he had made a conscious decision to plagiarize. He reported that he had done so because he had waited too long to complete the assignment, and having weighed the odds of being detected by the Turnitin.com system, he felt that plagiarizing was the only way he could finish in time and that it was worth the risk. [Youmans p. 759]

Academic Standards and Policy Committee of the Academic Board has for several years been struggling to achieve any systematic reporting of the form outlined in the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy and as described below:

4.5 Academic Board Reporting
4.5.1 In March each year, faculties will report to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee of the Academic Board on:
   (a) the number of notifications of academic dishonesty and plagiarism received by the faculty during the previous year;
(b) the manner in which the faculty handled any notifications of academic dishonesty or plagiarism; and
(c) steps taken by the faculty to promote compliance with this policy, including maintenance of a register of units of study or groups of units of study in which similarity detecting software has been used.

The effective application of this policy has been hindered by the variability between faculties in reporting and in the level of faculty responsibility accepted for this process.

Finally, and from a different perspective, more could be done on the assessment of students’ skills in relation to academic honesty. For example in report writing, specific outcomes could relate to students' awareness of the issues of plagiarism. As described by Barrie et al. (2012) in AAGLO Summary 7, the use of report writing, including an analysis of both process and outcome is not uncommon in assessing graduate learning outcomes. They provide examples in engineering, veterinary science, business, chemistry and archaeology, though the detail at the level of the assessment rubrics used is not included.
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Attachment 11 - Cheating in Examinations
Multiple Choice Exams

Scope
This review focuses on cheating in examinations that are rich in Multiple Choice Questions (MCQs) and is exclusively concerned with transcribing answers from nearby students. At this stage, it does not deal with other example of examination fraud; for example, smuggling in cheat-sheets, pre-meditated inter-student communication during the exam or, the rapidly-rising substitution and impersonation. It also does not deal with the copying of written answers as, in a traditional setting, this is much less common, although the recent ‘innovation’ of conducting examinations in tiered lecture theatres makes this an intriguing new area of investigation for those of us interested in detection.

Addressing this is simple
The measures required to stamp out MCQ cheating (and, markedly reduce the risk of other forms of exam cheating) are inexpensive and generally straightforward. They could be implemented immediately. Whilst basing drastic action on a scholarly ‘literature review’ and cost-benefit analysis would be sensible, the simplicity, common sense and immediate return of the solutions should short-circuit such caution. Regardless of whether the Taskforce believes that cheating occurs in exams, our examination processes would be greatly improved by implementing the suggested solutions.

Grades of cheating
I agreement with other Unis which have bothered to check, for example, McGill University (Harpp, 2008), cheating in our MCQ exams run at about an average of 5%. However, it is important to define what this means. There are various levels of engagement in the process

Full on. About 1% of students copy the entire paper from those around them. These students have made NO attempt to answer the questions themselves. They even copy ‘calibration questions’ which should uniquely identify their own paper! The ramifications of this should not be underestimated – it means that 1 in 100 our students have passed or have even achieved higher grades (!) without doing any study at all.

Sectional. Up until recently, the data shows that about 7% of students resort to copying particular sections from those around them. This is a strategic approach; the student may feel that a particular batch of lectures or a specific topic is too difficult and so they study for all the other sections but plan (or simply find it too easy) to plagiarise the tricky part. Recently, the move to hold examinations in tiered rooms (e.g., lecture theatres) has increased the frequency of this type of cheating to 15% for some (but not all) venues.

Grazing. This is an opportunistic type of copying in which strings of 3-6 answers are copied from neighbouring students. It is sporadic but clustered and, again, the frequency depends on how one defines and identifies actual copying. The close proximity of students to each other in the exam room and the ease at which humans ‘pattern match’ make this very common. There is some degree of seduction/entrapment in the way the exams are conducted that encourages this activity but, not surprisingly, it is much more likely to happen with the weaker students who lack confidence in their choices when they see that others around them have selected differently.

So why can’t we do away with MCQs?
As class sizes increase more and more of these examinations can contain a significant proportion of multiple choice questions (MCQs). As a testing tool, MCQs are efficient for large classes, and if thoughtfully set, can assess student understanding at a deep level (Marrelli, 1995; Athanosou and Lamprianou, 2005) especially when integrated with a partial marking system to reward “near misses” (Denyer & Hancock, 2002).
However, as is claimed above, one of the major drawbacks of MCQ-based examinations is the ease with which ill-prepared students can cheat. The answer sheets are designed to be accurately scanned by computer-based scanners but, as a consequence, this makes the pattern of student responses very easy to spot even from several metres away.

As a consequence, the literature tells us that cheating in all its forms (casual or opportunistic through to organised and pre-meditated) is widespread in MCQ exams (Bellezza and Bellezza 1989; Frary 1993; Sotaridona and Meijer 2001; van der Linden and Sotaridona 2002).

Of course, considerable resources are devoted to ensuring the correct conduct of our examinations. Invigilators patrol the examination hall and strictly enforce issues of silence, timing and movement. However, although students with “wandering eyes” might attract close attention of observant invigilators, proving that any misdemeanour had occurred is very difficult. Actually challenging the students during the exam would lead to an unpleasant and disruptive confrontation. This, combined with the fact that surreptitious copying can be done so easily and subtly, means that it is exceptionally rare for invigilators to accuse students of looking at another’s answer sheet.

So how do we tell if cheating has occurred?

This can only occur post-exam, with access to each student’s answers and an accurate seating plan. However, with conventional MCQ exams, actually proving that copying has happened is almost impossible. This is because detection involves finding students with identical responses to questions. However, of course, two well-prepared students would be expected to have identical answers, both for correct options and distractors. Therefore, the standard way of identifying cheats is to match wrong answers (see the figure on the right). There are several major problems with this approach: a) if a poor student copies off an very good student, the cheating will, by definition, go undetected, b) most University’s are unwilling to act on this type of statistical evidence and c) either student could claim that the other was guilty. In short, a lose-lose conflict situation is created for all parties.

More objective evidence is obtained by deploying different versions of the exam paper, altering the option order for each question in each version. Four versions are adequate as these can be laid out in such a manner that no student has the same version of the paper next to him/her. The question order can be kept the same for equity reasons and to facilitate the inclusion of questions that refer to common stimulus material, and changing question order does not add much in the way of detection.

Note that an exceptional benefit of this type scheme is that if a...
student copies any of their neighbours’ correct answers then, by definition, they choose the wrong answer on their own sheet. This is important because it means that the cheating student has got fair reward for their misbehaviour without any unpleasant confrontation or investigation. Crucially, however, and in contrast to the post-exam analysis for a regular MCQ exam, if the academic wants to pursue a case, it is now very easy to identify exactly who has cheated of whom. In our own Institution, the evidence has stood up to analysis, even when tested at the highest level (OGC). Furthermore, it is possible to conduct the enquiry and administer any disciplinary actions without the student that was copied off even being aware. In this scheme, University is in control; no-one innocent is punished and no-one guilty benefits (Denyer and Hancock, 2006)

Recommendations

Easy, low-tech and could be implemented right now

- Do not conduct examinations with substantial MCQ components in sloping lecture theatres.
- Conduct two or more different exams in the same room, arranging students doing the two different exams in alternating columns (the most common form of cheating is diagonally in front!).
- Instigate fully randomised (but well documented) seating. Do not let students know where (or near whom) they will be sitting until they actually get to the exam room. On no account allow close-knit cohorts to sit near each other.

More advanced solutions which would eliminate cheating completely

- Deployment of multiple versions of each exam paper (with rotated/scrambled options) as described above. This is actually very simple to administer and just involves having multiple key sheets.
- Subjecting the results of every MCQ examination to plagiarism detection analysis
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## Attachment 12 - Example Academic Integrity Plan for a Science Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Deployment Mode</th>
<th>Likelihood/Opportunity</th>
<th>Consequence/Impact</th>
<th>Comments/Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concept Quiz</td>
<td>Online, unsupervised</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Minor. 2% final. Revision of basic concepts</td>
<td>New questions this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory A</td>
<td>Online, unsupervised</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Minor. 3% final.</td>
<td>Recycled questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical A</td>
<td>Student results at bench</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Minor. 3% final</td>
<td>Original data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical B</td>
<td>Oral presentation</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium. 10% final</td>
<td>Content based on original data but could have assistance in preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam A (Theory of Prac)</td>
<td>Invigilated exam</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Very High. 25% final</td>
<td>Scrambled MCQ answers. No cheating possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory B</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory C</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences have worked with Records to design a TRIM workflow for the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism policy. This has been in use in the faculty for 18 months and has handled approximately 230 cases without any issues. Staff feedback to date is that the system is easy to use and significantly reduces workload.

To begin, the reporting examiner uses an online form to lodge a case:

```
ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM
FORMAL CASE LODGEMENT

Reminder
The UoS Coordinator or School nominates responsibility for managing minor referencing errors locally. Advice may also be sought from the Academic Honesty Coordinator, however only cases warranting formal investigation should be lodged using this form.

To lodge a case of alleged academic misconduct
Please complete the following fields to lodge a case of alleged academic dishonesty or plagiarism under this Faculty’s formal process for review by the Faculty Academic Honesty Coordinator.
Please note that TRIM does not offer case functionality when completing this form. Please ensure you have all the relevant information and documentation ready before you complete this form.
You will also receive a case reference number, which you may wish to note of upon submitting this form to track the cases progress.

Required Information
Fields marked * are mandatory

UoS Coordinator Details

Unikay: msk2193
Surname: Robertson
Given Name/s: May
University Email Address: may.robertson@sydney.edu.au
Work Phone Number *

Student Details

Type the student number, then click Lookup.
If you need to search again, change the student number then click Lookup.

Student Number *

Name *

Email Address *

LOOKUP
```

The case lodged is then assessed by an administrative staff member (academic honesty assistant) to ensure that all the evidence the academic honesty coordinator (the nominated academic) needs is attached to the file. If not, they will return the case to the examiner for further information. If so, they will check it as complete in the system, which will then send the following email to the nominated academic:

**Submission of case to the Academic Honesty Coordinator**

Dear Academic Honesty Coordinator,

A new case of alleged academic dishonesty or plagiarism has been lodged for your consideration. You may view the relevant documents for this case as listed in the table below by clicking on the available link. This will require your UniKey login. You must not forward this email to any other email account.
After reading through the available documentation, you need to take one of the following actions:

Conclude that there is no academic dishonesty or plagiarism present:

No further action should be taken and the work should be assessed based on its academic merit in accordance with clause 5.5 of the Policy.

- Conclude that there is no academic dishonesty or plagiarism present, however minor referencing errors have been detected

No further action should be taken against the student and the work should be assessed based on its academic merit in accordance with clause 5.5 of the Policy. However, the UoS Coordinator or School representative should provide remedial education to assist the student.

- Conclude that a meeting with the student is required, as sufficient evidence exists to support an notification of academic dishonesty or plagiarism:
  - evidence exists to support an notification of academic dishonesty or plagiarism:
    - If this action is taken, you must provide a preliminary view of the type of misconduct, which will be included in the letter to the student. In accordance with clause 5.2.1(a) of the Policy, the preliminary view must be in sufficient detail to enable the student to understand the precise nature of the notifications and properly to consider and respond to them.

Next step
To proceed, you must select the appropriate action button below. If you select 'meeting required with the student' you must provide your preliminary view of the notification, as required under clause 5.3.4 of the Policy, at the top of the return email. Please do not delete any of the information below in the return email as this relates to the TRIM process.

What happens after I have made my decision?
If you select one of the first two options, a TRIM email will be generated advising the relevant UoS Coordinator of the outcome. If a meeting with the student is requested, the Academic Integrity Assistant will draft the student letter requesting the meeting and forward it to the student and relevant UoS Coordinator. Once this has occurred, you will receive a TRIM generated email for you to action at the meeting with the student.

Please choose the relevant action for this case.

Thank you,

Academic Integrity Assistant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision to meet with student</td>
<td>Decision to meet with student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor referencing errors found</td>
<td>Minor referencing errors found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No academic dishonesty or plagiarism found</td>
<td>No academic dishonesty or plagiarism found</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All documents associated with this workflow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEMONSTRATION, University Of Sydney 299900001 Student Assessment</td>
<td>DOC2015/1713</td>
<td>Document</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMONSTRATION, University Of Sydney 299900001 UOS Outline</td>
<td>DOC2015/1714</td>
<td>Document</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMONSTRATION, University Of Sydney 299900001 FASS AHP Web Form</td>
<td>DOC2015/1712</td>
<td>Document</td>
<td>HTM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the email received, the nominated academic can select the outcome, which will be recorded in the system and the next steps triggered. These may include sending the reporting examiner an email such as this:

Dear UoS Coordinator,
You recently submitted a case of alleged academic dishonesty or plagiarism. I have reviewed the case and have determined that I need to meet with the student. You are not required to take any further action until I have met with the student and made my final decision. Below you will find a link to the letter that I have sent to the student for your information. In order to meet privacy requirements, you are not permitted to download or save the letter. You will require your UniKey login to open the document. The student has approximately 2 weeks to respond to the notification and attend the meeting. Once the meeting has been held, you will receive an email providing instruction on the next step in the process.
Kind Regards,
Academic Honesty Coordinator

The system also emails the student with the invitation to a meeting, with the outcome decision, and sends an email to the coordinator to discover the decision. At all times, these steps are recorded into TRIM. TRIMs reporting capabilities would allow any of the fields listed at the top of the below screenshot to be searched. A workflow could be developed to create reports from this information. Note that this is real information from TRIM so student names have been blanked out, causing the white space in the screenshot.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Workflow Outcome</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1029 1406031627</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>SLAM</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2105110561</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>SLAM</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 1406031630</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>SLAM</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>SLAM</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140049</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>SLAM</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171333</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>SLAM</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007 1410140018</td>
<td>No academic dishonesty</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>SLAM</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1007 1410140020</td>
<td>No academic dishonesty</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>SLAM</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1411201224</td>
<td>No academic dishonesty</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>SLAM</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3014</td>
<td>Dishonest plagiarism</td>
<td>French Studies</td>
<td>SLC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12901 1406261745</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>French Studies</td>
<td>SLC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M00526501 140627...</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>French Studies</td>
<td>SLC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2119</td>
<td>No academic dishonesty</td>
<td>French Studies</td>
<td>SLC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1170934</td>
<td>No academic dishonesty</td>
<td>French Studies</td>
<td>SLC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A GCST1601 1506221...</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1601 150622130</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0201628</td>
<td>Dishonest plagiarism</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11500626149</td>
<td>Dishonest plagiarism</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201636</td>
<td>Dishonest plagiarism</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201367</td>
<td>Dishonest plagiarism</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 1407111605</td>
<td>Dishonest plagiarism</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021631</td>
<td>Minor referencing error</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81839</td>
<td>Minor referencing error</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1407111602</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501061638</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10271614</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1401241052</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCST1801 1400271513</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCST1801 1407111519</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCST1801 1407111520</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCST1801 1407111521</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCST1500 1407111545</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121048</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYAH gcst1802 141020...</td>
<td>Negligent plagiarism</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1508055</td>
<td>No academic dishonesty</td>
<td>Gender and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>SOPHI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2V1101 1306091943</td>
<td>Government and International Relations</td>
<td>SSPPS</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1202 1505182129</td>
<td>Government and International Relations</td>
<td>SSPPS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 14 – Working Party’s Terms of Reference

Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce – Working Party
DRAFT Terms of Reference

The Working Party is established to support the Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce. The Taskforce is required to review the effectiveness of the University’s policies and procedures relating to academic misconduct, including plagiarism, on the part of its coursework and research students.

The Working Party will:
- Scope and design each piece of work to be undertaken under the Taskforce’s approved work plan
- Undertake the work, including through gathering information, analysing results, and providing advice and recommendations to the Taskforce
- Report to the Taskforce (via the Chair and Secretariat) on progress against the work plan
- Manage consultations on behalf of the Taskforce
- Support the Taskforce in any other work required under the Taskforce Terms of Reference

The Working Party will meet every two weeks during the tenure of the Taskforce.

Membership of the Working Party is as follows:

Associate Professor Peter McCallum, Chair Academic Board (Chair)
Professor Pip Pattison, Deputy Vice-Chancellor Education
Professor Tyrone Carlin, Registrar (as needed)
Craig Prosser, Director, Audit and Risk Management
Rebecca Halligan, Director Research Integrity and Ethics
Sarah Heesom, Solicitor and consultant (OGC rep)
Pearl Rozenberg, Sub Dean Business School
Kerrie Henderson, University Policy Manager
Dr Sarah Jones, Vice-Chancellor’s Office
Beth Quinlivan, Manager of Strategy, Sydney Medical School
Dr Leah Schwartz - Executive Officer, Higher Education Policy (Secretariat)
Attachment 15 – Taskforce’s Terms of Reference

Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce
DRAFT Terms of Reference

The University proposes to establish a Taskforce to review the effectiveness of its policies and procedures relating to academic misconduct, including plagiarism, on the part of its coursework and research students.

By establishing the Taskforce, the University is concerned to ensure that it has in place policies, procedures and practices that promote and uphold the academic and research integrity of all of its courses and units of study, research and research training activities, and which ensure that allegations of misconduct are managed fairly, efficiently and effectively.

1. In particular, the Taskforce is to review and report to the Senate on:

   (a) The coverage and adequacy of programs offered to inform students about the academic standards and the conduct which is expected of them in relation to both the various processes of assessment in which they will participate and the conduct of research which they may undertake whilst students of the University, together with the guidance that is provided to students for the duration of their studies about the development of good practices in maintaining academic and research integrity;

   (b) The appropriateness and effectiveness of practices adopted by the Faculties and Schools of the University, which are calculated to preclude or mitigate the foreseeable risks of students engaging in academic misconduct, whether in respect of coursework or research activity including misrepresentation, fabrication, cheating, plagiarism, collusion and misuse of intellectual property, and to prevent recurrences of breaches;

   (c) the adequacy of practices adopted by the Faculties and Schools of the University, and the procedures which are made available by the University, to detect academic misconduct and, in particular, to detect plagiarism;

   (d) the extent to which electronic plagiarism detection technology is used in the University’s coursework and research programs, and the areas where increased use of such technology may be appropriate or inappropriate;

   (e) the sanctions applied by the Faculties and Schools of the University when they detect academic misconduct, including plagiarism, as well as the differing circumstances which attract the application of those sanctions;

   (f) where the imposition of a sanction involves a requirement on the part of a coursework or research student to undertake a program of remediation, the appropriateness of the various programs of remediation which students may be required to undertake;

   (g) the expectations placed on staff who suspect a student has engaged in academic misconduct, the levels of guidance and support provided to staff about how to manage such matters, and the timeliness and effectiveness of the University’s policies and processes for investigating and acting upon allegations of academic misconduct;

   (h) the extent to which there is consistency across the University in respect of the programs referred to in (a), the practices referred to in (b), the practices and procedures referred to in (c), the use of technology referred to in (d) the sanctions referred to in (e), the programs of remediation referred to in (f), and the expectations referred to in (g); and
(i) the efficiency of the procedures established under Chapter 8 of the University of Sydney By-law 1999 (as amended) for the administration of student discipline.

2. The Taskforce will review Chapter 8 of the University of Sydney By-law 1999 (as amended), the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy and the Research Code of Conduct, as well as the Procedures adopted to support the operation of that Policy and that Code and recommend such amendments to Policy, the Code and Procedures, and their implementation, as seem to the Taskforce to be desirable having regard to:

   (a) the importance of ensuring that students are adequately informed about the standards of academic and research integrity that are expected of them, whether undertaking coursework or engaged in research, as well as being given appropriate guidance about the development of good practices in maintaining academic and research integrity;
   
   (b) the importance of ensuring that University staff are provided with clear guidance, ongoing training and support in relation to the implementation of relevant policies and procedures;

   (c) the need for preventative action to be taken to mitigate foreseeable risks to academic and research integrity including misrepresentation, fabrication, cheating, plagiarism, collusion and misuse of intellectual property, and to prevent recurrences of breaches;

   (d) the need for rigour when ensuring observance by students of academic standards and research integrity; and

   (e) the requirement for consistency between the Faculties and Schools of the University when promoting appropriate academic standards, reporting and investigating potential breaches, and applying sanctions in instances where breaches are found to have occurred; and

   (f) the desirability of the procedures for administering student discipline being both fair and efficient.

3. The Taskforce will also recommend any changes that are, in its opinion, required in the University to ensure it maintains effective oversight of academic and research integrity on the part of students, including monitoring of potential risks, and promoting the adoption of best practice approaches from within the University, nationally and internationally.
ITEM 6.4 STUDENT DISABILITY SUPPORT POLICY

The 15 June 2015 Senate Learning and Teaching Committee noted that the Student Disability Support Policy had been circulated for approval by flying minute subject to minor amendments and subject to formatting into the approved Policy template.

Recommended Resolution:
Academic Senate resolves to approve the Student Disability Support Policy.
ITEM 6.4 STUDENT DISABILITY SUPPORT POLICY

Issue:
The University has never had a Student Disability Support Policy, procedure or guideline to inform students and staff or direct the actions of Disability Support Advisors in relation to reasonable adjustments leading towards accommodation. There is some financial and decision risk associated with reasonable adjustments and higher education accommodation.

Discussion:
The Senate Learning and Teaching Committee has ratified a draft Student Disability Support Policy following its discussion at the February and May meetings (refer attachment one). A draft Student Disability Support Procedure and Guideline has been developed and is being tabled at the upcoming SLTC meeting for discussion.

The Disability Discrimination Act (1992) and Disability Standards for Education (2005) currently provide direction to Higher Education providers in relation to ‘accommodating’ students with a disability. Further, the New South Wales Privacy and Personal Information Act (1988) and Health Records Information Privacy Act (2002) provide direction in regards to information sharing.

The World Health Organisation International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health has been utilised to inform the operationalisation of this Policy through procedures and guidelines.

The costs associated with provisions for reasonable adjustment have increased as the numbers of students with a disability has increased, and staff have asked for greater clarity and consultation in regards to reasonable adjustment decision-making.

Consultation process:
All University Disability Support Advisors were involved in the development of the policy. The Legal Office has reviewed, made changes to, and recommended the draft Student Disability Support Policy for introduction. The Equity and PACE Office has provided feedback. All Associate Dean’s L&T were consulted and the SLTC has ratified the Policy for consideration by the Senate.

Recommendation:
That the Student Disability Support Policy is adopted.

Impact(s):
There will be a range of operational impacts which require attention:

a) Communicating the key elements of this policy to students and staff.

b) Setting eligibility limits to some forms of accommodation due to a functional assessment.

c) Standardised and timely communication of accommodation needs to academic and other staff.

Submitted by:
Darren Peters, Director Campus Wellbeing & Support Services
STUDENT DISABILITY SUPPORT POLICY

1 PURPOSE

This policy supports Macquarie University’s provision of a virtual or physical, social and learning environment that complements and enhances the University experience for students with a disability on the same basis as other students, in an environment free from harassment and discrimination.

2 BACKGROUND


This policy outlines the rights and responsibilities of Macquarie University staff and students in relation to:

a) Students with disability;
b) Students who have an associate with disability;
c) The University’s application of the principle of reasonable adjustment to ensure fair and inclusive treatment for students with disability.

3 SCOPE

This Policy applies to all staff and students of the University

4 DEFINITIONS

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

Adjustment
A measure or action (or a group of measures or actions) taken by the University that has the effect of assisting a student with disability on the same basis as a student without disability, and includes an aid, a facility, or a service that the student requires because of their disability. An adjustment can be administrative, environmental or procedural alterations in the learning situation which removes barriers for a student with disability so they can perform the inherent requirements of the course of study.

Assessment
Illustrative task or performance opportunity that closely targets defined learning outcomes, allowing students to demonstrate their knowledge and ability to meet the learning requirements of a course. This includes both the content and design of assessment tasks.
Associate
A student who provides support to a person with disability who may or may not be a student at the University. An associate may include but is not limited to:
   a) a spouse of the person; or,
   b) another person who is living with the person on a genuine domestic basis; or,
   c) a relative of the person; or,
   d) a carer of the person, or,
   e) other groups listed within the Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Commonwealth).

Disability
Disability is very broadly defined under the DDA as any physical, sensory, neurological, intellectual, psychiatric, or learning disability in relation to a person and includes:
   • total or partial loss of the person’s bodily or mental functions; or
   • total or partial loss of a part of the body; or
   • the presence in the body of organisms causing disease or illness; or
   • the presence in the body of organisms capable of causing disease or illness; or
   • the malfunction, malformation or disfigurement of a part of the person’s body; or
   • a disorder, illness or disease that affects a person’s thought processes, perception of reality, emotions or judgment or that results in disturbed behaviour;
   • presently exists; or
   • previously existed but no longer exists; or
   • may exist in the future (including because of a genetic predisposition to that disability); or
   • is imputed to a person.

A disability that is otherwise covered by this definition includes behaviour that is a symptom or manifestation of the disability.

Disability Action Plan
An organisational plan for the removal, as far as possible, of discrimination against people with disability. The Disability Action Plan identifies actions that the University does and will take to ensure that education and employment, services, premises and facilities are accessible and non-discriminatory to people with disability.

Disability Service
The University Disability Service provides specialised assessment, advice, information, support and recommendations to staff and students regarding reasonable adjustments, resources and services for students with a disability. Academic and professional staff can obtain advice and information on accessibility, inclusive teaching and learning strategies and how various disabilities may affect a student’s study.

Disruption to Studies
A process implemented by the University intended to help minimise the impact of serious and unavoidable disruptions that arise after a study period has commenced, which may adversely affect a student’s academic performance in assessment activities. Such disruptions commonly relate to changes in personal, social or domestic circumstances, and may include, the commencement or exacerbation of illnesses (either physical or psychological) or injuries, accidents, societal demands (such as jury service), bereavement, family breakdown, or unexpected changes in employment situations.

Harassment
Any type of behaviour, explicit or implicit, verbal or non-verbal that is unwelcome, offensive, abusive, belittling or threatening.

**Individual Educational Access Plan**
A student centred plan that sets out the academic, practicum, examination, assessment, library, security and information technology requirements the student will need whilst studying at Macquarie University. Where appropriate, a student undertaking placement may require the development of an additional plan that includes adjustments recommended by an independent workplace risk assessment.

**Inherent requirements**
The essential activities, capacities and academic requirements that are necessary for a student to successfully achieve the core learning outcomes of a Macquarie University degree or program or unit. Students must meet the inherent requirements in order to complete their Macquarie University degree, program or unit and graduate.

Inherent requirements do not refer to all of the requirements of a learning outcome, but rather contrast with the minor or non-essential elements, which may be negotiable or flexible. All students, including students with disability, must meet the inherent requirements of the individual compulsory units to complete the course or program of study. Inherent requirements ensure the academic integrity of a course or unit is maintained and preserves the University’s learning, assessment and accreditation processes. They must be met by all students. In assessing whether an adjustment to the course or unit in which the student is enrolled, or proposes to be enrolled, is ‘reasonable’ (see below), the University is entitled to maintain the academic requirements of the course or unit, and other requirements or components that are inherent in or essential to their nature.

**On the same basis**
A student with disability has opportunities and choices in courses or programs and the use of the University’s facilities and services comparable to those of other students without disability.

**Placement**
Fieldwork, workplace experiences and/or other practical training requirements that compromise:

a) all or part of a subject or course and/or,
b) a PACE unit and/or,
c) optional placements or internships offered by the University.

**Reasonable**
An adjustment is reasonable in relation to a student with disability or an Associate if it balances the interests (including the health and safety) of all parties affected. Consideration needs to be given to:

a) the effect of the adjustment on the student’s ability to meet the inherent requirements and learning outcomes of the unit or course;
b) the costs and benefits of making the adjustment; and
c) the interests of all parties affected, including those of the student with disability, staff and other students, the University or colleges.

**Staff**
All persons appointed as academic or professional staff of Macquarie University, whether they hold full-time, part-time, casual or conjoint appointments.

**Student**
A person registered for a course at Macquarie University including a person who approaches the University about seeking admission to, or applying for enrolment in, the University.

**Support Services**
An action or program provided by Macquarie University that assists a student’s ability to participate in the University’s physical, virtual, social and learning environments

**Universal design**
Is the design of services, devices, products, communication and built environments, to be usable by as many people as possible at little or no extra cost without need for adaptation or specialised design.

A universal design to curricula is student centred, inclusive and enables students with disability to fully participate and demonstrate equivalence in learning outcomes.

**University Activities**
The activities of the University, any student organisation or any member of the University community including:

a) teaching, study and research at the University;
b) the conduct of any academic exercise;
c) recreational, commercial, disciplinary, commercial or ceremonial activities of the University or the University community;
d) any clinical, professional or practical work, research, workshops, camps or field or vocational placements and any other activities arranged, sponsored, controlled or supervised by the University whether or not it is part of a program or unit of study at the University;
e) the provision by the University of services to the general community;
f) the use or enjoyment of any University property by any person authorised by the University; and
g) the management or administration of the University.

**Unjustifiable hardship**
Under section 10.2 of the Standards, it is not unlawful for the University to fail to comply with a requirement of the Standards if, and to the extent that, compliance would impose unjustifiable hardship on the University.

Unjustifiable hardship has a meaning in accordance with Section 11 of the DDA.

In determining what constitutes unjustifiable hardship, in relation to an adjustment for a student with disability, all relevant circumstances of the particular case are to be taken into account including:

a) the nature of the benefit or detriment likely to accrue or be suffered by any persons concerned; and
b) the effect of disability of a person concerned; and

c) the financial circumstances and the estimated amount of expenditure required to be made by the person claiming unjustifiable hardship; and

In the case of the provision of services, or the making available of facilities - an action plan given to the Australian Human Rights Commission under section 64 of the DDA

5 **POLICY STATEMENT**

Macquarie University aims to:
• provide current and future students with a disability the opportunity to realise their potential for physical, social, emotional and intellectual development through full participation in the
University:
- respect an individual’s right to privacy and confidentiality when providing support services to current and future students with disability;
- raise the awareness of its community regarding the requirements and rights of people with disability;
- provide a university experience to be treated with dignity and respect which provides equal opportunity for all students with disability to access, participate and enjoy the benefits of education and to participate fully in university life;
- to ensure that future students with disability are able to seek admission to the University on the same basis as future students without disability and without experiencing discrimination.

The University will:
- consult with students with disability to identify reasonable adjustments that may be required to facilitate their access to and participation in programs and courses on the same basis as students without disability;
- ensure that students with disability can access support services that it provides on the same basis as students without disability and without these students experiencing discrimination. The University will provide specialised support services to students with disability so that they may negotiate reasonable adjustments;
- identify and uphold the essential academic requirements of its programs and courses;
- implement universal design principles that plan for maximum access to content, tasks, activities, events and environments without the need to action adjustments based on individual circumstances or needs;
- consider and respond to the health and safety needs of all individuals during university activities;
- provide an environment free from harassment and discrimination, and a clear process for redress where a student believes they have been harassed, bullied or discriminated against.

STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES AND DISCLOSURE

All current or future students are required to familiarise themselves with the inherent requirements of their chosen course before enrolment.

All current or future students are required to familiarize themselves with the eligibility criteria for registration with professional registration boards before enrolling in the course.

Current or future students with a disability are encouraged to disclose the nature and extent of their disability to the Disability Service. Students have the right to disclose only to the Disability Service for the purpose of identifying and implementing appropriate education related adjustments without having to disclose their disability to all other staff.

It is the responsibility of the student with disability to register and disclose to the Disability Service any disability they experience that is likely to impact on their ability to access course materials/content or environments, participate and meet the learning outcomes or inherent requirements (including assessments) of course units in which they are enrolled.

Information provided to the Disability Service about the nature of a student’s disability will not be disclosed outside of the Disability Service unless:

a) the University has reasonable grounds for concern about the health or safety of the student or other persons; or
b) the student gives express consent; or
c) the disclosure of the information is required by law; or
d) it is necessary for the University to obtain legal advice.
Information about the functional impact of a student’s disability will be included in the student’s Individual Educational Access Plan for each student with a disability registered with the Disability Service. The Individual Educational Access Plan will set out the specific reasonable adjustments required for the student. Students will be required to give written approval for the Individual Educational Access Plan to be distributed, in accordance with the University’s privacy compliance framework to those with a legitimate need to know, for implementation.

Current or future students with a disability who believe they will require any reasonable adjustments will be required to disclose the nature of their impairment or medical condition and provide appropriate supporting documentation about the possible impact on them in the context of the learning environment in a timely manner and to the Disability Service.

While the University undertakes to assist students with disability, it can only do so if students identify and engage in a process of consultation with the University to determine reasonable adjustments. Students are responsible for disclosing to the Disability Service if thereasonable adjustments provided are ineffective and/or if further adjustments are required to manage the impact of their disability. Failure to declare specific requirements at the earliest opportunity may lead to a disruption of a student's study program, or a delay in service provision.

The purpose of disclosure is not to exclude students from opportunities but to enable full participation, and access to a safe environment with appropriate adjustments.

**MAKING REASONABLE ADJUSTMENTS**

The University will provide reasonable adjustments to students with disability consistent with the Disabilities Standards for Education 2005. In determining whether a particular adjustment for a student with disability is reasonable, all relevant circumstances and interests will be taken into account, including the following:

a) the student’s disability;

b) the views of the student and the student’s advocate;

c) the effect of the adjustment on the student, including the effect on the student’s:
   - ability to achieve learning outcomes,
   - ability to participate in courses or programs, and
   - independence;

d) the effect of the proposed adjustment on anyone else affected, including but not limited to the University and its Colleges, staff and other students;

e) the inherent requirements of the course or program; and

f) the costs and benefits of making the adjustment.

Following assessment and registration with the Disability Service, the University may implement support services and programs intended specifically for the benefit of a student with disability to participate in their studies and to facilitate independent learning.

The Disability Service may support a student who is an Associate of a person with disability by making recommendations for adjustment to meet the specific needs of the Student.

**EVIDENCE**

To assist with the identification of appropriate reasonable adjustments, the University requires students seeking adjustments to supply supporting documentation about the nature and impact of their disability in the learning environment. In assessing a particular
adjustment for a student with a disability, current, relevant and appropriate medical or specialised documentation must be provided to substantiate the reasonableness of the adjustment.

The evidence must:
- identify and describe the disability;
- explain the severity and impact of the disability;
- clearly describe how the disability may adversely impact on the student’s capacity to undertake educational tasks; and
- state whether the disability is temporary, permanent/unchanging, or likely to fluctuate over time.

For conditions that are indicated to be temporary or fluctuate over time, the Disability Service may need to request updated disclosures, via new supporting documentation from the student’s health professional, prior to completing their assessment and recommending reasonable adjustments to be implemented.

The University may not be able to assess and/or determine the provision of a reasonable adjustment if supporting evidence is not provided to the Disability Service.

A student who is an Associate of a person with disability may be entitled to reasonable adjustments. Alternatively, such students may be eligible for special consideration. In this case, students should refer to the Disruption to Studies Policy to determine whether they are eligible. In either case, the student associate of the person with disability will need to provide evidence of their relationship to the person with disability and how their responsibilities in that relationship impact on their capacity to undertake educational tasks.

ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT

A student with disability may be entitled to reasonable adjustment to assessment.

Consultation shall occur in relation to reasonable adjustment to assessments. Consultation shall involve the student requesting reasonable adjustment, the Unit Convener and/or HDR supervisor.

Students with disability who have not registered with the Disability Service may be eligible for special consideration for an assessment task and should refer to the Disruption to Studies Policy.

PRACTICAL PLACEMENT

A student with disability undertaking fieldwork, workplace experiences and/or other practical training (e.g. PACE unit) may be entitled to reasonable adjustment.

Consultation shall occur in relation to reasonable adjustment to placements. Consultation shall involve the student requesting reasonable adjustment, the Disability Service, the staff member responsible for coordinating the placements, and (if applicable) the placement organisation.

Where appropriate, an independent workplace risk assessment may be completed to make recommendations regarding reasonable adjustments for students with disability on placement.

Students are encouraged to contact the University as early as possible to disclose their disability to discuss required reasonable adjustments. Late disclosure may affect the
University in being able to assess or provide for reasonable adjustments for students before they commence their placement.

**WORK HEALTH AND SAFETY**

Macquarie University recognises its obligations and responsibilities under the Work Health and Safety Act 2011. The University is committed to ensuring a safe work/study environment and to ensuring that Work Health and Safety planning and activities also incorporate the requirements of people with disability. Students with disability must meet Work Health and Safety requirements when participating in University activities.

**COMPLAINTS**

Complaints are governed by the University’s Complaints Management Policy and Procedure.

Students who believe they have been treated unfairly, or received inadequate delivery or quality of services, are encouraged to use the University procedures on appeals, grievances and complaints. Macquarie University is committed to accessible, fair and confidential processes for the resolution of complaints, including those based on allegations of discrimination on the grounds of disability.

Any questions or concerns on matters pertaining to disability discrimination may be referred to the Equity and Diversity Unit or to Disability Services in the first instance.

Complaints may also be made externally to the Australian Human Rights Commission or the NSW Anti-Discrimination Board.

6 **RELEVANT LEGISLATION**

- Disability Discrimination Act (Cwlth) 1992
- Disability Standards for Education 2005 and accompanying Guidance Notes

7 **KEY RELATED DOCUMENTS**

- Macquarie University Privacy Framework
- Macquarie University Disability Action Plan
- PACE Operational Disability Action Plan
- Assessment Guideline
- Complaint Management Procedure for Students and Members of the Public (under development)
- Discrimination, Bullying and Harassment Prevention Policy
- Disruption to Studies Policy
- Final Examination Policy

8 **NOTES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.1</th>
<th>Contact Officer</th>
<th>Director Campus Wellbeing and Support Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Implementation Officer</td>
<td>Director Campus Wellbeing and Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Approval Authority / Authorities</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please complete the following:

### REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLISHING TO POLICY CENTRAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category [select ONE only]</th>
<th>Academic (including Learning and Teaching; Academic Quality; Library)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate Engagement and Advancement (including Marketing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governance (including Legal; Risk, Compliance and Insurance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations (including Equity and Diversity; Finance; Health and Safety; Human Resources; Information Technology; Property; Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research (including Higher Degree Research Administration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students (including Academic Administration; Student Support; Sports and Recreation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience [select ALL that apply]</th>
<th>Academic staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Researchers &amp; HDR Candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visitors to Macquarie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other – specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM 8.1  REVISIONS TO THE GENERAL COURSEWORK RULES

For discussion.

Recommended Resolution:
Academic Senate resolves to recommend to University Council the proposed amendments to the General Coursework Rules 2015.
ITEM 8.1  REVISIONS TO THE GENERAL COURSEWORK RULES

Issue
A review of the Academic Rules forms part of the annual schedule for the Academic Senate. The introduction of the Macquarie Diploma and Foundation programs offered through the MUIC, scheduled to commence in early November and the work on an academic progression framework, has resulted in the review of the General Coursework Rules being separated into two stages. The key dates and scope for each stage is outlined below.

General Coursework Rules: Tranche 1

Scope: Amendments required to support MUIC programs

Key Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 August</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>Briefing Paper and Proposed Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 September</td>
<td>Senate Standing Committee</td>
<td>Final Amendments Recommended to Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 October</td>
<td>University Council</td>
<td>Approval of Rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Coursework Rules: Tranche 2

Scope: Minor amendments and potential inclusion of requirements to support academic progression framework

Key Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 September</td>
<td>ASQC</td>
<td>Briefing Paper and Proposed Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 October</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>Briefing Paper and Proposed Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 November</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>Final Amendments Recommended to Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 December</td>
<td>University Council</td>
<td>Approval of Rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Proposed Amendments – Tranche 1 of the Review of the General Coursework Rules

- Definitions: Inclusion of MUIC means the Macquarie University International College
- Admission: Inclusion of MUIC
- Enrolment: Inclusion prohibiting students enrolled in MUIC from concurrent enrolment and transferring courses
- Enrolment – Double Fail: Inclusion of MUIC
- Progression - Unduly long time: Inclusion of Foundation along with other programs with a duration of 1 year or less. However the maximum period of enrolment for all programs in this category will require further consideration by the ASQC Working Group conducting the full review of the General Coursework Rule based on benchmarking with peer institutions.
- Minimum Rate of Progress: Inclusion of a rule for MUIC Programs, based on the draft MUIC Progression Procedures.
- Deeming a Unit Equivalency: Inclusion of the Director of MUIC
- Awards and Graduation: limiting graduation to undergraduate and postgraduate programs as Foundation students will not be attending a formal graduation ceremony

A marked up version of the General Coursework Rules with proposed amendments is attached for reference.

The required amendments to University Policy and Procedure are being scoped and will be presented to Academic Senate for approval.

Consultation Process
At the ASQC meeting of 21 July a working party was established to review the General Coursework Rules. The membership of the working party includes:

- Associate Professor Pamela Coutts, Chair, ASQC
- Associate Professor Carlos Bernal-Pulido, Arts
- Hayley Harris, Medicine and Health Sciences
- Kathryn Whittingham, Head, Student Administration
- Zoe Williams, Head, Governance Services
- Dr Rod Yager, Science and Engineering
Recommendation:
That Academic Senate RESOLVE TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL the proposed amendments to the General Coursework Rules.

Submitted by: Professor Dominic Verity, Chair of Academic Senate

For enquiries contact: Zoe Williams, Head, Governance Services
Zoe.Williams@mq.edu.au or extension 4322
PART 1 PRELIMINARY

1. Name of rules
These Rules may be cited as the 'General Coursework Rules'.

2. Enactment
These are Rules made by the Council of Macquarie University under section 29 of the Macquarie University Act 1989.

3. Commencement
These rules take effect on the day on which they are published on the Internet by means of the website of the University or in another official University publication under section 29(c) of the Macquarie University Act 1989 and section 35(4) of the Macquarie University By-Law 2005.

4. Application
The General Coursework Rules apply to all preparatory, undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate coursework awards offered by Macquarie University.

5. Purpose
The purposes of these Rules are to outline the admission; credit recognition; enrolment; progression; assessment; awards and graduation; and review and appeal requirements; and connected matters of General Coursework at Macquarie University.

PART 2 INTERPRETATION

6. Interpretation
In these Rules:

*Academic Senate* means the Academic Senate of the University.

*Academic Year* means the period which extends for one calendar year from the commencement of the first study period.

*Award or Award Course* means the qualification resulting from the satisfactory completion of a specific program of study. Also known as qualification or degree.

*By-law* means the Macquarie University By-law 2005.

*decision* includes a determination.

*Council* means the Council of the University.
Corequisites mean a unit which has to be completed prior to or concurrently with another.

Degree means the major qualification awarded by a university. It is awarded either for successful work at undergraduate (bachelor degree) or postgraduate (higher degree) level, or as an honorary recognition (honorary degree) of achievement.

Effective enrolment means when a student remains enrolled in a unit, or units, beyond the study period census date and includes a ‘F’ ‘FA’, ‘FW’ grade or ‘W’ status.

Exit Award means an approved lesser award that a student may elect to qualify with provided the requirements of the exit award have been met. Some exit awards are exit qualifications only and are not offered for admission.

Faculty means an administrative grouping of research, academic and professional staff and students based on the area they teach, support and study.

Full-time student means a student who is enrolled in units in a calendar year which comprise at least 0.75 of an Equivalent Full-time Study Load for the course for which they are admitted.

Grade Point Average (GPA) means a calculation, which reflects the overall grades of a student in a coursework program. It is based on the units completed in that program at Macquarie University and does not take into account any credit points granted for advanced standing or non-award study.

Major means a structured sequence of undergraduate units, which is approved by the University.

MGSM means the Macquarie Graduate School of Management.

Minor means a structured group of units, which is approved by the University. All minors must contain at least 6 credit points of study at 200 level or above.

MUCIC means the Macquarie University International College

Part-time student means a student who is enrolled in units in a calendar year which comprise less than 0.75 of an Equivalent Full Time Student Load for the course for which they are admitted.

Practical, clinical or professional programs and units means those programs and units listed in the Schedule of practical, clinical or professional programs and units in the current University Handbook.

Prerequisites mean a statement of the required knowledge or conditions that must be satisfied before enrolment in a particular unit is permitted.

Program of Study means the minimum sequence of required study which would enable a student to qualify for an award, including both the general requirements of a specific award and the specific requirements of a qualifying major or specialisation where applicable.

Qualifying Major means major that is listed as satisfying the general requirements for a specific program. Programs that allow a choice of the particular subject area to be studied (such as the Bachelor of Arts, the Bachelor of Science and the Bachelor of Commerce) require the completion of a qualifying major.

Specialisation means a structured set of postgraduate units, which is approved by the University.

Units mean the units of study (also known as subjects) comprising a program of study, each worth a fixed number of credit points.

University Handbook means the University’s digital presentation and organisation of information for students, which is revised and published annually, containing the Schedules and listings of degrees, diplomas and certificate awards, programs and specialisations, prerequisites and corequisites, majors, units and People, Planet and PACE units in relation to undergraduate, graduate, research training and postgraduate study. The University Handbook also references University Rules, Policies and Procedures and other information to assist students, including those referenced in the Rules.

University means the Macquarie University established by the Macquarie University Act 1989.

[Note: The Interpretation Act 1987 of New South Wales applies to these Rules].
PART 3 SUBSTANTIVE PROVISIONS

7. Admission
   1) To be admitted to enrolment for any coursework award of the University, a student must meet requirements referred to in the Admission (Coursework) Policy or set out in the University Handbook.

   2) A student who has met the criteria for admission will be admitted to an award course and assigned to a Faculty, or the MGSM or the MUIC.

8. Credit recognition
Credit for previous study is governed by the Recognition of Prior Learning Policy.

9. Enrolment
   1) A student will enrol in a program of study and complete units to satisfy the requirements of that program of study.

   2) A student may vary their enrolment within a program of study, according to the published procedures for adding or withdrawing from units.

   3) Transfer between University undergraduate and postgraduate award courses is governed by the Course Transfer Policy and related Procedure.

   4) A student may undertake concurrent enrolment in and concurrent completion of two programs of study to qualify for up to two of the awards listed in the Schedule of Awards included in the University Handbook current at the time of admission. Completion of the programs of study will qualify the student for each of the awards. A student enrolled in a program offered by MUIC is not permitted to undertake concurrent enrolment.

   5) Cross-institutional enrolment is governed by the Cross-Institutional Enrolment Procedures.

   6) A student excluded from enrolment may apply to re-enrol after the expiration of the period of exclusion in accordance with published procedures.

   7) A student who has twice had a grade of Fail recorded for a unit may not enrol again in that unit, except with the prior approval of the Executive Dean of the relevant Faculty in which the unit is offered, or, if applicable, the Dean of the MGSM or, the Director of MUIC. A student who fails a required professional or clinical unit is governed by Rule 9(9)(b)(ii).

   8) The following NSW legislative requirements apply where a program of study or unit requires a student to undertake professional experience and practical training or research that may involve direct contact with children under the age of eighteen and/or be in NSW public health facilities:
      a. a student admitted to such a course or unit will be required to complete certain declarations and have certain personal information checked by government authorities; and
      b. eligibility for commencement and continuing participation in such a course or unit is determined on the basis of information obtained through these checks; and

Comment [Z1]: References to Executive Deans, Dean of the MGSM and Director of MUIC will be amended to Faculty Board in Tranche 2 of the Review of the General Coursework Rules.
c. the provision of inaccurate or unsatisfactory information or refusal to undergo these checks can result in withdrawal of an offer of admission and/or cancellation of enrolment in such a course or unit.

9) a. Where a program of study or unit requires students to undertake practical clinical or professional experience:
   i. the University and the provider of the clinical or professional experience opportunity may appoint a suitably qualified supervisor who is external to the University to supervise a student’s practical professional experience; and
   ii. while undertaking practical clinical or professional experience, a student may be summarily excluded from participating in such activities for a specified period of time; and
   iii. if a student is assessed as not ready to proceed with, or unsuitable to continue, a required clinical or professional experience or unit, then it may be determined that the student is unable to complete the program requirements.

b. The following requirements apply where a student is enrolled in a practical, clinical or professional program, or unit of study:
   i. if a student fails a required unit twice in an undergraduate professional program, listed in the schedule, then they may be excluded from further enrolment in that program; and
   ii. if a student fails a clinical or professional unit which is required for their enrolled program of study, then they may be excluded from further enrolment in that program of study; and
   iii. if a student records two fail grades, or fails the equivalent of 8 credit points, in a postgraduate-level clinical or professional program, then they may be excluded from further enrolment in that program; and
   iv. if a student is required to maintain professional accreditation or registration as a requirement for admission and continuing participation to a program of study or unit, a lapse in accreditation or registration shall then lead to exclusion.

c. Any determinations made under Rule 9(9)(a) (i-iii) will be made following procedures in the Policy and Procedures on Practical Placements.

d. Any determinations made under Rule 9(9)(b) (i-iv) will be made in accordance with Rule 10(7).

10. Progression

1) Disruption to study is governed by the Disruption to Studies Policy.

2) A student who is taking an unduly long time to complete a program of study may be excluded from further enrolment. An unduly long period of time is considered to be effective enrolment longer than:
   a. 10 years for Bachelor degrees;
   b. 10 years for extended Masters degrees;
   c. 7 years for Masters degrees;
   d. 7 years for Associate degrees; or
   e. 4 years for the Foundation, Bachelor of Philosophy, Diplomas, Graduate Certificates, Graduate Diplomas, Postgraduate Certificates and Postgraduate Diplomas and 1 year Extended Masters.
3) A student must meet a minimum rate of progress requirement at the end of each academic year, this being:
   a. for a student enrolled in a course delivered by MUIC successful completion of 50% of enrolment load in the study period under consideration; or
   b. for a student enrolled in an undergraduate course who has attempted at least 36 credit points, an overall Grade Point Average (GPA) of at least 1.00 and a GPA of at least 1.00 in the academic year under consideration; and or
   c. for a student enrolled in a postgraduate course who has attempted at least 24 postgraduate credit points, an overall Grade Point Average (GPA) of at least 1.00 and a GPA of at least 1.00 in the academic year under consideration.

4) A student may withdraw from a unit in accordance with the Withdrawal and Discontinuance (Coursework) Policy.

5) A student may discontinue enrolment in a program of study in accordance with the Withdrawal and Discontinuance (Coursework) Policy.

6) A student re-enrolling after a period of non-enrolment will apply the General Coursework Rules of the year of re-enrolment.

7) A student may be excluded from enrolment as follows:
   a. where a student has taken an unduly long time to complete a program of study as set out in Rule 10(2), then they may be excluded from that program indefinitely; or
   b. where a student has failed to meet the minimum rate of progress requirement as set out in Rule 10(3), then they may be excluded for a period of 2 calendar years from further enrolment at the University; or
   c. where a student has failed to meet the conditions of a legislative requirement set out in Rule 9(8), then they may be excluded from the unit or program of study indefinitely; or
   d. where a student has failed to meet the professional experience requirements set out in Rule 9(9) they may be excluded from the unit or program of study indefinitely; or
   e. where a postgraduate student who has not shown cause why enrolment should not be terminated, then they may be excluded from the program of study indefinitely; or
   f. where a postgraduate student has shown cause why enrolment should not be terminated and the Executive Dean of the relevant Faculty, or if applicable the Dean of the MGSM confirms termination and exclusion, then they may be excluded from that program of study indefinitely.

8) Re-admission following Exclusion is governed by the Admission (Coursework) Policy.

9) The Executive Dean of the relevant Faculty, or if applicable, the Dean of the MGSM or the Director of MUIC may determine that a student has completed the specified required unit where other work completed by the student is deemed to be equivalent to the prescribed unit.

11. Assessment
   1) Assessment is governed by the Assessment Policy.
   2) Examinations are governed by the Final Examinations Policy.
3) Grades are governed by the Grading Policy.

12. Awards and graduation

1) To be eligible to graduate a student must be enrolled in an undergraduate or postgraduate program of study.

2) To be eligible to graduate a student must satisfy all requirements specified for that program of study, including any specialisation or major requirements where applicable.

3) The University offers certain exit awards as scheduled in the University Handbook. A student may elect to qualify with an exit award provided the requirements of the exit award have been met.

4) No award that comprises the same program of study may be conferred by Council more than once on the same student. A student admitted to a combined degree can elect to have each of the degrees conferred separately.

5) A student admitted to a Bachelor of Laws or Bachelor of Education combined degree program cannot elect to have the Bachelor of Laws or Bachelor of Education degree conferred first, unless that student has completed an approved undergraduate degree.

6) The Academic Senate will determine eligibility requirements for the award of the University Medal.

13. Review and appeals

1) A request by a student for review of a grade is governed by the Grade Appeal Policy.

2) The Academic Appeals Policy governs appeals against determinations relating to:
   a. exclusion;
   b. re-enrolment;
   c. discontinuation;
   d. enrolment in a unit for the third time;
   e. termination of candidature; and
   f. Recognition of Prior Learning.

PART 4 GENERAL

14. Notice

1) Any notice to a candidate must be in writing and will be served by being:
   a. delivered personally; or
   b. left at or sent by post to;
      i. the last known residential or business address in or out of New South Wales of the person to be served as it appears in the records of the University; or
      ii. such other address as appears to the sender to be an address where the person to be served resides or works, as the case requires; or
c. delivered by email to;
   i. the University email address of the addressee or to another email address that has
      been given to the sender by the addressee for the purpose of serving notices.

[Note: It is University policy that the University issued student email account is used for official
University communication].

2) Any notice will be deemed to be served:
   a. in the case of sending by post, if posted in the Commonwealth of Australia to an address in
      the Commonwealth of Australia, within three working days of posting and in any other case
      within five working days after posting by airmail; or
   b. in the case of delivery by email, when it enters the addressee's information system as shown
      on a confirmation of delivery report from the sender's information system, which indicates
      that the email was sent to the email address of the addressee; and
   c. if more than one copy of a notice is sent, when one of those notices is first served or deemed
      to be served on the addressee.

3) In Rule 14(2) a reference to:
   a. a “working day” means any day other than:
      i. a Saturday, a Sunday or a public holiday; and
      ii. 27, 28, 29, 30 or 31 December;
      in Sydney, Australia.
   b. a “notice” is to any notice or other communication and includes, any notice which these
      Rules require or authorise to be served on any person.

15. Notes
Notes in these Rules do not form part of these Rules.
ITEM 8.2 REVISIONS TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE RULES

For discussion.

Recommended Resolution:
Academic Senate resolves to recommend to University Council the proposed amendments to the Academic Senate Rules 2015.
ITEM 8.2 REVISIONS TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE RULES

Issue

The introduction of the Faculty Boards and the establishment of the MGSM Academic Board reporting directly to Senate has resulted in a need for minor amendments to be made to the Academic Senate Rules.

Summary of Proposed Amendments – Academic Senate Rules

- Elections – casual vacancies: amended rule to reflect only those electorates with multiple elected positions on Academic Senate, i.e., Faculties
- Specific Function of the Academic Senate: amend Faculties and MGSM to Faculty Boards
- Specific Function of the Academic Senate: amended rule to align more closely with the Faculty Rules and reflect the equivalent breadth of responsibility for Senate where programs and units are not delivered through a Faculty

At its meeting of 4 August, the Academic Senate Standing Committee approved the Terms of Reference for the MGSM Academic Board and established a direct reporting line between the MGSM and Academic Senate. It should be noted that in the Terms of Reference for the MGSM Academic Board, the Academic Senate has authorised the MGSM to:

1. Approve the MGSM’s unit offerings, including the approval of new units and the amendment, renewal or disestablishment of existing units;
2. Ratify examination results for the MGSM’s units in accordance with the relevant academic rules and quality assurance frameworks prescribed by Academic Senate.

A marked up version of the Academic Senate Rules with proposed amendments is attached for reference.

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

Recommendation:
That Academic Senate RESOLVE TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL the proposed amendments to the Academic Senate Rules.

Submitted by: Professor Dominic Verity, Chair of Academic Senate

For enquiries contact: Zoe Williams, Head, Governance Services
Zoe.Williams@mq.edu.au or extension 4322
PART 1 PRELIMINARY

1. Name of rules
   These Rules may be cited as the ‘Academic Senate Rules’.

2. Enactment
   These are Rules made by the Council of Macquarie University under section 29 of the Macquarie University Act 1989.

3. Commencement
   These Rules take effect on the day on which they are published on the Internet by means of the website of the University or in another official University publication under section 29(c) of the Macquarie University Act 1989 and section 35(4) of the Macquarie University By-law 2005.

4. Application
   The Academic Senate Rules apply to the Academic Senate which is the principal academic body in the University and is to have such powers and duties as may be delegated to it by the Council, subject to the By-law and to any resolution of the Council.

5. Purpose
   The purposes of these Rules are to outline the composition; elections procedures; proceedings and functions; and connected matters of the Academic Senate at Macquarie University.

PART 2 INTERPRETATION

6. Interpretation
   In these Rules:
   - **Academic Senate** means the Academic Senate of the University.
   - **By-law** means the Macquarie University By-law 2005.
   - **Council** means the Council of the University.
   - **Faculty** means an administrative grouping of research, academic and professional staff and students based on the area they teach, support and study.
   - **MGSM** means the Macquarie Graduate School of Management.
   - **University** means the Macquarie University established by the Macquarie University Act 1989.

   [Note: The Interpretation Act 1987 of New South Wales applies to these Rules].
PART 3 SUBSTANTIVE PROVISIONS

7. **Composition**
   1) The Academic Senate comprises ex-officio and elected members:
      a. the Vice-Chancellor;
      b. the Chair of Academic Senate;
      c. the Deputy Chair of Academic Senate;
      d. the Deputy Vice-Chancellors and the Pro Vice-Chancellors;
      e. the Executive Deans of Faculties;
      f. the Dean of Higher Degree Research;
      g. the Dean of the MGSM;
      h. the Director of Learning and Teaching Centre;
      i. the Head of Department of Indigenous Studies;
      j. the University Librarian;
      k. four members from each of the Faculties of Arts, Business and Economics, Human Sciences, and Science and Engineering;
      l. two members from the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences;
      m. one member from the MGSM;
      n. one member from the non-Faculty electorate;
      o. eight student members; and
      p. up to four additional members appointed by resolution of Academic Senate.

   2) Any member identified under rule 7(1)(a), 7(1)(b), 7(1)(c), 7(1)(d), 7(1)(e), 7(1)(f), 7(1)(g), 7(1)(h), 7(1)(i), 7(1)(j) is considered an ex-officio member.

   3) Any member under rule 7(1)(k), 7(1)(l), 7(1)(m) or 7(1)(n) is elected by and from the academic staff from the respective electorates in accordance with Schedule 1 of the By-law provided that:
      a. only members of the academic staff who are full-time or part-time continuing, or fixed term for three or more years and with fractional appointment of 50 per cent and above are eligible to participate in the election and to be elected; and
      b. of the members elected from each Faculty electorate:
         i. at least one must be a Head of Department or Professor; and
         ii. members must be from different departments.

   4) Any student member under rule 7(1)(o) is elected annually in accordance with Schedule 1 of the By-law, being:
      a. one student member from each of the Faculties of Arts, Business and Economics, Human Sciences, and Science and Engineering enrolled in an undergraduate program;
      b. one student member from the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences
      c. two student members enrolled in a postgraduate coursework program; and
      d. one student member enrolled in a postgraduate higher degree research program.
8. **Elections (Procedures for elections in Schedule 1 of the By-law)**

1) The elections to Academic Senate will be held biennially in November and the term of office of a member elected at any such election will commence the following January and will expire two years from commencement.

2) A member who is an ex-officio member of Academic Senate is ineligible for election and if a member elected takes up an ex-officio position, the place occupied by that member will immediately become vacant.

3) Elected members to Academic Senate are eligible to be elected to three consecutive terms of office.

4) When a vacancy occurs in the office of a member of the Academic Senate due to the failure of an electorate to elect a member to the eligible positions, the Academic Senate is to co-opt to membership an eligible member from the relevant electorate, as the case may be.

5) Where a casual vacancy occurs in the office of an elected member of the Academic Senate the remaining members of the Academic Senate must proceed to fill the vacancy by co-opting to membership an eligible member from the relevant electorate, as the case may be.

6) A member of the Academic Senate will be deemed to have vacated office if that member:
   a. dies;
   b. resigns that office by notice in writing;
   c. resigns from the University;
   d. proceeds on leave of absence for a period exceeding nine months;
   e. is absent without leave of the Academic Senate from three consecutive meetings of the Academic Senate; or
   f. in the case of an elected student member, ceases to be a student.

7) Where an elected member of the Academic Senate proceeds on leave of absence from the University for a period exceeding three months but less than nine months, the Academic Senate will:
   a. co-opt an eligible member from the relevant electorate, as the case may be, to fill the vacancy for the period of absence but not beyond the expiry of the term of office on Academic Senate of the member proceeding on leave; and
   b. at the conclusion of that period of leave, allow the member on leave to resume membership of Academic Senate for the balance of the term of office.

8) Where a person other than a member of the Academic Senate is appointed to act in the position of an ex-officio member of Academic Senate, that person will for the purposes of these rules become a member of the Academic Senate during the period of such appointment.

9) Where an elected member of the Academic Senate is appointed to an ex-officio role, the members of the Academic Senate must co-opt to membership an eligible member of the academic staff from the relevant electorate during the period of appointment.
10) Where a casual vacancy occurs in the office of a member of the Academic Senate under rule 7(1)(k)(l) A panel comprising the Chair of Faculty Board, Executive Dean of the relevant Faculty, or if applicable the Dean of the MGSM and elected members from the relevant electorate Faculty will nominate eligible staff for co-option with the exception of appointments made in accordance with 7(1)(p).

11) The members of the Academic Senate will elect from the members of Academic Senate:
   a. any full-time academic staff member at level D or E to be Chair of Academic Senate; and
   b. any academic staff member to be Deputy Chair of Academic Senate;
   to hold office for the ensuing biennium.

12) The elections of Chair and Deputy Chair of Academic Senate will be held biennially in June and the term of office of a member elected at any such an election will commence on the first day of July following the member’s election and expire two years from commencement.

13) The Chair and Deputy Chair of Academic Senate are eligible to be elected to three consecutive terms of office.

14) A casual vacancy in the office of either the Chair or Deputy Chair of Academic Senate:
   a. is to be filled by members electing one of their number to be Chair or Deputy Chair as the case may be; and
   b. will result in that person holding office for the residue of the term of office of the Chair or Deputy Chair whose place that person has filled.

15) Any period served in filling a casual vacancy under rule 8(14) does not preclude a person from serving a full three terms in that position if elected at a biennial election.

9. Proceedings

1) The Registrar of the University, or nominee, is Secretary to the Academic Senate.

2) The number of members who constitute a quorum must be half the membership plus one.

3) All questions which come before the Academic Senate will be decided by the majority of the members present and voting at the meeting and the member presiding at the meeting will have a deliberative vote and, in the case of an equality of votes, a casting vote.

4) The Academic Senate may:
   a. determine its own procedures;
   b. request that other persons attend meetings of Academic Senate; and
   c. establish committees to assist it in connection with the exercise of any of its functions.

10. General functions of Academic Senate

1) Advise the Council and the Vice-Chancellor on:
   a. academic matters and related activities of the University;
   b. measures to safeguard the academic freedom of the University;
c. academic standards and quality, and on teaching effectiveness at the University; and
d. academic priorities of the University.

2) Provide a forum to facilitate information flow and debate within the University and between the senior executive officers of the University and the wider academic community.

3) Consider and report on matters referred to it by the Council or by the Vice-Chancellor.

4) Undertake such other functions as specified in Council resolutions.

11. Specific functions of Academic Senate

1) Approve policies on academic matters.

2) Approve the establishment, dis-establishment or changes to a degree, diploma, certificate or other award course, including programs of study, majors and award rules and academic requirements to be offered by the University or through a third party provider.

3) Request, consider and take action on reports from Faculty Boards, the MGSM and organisational units engaged in supporting the academic activities of the University.

4) In the absence of a Faculty Board, assume the responsibilities for all general and specific academic matters that would otherwise be performed by the Faculty Board.

4) Perform the duties of a Faculty for all units not relating to any Faculty or the MGSM.

5) Dispense with or suspend any requirements of, or prescription of, the General Coursework Rules, the Higher Degree Research Rules or the Higher Doctoral Degree Rules in any exceptional student case in which it may deem it appropriate to do so.

PART 4 GENERAL

12. Notes

Notes in these Rules do not form part of these Rules.
ITEM 8.3  ISSUING OF QUALIFICATIONS

For discussion.

Recommended Resolution:
That the scope of the Working Party drafting policy and related procedures on the issuing of qualifications be expanded to include recommendation to Academic Senate appropriate delegations for the approval of the development and delivery of non-AQF academic activities.
ITEM 8.3 NEW POLICY DOCUMENT – ISSUING OF QUALIFICATIONS

Issue:
At its meeting of 14 July 2015, the Academic Senate Standing Committee resolved to establish a Working Party to progress a draft policy and related procedures on the issuing of qualifications. This policy will cover all AQF and non-AQF documentation produced by the University, including testamurs, transcripts, AHEGS, jointly badged documentation, MUIC awards and certificates of attainment.

The Working Party, comprises the following staff:

- Head Student Administration
- Team Leader Completions, Student Administration
- Manager Policy Unit
- A member from the Centre for Open Education
- A member of Academic Senate

The Standing Committee endorsed a complete audit of all documentation issued by the University for academic activities at both AQF and non-AQF levels. Related to this is the need for clear delegations on the approval of the development and delivery of non-AQF activities. The purpose of this paper is to propose the expansion of the scope of the Working Group to also recommend to Academic Senate on appropriate delegations.

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

Head, Student Administration
Quality Assurance and Compliance Unit, Governance Services
Policy Unit, Governance Services

Recommendation:
That the scope of the Working Party drafting policy and related procedures on the issuing of qualifications be expanded to include recommendation to Academic Senate appropriate delegations for the approval of the development and delivery of non-AQF academic activities.

Operational Impact:
Student Administration
Quality Assurance and Compliance Unit, Governance Services
Policy Unit, Governance Services

Submitted by: Professor Dominic Verity, Chair Academic Senate

For enquiries contact: Ellen Carlson, Policy Unit Manager, Ellen.Carlson@mq.edu.au
ITEM 8.4 GOVERNANCE OF RESEARCH AND RESEARCH TRAINING

Attached are the following:

- Draft Terms of Reference for the Research & Research Training Committee
- Draft Terms of Reference for the Thesis Examination Subcommittee

For noting and circulation.
ITEM 8.4 GOVERNANCE OF RESEARCH AND RESEARCH TRAINING

Issue
A draft Terms of Reference for a proposed Research and Research Training Committee has been developed, for consultation, by a working party comprising the Chair of Academic Senate, the PVC Research Integrity and Development and the Vice-Chancellor’s Chief of Staff. This has been promulgated to a broad group of stakeholders, and further feedback is being sought.

The proposal under consultation is to establish a single expert committee to assist Academic Senate with the Academic Governance both of Research and of Research Training. Should this be adopted, the Higher Degree Research Committee (HDRC) would be revised to focus on operational matters, its reporting line would be transferred to the DVC-R’s portfolio, and its academic governance responsibilities would be taken up by the new committee.

The attached documents comprise the draft Terms of Reference of this Research and Research Training Committee of Academic Senate and a draft Terms of Reference of a single sub-committee that, in this model, would be made responsible for the conduct of HDR examination, replacing the existing Programs and Examinations Sub-Committee (PESC) of HDRC. These documents are those originally circulated for consultation, and have not been amended to reflect feedback received thus far.

Feedback to date has focussed upon the question of a single committee to govern both research and research training matters and upon questions of committee structure and membership. A call for further written feedback will be made following this meeting, and a feedback report and amended draft Terms of Reference will be brought to the 6th October Academic Senate meeting for discussion. Members are encouraged to circulate these documents in their networks and to submit any feedback to the Chair of Academic Senate by the deadline of close of business on the 18th September.

The full consultation and approval plan for the establishment of Academic Senate’s research governance committee(s) is provided below for information.

Consultation Plan

2014

13th November & 1st December: Academic Governance Workshops.
18th December: Academic Senate Meeting, presentation and approval of outcomes, feedback and implementation report from Academic Governance Workshops.

2015

March to July: Negotiation of initial draft Terms of Reference prior to consultation, Vice-Chancellor’s Chief of Staff, PVC Research Integrity and Development, and Chair of Academic Senate.
July & August: Chair of Academic Senate meetings with Executive Deans.
10th July: Roundtable with Associate Deans (HDR), Professor Nick Mansfield, Dr Ren Yi.
28th July: Roundtable with Associate Deans Research, Tori Hocking and Louise Fleck
4th August: Draft terms of reference presented to Academic Senate Standing Committee for discussion
11th August: Presentation at Faculty of Arts and Faculty of Science & Engineering Research Committees.
12th August: Presentation at Faculty of Medicine & Health Sciences Research Committee.
13th August: Presentation to and discussion with elected members of Senate.
25th August: Academic Senate Meeting, preview of draft Terms of Reference and presentation of consultation plan.
25th August: Presentation at Faculty of Business & Economics Faculty Research Committee.
25th August: Circulation of a call for written feedback.
10th September: Academic Senate Standing Committee meeting, preliminary report on feedback from consultation.
18th September: Deadline for submission of written feedback.
22nd September: Presentation at Faculty of Human Science Research Committee.
6th October: Academic Senate meeting, discussion of draft Terms of Reference and consultation feedback.
9th October: Broad circulation of feedback report and amended Terms of Reference.
30th October: Research Strategy and Policy Meeting – Chair of Academic Senate to present draft Terms of Reference and report on consultation.
10th November: Academic Senate Meeting, approval of Terms of Reference
11th November to 10th December: Call for membership nominations from Executive Deans, Faculty Boards and Academic Senate. 15th December: Academic Senate Meeting, approval of Committee membership.

TBC: Consultation with HDR and MRes students  
TBC: Consultation with Faculty MRes directors.  
TBC: Faculty HDR Committees

Recommendation: For noting and circulation.

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

For enquiries contact: Ainslee Harvey, Academic Senate Project Officer (ainslee.harvey@mq.edu.au)
Research and Research Training Committee
Terms of Reference

The Research and Research Training Committee (the Committee) was established by the Academic Senate of Macquarie University (the University) in XX 2015 under Rule 9(4)(c) of the Academic Senate Rules 2015, and is directly responsible and accountable to Academic Senate for the exercise of its responsibilities.

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

1. Objectives

The Macquarie University Research and Research Training Committee (the Committee) is responsible for advising Academic Senate on academic research and research training matters. Furthermore, the Committee is tasked with cultivating a culture of sustained excellence, engagement and impact, in the University’s research activities and research training programs.

The Committee is responsible for the discussion and dissemination of the research and research training strategies of the University, and for consulting broadly within the University community on these matters.

The Committee is also tasked with: identifying and responding to emerging research challenges (both internal and external); promoting research excellence; and encouraging the adoption of best practice in research across the University.

2. Role and responsibilities

The Committee is to:

(1) Advise Academic Senate and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) on:

   (a) The activities of Faculties and Offices established within the University that support the University's research activities and research training programs;

   (b) Strategic planning and quality enhancement in research initiatives and research training academic programs, such as those that support the implementation of the Strategic Research Framework and achievement of the 2024 research targets;

   (c) External regulatory requirements, such as the Higher Education Standards Framework, and on their alignment with the University’s policies and procedures in respect of research activities and research training programs;

   (d) Implementation of the Macquarie University Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research, ethics policies and other legislative frameworks both internal and external;
(e) The evolving risk profile of the University’s research and research training programs and on measures to effectively manage those risks;

(f) National and international trends on the development of performance indicators for research; and

(g) The appropriate use of funds allocated to research and research infrastructure.

(2) Regularly review the University's policies governing academic matters in research, research training and intellectual property and recommend any necessary amendments to Academic Senate for approval;¹

(3) Identify the need for the development of new policies, procedures and frameworks that govern academic matters in research and research training, oversee their development, and recommend their introduction to Academic Senate for approval;¹

(4) Monitor, provide advice, and make recommendations to Academic Senate on the implementation and effectiveness of academic aspects of research and research training policy;

(5) Oversee and monitor the requirements for higher degrees by research admission, supervision, academic progress and assessment;

(6) Consider the establishment, review, revision or termination of higher degree research programs, including program and award rules and academic requirements, and make recommendations to Academic Senate for approval;²

(7) Consider the establishment of joint and cotutelle research training degree programs and make recommendations to Academic Senate for approval;²

(8) Receive, consider, and decide upon matters referred to it by its Thesis Examination Subcommittee;

(9) Contribute to the development and maintenance of those aspects of the University’s academic risk register that relate to academic research and research training programs;

(10) Require the Faculties and Offices of the University to report on their activities as they relate to the role and responsibilities of the Committee.

(11) Consider and report on any matters referred to it by Academic Senate, from time to time, as required.

3. Membership

In accordance with Clause 22 of the Standing Orders for Committees of Academic Senate, the Committee shall have a membership, which comprises:

(a) The Chair of the Committee

¹ under Academic Senate rule 11(1)
² under Academic Senate rule 11(2)
o Professor Sakkie Pretorius - Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research)

(b) The Deputy Chair of the Committee
  o To be confirmed (to be drawn from the membership of the Committee)

(c) The Chair or Deputy Chair of Academic Senate
  o Professor Dominic Verity

(d) Up to five (5) ex-officio members
  o Pro Vice-Chancellor Research (Integrity & Development) – Professor Lesley Hughes
  o Pro Vice-Chancellor Research (Performance & Innovation) – Professor Peter Nelson
  o Dean of Higher Degree Research – Professor Nick Mansfield

(e) One (1) member nominated by the Executive Dean of each Faculty
  o To be confirmed – Faculty of Arts
  o To be confirmed – Faculty of Business & Economics
  o To be confirmed - Faculty of Human Sciences
  o To be confirmed – Faculty of Medicine & Health Sciences
  o To be confirmed – Faculty of Science & Engineering

(f) One (1) member nominated by the Faculty Board of each Faculty who are high profile, well known researchers.
  o To be confirmed – Faculty of Arts
  o To be confirmed – Faculty of Business & Economics
  o To be confirmed – Faculty of Medicine & Health Sciences
  o To be confirmed – Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences
  o To be confirmed – Faculty of Science and Engineering

(g) Up to three (3) members of Academic Senate
  o To be confirmed

(h) Up to four (4) members in a specialist capacity
  o Director of the Research Office – Louise Fleck
  o Director of the Higher Degree Research Office – Dr Ren Yi

(i) At least one (1) student member
  o Cheryl Ware – Postgraduate Research student representative on Academic Senate

(j) Up to three (3) co-opted members as required

4. Tenure

(1) The term of appointment of all appointed members, excluding student representative and co-opted members, shall be two (2) years.

(2) The term of appointment of all appointed student representative and co-opted members shall be one (1) year.

(3) The Chair of Academic Senate may renew any such term of appointment.
5. Authorisations

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

(1) Approve the guidelines and selection processes that apply to internal research funding schemes;

(2) Approve the award of HDR degrees on the advice provided by its Thesis Examination Subcommittee;

(3) Approve the award of Vice-Chancellor Commendation for HDR theses on the advice provided by its Thesis Examination Subcommittee.

6. Rules of operation

The Committee shall conduct its business subject to the Standing Orders for Committees of Academic Senate.
Thesis Examination Subcommittee
Terms of Reference

The Thesis Examination Subcommittee was established by the Academic Senate of Macquarie University (the University) in June 2015 under Rule 9(4)(c) of the Academic Senate Rules 2015, and is directly responsible and accountable to the Research and Research Training Committee for the exercise of its responsibilities.

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

1. Objective

The Thesis Examination Subcommittee is responsible for the review of examiners’ reports, coordination of recommendations emerging from the examination process, assessment of higher degrees by research (HDR) theses, and ensuring best practice in the thesis examination processes. The Subcommittee makes decisions in accordance with policies of Academic Senate relating to the HDR examination processes.

2. Role and responsibilities

The Committee is to:

(1) Advise the Research and Research Training Committee on:

(a) Policies and procedures governing the HDR examination;

(b) Identified problems or systemic issues in HDR thesis examination processes; and

(c) Statistics relating to the examination of PhD theses.

(2) Oversee the implementation of processes and policies governing the University’s HDR thesis examination;

(3) Consider submissions of HDR theses for examination, determine their appropriateness for examination, and approve examiners;

(4) Consider reports from examiners of HDR theses and make recommendations on the award of HDR degrees to the Research and Research Training Committee for approval;

(5) Make recommendations on the award of the Vice-Chancellor’s Commendation for HDR theses to the Research and Research Training Committee for approval; and

(6) Monitor the thesis examination progress of all candidates and take appropriate action where unreasonable delays are encountered.

3. Membership
The composition of this subcommittee shall be as follows:

(1) The Chair appointed by Chair of Academic Senate,
(2) Dean of Higher Degree Research,
(3) A nominee of the Faculty Board of each Faculty,
(4) One elected member of Academic Senate, and
(5) Two academic staff members nominated by the Research and Research Training Committee.

4. Tenure

(1) The term of appointment of all appointed members shall be two (2) years.
(2) The Chair of Academic Senate may renew any such term of appointment.

5. Rules of operation

The Committee shall conduct its business subject to the general provisions of the Standing Orders for Committees of Academic Senate.
ITEM 8.5 UNIVERSITY COUNCIL AND ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING DATES FOR 2016

For noting.
ITEM 8.5 2016 UNIVERSITY COUNCIL AND ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING CYCLE

Issue
This paper provides the 2016 University Council and Academic Senate meeting dates in the following table. Governance Services will shortly send calendar invitations to Academic Senate members.

In addition planning for the Committees of Senate meeting dates for 2016 is being scoped to ensure greater alignment with Faculty Standards and Quality Committee and Faculty Board meeting dates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNCIL</th>
<th>ACADEMIC SENATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>25 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>16 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.30am to 12.00 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>7 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>5 April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.30am to 12.00 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesday 24 May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.30am to 12.00 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>30 June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>26 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.30am to 12.00 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>25 August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTMBER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>13 September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.30am to 12.00 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>27 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>1 November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.30am to 12.00 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>8 December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At 3pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>6 December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.30am to 12.00 noon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Transition meeting of new members]

Consultation Process
The 2016 Council and Academic Senate meeting dates were endorsed by the University Council on 2 July 2015.

Recommendation:
That Academic Senate RESOLVE TO NOTE the 2016 University Council and Academic Senate meeting dates.

Operational Impact: The University Council and Academic meeting dates have University-wide impact, with the Committees of Council and the Committees of Academic Senate and Committees reporting to Senate feeding into this reporting cycle.

All staff should note the dates, particularly those responsible for providing reports to these senior bodies.

Submitted by: Professor Dominic Verity, Chair of Academic Senate

For enquiries contact: Amanda Phelps, University Committee Secretary
Amanda.Phelps@mq.edu.au or extension 7316
ITEM 8.6   VICE-CHANCELLOR COMMENDATIONS - UNDERGRADUATE

For approval.

Recommended Resolution:
That the Vice-Chancellor's Commendation be awarded to the 8 Bachelor degree graduands listed at item 8.6 of the 25 August 2015 Academic Senate Agenda.
ITEM 8.6 VICE-CHANCELLOR’S COMMENDATIONS

NOMINATIONS FOR BACHELOR DEGREE CANDIDATES

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Student name</th>
<th>Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83184252</td>
<td>ADAMS, Libby</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41915968</td>
<td>COURTIS, Margaret Catherine</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42610206</td>
<td>HAMMERLE, Mara Maile</td>
<td>Bachelor of Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43428029</td>
<td>MARDIAN, Ricky</td>
<td>Bachelor of Applied Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42736129</td>
<td>ROSENBERG, Alexandra</td>
<td>Bachelor of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43437346</td>
<td>UONG, Tien Tai</td>
<td>Bachelor of Applied Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42738083</td>
<td>HANCOCK, Ronald Stephen</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42869730</td>
<td>MADDOX, Carly Anna</td>
<td>Bachelor of Advanced Science</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 Bachelor degree 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 8.7 VICE-CHANCELLOR COMMENDATIONS - POSTGRADUATE

For approval.

Recommended Resolution:
That the Vice-Chancellor’s Commendation be awarded to the 32 Master Coursework graduands listed at item 8.7 of the 25 August 2015 Academic Senate Agenda.
ITEM 8.7  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>
</table>
| Faculty of Arts
| 40081729   | BALMER, Karin         | Master of Arts               |
| 43038522   | BAXTER, Susan Lea     | Master of Arts               |
| 41467590   | BESSANT, Nathan Philip| Master of Arts               |
| 40040356   | CALDER, Lynda Anne    | Master of Arts               |
| 41765532   | CORRIGAN, Laura Carolina | Master of Future Journalism |
| 42141982   | HALL, Fleur           | Master of Policy and Applied Social Research |
| 4364493    | MACKERRAS, Kirsten Hope | Master of Arts               |
| 42836956   | O'BRIEN, Grace Marie  | Master of Indigenous Education |
| 43206956   | STEINWEISS, Kathryn Jayne | Master of Politics and Public Policy |
| 42486475   | WHITE, Mark           | Master of Arts               |
| 42787114   | WILSON, Joshua Robert | Master of Arts               |
| Faculty of Business and Economics
| 41233972   | KING, Robert David    | Master of Accounting (Professional) |
| 43140661   | LANGLEY, Catherine Ann| Master of Applied Finance    |
| 42985382   | SHENTU, Liyang        | Master of Accounting (Professional) |
| 43221602   | YAP, Wai Tieng        | Master of Advanced Professional Accounting |
| Faculty of Human Sciences
| 42449219   | AMURAO, Kimberley     | Master of Special Education  |
| 43829953   | FORD, Bethany Joanne | Master of Applied Linguistics |
| 30271665   | GRAVINA, Josephine    | Master of Clinical Psychology |
| 43145450   | ANTEES, Cassandra     | Master of Clinical Neuropsychology |
| Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences
<p>| 43022839   | DEAN, Bridget         | Doctor of Physiotherapy      |
| 42474272   | SPRING, Rhyannon      | Doctor of Physiotherapy      |
| 43022454   | HUDSON, Stephanie     | Doctor of Physiotherapy      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43784666</td>
<td>CASSANO, Daniel</td>
<td>Master of Applied Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69276196</td>
<td>CROSS, Marilyn</td>
<td>Master of Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41481569</td>
<td>NAYLOR, Clare Margherite</td>
<td>Master of Environmental Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89231686</td>
<td>O'MEARA, Jennifer Margaret</td>
<td>Master of Environmental Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43365914</td>
<td>RODRIGUEZ ASQUI, Ivan Giancarlo</td>
<td>Master of Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42144930</td>
<td>SEETO, Mark Benjamín</td>
<td>Master of Applied Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43037968</td>
<td>STREET, Neil Edward</td>
<td>Master of Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42410657</td>
<td>THOMAS, Benjamin Claude</td>
<td>Master of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43772501</td>
<td>TURNER, Liam Sean</td>
<td>Master of Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43171400</td>
<td>WELSMAN, Evan Noel</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 32 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 8.8 TRANSITION ADMISSION SCHEME FOR SIBT STUDENTS

At the 21 July 2015 Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) meeting the Committee considered the request to seek endorsement of ASQC of the proposed Transition Admission Scheme for SIBT students, for the approval of Academic Senate. Professor Sherman Young outlined the request. The Committee acknowledged the transitional nature of this scheme due to the ending of the SIBT contract and noted the conditions of the scheme.

ASQC resolved to endorse the proposed Transition Admission Scheme for SIBT Students for the approval Academic Senate.

For approval.

Recommended Resolution:
Academic Senate approves the proposed Transition Admission Scheme for SIBT Students.
ITEM 8.4: TRANSITION ADMISSION SCHEME FOR SIBT STUDENTS

Issue:
At the time the SIBT contract ends on 12th February 2016 it is estimated that there will be up to 900 students who are partway through their Diploma program on the North Ryde campus.

Whilst the four MUIC Diploma programs being offered and the timing of the offering (being MUIC’s teaching term 2) are likely to be attractive to most of those continuing SIBT Diploma students, there are three groups who may be disadvantaged by a lack of available transition options.

These groups include:

1. All continuing SIBT Domestic Diploma students – MUIC is unable to enrol Domestic students due to funding/CSP restraints under our current funding agreement with the Commonwealth
2. Continuing SIBT International Diploma students who have packaged offers into a Macquarie Degree where MUIC has no articulation pathway.
3. Continuing SIBT International Diploma students who have only 1 or 2 units still to complete. If these students complete their units at MUIC in teaching term 2 (ending on 15/4/2016) they will have to wait 15 weeks to enrol in their degree program in Macquarie University session 2.

We propose a “transition admission scheme” enabling appropriately qualified SIBT students, who are partway through their Diploma program, admission into a Macquarie Degree. The conditions of this “transition admission scheme” are that the student has:

1. Completed a minimum of 4 Diploma units.
2. A Grade Point Average of 2.0 or above (as per existing articulation requirement).

Both International and Domestic students would be eligible to apply for direct entry into the “transition admission scheme”. A precedent for such criteria exists with the Next Step program, which enables non-award students with 4 completed units entry into an undergraduate degree.

Those students who do not meet the conditions would need to complete their Diploma program at either MUIC or SIBT’s city campus.

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

1. Macquarie College Transition Task Force*
2. Professor Dominic Verity
3. Associate Professor Pamela Coutts – Associate Dean (Course Quality Assurance) – (Faculty of Human Sciences)
4. Jonathan Wylie, Deputy Registrar

* Macquarie College Transition Task Force membership

Professor John Simons, DVC (Academic) – Chair
Professor Jim Lee, DVC (International) – co-Chair
Mr John Gorman, CFO
Dr Paul Schreier, COO
Ms Deidre Anderson, DVC (Students)
Professor Mark Gabbott, Executive Dean (FBE)
Professor Sherman Young, PVC LT&D
Jake Garman, College Director, MUIC

Paul Luttrell, General Counsel
Nicole Brigg, Director (International)
John Chatterton, Interim Director (Marketing)
Steve Robertson (Project Consultant)
Noni Przybylski (MUIC Project)
JoAnne Page (MQC Project)

Recommendation:
That ASQC endorse the Transition Admission Scheme as proposed for the approval of Academic Senate
**Operational Impact:**

SIBT students would be required to apply for entry under this scheme. An appropriate time to publicise the details of this scheme would be in August and September 2015 towards the end of SIBT’s session 2. This should provide sufficient time to assess each application and create a unique articulation path for each student.

The Curriculum Working Group would develop, in liaison with the Associate Deans Learning and Teaching from each of the Faculties, a standard application form. The applications would be processed and assessed against the agreed criteria with appropriate Faculty input. Details of all applications would be provided to relevant offices (e.g. Faculties, Registrar’s office and Analytics).

**Submitted by:**
Professor Sherman Young, PVC – Learning, Teaching and Diversity

**For enquiries contact:**
Professor Sherman Young
ITEM 9.1  ACADEMIC SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE

Attached are reports from the meetings held on 14 July and 4 August 2015.

For noting.
The 14 July 2015 Academic Senate meeting was cancelled and converted into an Academic Senate Standing Committee (Standing Committee) meeting.

ITEMS APPROVED
At the 16 June 2015 Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) meeting ten new 2016 awards were considered and recommended for approval by Academic Senate.

The Standing Committee approved the academic case and subject to confirmation from the ASQC that the feedback provided at the meeting of 16 June 2015 has been incorporated, approved the following seven awards: Bachelor of Applied Finance with the degree of Bachelor of Business Analytics, Bachelor of Business Analytics with the degree of Bachelor of Security Studies, Bachelor of Commerce – Professional Accounting with the degree of Bachelor of Business Analytics, Bachelor of Economics with the degree of Bachelor of Business Analytics, Bachelor of Security Studies with the degree of Bachelor of Laws, Master of Applied Linguistics, Master of Policy and Applied Social Research (OUA).

The remaining three new awards - Diploma of Speech and Communication, Graduate Certificate of Business Psychology and Graduate Diploma of Business Psychology - were not approved as confirmation of the business case approval had not been received.

The 16 June 2015 ASQC meeting also recommended for approval an exception to minimum requirements. The Standing Committee approved that an exemption be granted for the requirement that students complete a minimum of 32 credit points at 800 level or above, for students who have completed the Graduate Diploma of Auslan–English Interpreting articulating into the Master of Translation and Interpreting Studies, effective 1 January 2016. This exception to the minimum requirements will enable such students to receive RPL for a maximum of 32 credit points towards the Master of Translation and Interpreting Studies, leaving 16 credit points to complete in the Master.

On the recommendation of the 16 June 2015 ASQC, the Standing Committee also approved a new major Counselling Theory and Principles, effective 1 January 2016, subject to the structure amendments proposed at the 16 June 2015 ASQC meeting being provided to ASQC.

The Standing Committee approved a request for approval to proceed to establish a working party tasked with the development of a University policy and procedures on the issuance of qualifications and related procedures. The Chair noted consideration of possible amendments to the Delegations of Authority and the development of a governance framework around non-award courses offered by Macquarie.

The process of the Assessment of Emeritus Professor nominations was considered and the Chair acknowledged that he had become aware that the process prescribed by the Award of Emeritus Professor Policy and Procedure had not been strictly complied with by Academic Senate when considering these nominations. The Chair proposed that a working group be established to develop a Terms of Reference for consideration of the assessment of Emeritus Professor nominations moving forward and the Committee members were supportive of this approach.

ITEMS FOR NOTING
The Chair noted that Professor Jacqueline Phillips had been elected by members of Academic Senate as the new Deputy Chair of Academic Senate. It was noted that this would be the last meeting for Professor Sherman Young as he was no longer the Chair of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee nor Deputy Chairperson of Academic Senate.

The Standing Committee considered the Higher Doctoral Degree Committee (HDDC) Report of 2 June 2015 and the reports of three external examiners. Members considered the case and highlighted that a Higher Doctoral Degree award is to be awarded for distinguished service and noted in this case that the Faculty and 2 out of 3 examiners were not in favour of this award being granted. The members concluded that they were not supportive of this award being granted in this case and confirmed the recommendation of the HDDC not to award a Higher Doctoral Degree to the candidate. It was also resolved to establish a working party to review the Terms of Reference, processes, membership and authorisations of the Higher Doctoral Degree Committee.

Members also noted that at the 19 June 2015 Higher Degree Research Committee, two students were awarded a Vice-Chancellor's commendation, six students completed the requirements of the Master of Research, and a proposal to establish a joint PhD Program with the University of Southampton was approved.

The next meeting of Academic Senate Standing Committee will be held on Tuesday 4 August 2015.

Professor Dominic Verity
CHAIR
ITEMS FOR APPROVAL
The Academic Senate Standing Committee (Standing Committee) approved the co-option of undergraduate student Ms Julia Yang from the Faculty of Human Sciences, to fill the casual vacancy on Academic Senate. As a result, Academic Senate now has a full complement of student representatives.

ITEMS FOR NOTING
The Standing Committee received an update on the approval of business cases following the meeting of 14 July 2015. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic informed the Standing Committee that a pro forma for business case approval was currently under development, which would assist in the streamlining of approval processes for new programs.

A paper concerning the award of supplementary exams in the Faculty of Business and Economics was discussed. This related to an issue concerning the award of supplementary exams for students who achieved a Standardised Numerical Grade (SNG) mark of between 40-49 in their final unit of study, and as a result, have been prevented from graduating. In response to this issue, the Standing Committee confirmed support for the following course of action:
(a) Task the results ratification working party of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) with a review of the handling of supplementary examinations processes in all Faculties, as part of its broader analysis of Session 1, Ratification of Results; and
(b) The Assessment & Grading working party of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC) will be tasked with the re-consideration of the conditions under which the University will award supplementary examinations to students.

The Standing Committee confirmed membership nominations for SLTC and ASQC. The Standing Committee approved a request from ASQC to expand the number of co-opted members allowed under the Standing Orders from 3 to 5, on the basis of workload and the need for expert knowledge. The Chair noted that the Chair of SLTC is yet to be determined and that conversations are ongoing. The Standing Committee approved the membership of the Macquarie University International College (MUIC) Subcommittee of ASQC, and the Chair thanked Dr Catriona Lavermicocca for agreeing to be the Chair of this Subcommittee.

Draft terms of reference for the MGSM Academic Board were presented to the Standing Committee for comment. Members were advised that the terms of reference would be discussed at an MGSM meeting scheduled for 25 August and will return to Senate for final approval.

The Standing Committee reviewed the draft terms of reference for the proposed Research & Research Training Committee and Thesis Examination Subcommittee and the Chair updated members on the progress of ongoing consultations.

The Standing Committee considered an update from the English Language Policy Implementation Working Group and subsequently approved the English Language Implementation Pilot Plan. However, the Standing Committee recommended that the pilot study be expanded to trial implementation in more analytical units such as those in maths, science and computing. The Chair agreed to raise these concerns with the Pro-Vice Chancellor Learning and Teaching. Following the pilot study, further work will be undertaken on the procedure and schedule to accompany the English Language Policy.

The Standing Committee approved the Terms of Reference for the Emeritus Professor Working Party of Academic Senate. The working party will assess nominations on behalf of Academic Senate in accordance with the criteria and process outlined in the Award of Emeritus Professor Policy and Procedure.

The Standing Committee noted the Higher Degree Research Appeals Committee minutes of meetings held 28 April, 19 May and 11 June 2015.

The next meeting of the Academic Senate Standing Committee will be held on Thursday 10 September 2015.

Professor Dominic Verity
CHAIR
ITEM 9.2  ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND QUALITY COMMITTEE

Attached are reports from the meetings held on 19 May, 16 June and 21 July 2015.

19 MAY 2015 MEETING
Arising out of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee meeting of 19 May 2015, the following items recommended for approval were considered at the 2 June 2015 Academic Senate meeting:

- New Major in English as a Foreign Language
  
  **Resolution 15/63**
  Academic Senate approves the academic case for the new Major in English as a Foreign Language, effective 1 January 2016.

- Master of Accounting (ACCA Extension) – Name change
  
  **Resolution 15/64**
  Academic Senate approves that the Master of Accounting (ACCA Extension) be renamed to the Master of International Accounting, effective 1 January 2016.

- ASQC Terms of Reference
  Arising out of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee meeting of 19 May 2015, the ASQC Terms of Reference was considered and approved at the 4 August 2015 Academic Senate Standing Committee meeting.

16 JUNE 2015 MEETING
Arising out of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee meeting of 16 June 2015, the following items recommended for approval were considered at the 14 July 2015 Academic Senate Standing Committee meeting:

- Proposals for New Awards
  
  **Resolution 15/18**
  That the Academic Senate Standing Committee approves the academic case and subject to confirmation from the Academic Standards and Quality Committee that the feedback provided at the meeting of 16 June 2015 has been incorporated, approves the following seven awards:

  Bachelor of Applied Finance with the degree of Bachelor of Business Analytics  
  Bachelor of Business Analytics with the degree of Bachelor of Security Studies  
  Bachelor of Commerce – Professional Accounting with the degree of Bachelor of Business Analytics  
  Bachelor of Economics with the degree of Bachelor of Business Analytics  
  Bachelor of Security Studies with the degree of Bachelor of Laws  
  Master of Applied Linguistics  
  Master of Policy and Applied Social Research (OUA).

  **Resolution 15/19**
  That the Academic Senate Standing Committee provides the Chair of Academic Senate with the authority to approve the following upon confirmation of business case approval by the Executive Group and pending consultation with the Chair of Academic Standards and Quality Committee:

  Diploma of Speech and Communication  
  Graduate Certificate of Business Psychology  
  Graduate Diploma of Business Psychology
• **Application for Exception of Minimum Requirements: Schedule B Postgraduate Awards – Graduate Diploma of Auslan-English Interpreting**

**Resolution 15/24**
That the Academic Senate Standing Committee approves the exception be granted for the requirement that students complete a minimum of 32 credit points at 800 level or above, for students who have completed the Graduate Diploma of Auslan-English Interpreting articulating into the Master of Translation and Interpreting Studies, effective 1 January 2016. This exception to the minimum requirements will enable such students to receive RPL for a maximum of 32 credit points towards the Master of Translation and Interpreting Studies, leaving 16 credit points to complete in the Master.

• **Proposal for New Major - Counselling Theory and Principles**

**Resolution 15/25**
That the Academic Senate Standing Committee approves the new major Counselling Theory and Principles, effective 1 January 2016, subject to the structure amendments proposed at the 16 June 2015 Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) meeting being provided to ASQC.

• **Course Transfer Schedule – Change to Course Transfer Schedule Mid-year 2015**

The Chair of Academic Senate approved the mid-year 2015 undergraduate course transfer schedule, based on the recommendation of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee with effect from 26 June 2015.

**21 JULY 2015 MEETING**
Arising out of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee meeting of 21 July 2015 is the Transition Admission Scheme for SIBT students listed at item 8.8 for approval.

*For noting.*
ITEMS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

1. Program update – New Major in English as a Foreign Language

The Committee discussed this new Major which has a focus on English language, culture and communication. It is not intended to be a qualification for a teaching degree.

RESOLUTION

The Committee RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO ACADEMIC SENATE the academic case for the new Major in English as a Foreign Language as a qualifying major for the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Global Business effective 1 January 2016.

2. Program update – Name Change of Master of Accounting (ACCA Extension)

The Committee discussed the proposed change to recognise that a variety of students would wish to complete a postgraduate qualification that has an international focus, using ACCA Extension as a basis for a number of units.

RESOLUTION

The Committee RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO ACADEMIC SENATE that the Master of Accounting (ACCA Extension) be renamed to the Master of International Accounting, effective 1 January 2016.

3. ASQC Charter and Terms of Reference

The Committee discussed its Charter and Terms of Reference and Membership.

RESOLUTION

The Committee RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO ACADEMIC SENATE FOR APPROVAL the ASQC Charter and Terms of Reference.

ITEMS FOR NOTING

1. Late changes to the schedule of programs, majors or specialisations

The Committee noted the late program changes to TECE01 – Bachelor of Teaching (ECE) and ECEC01 – Bachelor of Education (ECE)(Birth-12)

2. Program changes to the Bachelor of Science and related double degrees

The Committee noted changes to the Bachelor of Science and related double degrees to add Foundation option sets to the Bachelor of Science so that students are required to do a quantitative unit.

RESOLUTION

The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the introduction of a Foundation requirement to the following degrees effective from 1 January 2016:

- Bachelor of Science
- Bachelor of Arts with the degree of Bachelor of Science
- Bachelor of Science with the degree of Bachelor of Laws
- Bachelor of Science with the degree of Bachelor of Laws (With Honours)
- Bachelor of Science with the degree of Bachelor of Education (Secondary)
- Bachelor of Actuarial Studies with the degree of Bachelor of Science
- Bachelor of Engineering with the degree of Bachelor of Science
- Bachelor of Engineering (With Honours) with the degree of Bachelor of Science.

3. Program update – Name change Master of Creative Media

The Committee noted that the change to the postgraduate program title from the Master of Creative Media (CRME13M) to the Master of Creative Industries was approved, effective 1 January 2016, by the Chair on Wednesday 13 May 2015.

4. Program update – updated structure of the Master of Banking and Finance

RESOLUTION

The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the changed structure of the Master of Banking and Finance from 1 January 2016.
5. Unit proposals – People, Planet, PACE or Capstone

RESOLUTION
The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the CAPSTONE UNITS, HLTH310 – Health Promotion and PHTY301 – Human Movement, effective from 1 January 2016.

The Committee RESOLVED to APPROVE the PEOPLE UNIT LAWX101 – Law, Human Rights and Global Governance, effective from 1 January 2016.

The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the PACE CAPSTONE UNITS, PICT312 (and PICX312 OUA) – Dynamic Simulation and Strategic Planning, effective 1 January 2016, subject to the requested further information being provided to the ASQC for approval.

The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the PACE UNIT PHL354 (recoded to PHIL344) – Philosophy Capstone, effective 1 January 2016, subject to the requested additional information being provided to the ASQC for approval.

6. 2016 Curriculum Changes Summary

RESOLUTION
The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the 2016 Curriculum Changes subject to the discussed amendments and information being received by the ASQC for approval.

7. Co-taught Units

RESOLUTION
The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the following co-taught units, effective 1 January 2016:

- LAWS543 Climate Change Law and LAWS851 Climate Change Law
- LAWS575 Advanced Topics in Environmental Law and LAWS853 Comparative Environmental Law
- LAWS582 Special Seminar 2 and LAWS852 Trade and Environment Law
- PICT850 Foundations of Security Studies and PICT705 Understanding Foundations of Security Studies
- POIR701 Advanced Studies in International Relations and POL821 Case Studies in Politics and Policy
- ECED834 Organisation of Early Childhood Education and ECED745 Organisation of Early Childhood Education.

8. Approval of MGSM Units and Programs

The Committee discussed the potential need for additional governance oversight of MGSM’s Standards and Quality Committee as MGSM does not fall under the new Faculty Rule. The Committee noted further discussions would be needed.

9. Faculty Reports

The Committee noted the Faculty Reports of Individual Student Cases.

The next meeting of ASQC will be held on Tuesday 16 June 2015: agenda items are due by Thursday 4 June 2015.

A full copy of the minutes summarised above will be accessible after the next meeting of ASQC via this link.

A/Professor Pamela Coutts - CHAIR
ITEMS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

1. Proposals for New Awards

The Committee considered the academic case for several new awards.

RESOLUTION
The Committee RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO ACADEMIC SENATE the academic case for the following awards, effective 1 January 2016:

- Diploma of Speech and Communication
- Bachelor of Applied Finance with the degree of Bachelor of Business Analytics
- Bachelor of Business Analytics with the degree of Bachelor of Security Studies
- Bachelor of Commerce – Professional Accounting with the degree of Bachelor of Business Analytics
- Bachelor of Economics with the degree of Bachelor of Business Analytics
- Bachelor of Security Studies with the degree of Bachelor of Laws
- Graduate Certificate of Business Psychology
- Graduate Diploma of Business Psychology
- Master of Applied Linguistics
- Master of Policy and Applied Social Research (OUA).

2. Proposal for New Major

The Committee considered a proposal for a new Major Counselling Theory and Principles as a qualifying major for the Bachelor of Human Sciences. The Committee noted that the major is intended for students who did not wish to undertake accreditation in psychology and suggested this be made clear in marketing material.

RESOLUTION
The Committee RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO ACADEMIC SENATE the academic case for the new major Counselling Theory and Principles, effective 1 January 2016 (subject to minor structural amendments being provided to ASQC).

3. Program Update – Exception to RPL Minimum Requirements Schedule B

The Committee considered an exception to the RPL Minimum Requirements Schedule B for the Master of Translation and Interpreting Studies for students who had successfully completed the Graduate Diploma of Auslan-English Interpreting.

RESOLUTION
The Committee RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO ACADEMIC SENATE that exception be granted for the requirement that students complete a minimum of 32 credit points at 800 level or above, for students who have completed the Graduate Diploma of Auslan-English Interpreting articulating into the Master of Translation and Interpreting Studies, effective 1 January 2016

4. Course Transfer Schedule – Change to Course Transfer Schedule for Mid-year 2015

RESOLUTION
The Committee RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO ACADEMIC SENATE the amendments to the mid-year 2015 undergraduate course transfer schedule.

ITEMS FOR NOTING

1. Approval of MGSM Units

The Committee resolved to approve several MGSM units – full details are available in item 3 of the Minutes.

2. Late Changes to the Schedule of Programs, Majors or Specialisations

The Committee considered several late changes to the 2015 and 2016 Schedule of Programs, Majors or Specialisations.

RESOLUTION
The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the late changes to the following 2015 specialisations with immediate effect: LTE11S – Learning and Teaching; LDM11S – Leadership and Management.
The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the late changes to the 2016 SCHEDULE of Programs, Majors and Specialisations, effective 1 January 2016:

- Bachelor of Marine Science
- Graduate Certificate of Education Studies
- Graduate Certificate of Higher Education
- Master of Early Childhood
- Master of Education
- Master of Educational Leadership (School Education)
- Higher Education specialisation
- Telecommunications Engineering major
- Wireless Engineering major
- Master of Educational Leadership (School Education)
- Master of Education (all specialisations).

3. Proposal to Amend Program Structure – Master of International Relations

RESOLUTION
The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the amended program structure of the Master of International Relations, effective 1 January 2016.

4. Discontinuation of Specialisations

RESOLUTION
The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the discontinuation of the specialisations: Actuarial Studies, Information Systems and Web Engineering, effective 31 December 2015.

5. Unit Proposals – People, Planet, PACE or Capstone

The Committee resolved to approve new People, PACE and Capstone designations, effective 1 January 2016 – for details refer to item 5.6 in the minutes.

6. Co-taught Unit

The Committee resolved to approve several co-taught units, effective 1 January 2016 – for details refer to item 5.7 in the minutes.

7. Recognition of Prior Learning

The Committee noted an issues paper from the Manager of Curriculum and Planning and the Lifecycle Manager on a review of postgraduate applications under the RPL Policy in 2015. The Committee resolved to approve the recommendations proposed – for full details refer to item 9.2 in the minutes.

8. Changes to MUIC Programs

The Committee considered a request for changes to MUIC programs submitted by the MUIC Director.

RESOLUTION
The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE that the commencement of the first offering of the Intensive Foundation Program be changed from September 2015 to late October 2015 and TO APPROVE the changes to the Diploma program structures/units.

9. Faculty Reports

The Committee noted the Faculty Reports of Individual Student Cases.

The next meeting of ASQC will be held on Tuesday 21 July 2015: agenda items are due by Friday 10 July 2015.

A full copy of the minutes summarised above will be accessible after the next meeting of ASQC via this link

A/Professor Pamela Coutts - CHAIR
ITEMS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

The Committee considered the proposed Admission Transition Scheme for SIBT students resulting from the conclusion of the University’s contract with SIBT.

RESOLUTION
The Committee ENDORSED the proposed Admission Transition Scheme for SIBT Students for the approval of Academic Senate.

ITEMS FOR NOTING

1. Late Changes to the 2015 Schedule of Programs, Majors or Specialisations

The Committee considered several late changes to the 2015 Schedule of Programs, Majors or Specialisations.

RESOLUTION
The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the 2015 late changes to the following programs with immediate effect:

- Postgraduate Certificate of Applied Finance – 2014
- Master of Applied Finance
- Graduate Diploma of Applied Finance.

2. Co-Taught Units for 2015

RESOLUTION
The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the request for co-taught units with immediate effect:

- PSY904 Working with Special Populations and PSYS841 Contemporary Issues in Social Health.

3. Late Changes to the 2016 Schedule of Programs, Majors and Specialisations

The Committee considered several late changes to the 2015 Schedule of Programs, Majors or Specialisations.

RESOLUTION
The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the 2016 late changes to the following programs, effective 1 January 2016:

- Graduate Certificate of Editing and Electronic Publishing
- Leading Teaching specialisation – Graduate Certificate of Education Studies
- Bachelor of Teaching (Early Childhood Education)
- Graduate Diploma of Auslan-English Interpreting
- Bachelor of Business Administration
- Bachelor of Commerce – Professional Accounting
- Graduate Certificate of International Relations
- Graduate Certificate of Politics and Public Policy.

4. Co-Taught Units for 2016

RESOLUTION
The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the request to co-teach AFCP613 Financial Statement Analysis and Modelling and AFCP813 Financial Statement Analysis and Modelling for the next offering. Approval for future offerings would be subject to further documentation being received by ASQC.

RESOLUTION
The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the request to co-badge PSYC439 Evolution of Social Sexual and Emotional Behaviour and PSYC739 Evolution of Social Sexual and Emotional Behaviour, effective January 2016.

5. Unit Approval

RESOLUTION
The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE a Capstone designation to the following units, effective 1 January 2016: Bus301 Global Business Strategy; MGMT310 Entrepreneurship Project.
6. **Program and Unit Review Cycles**

The Committee discussed a Draft Discussion Paper on Quality Assurance Principles of Program and Unit Reviews and determined that a Working Group should be formed to continue this work.

7. **Ratification Of Session 1 2015 Examination Results Reports**

The Committee noted the Ratification of Results reports received from Faculty Boards. The Committee noted its responsibility for ensuring that established processes were followed by the Faculties, and that ASQC would then present a summary report on institutional-level issues and themes for consideration by Academic Senate.

8. **General Business**

**RESOLUTION**

*The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE an International Articulation Agreement with the ITESM, Mexico.*

**RESOLUTION**

*The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the granting of exemption of a generic People unit for any Singapore Polytechnic 3-year diploma student who has completed a minimum of three General Education Units.*

The next meeting of ASQC will be held on Tuesday 18 August 2015: agenda items are due by Friday 7 August 2015.

**A full copy of the minutes summarised above will be accessible after the next meeting of ASQC via this link**

A/Professor Pamela Coutts – CHAIR

Meeting Chaired by Professor Dominic Verity
ITEM 9.3  HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH APPEALS COMMITTEE

Attached are the minutes of the Higher Degree Research Appeals Committee meeting held 30 July 2015.

*For noting.*
A meeting of the Higher Degree Research Appeals Committee was held on Thursday 30th July 2015 at 3pm in the Higher Degree Research Office Meeting Room C5C Level 3 (East Wing)

PRESENT: Professor Julie Fitness (Chair)
        Professor Anne Castles (Faculty of Human Sciences)
        Associate Professor Brian Atwell (Faculty of Science and Engineering)
        Professor Alberto Avolio (Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences)

IN ATTENDANCE: Ms. Jennifer Martin (Higher Degree Research Office)

APOLOGIES: Dr Alison Holland (Faculty of Arts) Conflict of Interest
        Dr Chris Baumann (Faculty of Business and Economics)
        Ms. Amanda Phelps (Academic Governance)

A meeting of the Higher Degree Research Appeal Committee (HDRAC) was held to determine the Committee’s response in the case of Master of Research Candidate 43567274

1. Procedural introduction

In relation to this case, the Committee discussed in particular the Nomination of Examiners (NoE) procedure for the Master of Research. This process differs from PhD NoE processes in that the candidate does not sign off on potential examiners who have been agreed upon with the supervisor. Instead, the candidate is allowed verbally to veto examiners they do not want to have examine their thesis, but this is not formalised on the NoE form. The NoE form is processed at the Faculty level, and not centrally as for PhD examiners.

The candidate in the case being considered at this meeting is questioning the academic judgment of one of the three examiners chosen in particular (Examiner B).

The candidate is also claiming that their anonymity was compromised in relation to the third, who was internal. The candidate is arguing that because the MQ examiner was aware of their identity, a possible negative bias will have affected their marking of the thesis. It should be noted that third examiners are no longer internally appointed as a process improvement for Master of Research examinations.

2. Conflicts of Interest

Dr Alison Holland’s self-assessed conflict of interest with this case being from her Department was noted prior to the meeting. Dr Holland did not attend this meeting.

3. Candidate 43567274

Committee Discussion from documentation
The Committee made reference to the Dean, Higher Degree Research’s letter to the
Candidate (Agenda page 53) addressing the request of the Candidate for the PESC committee to review the examination result. The Committee noted that the discrepancy between the numerical marks and the comments of examiners, and how these are communicated to the Candidates, appears to be an issue in this case, similar to others investigated by the Committee.

The Committee noted that from the documentation presented there had been some conflict between the Supervisor and the Candidate. However, such supervisory conflicts are not the subject of this appeal by the Candidate.

**Appeal Claim: Examiner B biased, did not examine thesis in a procedurally correct and fair manner**

The Committee noted that its role was not to determine a new grade, but that it was empowered to refer cases back to PESC and the Faculties for review, moderation or re-examination.

**The Faculty Associate Dean (HDR) presented to the Committee at 2.30pm**

In response to questioning from the Committee, the Faculty provided the following details:
- the ADHDR has provided Faculty correspondence to the Candidate and attended this meeting to assist the Committee to separate out the background of supervisory issues between the Candidate and their supervisor and the appeal being investigated by the Committee
- the ADHDR confirmed that in the Faculty of Arts the Master of Research candidates do not sign off on the examiners chosen to examine their thesis
- the Faculty HDR office checks potential examiners nominated by Supervisors. The checks include that they are research active, and are qualified to examine theses
- The ADHDR confirmed that the two external examination reports are received by the Faculty HDR office, that then the Dean, HDR centrally decides if a third examiner is required, and that if a third examiner is required then the MRes Director in the Faculty (Dr Noah Bassil for Arts in 2014) is asked to nominate a suitable third examiner
- The ADHDR advised the Committee that internal third examiners were chosen based on their research interest, and not having been involved in or interested in future supervision of the Candidate. They may be in the same Department as the Candidate’s supervisor, but they are determined as not having a conflict of interest
- The ADHDR confirmed that the Supervisor only comments on Master of Research theses examiner reports if the Candidate is going to be asked to revise and resubmit or if one of the examiners recommends a Fail grade. There is no moderation of examiner comments between the Supervisor and the Candidate as there is for PhD examinations
- The Candidate is appealing on the second marker’s (Marker B) report. They would not have known the specific numerical grades at the time of appeal (subsequent Freedom of Information request and access to Appeal agenda papers with Part A of the examiner reports including the numerical grades)
- The ADHDR confirmed that the thesis grade is worth 90% of the final grade, and Research Frontiers 2 grade is worth 10% of the final grade. The final grade this Candidate would receive, after corrections, will not be high enough for entry to a PhD here at Macquarie, nor for a scholarship
- The ADHDR confirmed the Faculty’s support for the Candidate to complete and graduate with the Masters of Research. Dr Bassil is available to assist with the corrections process.
- The 112 pages of email correspondence were provided to demonstrate the Faculty’s support of the candidate throughout the Master of Research
- The ADHDR confirmed he was not directly involved in the conflict situation between the Candidate and the Supervisor
- The Faculty managed the conflict situation with the supervisors involved being removed from the candidate’s candidature management.
- the ADHDR confirmed that he is not aware of any official grievance complaint lodged by the Candidate against the Supervisor, and that therefore this situation was managed by the Department and the Faculty
- The ADHDR agreed with the Committee that the Candidate has misunderstood how the examination process works, particularly in his belief that Examiner B’s report ‘over turned’ the more positive Examiner A’s report
- The ADHDR attempted on three occasions to meet with the Candidate to explain the processes, but the Candidate did not respond to these three attempts

The Candidate presented to the Committee at 3pm (Teleconference)
In response to questioning from the Committee, the Candidate provided the following details:
- The Candidate advised the Committee of their belief that Examiner B did not read the whole of the thesis because of the lack of reference to the final chapter in their report
- The Candidate advised the Committee that from information available, they believe that Examiner B rejected a PhD application to their University from the Candidate, that they are therefore negatively biased, and should not have been nominated as an examiner for this thesis.
- The Candidate advised that their time in Australia for the Master of Research study was unhappy due to being under funded, having a bad living situation and health issues
- The Candidate wants to continue to PhD research, and is confident of their abilities to do this based on the favorable report of Examiner A
- The Candidate also believes that the Third Examiner would have been negatively biased towards the Candidate due to public altercations with the Candidate’s supervisors in close proximity to other Department staff offices
- The Candidate claims they have in writing from the Dean that the right to anonymity of the Candidate was not enforced for the third examination when it should have been
- However, the Candidate does not want the thesis to be examined by another external examiner and accepts the report (though not the mark) of Examiner C as being quite reasonable. However, the candidate wants Examiner B’s report and mark to be overturned.
- The Candidate believes that Examiner B’s and C’s marks being both in the low 50s is “not a coincidence”.

After the presentations, the Committee deliberated further on the case. It was noted that, had the appeal been based on the irregularity of Examiner C’s report, there would have been grounds to set it aside because of the lack of candidate anonymity. This would mean a 3rd, external examiner would have been appointed to resolve the grading issue. However, the candidate wants an externally appointed examiner’s report and mark to be set aside on the basis that the examiner did not fully engage with their thesis. However, in relation to the NoE process, neither we nor the Faculty could know if the claim of the Candidate is true, ie, that he had been going to apply for a PhD position with the examiner he believes to be Examiner B and that he subsequently believes he made a ‘bad impression’ on them by submitting a very rough protocol and missing appointments. No conflict of interest was noted by the Faculty for this examiner as part of their checking at the time of NOE.

The Committee was therefore not able to find any evidence of any procedural irregularity or unfairness in relation to the appointment of Examiner B, and this examiner’s detailed thesis report did not support the Candidate’s grounds of appeal regarding the engagement of Examiner B with the thesis and examination guidelines.

Hence, the Committee agreed that the claim of procedural unfairness and irregularity in this case should not be upheld.
4. Conclusion

The Committee agreed that the appeal of Candidate 40973484 is to not be upheld on the grounds that the current procedures were followed by the three examiners and the University, specifically by ‘Examiner B’ and that this report cannot be discounted as part of this examination process.

5. Next Meetings

Master of Research case Thursday 27th August 2015
PhD case Tuesday 17th September 2015

6. Procedure improvements suggested through the investigations for this case:

1. It was noted in the course of discussions that in this faculty, one examiner could potentially examine a number of Master of Research theses. The ADHDR acknowledged that in the case where one examiner is marking several theses, it is unavoidable that they may rank them in relation to each other, despite being instructed to mark each on its own merits. The Committee suggests a review of the practice of examiners doing ‘bulk’/’or job lot’ examinations to confirm that they are not ranking the theses they are examining, but are examining each on their individual merits as instructed.

2. The Committee suggests a review of the Master of Research NoE procedures, specifically on the possibility of these being aligned with the PhD examination procedures of Candidates signing off on the list of potential examiners for their thesis.

3. In regards to the Master of Research Marking Grades (agenda papers pp. 16-17) and instructions to examiners, the Committee suggests potential review of the information to examiners, in particular making it clearer that the MRes thesis is based on one (partial) year of research, and not two, as is the case for many other Masters courses.
ITEM 9.4    SENATE LEARNING AND TEACHING COMMITTEE

Attached are reports from the meetings held on 15 June, 13 July and 10 August 2015.

Arising out of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee meeting is the Student Disability Support Policy listed at item 6.4 for approval.

For noting.
ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

Student Disability Support Policy
The Student Disability Support Policy is recommended for approval by the Academic Senate.
(Refer to Agenda, Item 2.1)

ITEMS FOR NOTING

Chair’s report
The Chair provided an oral report on the following matters:

- Chair of Academic Senate – The Chair congratulated Professor Dominic Verity on his successful re-election to his role as the Chair of Academic Senate.
- Chair of SLTC – The Chair will continue to act as Chair of SLTC at the July meeting.
- Learning and Teaching Strategic Framework – It was advised that an addendum to the Green Paper has been published and should be taken in to consideration when submitting feedback to the Green Paper.
  The Chair reported that the Town Hall meeting held 9 June 2015 was a success and passed thanks to all of those who were involved.
- Working Groups of SLTC – Following the resolution of Academic Senate, two working groups of SLTC are in the process of being established:
  - Academic Progression and Students at Risk, and;
  - Review of Assessment and Grading Policies
  To assist the groups in their task, the primary documentation that is to be considered by the working groups is currently being drafted. Following this, the terms of reference and memberships of the groups will be finalised.

General Business

- Themed Discussion – Dr Ayse Bilgin lead discussions surrounding Mastery of Learning/Examinations. Following the discussion, the Committee determined that MoL should be considered by the Assessment and Grading Policies working group.
- Student Discipline Rule and Procedure – The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar) and the Head of Governance Services provided an update on this matter. It was advised that with there will be training provided to necessary staff. HR are currently conducting a needs analysis for training.
- SLTC Membership – The terms of reference, as approved by Academic Senate 2 June 2015 were noted by the Committee. It was noted that the membership listed within the Terms of Reference is still subject to Faculty Board and Executive Dean nomination.
  All members were reminded that the meetings of Academic Senate and its Committees are open to those who wish to attend.
- Academic Appeals Data – Session 2, 2014 Academic Appeals data was provided to the Committee for noting. It was resolved that Governance Services are to provide Academic Appeals Data after each appeal period, which includes a proportionate breakdown by Faculty; Program; Undergraduate and Postgraduate.
- International Students and study load requirements – Following a request by SLTC in March, information in relation to the minimum study load requirements for international students was provided. Paul Fairweather, Quality Assurance and Compliance Manager attended the meeting to answer any questions from the Committee members.
- The Reading Game – Robert Parker, Educational Developer attended the meeting where all members were asked to participate in the immersive demonstration.

Reports from Faculties
The reports from Faculty of Arts, Faculty of Business and Economics, Faculty of Human Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences and Faculty of Science and Engineering were considered. A pattern within the Faculty reports was identified in relation to Academic Integrity and Assessment. Accordingly, a short discussion was facilitated.

The next meeting of SLTC will be held on Monday 15 July 2015; agenda items are due Thursday 2 July 2015.

A full copy of the minutes summarised above can be accessed via this link.

Professor Sherman Young
CHAIR
ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

English Language Policy
The English Language Policy, Procedure, Schedule and Implementation Pilot Plan is recommended for approval by the Academic Senate. (Refer to Agenda, Item 7.4)

ITEMS FOR NOTING

Chair’s report
The Chair provided an oral report on the following matters:

- **Learning and Teaching Strategy.** The deadline for submissions to the Green Paper has closed with approximately 100 written submissions received. The Reference Group conducted an initial review of submissions and the PVC L&T office is currently synthesising these submissions. A White Paper will be drafted shortly for consideration by the Reference Group.
- **Chair of SLTC.** The appointment of the Chair of SLTC is pending.
- **Office for Learning and Teaching (OLT).** A new learning and teaching institute is to be established following a consultative process including Macquarie University representatives.
- **Delegations of Authority Non-award Courses.** The Chair of SLTC has held discussions with the Chair of Academic Senate and Governance Services about Delegations of Authority relating to Non-award Courses.
- **Big History MOOC.** This will be available on Coursera next month.
- **Academic Integrity Working Group.** Initial discussions have been held with Dr Tracy Bretag (University of South Australia), with a view to establishing the working group shortly.

General Business

- **Assessment and Grading Policies Working Group.** A draft policy has been prepared for consultation based on the principles of assessment. Nominations to join the working group will be sought from staff with appropriate expertise from each Faculty and the Learning and Teaching Centre. An update will be provided to the next meeting.
- **Recognising and Rewarding Teaching Excellence.** A draft policy had been prepared and during discussion it was suggested that it be renamed to “Learning and Teaching Grants and Awards Policy”. Further amendments were also suggested and the policy is to return to SLTC for further consideration.
- **Membership of SLTC.** The Chair formally thanked all outgoing members for their contributions.
- **Disruption to Studies.** The recommendations of the Working Group were discussed and a majority of their recommendations were endorsed, a redrafted paper is to return to the next SLTC meeting.
- **Session Offerings Working Group – update.** The proposed models, including the 6 x 6 model was discussed and further discussion of the Four Semester Model is to be had by the Working Group who will provide a progress report to the office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor.
- **Themed Discussion.** Associate Professor Ian Solomonides lead discussions surrounding Research, Scholarship and Practice. The Committee noted that the Learning and Teaching Strategic Framework will encompass some of the ideas presented.

Reports from Offices
The reports from the Centre for Open Education, PACE, the Library, and Learning and Teaching Centre were noted.

The next meeting of SLTC will be held on Monday 10 August 2015.
A full copy of the minutes summarised above can be accessed via this link.

Professor Sherman Young
CHAIR
ITEMS FOR NOTING

Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) report

- Learning and Teaching Strategy. The development of the White Paper is on target, and will be launched in the Learning and Teaching Week in September with a view to implementation from October 2015.
- Macquarie University International College (MUIC) and Macquarie City Campus. Plans are underway to meet the scheduled November 2015 launch of the Macquarie University International College (MUIC) on campus. Macquarie City Campus will only provide postgraduate programs from 2016, but the inclusion of undergraduate programs may be reviewed at a future date.
- Draft Indigenous Strategy Green Paper. The Indigenous Strategy continues to be developed to deliver high quality student experiences using extensive stakeholder consultation and town hall meetings. Policies will be developed to capture objectives in research and learning and teaching activities.

Chair’s report

The Chair of Academic Senate assumed the Chair for this meeting and reported on the following

- Membership and Revised Terms of Reference. The appointment of the new Chair is pending. The refreshed membership of the newly constituted Committee is now in place.
- Learning and Teaching Strategy White Paper. The Committee will host the launch of the Learning and Teaching Strategy White Paper during Teaching and Learning week in September. Members will meet after the formalities for detailed discussions about Committee’s role in the governance of the strategy for feedback to Academic Senate.

Strategy and policy

- Assessment. The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) reported on the development of University-wide policy and procedures governing assessments. A working group will further progress this following the September launch of the Learning and Teaching Strategy White Paper.
- Academic Integrity Working Group Update. Dr Tracey Bretag (University of South Australia) and Dr Teddi Fishman (Clemson University) will join the 18-19 November 2015 workshop to scope an effective Academic Integrity project plan. Interested academics and student representatives are invited to express interest in joining the Working Group by contacting the Chair. The group will present a project plan to the October SLTC meeting.
- Disruption to Studies – Working Group Recommendations. The Manager, Student Connect spoke to the report. It was suggested that a flowchart be created to plot the management framework including the roles/responsibilities of all stakeholders. Campus Wellbeing will identify a more definite procedural path in assisting students following the outcome of a Disruption to Studies application.
- Last Unit Supplementary Assessments. There are inconsistencies between Faculties in providing supplementary assessments for students who fail their last unit of study. Session 1, 2015 process matters have been referred to the ASQC for further enquiry. The Assessment and Grading Working Party will report on the conditions under which the University may award supplementary examinations at the next meeting.
- Student Disability Support Procedures. The Director Campus Wellbeing and Support reported on the development of the new procedures, and will provide the suite of documents to the next meeting.
- Grade Point Average Discussion. The Committee discussed a paper on the transition to a 7 point scale for Grade Point Average (GPA) as endorsed by Academic Senate in April 2014, noting that Macquarie International College (MUIC) has moved directly to a 7 point GPA in anticipation of broader adoption by the University. Following considerable discussion on the two options provided, this matter was referred to ASQC for further consideration.

General Business

- Big History MOOC. The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) presented a demonstration of the Big History MOOC, which will be shortly be launched on Coursera. This will be the focus of a keynote panel discussion with Professor David Christian during the Learning and Teaching Week activities.
- Changes to Session 3 Last Day to Enrol. A pilot scheme to introduce early online student enrolment (units/classes) for 2016 will commence on Monday 14 December 2015. To accommodate this initiative, without overlap with the 2015 enrolment period, SLTC approved moving forward the last date to enrol into Session 3, 2015 by four days. Students wishing to enrol into Session 3 units after that date will be handled as exceptions and will be manually processed on a case-by-case basis.

Reports from the Faculties:

Reports from all Faculties were noted.

It was noted that the next SLTC meeting will be held as part of Learning and Teaching week and the next regular meeting of SLTC will be held on Monday 12 October 2015.

A full copy of the minutes summarised will be accessed via this link in the future.

Professor Dominic Verity
CHAIR
ITEM 10.3 REPORT THE FROM FACULTY OF HUMAN SCIENCES FACULTY BOARD

Attached is the report from the Faculty of Human Sciences Faculty Board meeting of 2 June 2015.

For noting.
ITEMS FOR APPROVAL
There were no items requiring Academic Senate approval.

ITEMS FOR NOTING
Report from the Executive Dean
The Deputy Chair reported that:
1. The Clinics Review is currently underway and working groups have been established.
2. The submissions regarding the Institute of Early Childhood and Education merger have now closed. Meetings between the Departments and the Executive Dean are to be scheduled. The Head of Department positions will be advertised externally and consideration is being given on how to preserve the IEC name in the new Department.

General Business
1. Business arising from Academic Senate
   The Deputy Chair and the Associate Dean (Course Quality and Assurance) provided the Board with a brief overview of matters currently being considered by Academic Senate including; Academic Integrity and the presentation by Dr Tracey Bretag and AIMA; the MyMaster student discipline cases; the new Census date proposal; the development of the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences and the presentation by Professor Patrick McNeil; and the review of the Committees of Academic Senate including the associated call for nominations from the Executive Deans and Faculty Boards.

2. Work Health and Safety Subcommittee
   There are currently no academic staff members on the WHS Subcommittee. Dr Mel Taylor (Psychology) was nominated by Professor Julie Fitness and a further call for volunteers will be announced at each Department meeting.

3. International Sustainability
   It was advised that international functional agreements are expanding with IEC and Psychology developing relationships in Singapore, Malaysia and China. To ensure continued engagement overseas, budget forecasting for travel is necessary. The Department representatives on the International Subcommittee will be asked to provide future projections.

Reports from Subcommittees
The minutes and reports of meetings held by the Standards and Quality Subcommittee, the Research Subcommittee and the Internationalisation Subcommittee were noted.

1. Standards and Quality Subcommittee
   a. Terms of Reference were endorsed by the Faculty Board.
   b. The Faculty Board resolved to authorise the Standards and Quality Subcommittee to approve future new units, subject to the initial Expression of Interest being approved by Faculty Board.
   c. The Faculty Board resolved to recommend the academic cases for the Graduate Certificate of Business Psychology, Graduate Diploma of Business Psychology, Master of Applied Linguistics and Diploma of Speech and Communication to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee.
   d. The Faculty Board approved the Recognised Prior Learning Schedules for the Master of Educational Leadership, Master of Education, Master of Advanced Conference Interpreting.

Minutes from Departments
The minutes of the meetings held by the Psychology Department, the Linguistics Department and the School of Education were noted.

1. School of Education
   Consultation continues with BOSTES in relation to entry requirements for students without Band 5 (including English) HSC results. Alternative pathways are being investigated.

The next meeting of Faculty of Human Sciences Faculty Board will be held on 7 July 2015, with the Session 1 2015 Ratification of Exam Results to be considered.

Professor Mike Jones
DEPUTY CHAIR