ACADEMIC SENATE

A meeting of the Academic Senate will be held at 9:30 am on Tuesday 1 November 2016 in the Senate Room, Level 3, Lincoln Building (C8A), 16 Wally’s Walk.

This symbol ★ indicates items that have been starred for discussion at the meeting. Members are requested to notify the Chair, Professor Mariella Herberstein, 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 Megan Kemmis (University Committee Secretary) by email senate@mq.edu.au.

AGENDA

1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY
2. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES
3. ARRANGEMENT OF AGENDA
   3.1 Disclosure of conflicts of interest
   3.2 Adoption of unstarred items
4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING
   4.1 The Minutes of the meeting held 13 September 2016 are provided. (For approval)
5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES
   (not dealt with elsewhere in the Agenda)
   5.1 Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure (For approval)
   5.2 Master of Research: Review Report and Recommendations
6. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR
7. ORAL REPORT FROM THE VICE-CHANCELLOR
8. QUESTION TIME
9. STUDENT LED BUSINESS
10. ITEMS FOR APPROVAL
    10.1 New Program Proposal for the Doctor of Medicine (Global MD) (ASQC)
    10.2 New Program Proposal for the Graduate Diploma of Physical Health (Exit Award) (ASQC)
    10.3 Proposal to discontinue the Master of Applied Finance (Dual Degree Program with ECNU Shanghai) (ASQC)
    10.4 Proposed amendments to the Disruption to Studies Policy and Procedure and Supporting Evidence Schedule (SLTC)
    10.5 Alignment of Last Day to Add Internal and External Units (SLTC)
    10.6 Vice-Chancellor Commendations: List of Recipients
11. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION
    11.1 Delegations of Authority
    11.2 Academic Senate: Purpose and Composition
12. **QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

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

13. **REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

Pages 145 to 146

13.1 Academic Senate Standing Committee
Report of the meeting held by circulation in September 2016
*(For noting)*

Pages 147 to 151

13.2 Academic Standards and Quality Committee
Reports of the meetings held 20 September and 18 October 2016
*(For approval and noting)*

Pages 152 to 155

13.3 Research and Research Training Committee
Report of the meeting held 25 October 2016
*(For approval and noting)*

Pages 156 to 158

13.4 Senate Learning and Teaching Committee
Report of the meeting held 19 September 2016
*(For approval and noting)*

14. **REPORTS FROM FACULTY BOARDS**

Pages 159 to 160

14.1 MGSM Academic Board
Report of the meeting held 11 October 2016
*(For approval and noting)*

Pages 161 to 164

14.2 Faculty of Human Sciences Faculty Board
Reports of the meetings held 13 September and 18 October 2016
*(For noting)*

Pages 165 to 167

14.3 Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences Faculty Board
Report of the meeting held 26 September 2016
*(For noting)*

Pages 168 to 171

14.4 Faculty of Science and Engineering Faculty Board
Report of the meeting held 20 September 2016
*(For noting)*

15. **CONSIDERATION OF CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS**

To be tabled

15.1 University Hearing Committee
Minutes of the meeting held 5 October 2016 will be tabled.

Separate confidential item

15.2 Retrospective Program Approval: Bachelor of Arts in Media
*(For approval)*

16. **OTHER BUSINESS**

Pages 171 to 172

16.1 2017 Schedule of Meeting Dates for Academic Senate and its Committees
*(For noting)*

Pages 173 to 175

16.2 Academic Senate Elections
*(For noting)*

17. **NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Academic Senate will be held on Tuesday 6 December 2016.

Agenda Items are due by Tuesday 22 November 2016.
ITEM 4.1    MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

For approval

The Minutes of the meeting held 13 September 2016 are provided.

Recommended resolution
Academic Senate resolve to approve the Minutes of the meeting held 13 September 2016 as a true and correct record.
ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes of a meeting of the Academic Senate held at 9:30 am on Tuesday 13 September 2016 in the Senate Room, Level 3, Lincoln Building (C8A), 16 Wally’s Walk.

MINUTES

PRESENT

Professor Mariella Herberstein (Chair)
Dr Trudy Ambler
Deidre Anderson
Professor Amanda Barnier
Associate Professor Ayse Bilgin
Dr Yvonne Breyer
Professor Enrico Coiera
Professor David Coutts
Associate Professor Pamela Coutts
Professor Catherine Dean
Professor Jim Denier
Professor S Bruce Dowton
Dr Kate Fullagar
Professor Simon George
Professor Simon Handley
Professor Norma Harrison
Thomas Hedl
Professor Lesley Hughes
Professor Kevin Jameson
Brayden Jones
Judith McKay-Tempest
Professor Nick Mansfield
Paris Manson
Professor Patrick McNeil
Professor Barbara Messerle
Professor Kathryn Millard
Professor Martina Möllering
Professor Peter Nelson
Dr Kerry-Ann O’Sullivan
Dr Mitch Parsell
Professor Jacqueline Phillips
Simon Populin
Professor Peter Radan
Cissy Shen
JoAnne Sparks
Professor Lucy Taksa
Professor Sherman Young

IN ATTENDANCE

Esther Frazer
Nicole Gower
Leanne Holt
Megan Kemmis (Secretariat)
Ashely Lai
Paul Luttrell
Kerri Mackenzie
Sue Pinckham
Thomas Pritchard
Beth Saunders
Alex Swain
Zoe Williams
1. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY**

A meeting of the Academic Senate commenced at 9:32 am. The Chair acknowledged the traditional custodians of the land and welcomed members and attendees to the meeting.

2. **WELCOME AND APOLOGIES**

The Chair reminded members of the purpose of Academic Senate and the role of its members. A number of visitors and presenters were welcomed including Judith McKay-Tempest, Leanne Holt, Thomas Pritchard, Sue Pinkham and Alex Swain. The Chair advised that the Director Human Resources, Nicole Gower, would join the meeting for item 10.1 and the General Counsel, Paul Luttrell would join the meeting for item 10.3.

The Chair noted that apologies were received from Dr Wylie Bradford, Nicole Brigg, Professor Linda Cupples, Professor Mike Jones, Professor Sakkie Pretorius and Professor John Simons.

3. **ARRANGEMENT OF AGENDA**

3.1 Disclosure of conflicts of interest

The Chair requested that Senate members declare any conflict of interest. No conflicts of interest were declared.

3.2 Adoption of unstarrred items

The following additional item was starred for discussion: Item 5.3.

**Resolution 16/207**

Academic Senate resolved that the items not starred for discussion (Items 9.4, 9.7, 9.8, 9.9, 12.1, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3, 13.4, 13.5, 13.6, 15.1 and 16.1) be noted and, where appropriate, be adopted as recommended.

4. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

4.1 The Minutes of the meeting held 26 July 2016 were provided. It was noted that the reference to the “Faculty of Health Sciences” under Item 10.1 Academic Progression should be corrected to read “Faculty of Human Sciences.” Members approved the minutes subject to this amendment.

**Resolution 16/208**

Academic Senate resolved to approve the Minutes of the meeting held 26 July 2016 as a true and correct record subject to the amendment identified.

5. **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

(not dealt with elsewhere in the Agenda)

5.1 Master of Research: Review Report and Recommendations

The Chair invited Professor Amanda Barnier to provide an update on the inaugural meeting of the Research and Research Training Committee (RRTC) and the review of the Master of Research. Professor Barnier provided members with an overview of the Committee’s terms of reference and membership and outlined the major priorities and projects as determined by the Committee at its first meeting on 30 August 2016.

Major items considered by RRTC included preliminary discussion of the report of the Master of Research review (as outlined in Item 13.5), agreement on the timetable for responding to the review’s recommendations, and the establishment of a working group on interdisciplinary research, which will develop a definition for interdisciplinary research at Macquarie. The working group will make recommendations on providing incentives for interdisciplinary research and engaging with research funding agencies on this issue.

**Resolution 16/209**

Academic Senate resolved to note the presentation and update on the establishment of the Research and Research Training Committee and the review of the Master of Research.
5.2 Open Staff Access to iLearn
The Chair invited Professor Sherman Young to provide the meeting with an update on this issue. Professor Young reminded members that at its meeting of 24 May 2016, Senate endorsed the provision of access to iLearn to all staff. Access will be available from Session 3 and will include access to 2016 units of study. An MQ Staff role will be created in iLearn to provide access to teaching materials, but not to student information. He responded to questions from members with the following points:
- Scope to allow a comments field for use by staff will be investigated, but he was unable to confirm that it would be possible to provide this facility;
- A communications plan is being developed with Associate Deans; and
- ECHO360 recordings will be visible, but he undertook to clarify whether or not announcements or confidential material will be visible (it was suggested they not be visible to other staff).

Resolution 16/210
Academic Senate resolved to note the update from the Pro Vice Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) on the proposal to provide open access to iLearn to all staff.

5.3 Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC): Membership
In addition to clarifying the participation of herself and the Deputy Chair on this standing committee, the Chair reported that a further request has been made to include representation from the Macquarie Graduate School of Management (MGSM) on SLTC, noting that the SLTC Chair, Dr Mitch Parsell, is in support of this proposal. The Chair asked members to approve this amendment to the SLTC terms of reference. The amendments were unanimously approved. It was noted that the MGSM will provide a nomination to fill this position.

Resolution 16/211
Academic Senate resolved to:
1. appoint the Chair of Academic Senate, Professor Mariella Herberstein to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee; and
2. approve the amendment to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee Terms of Reference to include representation from the MGSM.

6. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

6.1 Indigenous Representation and MGSM Representation on Academic Senate
The Chair reminded members that the Head of Indigenous Studies is an ex-officio member of Academic Senate, but the position has not been permanently filled for some time. Following discussions with Indigenous members of academic staff, she recommended that Judith McKay-Tempest be co-opted to Academic Senate until 31 December 2016 to ensure an indigenous perspective on Senate. The nomination was approved unanimously.

The Chair noted that the Acting Dean of MGSM, Professor Norma Harrison, has advised that Professor John Croucher has been nominated to fill the casual vacancy as an elected member from the MGSM. Members approved the nomination unanimously.

Resolution 16/212
That pursuant to Academic Senate Rule 7 (1) (p), Academic Senate resolved to approve the appointment of Associate Lecturer Judith McKay-Tempest as a co-opted member until 31 December 2016.

Resolution 16/213
That pursuant to Academic Senate Rule 8 (5), Academic Senate resolved to approve the nomination of Professor John Croucher to fill a casual vacancy of an elected representative in the Macquarie Graduate School of Management (MGSM) for a term of membership to expire at such time as the current interim Dean of the MGSM ceases in that role.

6.2 Other Matters
The Chair provided an update on Academic Senate’s projects and priorities, noting that a number of items have been completed (e.g. the establishment of the Research and Research Training Committee and Thesis Examination Subcommittee), some are listed for this agenda (including the review of Academic Prizes and Awards), and others should be finalised at Senate’s 1 November meeting (including Academic Appeals).

7. VICE-CHANCELLOR ORAL UPDATE
The Vice-Chancellor advised members that the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), Professor John Simons, had signalled his intention to retire towards the end of the year. The Vice-Chancellor praised Professor Simons for his work at the University, first as Executive Dean of the Faculty of Arts, and then as Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic).
The Vice-Chancellor reported that the University is close to appointing a new Executive Dean for the Faculty of Business and Economics, and that work continues to align the Faculty, the Applied Finance Centre and the Macquarie Graduate School of Management.

The Vice-Chancellor observed that there is a continuing absence of significant policy announcements from the Federal government regarding higher education, adding that any change to the funding of domestic students is more likely to take effect in 2018 than in 2017.

The Vice-Chancellor expressed concern that the government’s attempts to streamline the processing of international student visas has created a backlog across the sector, adding that Universities Australia is in urgent discussion with the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) to find a solution.

Members were reminded that the “Respect. Now. Always” campaign (which was launched on campus in August with the screening of the movie the “Hunting Ground”) is ongoing. Members were informed that a national independent survey, to be conducted by the Australian Human Rights Commission, has been launched to gather data across the sector on the extent of this problem.

The Vice-Chancellor noted that the PACE initiative continues to gather momentum, and advised that the Senior Executive has committed strategic development funds to the program to improve graduate employability.

The Vice-Chancellor advised members that the Minister for Education and Training has signalled his intent to make the admission processes, particularly the use of the ATAR and equivalent tertiary entry scores, more transparent, adding that Australian universities are finding it challenging to engage with the media to clarify how admission processes work.

Members were advised that there has been a 68% increase in student applications for the Global Leadership Entry Programme (GLEP), with the program being extended to international students with a strong response.

The Vice-Chancellor reported that Macquarie University has improved its position in the Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU). He reminded members of the continuing project to consolidate and validate the data being provided to the ranking agencies and that a permanent position is being created to oversee the continuation of this work.

The Vice-Chancellor noted that the MyMQ student newsletter had been launched successfully with initial and sustained high uptake as indicated by the numbers of students opening the newsletter email link. Between 60-70% of students had accessed the newsletter, compared with a sector average of around 25%.

In closing the Vice-Chancellor congratulated all staff involved with the launch of MQ Health, noting the integration of healing, learning and discovery under a single banner.

8. QUESTION TIME

The Chair reminded members that Academic Senate is trialling question time to provide them with an opportunity to raise questions arising from matters covered in the update from the Vice-Chancellor and the report from the Chair. Members were invited to raise questions with either the Vice-Chancellor or the Chair.

Associate Professor Ayse Bilgin informed members that Macquarie will host the 2016 ACEN (Australian Collaborative Education Conference) from 28 to 30 September 2016, and encouraged members to attend. The Chair offered to circulate information regarding the conference following the meeting.

Professor Sherman Young noted the comments on MyMQ, highlighting that one of the most read articles was on the Assessment Policy, indicating that students do take University policies seriously.

9. ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

9.1 Academic Prizes and Awards Working Group

Professor Jacqueline Phillips reminded members that the draft University Medal Policy and Procedure had been discussed at Academic Senate’s previous meeting, and that issues raised have been addressed in the final draft documents circulated with the agenda. A template for nominations and revised Terms of Reference for the University Medal Committee was also included with the agenda papers.

Senate noted that a student representative (Joel Berliner) has been added to the working group membership, and that a new working group will be formed to review the criteria for the University Medal (as discussed at Academic Senate on 26 July 2016). Academic Senate approved the University Medal Policy and Procedure and Terms of Reference for the University Medal Committee unanimously. Professor Phillips thanked the working group for their efforts, and the Chair thanked Professor Phillips in turn for her work.

Resolution 16/214

Academic Senate resolved to approve the following, with immediate effect:

i. University Medal Policy;

ii. University Medal Procedure; and

iii. the revised University Medal Committee of Academic Senate Terms of Reference.
9.2 **Academic Progression Policy and Procedure**

Professor Sherman Young noted that the draft Academic Progression Policy and Procedure was discussed at Academic Senate’s previous meeting, with identified issues referred to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee. As a result, documents have been revised to address matters in relation to the implementation date, and clarification on the application of sanctions, academic advice and the phased approach for the use of the policy and procedure for non-standard teaching sessions.

Academic Senate noted the amendment of the suspension period to refer to study periods, rather than a specific length of time. Members were informed $150,000 strategic initiative funding is being sought to support implementation of the policy. Academic Senate unanimously approved the Academic Progression Policy and Procedure and consequent amendments to the General Coursework Rule.

**Resolution 16/215**

Academic Senate resolved to:

i. approve the Academic Progression Policy and Procedure, effective Session 1 2017;

ii. authorise the Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) to approve the Schedules relating to professional programs and currency requirements;

iii. recommend to the University Council the following amendments to the General Coursework Rules effective immediately:
   a. an amendment to General Coursework Rule 9 (6) to reflect that students who have been excluded will need to re-apply for admission;
   b. the rescission of General Coursework Rules 10 (7) (a) and (b), the exclusion provision for students who do not meet the unduly long time and minimum rate of progress requirements; and
   c. amendments to the General Coursework Rules to reflect the introduction of the new Assessment Policy and the rescission of the Practical Placements Policy.

and

iv. recommend to the University Council the following amendments to the General Coursework Rules effective from 1 January 2017:
   a. the rescission of General Coursework Rule 9 (7) the provision for a student who has twice had a grade of Fail recorded for unit requiring approval of the Executive Dean or Dean to re-enrol in that unit;
   b. the rescission of General Coursework Rule 10 (2), the unduly long time requirement;
   c. an amendment to the General Coursework Rule 10 (3), that the minimum rate of progress requirements will apply to students enrolled in non-standard teaching periods; and
   d. the inclusion in the General Coursework Rules, a new rule articulating that academic progression for students enrolled in standard teaching periods is defined by the Academic Progression Policy and Procedure.

   e. amendments to the General Coursework Rules to reflect the scope of the Academic Appeals Policy.

9.3 **Placement Co-ordination Task Force Recommendations (SLTC)**

Dr Mitch Parsell advised Academic Senate that this significant body of work provides a definition for placements, and a glossary and toolkit to replace the existing Practical Placements Policy. The Vice-Chancellor commended the work, urging members to communicate these documents widely, and stressing the importance of using appropriate University processes for all student placements. Academic Senate approved the Definition of a Placement, the Placement Procedural Flowchart, the Placement Procedural Glossary of Terms, supporting toolkit and the rescission of the Practical Placements Policy unanimously.

**Resolution 16/216**

Academic Senate resolved to:

i. rescind the Practical Placements Policy from Policy Central; and

ii. approve the:
   a. definition of a Placement as ‘An experiential learning activity that is facilitated by the University and carried out (either partially or fully) under the direction of an external or third party)
   b. Placement Procedural Flowchart;
   c. Placement Procedural Glossary of Terms; and
   d. supporting toolkit of resources.
9.4 Master of Advanced Conference Interpreting – Change of Name proposal (ASQC)

**Resolution 16/217**

Academic Senate resolved to approve to rename the Master of Advanced Conference Interpreting as the Master of Conference Interpreting, effective 1 January 2017.

9.5 Bachelor of Engineering with Honours: Honours Classification (ASQC)

Associate Professor Pamela Coutts reminded members that Academic Senate approved the introduction of the Bachelor of Engineering with Honours earlier in the year, but the Academic Standards and Quality Committee had asked the Faculty for further information on how honours grades would be calculated. She commended the Faculty of Science and Engineering for its extensive benchmarking with other universities on this issue, and supported the recommendation. Members endorsed the introduction of an Honours Weighted Average Mark, amendment to honours class cut-offs and clarification of the thesis requirement unanimously.

**Resolution 16/218**

Academic Senate resolved to approve the:

i. introduction of an Honours Weighted Average Mark (HWAM);

ii. amendment of cut-offs for Honours Class I and Honours Class II.2; and

iii. clarification of the thesis requirement with regards to Honours Class 3.

9.6 Grading Hurdle Assessments (ASQC)

Associate Professor Pamela Coutts reported that both the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC) and the Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) had considered this item. SLTC recommended that failing all attempts at a hurdle assessment would result in a student failing the unit, even if the student has achieved an overall mark of 50 or more, and that a default mark of between 46 and 49 would be awarded. ASQC supported this recommendation but also recommends that a separate grade be established to differentiate between failing a unit due to failing a hurdle assessment, and failing due to not obtaining an overall mark of at least 50. This recommendation was supported by Dr Mitch Parsell, Chair of SLTC.

Academic Senate debated the recommendation for a separate fail grade. Some members expressed support as this approach would help clarify that the student cannot lodge a grade appeal if they have failed a hurdle assessment. Other members commented that it would add complexity to the current assessment process. Members voted in favour of the recommendation with two (2) votes against.

**Resolution 16/219**

Academic Senate resolved to approve the following additions to the Assessment Policy:

a. Section 3 of Schedule 2: Unit Assessment Requirements - A new clause to read:

   “Where a student who has obtained a raw mark over 50, yet failed all available attempts of at least one hurdle assessment as described within Schedule 2: Unit Assessment Requirements of the Assessment Policy, fails the unit”; and

b. Schedule 1: Grading Requirements - for those students who have failed under the above described circumstances, that the student be awarded a mark of 49 which will also have a separate grade category created to uniquely identify this grade.

9.7 Joint PhD Program with Stellenbosch University (RRTC)

**Resolution 16/220**

Academic Senate resolved to approve the Joint PhD Program proposal between Macquarie University and Stellenbosch University.

9.8 Joint PhD Program with l’Université Libre de Bruxelles (RRTC)

**Resolution 16/221**

Academic Senate resolved to approve the Joint PhD Program proposal between Macquarie University and l’Université Libre de Bruxelles.

9.9 AMIS: Amendment to the University Calendar

**Resolution 16/222**

That, in accordance with the Delegations of Authority (Delegation 5.2), Academic Senate resolved to endorse, and recommend to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), the following changes amendment to the Academic Calendar:

The OUA Sessions, namely Open Universities Australia (OUA) T1, T2 and T3 for Undergraduate and OUAS1, S2 and S3 for Postgraduate offerings, be aligned with the MQ 2017 dates for Session 1, 2 and 3.
10. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

10.1 Honorary Appointments Policy and Procedure

Honorary Appointments

The Chair welcomed the Director of Human Resources to the meeting. Ms Nicole Gower noted that the draft policy, procedure and schedule for Honorary Appointments had been circulated with the agenda and that her presentation would provide an update on this policy review since presentation in April 2016. MS Gower provided an overview of the five categories of honorary appointments covered in the amended policy and clarification as to how the categories would be applied. Discussion included the following:

- Implementation and transition arrangements to the amended titles are still being considered. Ms Gower invited feedback on whether all existing honorary appointees should have their titles amended, or whether the title change should occur as and when appointees come up for renewal;
- The procedure for awarding an honorary title refers to a “retired academic or retired research-only academic”, and it was noted that this was a deliberate inclusion;
- It was pointed out by the Dean of Higher Degree Research, that retired and external academics are appointed to assist in supervising HDR students and are referred as adjunct supervisors and this may cause confusion. Ms Gower undertook to address this matter following the meeting.

Amendments to the Academic Promotion Policy and Procedure

Ms Gower also provided an overview of proposed amendments to the Academic Promotion Policy and Procedure, in particular the amendments to the criteria to introduce a point scale and categories based on Boyer’s model of scholarship. The revised criteria will allow academic staff to focus on one or two of the areas of teaching, research and community, and a minimum achievement in Leadership and Citizenship will be required. Ms Gower thanked Professors Mariella Herberstein, Lesley Hughes, Patrick McNeil and Sherman Young for their efforts in developing the new criteria, adding that it will be implemented in 2017. Members provided the following feedback:

- The new criteria appear to allow an applicant to achieve the necessary points without being outstanding in any one category. Ms Gower acknowledged this point and invited members to provide feedback as to whether an applicant should score 3 in at least one category to be successful;
- It was clarified that the descriptors for achievement relate to the level the applicant is applying for, not their current level, and that examples will be provided for the scoring system for each level;
- Members discussed the principle of opportunity with respect to Leadership and Citizenship in detail, with Ms Gower noting that this criterion has been broadened to look beyond standard examples such as committee membership alone but to actual contribution.

Ms Gower undertook to circulate the slides following the meeting and encouraged members to provide feedback on the proposal by the end of September.

Resolution 16/223

Academic Senate resolved to note the presentation on the revised Honorary Titles Policy and Procedure, and the amendments to the Academic Promotion Policy and Procedure.

10.2 Indigenous Strategy 2016-2025

The Chair welcomed the newly appointed Director of Indigenous Strategy, Leanne Holt. The Chair noted that Ms Holt has been very active since commencing at Walanga Muru (Office of Indigenous Strategy), which included the launch of the University’s Indigenous Strategy on 7 September 2016. Ms Holt briefly introduced herself and her experience, and provided an overview of the Indigenous Strategy which embodies the University’s long-term vision for the next ten years.

Members noted the following three main components of the strategy:

- **Baduwa (Aspire)** unlocking capacity by: building aspirations and establishing a pipeline from schools for indigenous youth to come to our University; increasing Indigenous undergraduate and postgraduate student enrolments; supporting and building the capacity of Indigenous researchers; increasing the quality and impact of Indigenous research; supporting sustainable increases in Indigenous employment to complement existing and future enterprise agreements; supporting professional development and engagement opportunities for our current and emerging Indigenous workforce; and implementing and building the Indigenous alumni network;

- **Manawari (Discover)** developing cultural capability by: developing and implementing a cultural capability framework; engaging with and promoting an understanding of and respect for Indigenous communities, cultures and histories among students and staff; embedding Indigenous knowledges and perspectives into curriculum across all faculties; creating a learning environment in which all students have the opportunity to gain knowledge of Indigenous Australia; initiating cultural training opportunities for all existing and new staff and building the needs and interests of Indigenous Australians into relevant current and future programs and initiatives;
• **Djurali (Evolve)** support for indigenous success through: simplifying and clarifying systems, processes and policies between Walanga Muru and other support services across the university; evaluating and monitoring our support systems for improved quality standards and student success; building the Indigenous presence across the university; creating tailored pathways for indigenous students and staff through capacity building initiatives and programs; and developing systems that enhance undergraduate and postgraduate enrolments and completions.

Ms Holt emphasised the importance of working with Academic Senate to develop a framework for embedding Indigenous perspectives into curriculum, and acknowledged this would be a major piece of work.

Members noted that the next steps will include: the development of a three-year implementation plan for the strategy; meeting with Faculties to develop relationships and identify activity to support the strategy; developing KPIs and finalising the Reconciliation Action Plan with Reconciliation Australia.

Academic Senate expressed support for Macquarie’s Indigenous Strategy.

As part of discussions in relation to the support required to implement the Indigenous Strategy (including the role and resources of the Department of Indigenous Studies), the Faculty of Arts Executive Dean, Professor Martina Möllering, informed members that interviews are being held for the Head of Department, with appointments to other departmental vacancies expected to be filled in next six months.

The Chair thanked Ms Holt for her presentation.

**Resolution 16/224**

Academic Senate resolved to:

i. note the presentation on the Indigenous Strategy 2016-2025;

ii. provide ongoing feedback to Walanga Muru, the Office of Indigenous Strategy on the academic related components, in particular, the embedding of Indigenous knowledges and perspectives into course content; and

iii. support the release and implementation of the Indigenous Strategy across the University.

### 10.3 Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure

The Chair noted although it had been anticipated that the Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure would be provided to this meeting for approval, the working party had determined that further consultation was required, with the expectation that it will be submitted to the 1 November 2016 Academic Senate meeting.

The Chair invited the General Counsel, Paul Luttrell, to report on the background of the draft documents. Mr Luttrell informed members that the draft policy and procedure will provide a consistent approach to academic appeals across the University, with the policy providing a high level statement of principle and the procedure setting out how the policy will be applied. He noted that the procedure is a legal document outlining a legal process. Members noted that a range of supplementary materials, including training, will be developed to assist staff and students. Members were reminded that the scope of the policy was to manage appeals based on procedural grounds, not decisions of academic merit. Mr Luttrell agreed to circulate additional information to the Committee on appeals based on procedural fairness. One significant departure from the current approach is that the Appeal Panel will not make a new decision if an appeal is successful but will refer the matter back to an appropriate decision maker for reconsideration.

The Chair led a discussion on the draft documents which raised the following points:

- Members were invited to comment on the scope of the document and whether the list of grounds for appeal is sufficient. Mr Luttrell advised that examples will be provided in the supplementary materials;
- Mr Luttrell clarified that where a decision is returned to a decision maker, it will normally be to someone other than the person who made the original decision;
- It was suggested the wording in clause 5(5) of the policy be reworded to emphasise that the instruction to wait until the appeals process has finished before seeking an external review is for the benefit of the student, as the external body is unlikely to review the matter if the appeals process has not been exhausted;
- Student members were specifically asked to comment. It was noted that a briefing session has been arranged for students to discuss this and other academic policy issues;
- The role of the Student Ombudsman in appeals was discussed. Members noted that the Student Ombudsman has no authority to alter a decision of the appeal panel but can highlight any procedural or administrative issues that need to be reviewed;
- Members noted that the role of the Student Ombudsman should be reflected in the policy;
- Training for staff involved with academic appeals is being developed. Training will address different aspects of the policy and procedure and related legislation depending on staff members’ roles e.g. decision makers will receive training on procedural fairness, while aspects of administrative law will be included in the training for staff conducting investigations for appeals and complaints.
Professor Simon George departed the meeting at 11:28 am

Resolution 16/225
Academic Senate resolved to:
   i. note progress on the development of an Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure; and
   ii. request members to provide feedback to Governance Services on the draft Academic Appeal Policy and Procedure by 7 October 2016.

10.4 Academic Integrity Project
The Chair provided an update on this project, acknowledging the detailed work of the previous Chair on this issue. Professor Judi Homewood will chair a working group, which has been established to prioritise the recommendations from the original report. The working group will report to the November 2016 Academic Senate meeting, with suggestions regarding implementation of the prioritised recommendations.

Resolution 16/226
Academic Senate resolved to note the oral report on the development of the Academic Integrity Project.

11. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Members may submit questions on notice to the Chair two days in advance of the meeting.
No questions were received.

12. ITEMS APPROVED BY THE CHAIR
12.1 Vice Chancellor's Commendations: List of Recipients
Resolution 16/227
Academic Senate resolved to ratify the awarding of the Vice-Chancellor's Commendation to the lists of Bachelor degree and Master coursework graduands identified within the attached report as approved by the Chair of Academic Senate on 11 August 2016.

13. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES
13.1 Academic Senate Standing Committee
Academic Senate noted the report of the Academic Senate Standing Committee (ASSC) meeting held by circulation in July 2016.

13.2 Academic Standards and Quality Committee
Academic Senate noted the report of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) meetings held 19 July and 23 August 2016.

13.3 Higher Degree Research Committee
Academic Senate noted the report of the Higher Degree Research Committee (HDRC) meetings held 15 July and 12 August 2016.

13.4 MGSM Academic Board
Academic Senate noted the report of the Macquarie Graduate School of Management (MGSM) Academic Board meeting held 7 July 2016.

13.5 Research and Research Training Committee
Academic Senate noted the report of the inaugural Research and Research Training Committee (RRTC) meeting held 30 August 2016.

13.6 Senate Learning and Teaching Committee
Academic Senate noted the report of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC) meeting held 15 August 2016.

14. REPORTS FROM FACULTY BOARDS
There have been no meetings of Faculty Boards since the last meeting of Academic Senate.

15. CONSIDERATION OF CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS
15.1 University Hearing Committee
Confidential reports of the University Hearing Committee meetings held on 3 August and 17 August 2016 were tabled.
16. OTHER BUSINESS

16.1 Emeritus Professor Nominations

Resolution 16/228

Academic Senate resolved to:

i. endorse the recommendations of the Emeritus Professor working group; and

ii. recommend to the Vice-Chancellor and University Council that the title of Emeritus Professor be awarded to the two nominees identified.

17. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Academic Senate will be held on Tuesday 1 November 2016. Agenda Items are due by Tuesday 18 October 2016. The meeting closed at 11:34 am
ITEM 5.1 ACADEMIC APPEALS POLICY AND PROCEDURE

For approval

Recommended resolution
Academic Senate resolve to approve the Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure effective 1 January 2017.
ITEM 5.1  ACADEMIC APPEALS POLICY AND PROCEDURE

Recommended resolution
Academic Senate resolve to approve the Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure effective 1 January 2017.

Summary
The draft Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure were presented to the 5 April and 13 September meetings of Academic Senate. At the 13 September meeting the General Counsel spoke to the legal nature of Academic Appeals and of the need for a robust framework to mitigate risk to the University. Members noted that the draft documents would deliver greater clarity and transparency for students and staff.

The final draft Policy and Procedure incorporates feedback from members of the Academic Senate. In addition, the revisions respond to feedback provided by members of the Student Representative Committee during a forum co-convened by the Chair of Academic Senate and the Pro Vice-Chancellor Learning and Teaching. A summary of feedback is provided below.

Background
The following resources are under development to support the implementation of the Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure:

- Student-facing information, including frequently asked questions and guidelines which will be validated with student focus groups;
- Training for Academic Appeals Panel members;
- Resources to assist Academic Appeals Panel members such as frequently asked questions and checklists; and
- Correspondence templates to ensure consistency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project timeline</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working Group Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update to Academic Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senators to provide feedback following update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase One to Senate for approval (Academic Appeal Policy, Procedure and Workflow)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialisation of new Academic Appeal Policy and Procedure</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Two to Senate for approval (Revised Grade Appeal and identified amendments to Academic Appeals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>End of Session 1, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Operational Impact

- Faculties, including Faculty Boards
- Governance Services
- HDRO
- Student Advocacy and Support
- Student Administration

Consultation Process

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

- General Counsel
- Dean, HDRO
- Chairs of the Grade Appeals, Ranking and Higher Degree Research Appeal Committees

Outcome to be communicated to

- Faculties
- Governance Services
- HDRO
- Student Advocacy and Support
- Student Administration

Submitted by: Professor Mariella Herberstein, Chair of Academic Senate

For enquiries contact: Zoe Williams, Head of Governance Services, Zoe.Williams@mq.edu.au T: x 4322
# ACADEMIC APPEALS POLICY AND PROCEDURE

Summary of Feedback Received from members of Academic Senate and members of the Student Representative Committee

## POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment/Feedback</th>
<th>Response/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Inclusion of the ‘Academic Appeals Panel’ as an entity</td>
<td>• Incorporated to both Policy and Procedure (track changes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The scope of the Policy should be made clear to students from the outset (that Grade Appeals are not currently in scope)</td>
<td>• To be addressed through communication strategy and resource development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need to refer to the Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure within: - Disruption to Studies Policy - Recognition of Prior Learning</td>
<td>• The existing Policies and Procedures to be aligned with the Academic Appeals Policy, including: - Recognition of Prior Learning - Disruptions to Studies - Academic Progression - Admission (Coursework) - Termination from a Higher Degree Research Program Appeal Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The composition of the Academic Appeals Panel (Chair and Members) to be clearly identified. The eligibility criteria for this will bring confidence in the process</td>
<td>• To be addressed within the Academic Appeals Panel Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 5, Clause 5

‘A student must not pursue any judicial or other review by or make a complaint to, any person outside the University until the right of appeal of the student contemplated by this policy is exhausted’

| | Terminology used: |
| | • Amended to reduce perception of threatening tone |
| | Timeline and Role: |
| | • The Procedural Workflow will address this |

### Section 6

ESOS addresses overseas students, what about domestic?

Reference to the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015 included

## PROCEDURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment/Feedback</th>
<th>Response/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Section 4, Clause 5**  
• Removal of reference to ‘in writing via the University’s online system’ | • Amendment not accepted, appeal should be in writing  
• Clarity around this will be achieved through the development of the ‘ask.mq.edu.au’ form |

“The student is bound by the decision of the appeal panel”

Clarification sought regarding:

• About what a student can do if they feel discriminated against in the management of an appeal. Can they go to the Student Ombudsman?

| | Comments refer to the comments also received connected to Section 5, Clause 5 of the Policy  
| | The role of the Student Ombudsman within the Policy and Procedure requires consideration by the Office of General Counsel  
| | Once determined, this can be expanded within the Procedural Workflow |
ACADEMIC APPEALS POLICY

1 PURPOSE

To outline the principles governing appeals against an academic decision of the University.

2 BACKGROUND

The University is committed to providing transparent, equitable, and consistent mechanisms for students to appeal an academic decision. This policy reflects the expectations and responsibilities of both the University and its students in the management of an academic appeal.

3 SCOPE

This policy applies to academic decisions made by the University affecting any student enrolled in or seeking enrolment in a Macquarie University coursework or research program regarding decisions on:

- Admission and Readmission in accordance with the Admissions (Coursework) Policy
- Disruption to Studies in accordance with the Disruptions to Studies Policy
- Recognition of Prior Learning in accordance with the Recognition of Prior Learning Policy
- Suspension and Exclusion in accordance with the Academic Progression Policy
- Exclusion under the General Coursework Rule (Clause 10 (7))
- Termination of Higher Degree Research Candidature in accordance Higher Degree Research Rules (Clause 14(5)).

This policy does not apply to grade appeals (see Grade Appeals Policy), academic misconduct (see Student Discipline Rules and Student Discipline Procedure) or complaints or grievances (see Complaints Management Procedure for Students and Members of the Public).

4 DEFINITIONS

Commonly defined terms are located in the University Glossary.
5 POLICY STATEMENT

(1) The University’s Academic Appeals Panel will deal with appeals under this policy. The Academic Appeals Panel will consist of a Chair and two other members appointed by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar).

(2) The University will endeavour to ensure that procedures for dealing with appeals enable proceedings to be conducted with as little formality and technicality and as quickly as a proper consideration of the matters under consideration permits.

(3) An Academic Appeals Panel’s functions are to:
   (a) provide an opportunity to the relevant student to make submissions in respect of an appeal referred to the appeal panel; and
   (b) decide whether the appeal should be upheld; and
   (c) if the appeal is upheld, decide what should be done as a consequence.

(4) The decision of an Academic Appeals Panel is final and there is no further right of appeal or review within the University.

(5) A student should not pursue any judicial or other review by or make a complaint to, any person outside the University until the right of appeal of the student contemplated by this policy is exhausted.

[Note: A student in respect of whom a decision has been made may complain to the Macquarie University Student Ombudsman and the New South Wales State Ombudsman about the decision pursuant to the Ombudsman Act 1987 (NSW) and judicial review of the decision may also be sought from the courts.]

Timeframe

Timeframes for submission of an Academic Appeal are articulated in the Academic Appeals Procedure document attached to this policy.

Reporting

The Academic Appeals Panel will report to Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar).

6 RELEVANT LEGISLATION

Education Services for Overseas Students Act (2000)
National Standards for Higher Education Providers

7 KEY RELATED DOCUMENTS

Student Discipline Rules
General Coursework Rules
Higher Degree Research Rules
Grade Appeal Policy
Academic Exclusion Appeal Procedure
Admission or Readmission Appeal Procedure
Disruption to Studies Determination Appeal Procedure
Recognition of Prior Learning Determination Appeal Procedure
Termination from a Higher Degree Research Program Appeal Procedure
8 NOTES

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Contact Officer</td>
<td>Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Implementation Officer</td>
<td>To be identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Approval Authority</td>
<td>Academic Senate &amp; Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Date Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 Date of Commencement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6 Date for Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7 Documents Superseded by this Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8 Amendment History</td>
<td></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</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audience [select ALL that apply]</td>
<td>Students Academic staff Professional staff Researchers &amp; HDR Candidates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACADEMIC APPEALS PROCEDURE

1 PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to set out the procedure for an appeal pursuant to the Academic Appeals Policy.

2 SCOPE

The procedure applies to an appeal by a student against a decision made by the University affecting any student enrolled in or seeking enrolment in a Macquarie University coursework or research program regarding decisions on:

- Admission and Readmission in accordance with the Admissions (Coursework) Policy
- Disruption to Studies in accordance with the Disruptions to Studies Policy
- Recognition of Prior Learning in accordance with the Recognition of Prior Learning Policy
- Suspension and Exclusion in accordance with the Academic Progression Policy
- Exclusion under the General Coursework Rule (Clause 10 (7))
- Termination of Higher Degree Research Candidature in accordance Higher Degree Research Rules (Clause 14(5)).

Decisions which are appealed in accordance with the procedure are referred to in this document as “applicable decisions”.

This document does not apply to grade appeals (see Grade Appeals Policy), academic misconduct (see Student Discipline Rules and Student Discipline Procedure) or other complaints or grievances (see Complaints Management Procedure for Students and Members of the Public).

3 DEFINITIONS

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

4 RESPONSIBILITIES AND REQUIRED ACTIONS

1. A student may appeal against an applicable decision of the University which affects him or her on a ground specified in clause 2.

2. An appeal against an applicable decision may only be made on the grounds that:

   (a) the procedure for dealing with the matter was unfair in the circumstances because one or more of the following things occurred:

   (i) the student was not given a reasonable opportunity, appropriate to the circumstances, to present his or her case or provide an explanation, before the decision was made;
(ii) the decision maker in making the decision was biased or there was a reasonable apprehension of bias, against the student;

(iii) the decision maker in making the decision, took an irrelevant consideration into account;

(iv) the decision maker in making the decision, failed to take a relevant consideration into account;

(v) the decision maker in making the decision, acted dishonestly or for an improper purpose;

(vi) there was no evidence to justify the decision made by the decision maker;

(vii) the decision was so illogical or unreasonable that it could not have been rationally made;

(viii) the decision was made in accordance with a guideline or direction from the University of general application without regard to the merits of the particular case;

(ix) the decision maker made the decision in the particular case in accordance with the wishes of another person;

(x) the required procedure for making the decision was not followed; and

(b) as a result, the student affected suffered substantial injustice.

3. The merits of the decision (that is to say, whether the correct or preferable decision was made) cannot be appealed.

4. An appeal must:

(a) be made in writing via the University’s online system (ask.mq.edu.au);

(b) set out the details of the grounds for the appeal;

(c) be lodged by the student not later than, in the case of:

(i) admission and re-admission contemplated by Admissions (Coursework) Policy: 10 working days;

(ii) disruption to studies contemplated by Disruptions to Studies Policy: 5 working days;

(iii) recognition of prior learning contemplated by Recognition of Prior Learning Policy: 10 working days;

(iv) suspension and exclusion contemplated by Academic Progression Policy: 20 working days;

(v) exclusion contemplated by the General Coursework Rule (Clause 10 (7)): 20 working days;

(vi) termination of Higher Degree Research Candidature contemplated by the Higher Degree Research Rules (Clause 14(5)): 20 working days;

after being notified of the decision which is being appealed; and

(d) be lodged with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor - Students and Registrar within the relevant time frame stipulated in clause 4(c).
5. A decision which is appealable has no effect until:
   (a) if no appeal is made, the expiration of the period within which an appeal may be lodged; or
   (b) if an appeal is made, a final decision on the appeal is made (which may be a decision that the appeal has been abandoned).

6. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar) must, within 10 working days after receiving the notice of appeal, appoint a chair of an Academic Appeals Panel to hear and determine the appeal.

7. The chair of the Academic Appeals Panel must within 5 working days of being appointed review the notice of appeal and either:
   (a) dismiss the appeal if satisfied that it is frivolous, vexatious, misconceived or lacking in substance; or
   (b) determine that the appeal will be heard by the Academic Appeals Panel.

8. If the chair dismisses an appeal pursuant to clause 7(a), he or she must, within 5 working days after the decision to dismiss it, provide the student with a written notice of the chair's decision.

9. If the chair determines that the appeal will be heard by the Academic Appeals Panel pursuant to clause 7(b), he or she must, within 5 working days of so determining, give notice to the student that the appeal will be heard by the Academic Appeals Panel.

10. The Academic Appeals Panel must consider the appeal within 20 working days of the date on which, pursuant to clause 9, the student is advised that the appeal will be heard.

11. The decision of a majority of the members of the Academic Appeals Panel is the decision of the Academic Appeals Panel.

12. (a) The procedure for the calling of meetings of the Academic Appeals Panel and for the conduct of business at those meetings, may be determined by the chair.
    (b) The chair may, extend or shorten any time fixed by this document or by any decision of the chair and may do so as many times as the chair thinks appropriate.
    (c) The chair may extend any such time before or after the time expires whether or not an application for the extension is made before the time expires.
    (d) If no time is fixed by this document for the doing of anything in or relating to any proceeding before the appeal panel, the chair may fix the time within which that thing must be done.
    (e) Any act or proceeding of the Academic Appeals Panel may not be called into question merely because of:
        (i) any vacancy or change in the membership of the Academic Appeals Panel; or
        (ii) any defects in the appointment of any member of the Academic Appeals Panel; or
(iii) any irregularity in the manner in which any meeting of the Academic Appeals Panel has been convened or conducted; or

(iv) the presence or participation at any meeting of the Academic Appeals Panel of any person not entitled to be present or to participate at those meetings.

13. (a) The student must be given a reasonable opportunity to provide:

(i) any relevant written material to the Academic Appeals Panel; and

(ii) a written submission to the Academic Appeals Panel.

(b) The student may be given an opportunity to address the Academic Appeals Panel if the Academic Appeals Panel is satisfied it is appropriate to do so in the circumstances.

14. (a) The Academic Appeals Panel may:

(i) dismiss the appeal by affirming the decision of the decision maker; or

(ii) uphold the appeal by setting aside the decision and referring the matter to a decision maker for reconsideration of the decision.

(b) If the decision is set aside, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar) may appoint a decision maker who is to reconsider the decision.

15. The chair of the Academic Appeals Panel must, within 5 working days of the decision being made, notify the student of the decision of the Academic Appeals Panel and give a short written statement of the reasons for the decision.

16. The student is bound by the decision of the Academic Appeals Panel.

17. If, pursuant to clause 14(b), the matter is referred to a decision maker for reconsideration, the decision maker must reconsider the applicable decision and inform the student of the result of that reconsideration, as soon as practicable after being notified of the decision of the Academic Appeals Panel.

18. In this document, a reference to a "working day" is to any day other than:

(a) a Saturday, a Sunday or a public holiday in Sydney; or

(b) 27, 28, 29, 30 or 31 December.

19. (a) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar) may authorise any person to carry out any of his or her functions relating to this document.

(b) A reference in this document to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar), if the context permits, includes any person authorised to carry out any of his or her functions relating to this document.

5 RELEVANT LEGISLATION

Education Services for Overseas Students Act (2000)
Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015
6  KEY RELATED DOCUMENTS

Academic Appeals Policy
Admission (Coursework) Policy/Procedure
Disruptions to Studies Policy/Procedure
Recognition of Prior Learning Policy/Procedure
Academic Progression Policy/Procedure
General Coursework Rules
Higher Degree Research Rules
Frequently Asked Questions for Students Submitting an Appeal
Academic Appeals Panel Terms of Reference

7  NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contact Officer</th>
<th>Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Implementation Officer</td>
<td>To be identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Approval Authority / Authorities</td>
<td>Academic Senate &amp; Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Date Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Date of Commencement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Date for Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Documents Superseded by this Procedure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Amendment History</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM 5.2 MASTER OF RESEARCH: REVIEW REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

For noting

Recommended resolution

Academic Senate resolve to note the preliminary response to the Master of Research (MRes) review recommendations.
ITEM 5.2 MASTER OF RESEARCH: REVIEW REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommended resolution
Academic Senate resolve to note the preliminary response to the Master of Research (MRes) review recommendations.

Summary
This document summarises the plan for the university’s response to the 2016 Review of the Master of Research undertaken by Professor Jim Angus.

Background
In 2015, the Vice-Chancellor commissioned a review by Professor Jim Angus into the BPhil/MRes program. The review has submitted its report, and TESC has been asked by RRTC to produce a plan for how to respond to the report’s recommendation.

Operational Impact
Parties involved will be all faculties and MGSM; HDRO, the Dean HDR Office, and DVCR Office.

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

- HDRO
- Associate Deans/HDR
- Faculty MRes Directors

Outcome to be communicated to
- RRTC

Submitted by: Professor Nick Mansfield, Dean HDR

For enquiries contact: Professor Nick Mansfield, Dean HDR
HDRO Response to the Review of Master of Research Program

**Area 1: A comparative analysis of the admission standards and entry pathways into the PhD program of G08, ATN institutions**

Enrolment issues highlighted and response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE RAISED</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admission process is clunky</td>
<td>The eApplication system was introduced soon after the introduction of the MRes program, and the Deputy Director (HDRO) and Manager (Candidature Operations, HDRO) are working to streamline the application and admission processes in the HDRO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Online applications need to be transferred to a new management system | (1) Online application data is uploaded into the student management system (AMIS) weekly for successful applications, but HDRO is still working with IT and the AMIS team to optimise this. The frequency of this could be increased.  
(2) MQ is beginning the process of implementing a new student management system (including recruitment and admissions), and HDRO will be involved in both the steering group and project team. It is expected that there will be seamless integration between the admissions system and student management system. |
| Registrars and student system interface is not aligned | |
| Year 2: often late cohort lists making start of the year delayed | (1) The expectation that year 2 students will be enrolled from 01 January or 01 July causes problems, as currently candidates cannot be enrolled in advance in time-based units. HDRO will work with the AMIS team to see if this can be resolved;  
(2) Many Yr 1/BPhil candidates are enrolled in session 3 units, with outcomes not available until after the commencement of session 1 the following year; and  
(3) Yr 2 candidates must sign over their IP before being enrolled in the time-based unit. Historically there have been delays in obtaining the IP forms. |
| Multiple deadlines for domestic and international candidates | (1) To maintain flexibility in program offerings there needs to be two intakes per year;  
(2) Deadlines for international and domestic are different due to the processing time for international student visas; and  
(3) Deadlines for international applicants wishing to apply for scholarships needs to align with the international scholarship round closing date as currently MQ can only offer international scholarships for MRes Yr 2 as a bundle option with a PhD. |
| HDRO needs more resources | Currently HDRO staff are at full capacity, and projections indicate increased future numbers. It is envisaged that resources (1 – 3) FTE in the admissions, scholarships and completions areas would alleviate this pressure. |

Review Recommendation: A small working group investigate the current issues concerning the MRes enrolment process where communication/information/advice is incomplete and/or inconsistent and suggest solutions as soon as possible.

HDRO Response:
1. The HDRO and Faculty HDR Managers are closely involved in the web transformation project, and it is expected that a significant outcome of this project is that the information on the website will be better aligned and a single source of truth;
2. The Deputy Director (HDRO) and Manager (Candidature Operations) will work with the AMIS team to resolve the issue of Yr 2 candidates not being able to be enrolled in advance, eliminating the workload on HDRO staff in the first weeks of January and July of each year;

3. MQ is beginning the process of implementing a new student management system (including recruitment and admissions), and HDRO will be involved in both the steering group and project team. It is expected that there will be seamless integration between the admissions system and student management system; and

4. Currently HDRO staff are at full capacity, and projections indicate increased future numbers. It is envisaged that resources (1 – 3) FTE in the admissions, scholarships and completions areas would alleviate this pressure.

**English Proficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE RAISED</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Given that exemptions are made for proof of English proficiency if a candidate comes from a country listed as ‘English Speaking Countries’ it is very likely that some of them will have lower than acceptable English proficiency.</td>
<td>From 01 July 2016 the HDRO updated the exemption categories for providing proof of English proficiency to align with the Australia SSVF, which has vastly reduced the number of ‘English Speaking Countries’ and enforces a minimum of 5 years education in an English Speaking Country for exemption to providing proof of English proficiency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Review Recommendation:** Every student enrolled in a BPhil or MRes Yr 1 who has not passed an undergraduate degree in an Australian University be tested for English proficiency during their first semester by MQ, and that through students be offered a tailored course to strengthen their English proficiency as required.

HDRO Response: HDRO recommends against testing of students for English proficiency after they are enrolled in the program to avoid placing the University in a situation of high risk. Furthermore, this would not be possible with current resources. Alternatively, the HDRO recommends lifting the minimum English language proficiency requirements for entry to HDR programs, and note that some Faculties already make use of the option to set their English language requirements higher than the HDRO minimum requirement.

**Area 3: An assessment of the experience of MRes students, with a particular focus on building student confidence, aptitude and capacity to complete a PhD.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE RAISED</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HDRO Administration and website not helpful for Arts, Sci and Eng</td>
<td>As for area 1: The HDRO and Faculty HDR Managers are closely involved in the web transformation project, and it is expected that a significant outcome of this project is that the information on the website will be better aligned and a single source of truth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDRO administration and website still not as supportive of my research and candidature in ARTS, SCI and ENG</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One part-time MRes candidate was upset at the loss of stipend</td>
<td>(1) Stipends (living allowances) are for full-time study, acknowledging the financial difficulties associated with full-time study. Where candidates are unable to study full time due to caring responsibilities or illness they may be eligible to receive a part-time stipend with provision of medical documentation. Stipends are not designed to supplement part-time employment with part-time study. (2) Candidates are always encouraged to discuss their situation and stipends with the HDRO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Area 4: A review of the current examinations and appeals process and recommendations with regard to any suggested improvements.**
Examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE RAISED</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examiners receive a formal letter and invitation but <em>should not be contacted</em> otherwise by the supervisor to give direction or standard to apply; best practice dictates that an arm-length HDR examinations officer would contact prospective examiners to ensure objectivity</td>
<td>Current practice (as with PhD examinations) is that supervisors/Faculties contact the examiners prior to the formal invitation, to gauge availability, however variations exist between Faculties with regard to how much information about the program/requirements at this point. The HDRO could work with the Faculties to standardise this process, however the HDRO does not currently possess the resources to contact all prospective examiners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation (7.4): That a working group review the merits of the marking scale that is provided to the examiners and advise on a Pass/Fail, or rank H1, H2 etc or actual mark.

Response: The HDRO acknowledges the numbers of appeals and grade review requests associated with the current marking scheme, however, given the impact of this grading scheme on scholarship rankings and admission to the PhD, requests that if a working party is convened that a senior staff member from the HDRO be included in the working group.
# MRes Report Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Discussion/Action</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. That a small working group investigate the current issues concerning the M. Res enrolment process where communication/information/advice is incomplete and/or inconsistent and suggest solutions as soon as possible.</td>
<td>Problems with co-ordination between HDRO and faculties in communication and admin processing. Delays in enrolment. Under-resourcing, especially of HDRO</td>
<td>HDRO; Faculty HDR Managers HDRMC</td>
<td>See HDRO response (attached) Unresolved issue: do we need to reconsider the 1/1 starting date for Year 2? HDRO and faculties are currently considering setting MRes Year 2 enrolment and submission date in the same way HDR candidature is set, by period of enrolment with flexible start date. HDRO and faculties are also working towards a mid-year intake into Year 1 from 2018.</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. That every student enrolled in B. Phil or M. Res year 1 who has not passed an undergraduate degree in an Australian University be tested for English proficiency during their first Semester by Macquarie University and that those students be offered a tailored course to strengthen their English proficiency as required.</td>
<td>Problems in English competency for candidates about to write 20,000 word thesis, especially those from IELTS-exempt countries.</td>
<td>Dean HDR HDRO/AD's</td>
<td>There are differing views on this. FBE supports as they have a large number of NESB candidates entering in year 1. For FSE and FMHS, the larger international cohort enters in Year 2, so a Year 1 test wouldn’t help. HDRO is opposed, as this will be expensive and hard to administer. Options: 1. Increase the IELTS threshold? This might exclude a lot of academically gifted people who can be coached through. 2. Provide a service? This would be very expensive. 3. Refer them to English courses they pay for themselves. Action: Dean HDR to lead discussion with AD’s/HDR to make recommendation to RRTC for March 2017.</td>
<td>March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. That Macquarie University continues to work with Department of Education and Training to ensure that the Macquarie University M. Res remains eligible for RTS funding but with some flexibility as to the level of the</td>
<td>The government may back ACOLA’s alternative model for the MRes. Macquarie should insist on keeping its pioneering model as on the RTS.</td>
<td>DVCR Dean, HDR. HDRO</td>
<td>Action: Audit current offerings to make sure they are RTS compliant. Respond to government decisions as and when they arise.</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. That if Department of Education and Training indicates that they will implement the preferred Model 8 in the ACOLA report as the only acceptable model funded by CSP+HECS, then Macquarie University should clearly articulate its innovative research training offering and have a strategy and plan ready to demonstrate its leadership position in the Research Masters / PhD package. It will be important to gather data on the completion times for the PhD at Macquarie University for those coming through M. Res versus other pathways and from other countries. It is not at all clear whether the ACOLA Model 8 would provide for a viable 3 year PhD, or whether it would still slip out to 4 years.

| **Action:** | Gather comparative data on MRes performance compared to alternative pathway programs, including intake numbers, rates of conversion to PhD and completion times. | Dean HDR and HDRO |
| **Action:** | Prepare promotional materials on the superiority of the MQ MRes structure. | |

5. That supervisor training be widely valued and respected as BEST PRACTICE at Macquarie University with retraining required over a longer period such as 3 years.

- That the quality of supervision be evaluated at Department / Faculty level through agreed processes.
- That capacity for quality supervision be monitored at Faculty level through a register and medium term planning takes place to ensure M. Res / PhD growth is sustainable.

| **Eligibility to supervise and quality of supervision.** | Dean HDR, SEP, Faculties | New approach to SEP that involves greater buy-in from faculties, and move away from the compliance model. |
| **Difference in supervising MRes thesis compared to PhD thesis.** | | Discussion at faculty-level of how to supervise MRes. |
| | | Should there be a compulsory MRes supervision induction? |
| | | Action: Dean HDR and SEP staff to incorporate in 2017 SEP reform plan. |

<p>| Long-term | 2017 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>That the balance of M. Res and PhD commencements be closely monitored and ensure that mature M. Res graduates be made aware and supported to return to Macquarie University at some time to commence a PhD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some faculties are having trouble building an HDR cohort, and need support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean HDR/Faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action: Each faculty to develop HDR/recruitment strategy, that also deals with issues raised in student feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016 for 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>That consideration be given through a focussed working group on the advantages and disadvantages of moving (by examination in 2017) to a standard set out by HESF (2015) where Assessment for Masters Degree by Research incorporates assessment by at least two assessors (one of whom is external to Macquarie University) with international standing in the field of research, who are independent of the conduct of the research, competent to undertake the assessment and do not have a conflict of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Various examination issues. How to guarantee quality, while simplifying examination process in a way that locates examination judgement more clearly in departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action: TESC to make recommendations to RRTC on the structure of the MRes thesis examination process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016 for 10/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
merits of the marking scale that is provided to the examiners and advise on a Pass / Fail, or rank H1, H2 etc. or actual mark.

8. 1) that each Faculty constitutes an M. Res Year 2 and M. Phil/PhD candidate academic appeals committee that follows the governance process outlined on page 3 version 1.4 June 2016, HDR APPEAL LODGEMENT FORM and conforms to natural justice
2) that at The Faculty HDR Appeal hearing, the candidate be invited to attend with a supporter
3) that if the Faculty HDR Appeal Committee decision goes against the candidate, the candidate has the right to appeal the decision to the ACADEMIC SENATE which will be given resources to conduct this process.
4) that for all academic matters (not disciplinary) the ACADEMIC SENATE should be the FINAL, independent committee to hear the final appeal. This process would be consistent with the HESF (2015) appeal process.
5) that the Academic Senate would convene a 3 person committee to hear the appeal. The recommendation is to consider developing a general procedure to hear APPEALS TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE rather than only limited to M. Res, M. Phil / PhD candidates
6) The PROCEDURE for Appeal to The Academic Senate should be

| Reforms to the MRes grade appeal process | Chair of Senate Dean HDR TESC | These issues are covered by the university’s reform of Appeals processes. | None. Action already underway at university level. |
developed after agreement that a POLICY for such an appeal is approved by Senate and Council.

9. - That a ‘world-ready’ HDR graduate from Macquarie U will have had the opportunity to link with INDUSTRY through joint supervisor, co-developed projects as funded scholarships with industry
  - That barriers to Honorary Appointments, co-supervision or funding be addressed at Faculty level with Central Policy and Frameworks in place to ensure quality and consistency for Macquarie University.
  - That incentives are developed to ensure that there is a clear vision to strengthen the Macquarie University links to Industry through HDR candidates and their projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responding to the ACOLA Review's emphasis on industry-engagement for HDR's</td>
<td>Dean HDR</td>
<td>PACE unit in MRes</td>
<td>By end 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform of Supervision policy to encourage industry-based supervision.</td>
<td>AD's/HDR</td>
<td>Reformed Supervision Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty-based industry-engagement plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Action: Dean HDR to collect from faculties all HDR internship programs and develop internship/industry engagement program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. That Faculty and Central staff liaise regularly to ensure the marketing message, course offerings and materials are coherent, accurate and deliverable for the right student, right course, and right program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of communications and Marketing</td>
<td>HDRO</td>
<td>Action: HDRO and Faculties will negotiate with Marketing to develop a co-ordinated marketing plan, to report to HDRMC.</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculties Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. That graduate destination surveys track Macquarie University M. Res students employability. Staying connected through email etc. as Macquarie University alumni would be a way to monitor these important graduates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No meaningful longitudinal data on destinations of research graduates.</td>
<td>Dean HDR</td>
<td>Data that informs design of MRes and marketing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile of MRes cohort.</td>
<td>Alumni Office</td>
<td>Action: Dean HDR to develop plan for longitudinal; surveying of MRes graduates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. That to support the M. Res and PhD HDR candidates, there should be a recognition in effect that they are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for HDR candidates to feel engaged with their departments via space</td>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>Action: Each faculty to report a space plan for MRes candidates</td>
<td>Early 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘junior’ staff rather than students and be welcomed as colleagues in a nurturing academic environment. Space ‘just like home’ is a very important resource that is often game changing for HDR students especially International students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>allocation and support</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. That every effort be made at the highest level to advocate for RTS funding to continue to support domestic year 2 M. Res students.

See under 3
ITEM 10.1  NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL FOR THE DOCTOR OF MEDICINE (GLOBAL MD) (ASQC)

For approval

Recommended resolution
That Academic Senate approve the academic case for the Doctor of Medicine (Global MD), effective 1 January 2018.

Background
As per the attached papers.

The academic case for the proposal for the Doctor of Medicine (Global Medicine) was endorsed by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee at its meeting of 18 October 2016. The Committee noted that the business case for the proposed program will shortly be submitted to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) for approval.
ITEM 10.1 PROGRAM PROPOSAL FOR THE DOCTOR OF MEDICINE (GLOBAL MD) (ASQC)

Recommendation
That Academic Senate approve the proposal for the Doctor of Medicine (Global MD), effective 1 January 2018.

Summary
The Faculty is proposing the establishment of a Doctor of Medicine (Global MD) program, to commence in Session 1 2018.

The proposal has been considered and recommended by the Faculty Education Committee and Faculty Board.

Background
An Expression of Interest (EOI) for the program was endorsed by ASQC in November 2015.

A core Steering Group has been leading the development of a range of aspects relating to the program, including:

- Context of the Medical Program: Governance structures, staffing and resourcing
- Outcomes of the Medical Program: Purpose (Vision and Mission Statements), Program Outcomes
- Learning and Teaching: Philosophy and methods
- Curriculum: Duration and structure, Indigenous health, Curriculum Framework
- Assessment: Approach, feedback, quality, Assessment Framework
- Monitoring: Quality assurance
- Students: Admissions, student support and experience (including in offshore settings)
- Learning Environment: Educational facilities and resources, clinical environments and experiences, partnerships

The development of the program has involved extensive benchmarking of Australian and international medical programs and broad consultation with a range of stakeholders on distinct components of the development. Stakeholders include:

- Clinical, academic and research staff of the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences (including physiotherapy) and the Macquarie University Health Sciences Centre (including the Hospital and Clinics)
- Academic staff from relevant areas of the University, including education, audiology, psychology, public health, health law and ethics
- Australian Medical Council (AMC)
- Chair, ASQC and Critical Friend, ASQC
- Chair, SLTC
- PVC (L&T)
- Recent graduates of other Australian Medical programs
- Members of the MUHSC Consumer Advisory Committee (community/patients)
- Walanga Muru - Macquarie University’s Office of Indigenous Strategy (MUOIS)
• MindSpot Clinic – Executive and clinical staff
• Northern Sydney Local Health District – Executive and clinical staff
• Apollo Health City, Hyderabad – Executive and clinical staff
• Professional staff with expertise in academic governance, including quality assurance and policy development

Consultation with relevant stakeholders will continue throughout the detailed development of the program.

The program aligns with the three key objectives of the University’s Learning for the Future: Learning and Teaching Strategic Framework: 2015 – 2020:

• **Connected Experiences:** Clear aspirational pathways which incorporate flexibility and independence; Creative and innovative learning experiences; Blended and integrated learning activities; Linkages between disciplines through inter-professional learning and deep engagement with research and external partners.

• **Connected Curriculum:** Program-based approach to curriculum, outcome and assessment design; Embedded experiential and work-integrated learning; Significant research component relevant to the professional practice; Strong professional and cultural stream, including Indigenous health.

• **Connected People:** Faculty approach to integrated program development to reduce duplication and maximize resources; Strong emphasis on quality partnership development in Australia and across the globe; Creation of tailor-made development programs for academic and clinical staff.

The program aligns with the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) specifications for Level 9 Masters (Extended) programs.

The program is currently undergoing accreditation with the Australian Medical Council (AMC) and has been developed in line with the AMC’s Standards for Assessment and Accreditation of Primary Medical Programs (2012).

**Communication**

A Communication Plan has been developed. This Plan includes a proposed internal communication to the University community in November 2016 (pending approval by Academic Senate).

Given that the AMC accreditation processes are ongoing, the Faculty’s external communications will reflect the state of development and accreditation, and potential commencing date. It is likely that more definitive active marketing of the program will commence in mid-2017.

**Submitted by:** Professor Patrick McNeil (Executive Dean, FMHS)

**For enquiries contact:** Ms Hayley Harris (Program Manager, Education and Faculty Initiatives, FMHS)
General

The Education Services for Overseas Students (ESOS) Act 2000, and The National Code of Practice govern the delivery of courses to International students. All programs of study offered to International students studying in Australia on a student visa must have a CRICOS code and comply with these provisions. This includes the requirement that holders of an international student visa maintain full-time enrolment. Therefore, consultation with Macquarie International will be required prior to submission.

### Name of Award
Doctor of Medicine (Global MD)

### Exit Award Status
Is this award an exit award only (i.e. not available for admission)?  No

### AQF Level and Qualification Type
Level 9 Masters by Coursework Degree (Extended)

### Volume of Learning / Duration
4 years FTE

### Study Mode
Full-time + Part-time

### Attendance Mode
Internal

### Location
North Ryde

### Study Period Offerings
Other

If other, provide details. If multiple locations are available with different commencing study periods please include full details here. Eg: Terms 1 and 2 (Sydney CBD), Terms 2 and 3 (Melbourne)

* New Study Period A: 24 weeks (approx. Mid-January to Start July) - first needed in 2019
* New Study Period B: 24 weeks (approx. Start July to Mid-December) - first needed in 2019
* New Study Period C: 48 weeks (approx. Mid-January to Mid-December) - first needed in 2019
* New Study Period D: 20 weeks (approx. Mid-January to Start June) - first needed in 2021
* New Study Period E: 16 weeks (approx. Start June to Mid-September) - first needed in 2021

### Owning Faculty
Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences

### Owning Department
Department of Clinical Medicine

### Year of First Offering
2018

### Rationale
The Our University: A Framing of Future vision includes the creation of Australia’s first university-led fully integrated academic health enterprise, the Macquarie University Health Sciences Centre (MUHSC) – an initiative that has seen the dynamic convergence of education, biomedical and translational research, and high-level clinical care. Leveraging and integrating Australia’s only university owned and run Macquarie University Hospital (MUH); the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences (‘the Faculty’); and our new entity, Macquarie University Clinical Associates (MUCA), Macquarie is on a journey of transformational leadership in the Australian healthcare sector. The creation of MUHSC provides the context to understand the desire to establish a four-year graduate-entry Doctor of Medicine (MD) program. Embedding medical education, internship, and post-graduation training into our clinical practice settings is a vital part of our strategy to create the academic environment needed to pursue a safety and quality agenda that is at the heart of delivering patient-focused clinical care. As such, the student cohort will be a small boutique intake of 60 full-fee paying places, matched to the scale of our clinical enterprise, with a focus on educational quality, an exceptional student experience and strong graduate outcomes.

The Macquarie University Medical program is future-focused, designed for the predicted environment in which our graduates will practice. Macquarie graduates will not only be clinically competent individual practitioners, they will understand that they work within a health system that demands a focus on safety, quality and system improvement. They will have experienced, and be capable of practice within, an increasingly digital clinical environment, and through structured international experiences, they will have a global perspective and deep cultural awareness. Cognizant of the demonstrated educational value of international clinical placements for medical students, we intend to create Australia’s first Global Medical program, providing a transnational quality assured medical education experience. Though learning will be embedded within the Australian health care context, a design that fosters health care system comparisons, and uses
emerging technologies, will ensure our students master the cultural awareness and communication capabilities required for care in any setting. The Global Medical program will provide the foundations of medical practice, clinical reasoning and integrated clinical practice at the MUHSC, followed by two years of clinical placements in local (Australian) and global settings. The local experiences will be within the MUHSC, the Northern Sydney Local Health District (NSLHD) and the MindSpot Clinic. Clinical learning within MindSpot will be unique, allowing learning in a completely on-line therapy delivery model that is a likely exemplar of future clinical practice suitable for many chronic conditions.

The international experiences will be within the Apollo Health City in Hyderabad, India, with quality assured elective possibilities in North America and elsewhere. The partnership with India aligns with national educational strategic directions, including the National Strategy for International Education 2025 that calls for the strengthening of partnerships abroad and the enhancement of student mobility to support transnational education. Our approach is consistent with goals of the Australia India Education Council (AIEC), established by the Australian and Indian Governments in 2010 to set the strategic direction of the collaborative efforts in education and research between Australia and India. The global concept of the Medical program will be realised through a strong focus on comparative clinical learning across the local and global clinical settings. Students undertaking parallel placements in similar clinical disciplines in Australia and India will have opportunities to compare their experiences through technology-aided self-reflection and online communities of practice which will connect students undertaking equivalent placements across the globe.

The international experiences provided will contribute to the development of well-rounded, culturally capable and globally engaged practitioners. There is substantial evidence in literature and recent reports, including the Outcomes of Learning Abroad Programs report which was commissioned by Universities Australia, of the benefits of these experiences to the student, and to the nation: promotion of deep learning and cognitive development in relation to cultural differences; promotion of civic engagement, including increased understanding of moral and ethical issues, openness to diversity, more positive perceptions of multiculturalism, and greater levels of tolerance and the reduction of ethnocentrism. These are qualities which will promote the health of the multicultural Australian community, and the global community more broadly.

Teaching and learning will be integrated around authentic contexts and professional experiences, and incorporate evidence-based practice and technology-enhanced learning and practice. Reflective practice will be purposefully developed through design of activities and assessments. Macquarie University graduates will be doctors who capably practice quality medicine in diverse local and global communities, and effectively connect with patients and inter-professional teams across cultures. They will have the scientific, clinical, social and professional capabilities that will serve as a basis for post-graduate practice in Australia and in the broader global community.

The proposal has the support of the Federal Minister for Education and Training, and the New South Wales Minister for Health.

The program aligns with the three key objectives of the University’s Learning for the Future: Teaching and Learning Strategic Framework: 2015 – 2020:
- Connected Experiences: Clear aspirational pathways which incorporate flexibility and independence; Creative and innovative learning experiences; Blended and integrated learning activities; Linkages between disciplines through inter-professional learning and deep engagement with research and external partners.
- Connected Curriculum: Program-based approach to curriculum, outcome and assessment design; Embedded experiential and work-integrated learning; Significant research component relevant to the professional practice; Strong professional and cultural stream, including Indigenous health.
- Connected People: Faculty approach to integrated program development to reduce duplication and maximize resources; Strong emphasis on quality partnership development in Australia and across the globe; Creation of tailor-made development programs for academic and clinical staff.

The program aligns with the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) specifications for Level 9 Masters (Extended) programs.

The program will include a range of new units: coursework, integrated clinical study blocks and clinical placements.

Year 1: Foundations of Medical Practice (Traditional Coursework)
- Applied Medical Science 1
- Clinical Practice 1
- Evidence-Based Inter-Professional Health Care 1
- Applied Medical Science 2
- Clinical Practice 2
- Evidence-Based Inter-Professional Health Care 2
These units will include content in medical science (applied anatomy and physiology; biochemistry and genetics; pathology, immunology and microbiology; introductory pharmacology), foundation clinical skills, the social aspects of health, studies of the history, culture and health of the Indigenous peoples of Australia, evidence-based practice, professional practice, and research methodologies.

Year 1 will also include inter-professional learning experiences.

Year 2: Introduction to the Clinical Disciplines (Integrated Clinical Studies)
- Primary Care, Wellbeing and Cancer
- Musculoskeletal, Neurosciences and Ageing
- Cardiovascular, Respiratory, Gastroenterology, Surgery and Metabolism
- Critical Care, Patient Safety and Quality, and Research
- Reflective Medical Practice 1
These units will combine coursework content with clinical practice and will employ authentic clinical and practical experiences (e.g. clinical cases, actual experiences in the MUHSC, or appropriate contexts) as the basis for learning. Students will build their understanding of the range of clinical disciplines integrated with a continuation of the streams and curriculum from Year 1, including applied medical science, clinical skills and professionalism.

Year 3: Core Clinical Training (Core Clinical Placements and Research)
- Research Project 1
- Core Clinical Placements A
- Core Clinical Placements B
These units see the commencement of the 2 year research project which will run across the year, and a series of core clinical placements in Australian and global settings.

Year 4: Advanced Clinical Practice respective (Advanced Clinical Placements and Research)
- Research Project 2
- Advanced Clinical Placements A
- Advanced Clinical Placements B
- Reflective Medical Practice 2
These units see the completion of the research project which will run across the first half year, and a series of advanced clinical placements in Australian and global settings.

Replacement
Does the proposed award replace an existing award? No

Details

Admission Requirements

Admission Criteria
(Formal qualifications; GPA; Required Work Experience; Required Cognate Disciplines)
Published in Handbook, Coursefinder and UAC
• Completion of an AQF Level 7 Bachelor’s Degree, or higher, in a cognate area (or NOOSR recognised equivalent)
• Minimum GPA: 5.0/7.0 (or recognised international equivalents: Medical College Admission Test – MCAT, International Student Admissions Test – ISAT)
• Minimum Graduate Medical School Admission Test (GAMSAT) Score: 50 overall and in each section
• Interview[s] (likely to be Multiple Mini Interviews (MMIs))
• Relevant Prerequisite Knowledge: Human Anatomy
• Compliance requirements (willingness to comply)

Required Supporting Documents
(e.g. Portfolio or CV)
Published in Handbook, Coursefinder and UAC
N/A

Threshold Admission Criteria
(Threshold GPA; Alternative Criteria e.g. 300 level GPA or work experience)
Non-Published data for admissions assessment only
N/A

English Language Requirements

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

Overall: 7
Speaking: 7 Listening: 7
Writing: 7 Reading: 7

Program Structure

Is the award structured on Specialisations? No

Requirements

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

Requirements file has been uploaded.
To view the requirements download the file FOM PG A MedGloMD ID272-1.xlsx

Specific Minimum Requirements for Level 9 Masters degree (Coursework)

Identify standalone unit, or map and justify distribution across multiple units.

Capstone or Professional-practice
The professional-practice components of the program are provided through the clinical training. Students will be required to undertake a significant amount of clinical training, including experiences in all core clinical disciplines and across a range of models of care (private and public hospital settings and general practice).

The clinical training is designed to provide professional practice in a range of contexts, with increasing depth in Year 4 of the program with the ultimate goal to prepare students for practice as interns (the next natural pathway for further professional training and learning). This meets the AQF Level 9 Masters (Extended) specifications which state its purpose as follows: ‘to qualify individuals who apply an advanced body of knowledge in a range of contexts for professional practice and as a pathway for further learning.’

The practice-related learning is being developed in alignment with the standards set by the Australian Medical Council (AMC), and refined through collaboration with the AMC during the accreditation process. This addresses the AQF Level 9 Masters (Extended) specifications which stipulate that ‘as this qualification is designed to prepare graduates to engage in a profession, the practice-related learning must be developed in collaboration with a relevant professional, statutory or regulatory body.’

Across the program, approximately 94 weeks of clinical training will be undertaken. This is equivalent to the volume of learning of approximately 2.9 years (or approximately 92.8 credit points).

Responsibility and involvement will increase across the years of the program.

Year 2: Introduction to the Clinical Disciplines
• MEDI920 – MEDI923: Authentic clinical and practical experiences (approx. 2 days per week)

Year 3: Core Clinical Training
• MEDI932: Series of core clinical placements, each of 4 weeks duration, in Medicine, Surgery, Paediatrics, Mental Health, Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Primary Care – undertaken in an Australian health setting (approx. 5 days per week, 24 weeks)
• MEDI933: Series of core clinical placements, each of 4 weeks duration, in Medicine, Surgery, Paediatrics, Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Undifferentiated Care – undertaken in an international health setting (approx. 5 days per week, 20 weeks)

Year 4: Extended Clinical Practice
• MEDI942: Series of clinical placements providing opportunity for depth of professional-practice: Emergency Medicine and Selectives – undertaken in an Australian health setting (approx. 5 days per week, 16 weeks)
• MEDI943: Series of clinical placements providing opportunity for depth of professional-practice: Elective and Selective – undertaken in an international health setting (approx. 5 days per week, 16 weeks)

Given that professional-practice is a major component of 8 units (70cp), and that assessment in...
New Unit Requirements
Will new units be required for the program structure? Yes
If yes, what year will the units be introduced? 2018, 2019, 2020

Award Type
Is this a professional named award (accredited award)? Yes
Provide a brief rationale identifying the justification for a named award
The proposed name is in line with equivalent graduate-entry medical programs in the market. The AQF Qualifications Issuance Policy permits the use of the title 'Doctor of...' for Masters Degree (Extended) programs for five professions, including medical practice.

Professional Accreditation (if relevant)
Provide details of the professional body and timeframe
The program is currently undergoing assessment for accreditation with the Australian Medical Council (AMC). The accreditation process is multi-staged and involves detailed response to rigorous legislative and accreditation standards. The timelines are as follows:
- Stage 1 Resubmission - lodgement: 10 June 2016
- Stage 1 Resubmission - outcome: 1 September 2016
- Stage 2 Submission - lodgement: Jan/Feb 2017
- Stage 2 Submission - outcome: Feb/March 2017
- Site Visits: Mid-March 2017 (India); Early April 2017 (Australia)
- Draft report to University - informal outcome: Early July 2017
- Final outcome: October/November 2017

Articulated/Nested Award Arrangements (if relevant)
Does this award have Articulated/Nested Award Arrangements? No

Work Component
Refer to Section 1 of the CRICOS Application Guide
State the number of hours per week, the number of weeks, and the total number of hours that students must engage in work-based training as part of their program of study. TEQSA requires this information to be presented in this format, even where it does not align with a specific program structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours per week</th>
<th>Number of Weeks</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Working with Children Check
Will students require a working with Children Check? Yes
Overview and Aims of the Program

The Faculty intends to create a truly international medical education experience suitable for Australian and international students, by providing opportunities for clinical learning on at least two continents: Australia and South Asia, with elective possibilities in North America and elsewhere. While the primary focus is to prepare doctors who are ready to practice in Australia, the Macquarie Medical program will also achieve a balance between local and global experiences for our graduates, maintaining and promoting the AMC Standards in international settings.

The Overview and Aims of the program have been defined in terms of a Vision statement and associated Mission statements, as provided below.

Vision

To create Australia's first Global Medical program to provide a truly transnational quality assured medical education experience for local and international students. While embedded in learning within the Australian health care context, a strong emphasis on the comparison between health care systems and on emerging technologies in medical practice will ensure that our students master the cultural awareness and communication skills required for positive patient-centred care in any setting. Macquarie University graduates will be doctors who capably practice quality medicine in diverse local and global communities, and effectively connect with patients and inter-professional teams across cultures.

Mission

The primary mission of the Medical program is to graduate doctors with the scientific, clinical, social and professional capabilities that will serve as the basis for medical practice across the world. By collaborating with domestic and international partners who share similar value sets, we will provide an outstanding clinical and educational experience locally and globally. Our primary mission will be realised through our commitment to:

- Comparative and reflective approach to learning. We will use a comparative approach to the varied clinical, cultural and health system experiences of the program’s diverse group of students. By encouraging reflection on these experiences, we will foster the achievement of an international perspective and a global capability set for our graduates.
- Patient-centred Care. We will graduate doctors who will make the quality of the care of patients their first concern, ensuring health care systems work well for their patients, and applying their knowledge and skills in a practical, professional and ethical manner. They will be practitioners focusing on quality, safety, efficiency, patient advocacy, and team-based care.
- Innovation. We will develop a program that focuses on the role of health systems in the provision of quality care, and on the emerging technologies that will be required for medical practice into the future.
- Cultural competence. We will prepare doctors who are aware of the impact of their own culture and values on their medical practice, and have knowledge of, respect for and sensitivity towards the cultural needs of diverse populations, including Indigenous people. The development of cultural competence will be embedded in the education process of the program.
- Research, and Science-based Practice. We will prepare graduates with research skills who understand how knowledge is discovered and applied, and who will lead the improvement of health and medical care through scholarship and research-informed practice.

Program Learning Outcomes

Provide Program Learning Outcomes under the categories shown. The Graduate Capabilities should be referenced against each relevant Program Learning Outcome. Refer to senate.mq.edu.au/apc/resources.html.

Program Learning Outcomes

1. Explain the principles and concepts of the biological, clinical, epidemiological, social and behavioural sciences and apply this knowledge to the diagnosis and management of common and important clinical presentations. (K) (I) (T)
2. Design research questions, and critically evaluate and interpret medical and scientific literature and evidence to inform and improve medical practice. (T) (P) (L)
3. Demonstrate the ability to produce new knowledge by planning, executing and communicating a substantial research project to enhance medical practice or population health or healthcare delivery. (T) (P) (L)
4. Demonstrate effective communication skills as they apply to patient-centred care and effective participation in diverse health care teams and in face-to-face and online settings. (C) (E) (A) (J) (I)
5. Demonstrate safe, effective and patient-centred clinical reasoning and practice at a standard that meets the requirements of the Medical Board of Australia for registration as a doctor. (K) (I) (T) (E) (A)
6. Critically evaluate the social determinants of health of diverse populations, including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, and provide culturally respectful care. (K) (P) (C) (E) (A) (J)
7. Analyse health care systems and policies, use this analysis to enhance patient care and to recognise and respond appropriately to adverse events to improve healthcare and/or health systems. (K) (T) (P) (I) (E) (A) (J)
8. Synthesise and apply epidemiological concepts and current knowledge of major public health issues to identify and care for individuals at risk, and promote health. (K) (T) (I) (E) (A) (J)
9. Collaborate professionally in medical and inter-professional teams as colleague and/or leader. (I) (C) (E) (A) (J) (L)
10. Adhere to all ethical and legal standards and demonstrate a reflective approach to medical practice and learning. (E) (A) (J) (L)

The number of PLOs that a program should have is not specified. As a guide, between eight and twelve PLOs would be a reasonable number.

PLOs are made publicly available and so will be read by a wide audience. When writing PLOs it is useful to ask “is this written in a way which would be intelligible, accessible and meaningful to our students and prospective students?” Generally speaking, learning outcomes should be expressed in a form that includes action verbs, describing something your students can actually do, and can be assessed to have successfully done, like “identify”, “describe” or “differentiate”.

The AQF asks that PLOs should address the areas of Knowledge and Understanding, Skills and Capabilities, and the Application of Knowledge and Skills. It isn’t necessary for each PLO to be
Learning and Teaching Methods
Describe the mix of learning and teaching methods used in the program. Refer to senate.mq.edu.au/apc/resources.html.

**NOTE:** If this award is structured on specialisations, the Learning and Teaching Methods should be provided via the relevant Specialisation form.

The program will utilise a variety of teaching and learning methods to support learning and professional development in both pre-clinical placement sessions and during the clinical placements. Teaching will include:

- Real-time face-to-face contact through small-group lectures, case-based and case-method learning, research projects, group work, electronically simulated clinical situations.
- Online teaching and learning using quality video demonstrations, video animations, online quizzes and interactive lessons adapted from the BEST Network, and other sources.
- The use of asynchronous and synchronous online discussions, reflective learning activities and personal and professional development review opportunities using an e-portfolio system.

Learning and teaching methods in the clinical settings will include:

- Role modelling
- Supervised clinical skills development in clinical teaching sites in Australian and global settings
- Embedding students in teams in a range of roles which progressively increase in complexity and responsibility: observer, scribe, runner, and assistant (taking histories, performing examinations and learning to reason).
- Emphasis on enhancing workplace learning in clinical settings through formal and informal workplace-based peer groups. In these groups, peers will provide accessible and relevant resources to help each other navigate transitions, clarify roles and tasks, manage interpersonal challenges, and decrease isolation.

In alignment with the global mission of the Medical program, a key component is the comparative approach to teaching and learning across the different international settings. Global cases will be incorporated in the curriculum during Year 1 and 3, and opportunities for students to ‘virtually’ experience aspects of Indian culture, to strengthen their cultural competency and prepare them for the clinical experiences in India, will be provided.

Assessment
Describe the assessment methods that will be used to assess the learning outcomes. Refer to senate.mq.edu.au/apc/resources.html.

**NOTE:** If this award is structured on specialisations, the Assessment details should be provided via the relevant Specialisation form.

The assessment framework for the program aims to ensure a high degree of constructive alignment between the main program elements (teaching and learning activities and methods, assessments, unit and program learning outcomes). Constructive alignment will guide all aspects of the program design to ensure that the assessment and teaching activities support and foster relevant and required learning, and that students meet the program learning outcomes.

Assessment in the program will be outcomes based. The program learning outcomes have been translated into an operational form that is readily understood by staff and students: as four high level Capabilities, each with two key aspects. Each aspect has associated and detailed expectation statements that provide a clear and functional guide to both students and staff on the range and scope of the types of integrated performances graduates are expected to be able to undertake. In relevant areas directly related to clinical work, these performances are further described through the Entrustable Professional Activities (EPA) framework. The EPAs will form a focus of teaching and assessment in those areas of the program that directly relate to the main activities of hospital interns, the next stage of training for our graduates. Expectation statements and EPAs have been developed for both the main program (Years 1-4) and graduation (end of Year 4) points. Students will demonstrate their achievement of the capability expectations, and of required levels of trust in the EPAs, at mid-point and in order to graduate from the program. By expressing our learning outcomes as capabilities and aspects, and by focusing on clinical assessments on the EPAs, the program will prepare graduates for the next stage of their medical training, while at the same time giving them the critical, communication and reflective skills to sustain lifelong learning in medicine.

Assessment in the program will also be programmatic. In all years, there will be a mixture of unit and trans-unit/programmatic assessments, with the results from both being brought forward into a portfolio assessment that will form an assessment hurdle at the end of years 2 and 4. Informal portfolio reviews will be held in years 1 and 3 to help identify students at risk of failing the formal assessments and who may need additional support.

**Years 1 and 2**
Assessment methods in Years 1 and 2 will include a range of methods chosen to suit the focus of each unit. This may include essays; group assignments with individually assessed components; short examinations and spot tests of mainly science material involving a range of question types; OSCEs with simulated and standard stimulus material; role play assessments; case research and communication tasks. This part of the program may include some mastery and/or sequential testing assessments. Some clinical assessments will also be used, as students in this phase will be regularly engaged in clinical settings. Where possible the assessment tasks will be designed to provide an indication of progress in, and feedback on, multiple capability expectations. At the end of year 1 there will be a clinical skills examination and a portfolio review, the latter to check student progress towards achievement of the mid-program capability expectations, offering feedback and identifying students who may require additional support.

In addition to these assessment methods, all students before the end of Year 2 will sit the IFOM basic sciences examination, the most well-developed internationally-relevant benchmark assessment for assessing the core medical science knowledge of students engaged in medical education. Teaching and assessment activities in the program will be designed, inter alia, to support student preparation for this examination.

The end of Year 2 examination will involve a portfolio assessment of the aggregated assessment data to date, and a clinical examination in the form of a multi-station OSCE. These assessments, together with the IFOM BSE examination will be hurdle assessments for this stage of the program. The portfolio will assess achievement of each of the mid-program capability expectations.

**Years 3 and 4**
Assessment methods in these years will focus on ongoing clinical assessments, progress tests in the format of the IFOM 2 examination, and assessment of the research project – all aimed at encouraging development towards achievement of the program’s graduate capability expectations and, ultimately, a level of clinical competency appropriate for an intern in Australia.

The clinical assessment methods will likely include: OSCEs, DOPS, Mini-CEX, 360 Degree feedback; simulation exercises; and TMex teamwork assessments. The use of multiple formats to gather evidence about the student’s level of competence will increase the reliability of the assessment. Specific instruments will be used to test capability expectations not addressed by other methods, or where the data yielded by the other methods is insufficient to make an accurate assessment. While the assessments in these years will be primarily focused on performance in clinical settings, students will also be required to demonstrate an adequate grasp of essential applied and clinical
Support for Learning
Describe how learners are supported in the program. This might include descriptions of induction, staff expertise or standing, pastoral and academic support, academic advising, resources etc. Refer to senate.mq.edu.au/apc/resources.html.

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

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

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

A significant body of work is being undertaken to design appropriate support for students in the program. AMC Accreditation Standard 7.3 is based around ensuring adequate support for student wellbeing, learning and progression (students at risk), including appropriate support for students with special needs and/or students from under-represented groups.

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

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

Further, the program is subject to reaccreditation cycles with the Australian Medical Council (AMC) which will ensure its compliance with the Standards for Assessment and Accreditation of Primary Medical Programs (2012).

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

Graduate Destinations and Employability
The program will graduate students who have the appropriate knowledge, skills and professional attributes to function effectively as interns in Australian hospitals and will be positioned to undergo further training in any of the Australasian specialty colleges. In Australia, one year of internship is required prior to registration. Most junior doctors make their career choice during their second or postgraduate year. Clinical training under the supervision of one of the specialist colleges (e.g. Royal Australian College of Surgeons, Royal Australian College of General Practitioners) generally takes between three and six years.

Further, and unique to Australia, it is anticipated that graduates will also be prepared to capably practice quality medicine in diverse global communities.

Other careers for graduates of the program include medical research, teaching, medical administration, consulting and overseas aid work.

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

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

Students in the program will need to meet the assessment requirements of each unit and achieve the expected standard articulated for the mid-program (end of Year 2) and graduation (end of Year 4) progression points.

Due to the professional nature of the program, and the associated accreditation requirements of the Australian Medical Council (AMC) and registration requirements of the Medical Board of Australia, students in the program will be subject to progression rules similar to those in place at equivalent medical schools in Australia. These rules will primarily relate to the number of times a unit may be failed and retaken, and will impose a minimum time requirement for completion of the program and/or to meet the mid-program (end of year 2) programmatic assessment hurdles.

The programmatic assessments will be embedded within relevant units and are hurdle assessments for these units.

Students in the program will be registered as Medical Students with the Medical Board of Australia and are expected to act at all times in accordance with the standards outlined in the 'Good Medical Practice: a Code of Conduct for Doctors in Australia' published by the Board (http://www.medicalboard.gov.au/Codes-Guidelines-Policies/Code-of-conduct.aspx). Behaviour that is seriously unprofessional or unethical, or repeated minor lapses in professional behaviour, may be considered by the University to constitute serious misconduct and may result in suspension or exclusion from the Medical program. It is anticipated that this aspect will be covered by the University’s Fitness to Practice Policy (currently under development).

Practitioners, employers and education providers are all mandated by law to report (mandatory notification) medical students to the Medical Board, when they have a reasonable belief that the medical student has an impairment, which may place the public at "substantial risk of harm", while undertaking clinical training. The Board may impose conditions on a medical student seeking registration with the Board upon graduation from the program.

Mapping of Program Learning Outcomes to Units
Formal qualifications, RPL (where offered). Refer to senate.mq.edu.au/apc/resources.html.

Mapping of Program Learning Outcomes to Units
Requirements file has been uploaded. (Uploading another will replace the present one.)

To view the requirements download the file Map FOM PG A MedGloMD ID272-1.xlsx
RPL

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

Define cognate areas (relevant discipline) of prior studies:
Program will not commence until 2018 and discussions regarding RPL will take place within an MD Admission & Selection Committee during 2016.
Current Position: Not applicable


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

Define relevant areas of prior work or professional experience:
Program will not commence until 2018 and discussions regarding RPL will take place within an MD Admission & Selection Committee during 2016.
Current Position: Not applicable

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

RPL for Entry

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

Non-Cognate Bachelor (AQF7)
Complete Bachelor degree in any discipline
Not applicable

Cognate Bachelor (AQF7)
Complete Bachelor degree in a relevant discipline
Not applicable

Non-Cognate Bachelor (AQF7) + Work Experience
Complete Bachelor degree in any discipline and work experience in a relevant area
Not applicable

No Formal Learning + Work Experience
No studies complete including or higher than a Bachelor degree in any discipline and work experience in a relevant area
Not applicable

RPL for Credit Recognition

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

Cognate Diploma (AQF5)
Enter with a Diploma in a relevant discipline
Not applicable

Cognate Diploma (AQF6)
Enter with a Diploma in a relevant discipline
Not applicable

Cognate Bachelor (AQF7)
Complete Bachelor degree in a relevant discipline
Not applicable

Not applicable
### Justification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Analysis</th>
<th>Domestic Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain how the proposed new award fits with the Faculty's Learning and Teaching Plan providing specific examples. Demonstrate how this is consistent with the University’s Academic Plan. Refer to <a href="http://mq.edu.au/about/strategy/academicplan.html">http://mq.edu.au/about/strategy/academicplan.html</a></td>
<td>The program has been developed to embody the key objectives of the University’s Learning and Teaching Strategic Framework: 2015 – 2020. It will be designed as a fully integrated medical program that places connectivity, creativity and innovation at the centre of its curriculum. A program-based approach to the development and the assessment (namely Programmatic Assessment) has already been developed. Students in the program will learn in a connected learning ecosystem that will embed inter-professional learning, transnational learning and experiential learning opportunities in various learning settings in Australia and overseas. Specific attention will be given to the design of resources and learning experiences utilising new and emerging technologies. A full and pedagogically sound integration of the existing Learning Management System with tools that promote reflection and can advance employability skills, such as E-portfolios, is already taking place to support the delivery of the program. Plans to foster and promote peer learning using virtual learning teams in Australia and India are being discussed at an advanced level and will promote such things as team work, intercultural competency and digital competency development all of which are important priorities for Macquarie University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For awards which will be offered to the International market, explain why this award will be attractive to International students. For assistance please contact Nicola Bate, Associate Director, Business Development, Macquarie International (ext 1190).</td>
<td>Data from the Medical Training Review Panel Eighteenth Report (May 2015) tells us that of the students undertaking a medical program at an Australian university in 2014, 26.1 per cent were in a six-year course, 25.6 per cent were in a five-year course and 48.3 per cent were in a four-year course. The practice of entering into a four-year postgraduate ‘Doctor of Medicine’, after the completion of a bachelor degree, is increasingly popular to students, and is the model that many Australian universities (including Macquarie) are adopting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macquarie Advantages</td>
<td>Macquarie’s Global Medical Program has several unique selling points that will be highly appealing to both domestic and international students:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If an established need is recognised for the proposed award, explain how Macquarie University provides a desirable or unique opportunity for the successful establishment of the proposed award. Determine in what way your proposal is different from similar awards offered by competitors.</td>
<td>• Australia’s first Global Medical Program. • Structured international experiences will give students a global perspective and deep cultural awareness. • Two years of structured clinical placements in Australia and global settings (India) and quality-assured elective options in global settings (North America and elsewhere). • Macquarie University graduates will be doctors who capably practice quality medicine in diverse local and global communities, and effectively connect with patients and inter-professional teams across cultures. • Extensive clinical experience within Macquarie University Hospital – Australia’s only university owned, on-campus hospital – and other high-quality clinical settings. • Future-focused practice with a strong focus on comparative clinical learning and digital technology in an increasingly digital clinical environment. • When combined with Macquarie’s innovative fast-tracked Bachelor of Clinical Science, students will be able to enter their internship after six years of study. This compares to seven years of study at competitor universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Cognate Bachelor (AQF7) + Work Experience</td>
<td>Complete Bachelor degree in any discipline and work experience in a relevant area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognate Bachelor (AQF7) + Work Experience</td>
<td>Complete Bachelor degree in any discipline and work experience in a relevant area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Any Bachelor (AQF7)) + Cognate Honours and/or Graduate Diploma (AQF8)</td>
<td>(Assumed) Complete Bachelor degree in any discipline and Postgraduate study in a relevant discipline equal to or higher than AQF level 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Any other relevant pathway that may reduce the study load for an applicant. Consider: Additional Accreditation relevant to the field, employment etc. e.g. Membership to Charted Professional Accountants towards the Master of Accounting (Professional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Competitive Offerings

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>Competitive Offering</th>
<th>Additional information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of NSW</td>
<td>Bachelor of Medical Studies/MD</td>
<td>Undergraduate entry - 6 year program - large cohort size - focus on rural rather than global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Newcastle/University of New England</td>
<td>MBBS</td>
<td>Undergraduate entry - 6 year program - unstructured opportunities to undertake clinical placement abroad or participate in semester-long exchange with students from other medical schools in England, Sweden and/or Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Queensland</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Graduate entry - 4 year program - large cohort size - global stream with US for US citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Graduate entry - 4 year program - large cohort size - not a strong global focus - MQ looking to foster a collaborative relationship (sharing clinical learning environments)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Student Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Student Demand</th>
<th>1st Year of offering</th>
<th>2nd Year of offering</th>
<th>3rd Year of offering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Total EFTSU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest EFTSU for which award would be run</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Full-time and Part-time Students</th>
<th>1st Year of offering</th>
<th>2nd Year of offering</th>
<th>3rd Year of offering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of Full-time students</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of Part-time students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of international students expected to enrol in this award: 20
Number of domestic students expected to enrol in this award: 40

Consultation

Stakeholder Consultation

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultees</th>
<th>Date of consultation</th>
<th>Method of consultation and outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University: Clinical, academic &amp; research staff of the Faculty (incl. physiotherapy), the Hospital &amp; Clinics, relevant areas of the University (education, audiology, psychology, health ethics), Chairs of ASQC and SLTC, PVC (L&amp;T) Partners: Executive and clinical staff from MindSpot Clinic, Apollo Health City (India) and Northern Sydney Local Health District External: Community and patients (via the MUHSC Consumer Advisory Committee), recent graduates of other Australian medical programs, current medical students from international medical programs, the Australian Medical Council, Government</td>
<td>Various - Since September 2015</td>
<td>Full Day Planning Day; Various Curriculum Development Committees; Informal consultation with Executive Dean, Project Team and Steering Group; Faculty Town Halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Various - Since September 2015</td>
<td>Various meetings with Executive Dean and Project Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Various - Since September 2015</td>
<td>Various meetings with University Executive and Project Team; as part of the accreditation process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching Arrangements: Availability of teaching and support staff

Please address:

- Availability of academic and support staff to deliver the proposed award program
- A risk analysis including any backup plan in relation to the availability of academic and support staffing
- Processes in place to guarantee the quality of academic staffing, available resources for teaching and provision of adequate curriculum delivery, assessment and authentication of student work.

Details provided in full Business case - to be presented to DVC-A in October 2016 (prior to 1 November Academic Senate meeting).

The below sections need to be filled in by Library and LTC staff respectively prior to submission to your Head of Department. Relevant staff members can be found as follows.
### Library Consultation

**Library**: view a list of Research Librarians at [www.mq.edu.au/on-campus/library/research/research_librarians](http://www.mq.edu.au/on-campus/library/research/research_librarians)

**Learning and Teaching Consultation**: contact your Faculty Associate Dean of Learning and Teaching.

Please contact the relevant staff members with:
1. The name and unit code for this unit
2. The link to this webform ([http://senate.mq.edu.au/apc/webforms_prog/](http://senate.mq.edu.au/apc/webforms_prog/))

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

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

---

### Library Consultation: Address whether library resources and services are available to support the proposed new unit

**Research Librarian**: Mary Simons  **Date**: 23 August 2016

**Summary Impact Information**

**Resources**: The Doctor of Medicine Program, to be offered by the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences in 2018, will be supported by the Library. Macquarie University Library’s collection currently supports Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences programs including the Bachelor of Clinical Science.

Ongoing resource building to support this program is expected to fall within the normal scope of collection development. However, initial budgeting with be required to fill gaps in our existing collection, specifically in relation to eBooks to support units that are to be developed. We estimate an initial costing of AU$10,000, which should form a part of our 2018 budget submission.

In addition, depending on the final number of students enrolled within the entire program, the Library could incur additional charges in license costs due to increase in medical FTEs thus moving Macquarie into a higher FTE band for medical students. Any additional costing would be submitted as part of our 2018 budget submission.

**Services / Staffing**: Once unit conveners are allocated, they will liaise with the Clinical Librarians to identify resources and services to support the unit that may fall outside the normal scope of collection development.


Resources for Reserve and online Unit Readings need to be sent to the Library before each session: lib.reserve@mq.edu.au

---

### Learning and Teaching Consultation: Address whether learning and teaching resources and services are available to support the proposed new unit

**Educational Developer**: Sherrie Love  **Date**: 19 August 2016

**Summary Impact Information**

**Resources**: The University along with the Learning Innovation Hub support and service the Learning Management System (LMS) including but not limited to iLearn & ECHO360. Support is available in-person, email or phone to academic & professional staff and students. Both the Learning Innovation Hub and the Faculty of Medicine & Health Sciences will provide training and support to both staff and students with respect to learning technologies. Staff can enrol in workshops on the University’s Learning and Teaching Blog [http://teche.ltc.mq.edu.au/](http://teche.ltc.mq.edu.au/)

**Services / Staffing**: The Faculty education team will provide support in the areas of curriculum design, review, implementation and evaluation. In addition, a comprehensive program of themed activities such as the face-to-face and/or blended programs offered in the faculty and centrally will assist unit conveners and their teaching staff in developing their practice as leaders of learning in the higher education context.

---

### International

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Time Mode</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will international students be able to undertake the award in full time mode?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Mode</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will students be able to study the proposed award in internal mode for at least 75% each semester?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 2 commencements</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the student commences in S2 will the duration of the program of study be extended due to subject unavailability? (eg, are the core subjects available both S1 and S2 each year?)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International students studying on a student visa should commence in S1 only.
Certification

The below section needs to be filled in by a Macquarie International representative prior to submission to your Head of Department.

Please contact Please contact the International Compliance Manager (ext 7399; email mi.compliance@mq.edu.au) with the name of this proposal. You can proceed to any other part of this webform, but should only submit for approval when the below sections have been completed.

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

Name of MI representative: Carmen Law Date: 23/8/2016

Comments
reviewed by MI. carmen.law@mq.edu.au

Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Liability Category</th>
<th>Fee Paying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrangements with Other Providers</td>
<td>Does the program have arrangements with other providers? Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other provider arrangements may include partnerships with other institutions, higher education providers, or entities. Where an award proposes to use other provider arrangements, TEQSA requires information about the proposed responsibilities of every party involved in providing the course of study. Refer to Section 2 of the CRICOS Application Guide.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course management: curriculum design, delivery and academic standards, assessment and the entity awarding the qualification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program will be developed and approved by the University. The Medical program will be offered by the University alone, and the responsibility for the academic standards, including the development of curriculum and the development and implementation of quality assurance frameworks, will remain with the University. The Letters of Support and Intent clinical partners acknowledge that Macquarie University will have responsibility for the quality assurance of the clinical placements, including the clinical experiences and assessments. The detailed formal agreements which will be developed will explicitly detail this responsibility, and the ways in which it will be implemented and assured through commitments from the partner. These requirements are also stipulated in the AMC’s policy statement on Primary Medical Programs Provided Offshore by Australian and/or New Zealand Education Providers: 4.1.2: “[The AMC] will only assess proposals for medical programs that are located in an Australian or New Zealand higher education provider, where the Australian/New Zealand provider has developed the program and has a responsibility for the academic standards.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-enrolment engagement of students: marketing information and practices, information provided to students prior to enrolment, formalisation of enrolment and education agents The Faculty will provide transparent and upfront information to domestic and international students, especially in relation to requirements to undertake clinical placements in global settings, and associated costs and compliance aspects (e.g. visa and vaccination requirements). Other information which will be provided includes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program Requirements: structure; fees; requirements to undertake clinical placements in global settings, including locations and associated costs; clinical placement allocation policies; inherent requirements and reasonable adjustments; professionalism and fitness to practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compliance Requirements: Vaccination Policies; WWCC; Criminal Record Checks; Medical Board registration; Visa requirements; Insurance requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to Internships: Overview of internship application processes; clear overview of access to internships in Australia (COAG Agreement and International student access)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Selection and Admission: Admission requirements; application and selection processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care for and services to students: the arrangements for younger students (where applicable) and student support services Appropriate student support services will be available in domestic and offshore settings. In offshore settings, a student support program will be established consisting of an on-arrival reception and orientation/induction; an online Wellbeing program; virtual communities of practice to connect students, academics and clinicians across local and global settings; established serviced accommodation; a near-peer buddy system and an implementation of the University’s International SOS response and risk assessment initiative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student visa requirements: completion within the expected duration of study, monitoring course progress, monitoring work-based training attendance where applicable, course credit and deferring, suspending or cancelling a student’s enrolment. The program is available full-time, enabling completion within the expected duration of time. The program will adhere to standard University practices in terms of student visa requirements, including monitoring of course progression, monitoring work-based training attendance, credit, deferring, and suspending or cancelling a student’s enrolment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Benchmarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State the names (with links) of any external benchmarks that have been applied in the design of this program. Refer to senate.mq.edu.au/apc/resources.html.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Australian Medical Council (AMC): Standards for Assessment and Accreditation of Primary Medical Programs (2012): <a href="http://www.amc.org.au/files/d0ffcecda9608cf49c66c93a79a4ad549638bea0_original.pdf">http://www.amc.org.au/files/d0ffcecda9608cf49c66c93a79a4ad549638bea0_original.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC): Core Entrustable Professional Activities (EPAs) for Entering Residency: https://members.aamc.org/eweb/upload/Core%20EPA%20Curriculum%
# Approvals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ext</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hayley Harris</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hayley.harris@mq.edu.au">hayley.harris@mq.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Wed - 14/10/15</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Barton</td>
<td>5555</td>
<td><a href="mailto:linda.barton@mq.edu.au">linda.barton@mq.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Tue - 3/11/15</td>
<td>Faculty Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The FMHS Faculty Board met on 2 November 2015 and approved this EOI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Barton</td>
<td>5555</td>
<td><a href="mailto:linda.barton@mq.edu.au">linda.barton@mq.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Tue - 30/8/16</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submitted to FEC meeting 29 August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Barton</td>
<td>5555</td>
<td><a href="mailto:linda.barton@mq.edu.au">linda.barton@mq.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Tue - 30/8/16</td>
<td>Head of Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The following resolution was made at FEC meeting 16/5 held on 29 August 2016::</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RESOLUTION 16/45 That the FEC recommends the Program Proposal for the Doctor of Medicine (Global MD) to Faculty Board for endorsement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Barton</td>
<td>5555</td>
<td><a href="mailto:linda.barton@mq.edu.au">linda.barton@mq.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Tue - 27/9/16</td>
<td>Faculty Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At the meeting of the FMHS Faculty Board held on 26 September 2016 Faculty Board resolved to endorse and recommend the Doctor of Medicine (Global MD) Program to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you experience problems with this site, please email curriculum@mq.edu.au
**Postgraduate Award Template**

**AWARD NAME:** Doctor of Medicine (Global MD)

**General requirements:**
- Minimum number of credit points: 128
- Minimum number of credit points at 600 level: 0
- Minimum number of credit points at 800 level or above: 128
- Completion of other specific minimum requirements as set out below

**Specific minimum requirements:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Unit Code</th>
<th>Unit Title</th>
<th>Credit Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDI910</td>
<td>Applied Medical Science 1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDI911</td>
<td>Clinical Practice 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDI912</td>
<td>Evidence-Based Inter-Professional Health Care 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDI913</td>
<td>Applied Medical Science 2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDI914</td>
<td>Clinical Practice 2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDI915</td>
<td>Evidence-Based Inter-Professional Health Care 2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDI920</td>
<td>Primary Care, Wellbeing and Cancer</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDI921</td>
<td>Musculoskeletal, Neurosciences and Ageing</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDI922</td>
<td>Cardiovascular, Respiratory, Gastroenterology, Surgery and Metabolism</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDI923</td>
<td>Critical Care, Patient Safety and Quality, and Research</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDI924</td>
<td>Reflective Medical Practice 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDI931</td>
<td>Research Project 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDI932</td>
<td>Core Clinical Placements A</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDI933</td>
<td>Core Clinical Placements B</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDI941</td>
<td>Research Project 2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDI942</td>
<td>Advanced Clinical Placements A</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDI943</td>
<td>Advanced Clinical Placements B</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDI944</td>
<td>Reflective Medical Practice 2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL CREDIT POINTS REQUIRED FOR THIS PROGRAM**

128
ITEM 10.2  NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL FOR THE GRADUATE DIPLOMA OF PHYSICAL HEALTH (EXIT AWARD) (ASQC)

For approval

Recommended resolution
That Academic Senate approve the academic case for the Graduate Diploma of Physical Health (Exit Award), effective 1 January 2017.

Background
As per attached papers, the proposed program is an exit award of the Doctor of Physiotherapy.
The academic case for the proposed program was endorsed by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee at its meeting of 18 October 2016.
General

The Education Services for Overseas Students (ESOS) Act 2000, and The National Code of Practice govern the delivery of courses to International students. All programs of study offered to International students studying in Australia on a student visa must have a CRICOS code and comply with these provisions. This includes the requirement that holders of an international student visa maintain full-time enrolment. Therefore, consultation with Macquarie International will be required prior to submission.

Name of Award
Graduate Diploma of Physical Health

Exit Award Status
Is this award an exit award only (ie. not available for admission)? Yes
List specific awards for which this award is an exit pathway Doctor of Physiotherapy
Additional information about exit award status (if required)

AQF Level and Qualification Type
Level 8 Graduate Diploma

Volume of Learning / Duration
1 year FTE

Owning Faculty
Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences

Owning Department
Department of Health Professions

Year of First Offering
2018 Note: this is for implementation from 1 January 2017

Rationale
This award will be an exit award for students who are unlikely to meet the requirements of Doctor of Physiotherapy. It is proposed that the Graduate Diploma of Health be offered as an exit award to students who have completed the first 8 units in the Doctor of Physiotherapy program which is 32 credit points. At this point in the program students have completed units involving the integration, analysis and synthesis of complex information pertaining to physical health. As such it meets the University’s requirement for a Graduate Diploma by coursework since it has 800 level units designed around the advanced disciplinary knowledge, skill and application of knowledge and skills as per the AQF requirements. Graduates will have advanced theoretical and technical knowledge of physical health and advanced cognitive, technical and communication skills to select and apply methods and technologies to:
• analyse critically, evaluate and transform information to complete a range of activities
• analyse, generate and transmit solutions to complex problems
• transmit knowledge, skills and ideas to others
Graduates will apply knowledge and skills to demonstrate autonomy, well-developed judgement, of knowledge adaptability and responsibility as a learner. The volume of learning would be 1 year as students admitted to the Doctor of Physiotherapy Degree have a Bachelor’s degree in a cognate discipline.

Replacement
Does the proposed award replace an existing award? No

Details

Program Structure
Is the award structured on Specialisations? No

Requirements
Requirements file has been uploaded.
To view the requirements download the file FOM PG A GraPhyHea ID463-2.xlsx
Specification

Program Learning Outcomes
Provide Program Learning Outcomes under the categories shown. The Graduate Capabilities should be referenced against each relevant Program Learning Outcome. Refer to senate.mq.edu.au/apc/resources.html.

By the end of this program it is anticipated you should be able to:

1) Describe the regulatory and ethical frameworks, organisation of healthcare in Australia and roles and responsibilities of the health professionals who typically work in a interprofessional Healthcare team. (K, T, P, C, E, A)
2) Integrate background sciences (anatomy, physiology, neuroscience, biomechanics, psychology, motor learning, public health and psychology) and evidence to describe the theoretical rationale and concepts which underpin contemporary physiotherapy practice (K T P I C E A P)
3) Outline the biopsychosocial clinical reasoning model based on the World Health Organization (WHO)'s, International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health and explain how the model can facilitate physiotherapy assessment and treatment (K T P I C E A J)
4) Demonstrate an ability to assess, plan, develop, implement and evaluate physiotherapy interventions for adults presenting with common health conditions (K T P I C E A J)
5) Work collaboratively and communicate effectively in healthcare and educational settings as well as the wider community (K P C E A J L)
6) Critically appraise research and healthcare and demonstrate problem solving skills by articulating recommendations to improve healthcare (K T P I C E A J L)
7) Demonstrate skills in reflective practice by formulating appropriate professional development plans (K T P I C E A J L)

The number of PLOs that a program should have is not specified. As a guide, between eight and twelve PLOs would be a reasonable number.

PLOs are made publicly available and so will be read by a wide audience. When writing PLOs it is useful to ask "is this written in a way which would be intelligible, accessible and meaningful to our students and prospective students?". Generally speaking, learning outcomes should be expressed in a form that includes action verbs, describing something your students can actually do, and can be assessed to have successfully done, like "identify", "describe" or "differentiate".

The AQF asks that PLOs should address the areas of Knowledge and Understanding, Skills and Capabilities, and the Application of Knowledge and Skills. It isn't necessary for each PLO to be classified under one of these headings. However it is important for the overall collection of PLOs for a program to clearly address all of these factors.

Each program learning outcome should be mapped to the graduate capabilities it fosters, using the standard letter codes given.

RPL

There is nothing to enter on this page

Justification

There is nothing to enter on this page

Consultation

There is nothing to enter on this page

International

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Time Mode</th>
<th>Will international students be able to undertake the award in full time mode?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Mode</th>
<th>Will students be able to study the proposed award in internal mode for at least 75% each semester?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 2 commencements</th>
<th>If the student commences in S2 will the duration of the program of study be extended due to subject unavailability? (eg, are the core subjects available both S1 and S2 each year?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certification
The below section needs to be filled in by a Macquarie International representative prior to submission to your Head of Department.

Please contact the International Compliance Manager (ext 7359; email mi.compliance@mq.edu.au) with the name of this proposal. You can proceed to any other part of this webform, but should only submit for approval when the below sections have been completed.

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

**Name of MI representative:** Carmen Law  **Date:** 9/9/2016

**Comments**
Please note DPThas only a session 2 intake

### Other

There is nothing to enter on this page

### Approvals

Name: Catherine Dean  **Ext:** 6620  **Email:** catherine.dean@mq.edu.au  **Date:** Wed - 27/7/16  **Comment:**

Name: Kirsty Forrest  **Ext:** 3515  **Email:** kirsty.forrest@mq.edu.au  **Date:** Thu - 28/7/16  **Comment:**

Name: Linda Barton  **Ext:** 5555  **Email:** linda.barton@mq.edu.au  **Date:** Thu - 18/8/16  **Comment:**

Name: Linda Barton  **Ext:** 5555  **Email:** linda.barton@mq.edu.au  **Date:** Tue - 13/9/16  **Comment:**

Name: Linda Barton  **Ext:** 5555  **Email:** linda.barton@mq.edu.au  **Date:** Tue - 13/9/16  **Comment:**

Name: Rebecca Ball  **Ext:** 7237  **Email:** rebecca.ball@mq.edu.au  **Date:** Wed - 28/9/16  **Comment:**
If you experience problems with this site, please email curriculum@mq.edu.au

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ext</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Super user</td>
<td>candp</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john@jazzmedia.com.au">john@jazzmedia.com.au</a></td>
<td>Wed - 28/9/16</td>
<td>Sent back to HOD in error. Re-approved administratively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super user</td>
<td>candp</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john@jazzmedia.com.au">john@jazzmedia.com.au</a></td>
<td>Wed - 28/9/16</td>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AWARD NAME:
Graduate Diploma of Physical Health (Exit award for DPT)

### General requirements:
- Minimum number of credit points: **48**
- Minimum number of credit points at 600 level: **48**
- Minimum number of credit points at 800 level or above: **48**
- Completion of other specific minimum requirements as set out below

### Specific minimum requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Unit Code</th>
<th>Unit Title</th>
<th>Unit CP</th>
<th>Select</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHTY800</td>
<td>Foundation Sciences for Physiotherapy A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHTY801</td>
<td>Foundation Sciences for Physiotherapy B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHTY802</td>
<td>Foundations of Physiotherapy Practice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHTY803</td>
<td>Interprofessional Healthcare</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHTY804</td>
<td>Evidence-based Health Care</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHTY805</td>
<td>Physiotherapy Practice A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHTY806</td>
<td>Physiotherapy Practice B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHTY807</td>
<td>Physiotherapy Practice C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL CREDIT POINTS REQUIRED FOR THIS PROGRAM**: **32**
ITEM 10.3 PROPOSAL TO DISCONTINUE THE MASTER OF APPLIED FINANCE (DUAL DEGREE PROGRAM WITH EAST CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY (ECNU) SHANGHAI) (ASQC)

For approval

Recommended resolution
That Academic Senate approve the discontinuation of the Master of Applied Finance (Dual Degree program with East China Normal University (ECNU) Shanghai) from 31 December 2016.

Background
The proposal was endorsed by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee at its meeting of 18 October 2016. As per the attached papers, the Dual Degree program with East China Normal University (ECNU) Shanghai is being switched from the Master of Applied Finance to the new Master of Banking and Finance.

The Faculty of Business and Economics (owning department is the Applied Finance Centre) has indicated that the last cohort for the Bachelor of Applied Finance is 2016; with a new cohort for the Master of Banking and Finance from 1 January 2017.

There are no outstanding offers for the program.
### General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Award</th>
<th>Master of Applied Finance (ECNU)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owning Faculty</td>
<td>Faculty of Business and Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owning Department</td>
<td>Applied Finance Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuance Checklist</td>
<td>Deletions file has been uploaded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To view the requirements download the file <a href="http://senate.mq.edu.au/apc/resources.html">Del FBE PG A AppFinECN ID415-2.pdf</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Information**

The Dual Degree program with ECNU (Shanghai) is being switched from the MAppFin to the new Master of Banking and Finance. Last cohort for MAppFin is 2016; new cohort with MBF from Jan 2017. There are no outstanding offers for the program.

### Approvals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ext</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rita Haddad</td>
<td>6463</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rita.haddad@mafc.mq.edu.au">rita.haddad@mafc.mq.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Thu - 25/2/16</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Cooper</td>
<td>7073</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anne.cooper@mafc.mq.edu.au">anne.cooper@mafc.mq.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Thu - 25/2/16</td>
<td>Head of Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Boneham</td>
<td>4813</td>
<td><a href="mailto:helen.boneham@mq.edu.au">helen.boneham@mq.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Fri - 26/2/16</td>
<td>FSQC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Cooper</td>
<td>7073</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anne.cooper@mafc.mq.edu.au">anne.cooper@mafc.mq.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Fri - 26/2/16</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Cooper</td>
<td>7073</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anne.cooper@mafc.mq.edu.au">anne.cooper@mafc.mq.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Fri - 26/2/16</td>
<td>Head of Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Ross-Smith</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anne.ross-smith@mq.edu.au">anne.ross-smith@mq.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Fri - 26/2/16</td>
<td>FSQC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Jameson</td>
<td>9443</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kevin.jameson@mq.edu.au">kevin.jameson@mq.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Tue - 11/10/16</td>
<td>Faculty Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you experience problems with this site, please email curriculum@mq.edu.au
Checklist for Discontinuing Academic Programs

SECTION 1: Program Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Award</th>
<th>Master of Applied Finance (ECNU)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Code</td>
<td>ECNU11M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRICOS Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Faculty of Business and Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Lead</td>
<td>(Responsible for managing change process) Dr Anne Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Replacement Award</td>
<td>Master of Banking and Finance (ECNU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Program Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New CRICOS Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 2: Consultation

It is important that wide consultation takes place before the program is discontinued so that stakeholders who are impacted by the program are fully aware of the proposed change at the earliest possibility. For example, students in another Faculty will be affected if the discontinued program provided course units they wanted to take in future years, and if the program is offered to International Students there may be additional considerations.

1. **Is this Program part of an articulated pathway, or have any associated Major/Minor specialisations?**
   (This should include any Majors/Minors etc that can be taught with this Program)
   **YES/ NO**

   If YES, Program Leads in all associated programs should be informed of the proposed withdrawal, and date, by email. Please list each associated program (e.g. Major Bachelor of Arts), the name and title of the person who has been informed, and the date of the email:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of associated Program</th>
<th>Person contacted</th>
<th>Date of Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Is this Program taught off-Campus, and/or have any External partners?**  
   YES/NO  
   If YES, the appropriate officer/contact should be informed of proposed withdrawal, and date, by email. Please list each associated off-campus location, and/or External partner, the name and title of the person who has been informed, and the date of the email:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Off-Campus Location, and/or External Partner</th>
<th>Person Contacted</th>
<th>Date of Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECNU</td>
<td>Dr T Wang</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Is this Program available to International Students?**  
   Closed program, only available to ECNU dual degree students  
   YES/ NO  
   Closed program, only available to ECNU dual degree students  
   If Yes, advise Macquarie International of anticipated date to stop making offers.  
   (Note: This should be at least +18 months before Date of Discontinuance as international students may be given package offers with early start dates.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person contacted:</th>
<th>Date of Email:</th>
<th>Agreed Last Offer date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Outstanding Offers:</th>
<th>Will Offers be Retracted?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Note: MI Must be informed of this)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES/ NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Can Offers be Re-issued for Replacement Program?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES/ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Advise Admissions of anticipated date to stop admitting students with details of all associated programs**  
   (Note: This should be at least +1 year after Date of Discontinuance, e.g. if Program is submitted for discontinuance in 2014, the earliest last admission date would be December 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person contacted:</th>
<th>Date of Email</th>
<th>Agreed anticipated last admission date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Advise Marketing of anticipated date to stop marketing the program with details of associated programs
(Note: This should be at least +1 year before Date of Discontinuance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person contacted:</th>
<th>Date of Email</th>
<th>Agreed anticipated last advertisement date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION 3. Student Cohorts**

1. **Teaching arrangements for existing students:** Not applicable

   Based on the course length, structure and the nature of the student cohort, determine an achievable end date. This would normally be the full-time duration plus one further year (or it’s part-time equivalent). Estimated enrolments should include students who are studying the program as part of a Major/Minor specialisation and should be based on actual student numbers not equivalent FT students.

   (Note: The example below may need several years of teach out in practice, and would need to be adjusted to provide for any failure or disruption of study, but will be useful to calculate individual student teach out plans):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level/ Year 1</th>
<th>Level/ Year 2</th>
<th>Level/ Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Enrolment</td>
<td>Estimated Enrolment Year 1 of Teach Out</td>
<td>Estimated Enrolment Year 2 of Teach Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Mapping of Available Course Units:** Not applicable

   Based on the course length, structure and the nature of the student cohort, determine the Course Units which will be available in each year of Teach Out. If Course Unit offerings are reduced consideration must be given to allow students to complete the program on time. Students must have the opportunity to achieve the Program Learning Outcomes so the Core Units must be available. Where optional Course Unit offerings are reduced consideration must be given to any pre-requisites, and where necessary alternative Course Units should be made available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Units Offered</th>
<th>Planned Units Year 1 of Teach Out</th>
<th>Planned Units Year 2 of Teach Out</th>
<th>Planned Units Year 3 of Teach Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level/ Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level/ Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level/ Year 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION 4: Approval Sign Off**

1. **Submitted by Program Lead:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Anne Cooper</td>
<td></td>
<td>25/02/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applied Finance Centre**

**Faculty/ Department/ Research Centre**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Anne.cooper@mafc.mq.edu.au">Anne.cooper@mafc.mq.edu.au</a></td>
<td>9850 7073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Endorsed by Head of Department:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Department

3. **Approved by Faculty Standards and Quality Committee (FSQC)/ Faculty Board:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Position

4. **Reported to Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Position
SECTION 5: Post Approval Checklist:

Once disestablishment has been approved by ASQC, the Faculty/Department will need to:

1. Contact all of the stakeholders identified in the consultation above that the program is closed for admission, with an effective from date, and the anticipated closure of the program.
2. Run a report to identify every enrolled student, and all applicants in case the figures have changed since disestablishment was first discussed. If the program is taught at an off-campus location any report must include students at that location.
3. Write a communication plan for students and applicants to explain the changes.
4. When “teach out” has been completed, confirm with Governance Services

For Enrolled Students:

1. Contact all students to inform them of the change and to provide advice on approved “teach out” plans, based on section 3
   This should include:
   (i) The timeframes for teach out plans, and information on actions that would be taken if a student’s progress is delayed for any reason.
   (ii) Clear information about Core Course Units that must be completed to satisfy Learning Outcomes
   (iii) Clear information about any anticipated restrictions to the availability of Optional Course Units in future years, so students can plan options in advance.
   (iv) Emphasis on the importance of individual progress meetings to discuss teach out arrangements on at least an annual basis

For Existing Applicants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Course of Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. For any students with conditional or unaccepted offers that are due to commence after the last admission date | Contact students to:  
- Explain the charge  
- Cancel the Offer  
- Issue new Offer (if a replacement program has been approved) | Faculty to contact Admissions and/or MI if program available to international students |
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2. For any students with **accepted offers** that are due to commence after the last admission date | Contact students to:  
- Explain the charge, Cancel the Offer and one of 1, 2, or 3:  
  1) If the student’s start date (VAC for International Student) has not passed and there is a replacement/alternative program, Offer student a choice of  
     (a) Full Refund  
     (b) A place on the alternative program for the same start date  
  2) If the student’s start date (VAC for International Student) has not passed and there is not a replacement/alternative program, issue Full Refund  
  3) If the International student’s COE start date has passed (including as part of a package offer), issue Full Refund. Do not suggest/offer an alternative program as MQ will be responsible for any additional tuition fee and living expenses | Faculty to contact Admissions and/or MI if program available to International students |
| 3. For any student who was due to transfer to the disestablished program from a pathway program | Contact students to:  
- Explain the charge  
- Cancel the Offer | Faculty to contact Admissions and/or MI if program available to International students |
ITEM 10.4 PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE DISRUPTION TO STUDIES POLICY AND PROCEDURE AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE SCHEDULE (SLTC)

For approval

Recommended resolution

Academic Senate resolve to approve the identified amendments to the Disruption to Studies Policy and Procedure and Supporting Evidence Schedule with effect from 1 November 2016.
ITEM 10.4 PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE DISRUPTION TO STUDIES POLICY AND PROCEDURE AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE SCHEDULE (SLTC)

Recommend resolution
Academic Senate resolve to approve the identified amendments to the Disruption to Studies Policy and Procedure and Supporting Evidence Schedule with effect from 1 November 2016.

Summary
• Campus Wellbeing and Support Services coordinated a training session on Professional Authority Forms (PAF) and the supporting evidence schedule with student administration staff from each faculty, MUIC and Student Connect on Friday 29 July 2016.
• There are procedural and interpretation differences in its application due to its current wording.
• Amendments to the Schedule of Evidence have been drafted, endorsed by the faculty Student Administration Managers (SAMs), Campus Wellbeing and Support Services, MUIC and Student Connect staff for consideration.

Background
At the 9 May 2016 meeting of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC), Associate Professor Jenny Donald, Executive Dean nominee from the Faculty of Science and Engineering, requested that the Committee revisit concerns raised regarding the management and review of the PAF forms within the Faculties.

The number of supporting evidence assessments in 2016 for Disruption to Studies has risen to 15,315 in Tracker to 7 September 2016. Student Business and Administration Systems have reported that this has risen approximately 10 per cent in 2016 compared to 2015, despite applications now being lodged jointly for course units rather than separately. The volume increase in supporting evidence assessments is observed to relate to the number of assessments taking place in course units, but also the number of re-submission of evidence for consideration.

As requested, Campus Wellbeing and Support Services coordinated a professional development session on professional authority forms and the supporting evidence schedule with student administration staff from each faculty, MUIC and Student Connect on Friday 29 July 2016. During the training session, the SAMs requested that the supporting evidence schedule be updated to reflect current practice and for it to be more explicit in terms of what professions can provide supporting evidence.

During the training session on PAFs, the SAMs, MUIC and Student Connect staff members asked that the SLTC reconsider its decision made at the 13 July 2015 meeting regarding: "Acceptance of Medical Certificates as evidence of medical disruption, with a preference for Professional Authority Forms (PAF)". The Committee is noted to have supported the PAF only approach, however, the SAMs are reporting the delays created by requested PAFs is primarily only serving as double/triple handling of disruption requests. The delays created by requesting further documentation reportedly results in a further burden on faculty administrative and academic staff who need to create multiple remedies for the same assessment tasks (i.e. multiple supplementary quizzes, exams, etc.). There is a very low incidence of disruption to studies cases initially declined due to the submission of a medical certificate that are not subsequently approved following re-submission.

The Disruption to Studies policy and procedure is scheduled to be reviewed in December 2016. The SAMs have reported to Campus Wellbeing and Support Services an immediate need to amend the Supporting Evidence Schedule. Suggested amendments to the Schedule of Evidence have been drafted and endorsed by the SAMs (see attached track change documents for consideration).

Some proposed amendments to bring to SLTC’s attention include:
• Under the definition of serious and unavoidable, in class tests/quizzes and presentations are included as exceptions to the requirement that disruptions need to be of 3 days duration if the student is disrupted on the scheduled day of completion of the task. This definition change for serious and unavoidable is also proposed for the Policy.
• Reduced the table in the schedule to 2 columns to clearly identify which type of evidence could be used as evidence for disruption.
• A specific list of health practitioners is now stated as being able to provide evidence for medical / psychological / mental health disruptions.
• The PAF is stated as the preferred form of evidence for medical / psychological / mental health disruptions. Health documents that clearly indicate the duration and specific nature of impact on studies will also be considered as evidence. This change is also proposed to be updated within the Policy and Procedure.
• A statement is included to address a large volume of requests for disruption related to pre-booked holidays during supplementary examination periods.

Campus Wellbeing and Support Services and Student Connect support the drafted amendments to the Schedule.

Operational Impact
• All Faculties, MUIC, Deputy Vice Chancellor (Students and Registrar)

Consultation Process
The following offices have been consulted prior to the submission of this paper:
• SAMs for each faculty (Arts, Business and Economics, Science and Engineering, Human Science, Medicine and Health Sciences)
• MUIC
• Student Connect

Outcome to be communicated to
• Faculty and MUIC administrators
• Campus Wellbeing and Support Services
• Macquarie University Health Science Centre (GP Practice)

Submitted by: Darren Peters (Director, Campus Wellbeing and Support Services)
For enquiries contact: Ben Wilkes
(Manager, Allied Health, P: 9850 7497 E: ben.wilkes@mq.edu.au)
DISRUPTION TO STUDIES POLICY

1 PURPOSE

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

2 BACKGROUND

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

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

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

3 SCOPE

This Policy will be relevant to:

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

4 DEFINITIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5 POLICY STATEMENT

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

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

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

FIT TO SIT MODEL

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

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

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

**DISRUPTION TO STUDIES NOTIFICATION**

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

To be eligible for Special Consideration, a student must notify the University of a serious and unavoidable disruption no later than five (5) working days of the assessment task date or due date. For notifications made more than five (5) working days after the assessment task date or due date, an additional assessment task may not be possible (refer Disruption to Studies Outcomes Schedule). All Disruption to Studies notifications are to be made online via the University’s Ask MQ system and must include supporting documentary evidence. Notifications of Disruptions to Studies after 5 days will still be assessed, however they are more likely to have a remedy of Withdrawal without Academic Penalty applied if they are deemed serious and unavoidable.

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

**DECISION PROCESS**

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

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

The evaluation of how a serious and unavoidable disruption relates to an assessment task, which is or was to be undertaken during the period of that disruption, and the determination of appropriate Special Consideration, are Academic decisions.

Where a disruption is considered to be severe, Withdrawal without Academic Penalty will be considered as a remedy to be recommended by the Academic. This final determination to
grant a Withdrawal Without Academic Penalty is made at an Administrative level to ensure that all reasonable effort has been made to find a solution through the application of an assessment remedy.

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

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

**EVIDENCE**

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

The evidence must:

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

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

All documentary evidence must be submitted electronically at the time of submitting the Disruption to Studies notification.

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

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

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

All documentation (in hardcopy or electronic form) relating to a Disruption to Studies notification will be treated in accordance with the University’s Privacy Framework.

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

**SPECIAL CONSIDERATION**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**INTERNATIONAL STUDENT VISA HOLDERS**

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

**APPEALS**

A student may appeal an adverse outcome to a Disruption to Studies notification in accordance with the Academic Appeals Policy and Grade Appeal Policy.
COMPLIANCE AND BREACHES
The University may commence applicable disciplinary procedures if a person to whom this Policy applies breaches this Policy (or any of its related Procedures).

6 RELEVANT LEGISLATION

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

7 KEY RELATED DOCUMENTS

- Academic Appeals Policy
- Disruption to Studies Procedure
- Disruption to Studies Supporting Evidence Schedule
- Disruption to Studies Outcomes Schedule
- Final Examination Policy
- Grade Appeal Policy
- Participation Activity (Disruption) Procedure
- Privacy Framework
- Professional Authority Form (PAF)
- Disruption to Studies Website

8 NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.1</th>
<th>Contact Officer</th>
<th>Chair, Senate Learning and Teaching Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Implementation Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Approval Authority / Authorities</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>Date Approved</td>
<td>15 December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Date of Commencement</td>
<td>20 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>Date for Review</td>
<td>20 July 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.7 Documents Superseded by this Policy

The Special Consideration processes outlined in the University Handbooks (both published and online), the Academic Manual and any local policies (Faculty or Department) are replaced by this policy.

Special Consideration Policy approved 7 October 2008.
Withdrawal and Discontinuance (Coursework) Policy approved 4 October 2011.
Disruption to Studies Policy approved Academic Senate 12 November 2013 and University Council 5 December 2013.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.8</th>
<th>Amendment History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 2015 – alignment with new Policy Framework template</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISRUPTION TO STUDIES PROCEDURE

1 PURPOSE

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

2 SCOPE

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

3 DEFINITIONS

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

4 RESPONSIBILITIES AND REQUIRED ACTIONS

This Procedure requires actions by the following:

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

DVC STUDENTS AND REGISTRAR

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

EXECUTIVE DEAN/MUIC DIRECTOR

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

**DIRECTOR CAMPUS WELLBEING**

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

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

**STUDENT**

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

Submit the Disruption to Studies Notification no later than five (5) working days of the assessment task date or due date.

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

**Notification**

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

**Validity**

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

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

**Withdrawal of notice of disruption**

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

Where the particular circumstances pertaining to the disruption are medical (physical / psychological) in nature, a completed Professional Authority Form is the required preferred form of supporting documentation to be submitted with the Disruption to Studies Notification. Health documents that clearly indicate the duration and specific nature of impact on studies will also be considered as evidence. Medical certificates will not be accepted as supporting documentation.

A Professional Authority Form Health documents can be completed by any Professional Authority practitioner listed in the Disruption to Studies: Supporting Evidence Schedule relevant to the disruption event. The University may contact the Registered Health Professional or their practice to verify the authenticity of any Professional Authority.

Prior conditions

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

Disruptions relating to non-medical circumstances

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

Assessment remedy

In submitting a Disruption to Studies notification, students are agreeing to make themselves available for additional assessment activities when Fit to Sit. If they do not believe they are Fit to Sit, submitted evidence must support this. If an alternate assessment cannot be arranged after a determination of Serious and Unavoidable disruption has been made, then a Withdrawal Without Academic Penalty will be granted. Students are not able to negotiate the time, date, deadline or format of any extra assessable work.

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

Validation of evidence

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

Students must retain all original documentation for the duration of this six (6) month period and must supply original documents to the University within ten (10) working days of such a request being made.
STUDENT ADMINISTRATION MANAGER (Faculty, MUIC or DVC (S&R))

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

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

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

Arrange for all Disruption to Studies Notifications to be considered.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Notification considered but assessed as not serious and unavoidable (Disruption is not Serious and Unavoidable)
- Notification considered with the student being required to undertake additional assessable work (e.g., A supplementary examination) (Disruption is Serious and Unavoidable)
- Notification considered and Withdrawal without Academic Penalty granted (i.e., 'W' status for the unit) (Disruption is Serious and Unavoidable)
- Application is invalid (Invalid)

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

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

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

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

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

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

**STUDENT ADMINISTRATION OFFICER (LIFECYCLE)**

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

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

**COMMONWEALTH SUPPORTED STUDENTS OFFICER**

**Application for Withdrawal Without Financial Penalty**

1. Receive and log the application according to University procedures.
2. Ensure that the application is complete and that it includes satisfactory supporting documentation/evidence. Due to HESA requirements, this may involve the provision of further documentation than has been previously provided
3. Where an application is incomplete inform the student and request additional information as necessary. The claim may be rejected at this point if satisfactory evidence cannot be provided.
4. Determine whether the circumstances outlined by the student and the evidence are consistent with the Guidelines for Applying for Remission/Refund in Special Circumstances for the purpose of withdrawal without financial liability in accordance with the relevant legislation. (Higher Education Support Act)
5. If the application is approved according to legislation and/or University policy, process the application to effectively remove the debt. For any upfront payments approved for reversal of debt or refund, forward the application to the Office of Revenue Services for processing. Advise the student of the outcome.
6. If the application is denied according to legislation and/or University policy, inform the student explaining why it was unsuccessful. Outline any pathway for appeal.
Withdrawal Without Financial Penalty is governed by the Higher Education Support Act, and the decision making process is independent of the Serious and Unavoidable decision criteria for Academic Penalty. So it should be noted that it is possible for students to receive a W grade as an outcome of the Disruptions to Studies process, but not be successful in a Withdrawal Without Financial Penalty decision.

MANAGER, PATHWAYS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS, COE

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

5 RELEVANT LEGISLATION

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

6 KEY RELATED DOCUMENTS

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

7 NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.1</th>
<th>Contact Officer</th>
<th>Manager, Student Connect Head Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Implementation Officer</td>
<td>Manager, Student Connect Lifecycle Manager Faculty Student Administration Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Approval Authority / Authorities</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Date Approved</td>
<td>15 December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Date of Commencement</td>
<td>20 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Date for Review</td>
<td>20 July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Documents Superseded by this Procedure</td>
<td>Disruption to Studies Procedure approved DVC(S&amp;R) 10 March 2014 Withdrawal without Penalty (Coursework) Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Amendment History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISRUPTION TO STUDIES SUPPORTING EVIDENCE SCHEDULE

1 PURPOSE

This Schedule provides guidance to administrators and academic staff engaged in the process of determining whether a serious and unavoidable disruption to a student’s study should be regarded as being serious and unavoidable under the Disruption to Study Policy.

It also establishes minimum standards in regard to the documentary evidence required to substantiate such cases.

2 SCHEDULE

Under the Disruption to Study Policy the University deems a disruption to studies to be serious and unavoidable if it arises from a set of circumstances that:

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

The University does not regard conditions or circumstances that exist prior to commencing a unit of study as being serious and unavoidable disruptions, except in the event of unanticipated deterioration of that condition or circumstance. However, the University does provide for the ongoing support of students who experience acute adverse conditions, circumstances or disabilities. This planned support may be sought by contacting Campus Wellbeing and Support Services.

Disruption to Studies notifications that are intended to document a serious and unavoidable disruption must be supported by specific evidence as described below.

General Evidence Requirements:

Evidence must demonstrate that substantial disruption has been caused to the student’s capacity for effective study during an event critical study period and include:

- beginning date and duration of the effect of disruption; and
- a statement confirming that the student:
  - was unable to complete an assessment task scheduled for a specific date (e.g. final examination, in class test/quiz, in class presentation) because of the effect of the disruption; and / or
  - was unable to complete an assessable task, on the relevant date, because of the disruption which was of no fewer than three (3) consecutive days, or
had their preparation for an assessable task affected for not fewer than three (3) consecutive days duration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Disruption</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| medical / psychological / mental health | Professional Authority Form  
Documentary evidence that simply states “student is unfit for school or studies or work” will not be accepted. Consulting with your doctor at time of illness is highly recommended. Health professionals that are registered with a professional body such as:  
A Professional Authority Form is the preferred form of evidence for disruptions related to health conditions. A Professional Authority Form can be completed by a health practitioner that is registered with a National Board of Australia that is accredited by the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency (AHPRA):  
- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Practice  
- Chinese Medicine  
- Chiropractic  
- Dental  
- Medical practitioners  
- Medical Radiation Practice  
- Nursing and Midwifery  
- Occupational Therapy  
- Optometry  
- Osteopathy  
- Pharmacy  
- Physiotherapy  
- Podiatry  
- Psychology  
- Psychiatrists  
- Physiotherapists  
- Counsellors  
  - Social workers, OR a member of Macquarie Campus Wellbeing & Support Services  
Health documents that clearly indicate the duration and specific nature of impact on studies will also be considered as evidence. |

| compassionate grounds for example: Grief caused by the death or serious injury of a close family member or close friend. | Documentation that confirms the death or serious injury/illness and their relationship to the student  
Professional Authority Form  
Letter from relevant professional  
A Statutory Declaration |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect disruption, such as the requirement to care for family member or relative.</th>
<th>Professional Authority Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In all cases where the disruption is indirect, the documentary evidence must state the effect of the disruption on the student. It is not sufficient to only supply a medical certificate pertaining to a friend or family member.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect disruption, such as the requirement to care for family member or relative.</th>
<th>Professional Authority Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In all cases where the disruption is indirect, the documentary evidence must state the effect of the disruption on the student. It is not sufficient to only supply a medical certificate pertaining to a friend or family member.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hardship or trauma for example: Sudden loss of employment, family breakdown, severe disruption to domestic arrangements, impact of crime / accidents / natural disasters, or imprisonment or a motor vehicle accident.</th>
<th>Police event number and a Statutory Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Authority Form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter from relevant professional acknowledging impact of disruption on student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cases where other documentary evidence could not be obtained a statutory declaration may be used. Any available evidence, such as a flight itinerary or a death notice, should accompany this statutory declaration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health professionals that are registered with a professional body such as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Medical practitioners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Psychiatrists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Physiotherapists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Counsellors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Psychologists, OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a member of Macquarie Campus Wellbeing &amp; Support Services, OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Police officer, OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Legal officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hardship or trauma for example: Sudden loss of employment, family breakdown, severe disruption to domestic arrangements, impact of crime / accidents / natural disasters, or imprisonment or a motor vehicle accident.</th>
<th>Police event number and a Statutory Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Authority Form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter from relevant professional acknowledging impact of disruption on student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cases where other documentary evidence could not be obtained a statutory declaration may be used. Any available evidence, such as a flight itinerary or a death notice, should accompany this statutory declaration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health professionals that are registered with a professional body such as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Medical practitioners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Psychiatrists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Physiotherapists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Counsellors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Psychologists, OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a member of Macquarie Campus Wellbeing &amp; Support Services, OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Police officer, OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Legal officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unavoidable absence or commitments for example: Unavoidable work commitments. Cultural or religious commitments, such as weddings or funerals (of close family members) or significant religious festivals. Unexpected training or competition attendance demands placed upon an elite athlete. Transportation problems such as late trains, car breakdowns</th>
<th>Letter from a relevant professional acknowledging impact of disruption on student and requirement to attend the unavoidable commitment, or explanation of unavoidable absence.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentary evidence from employer must clearly state that the inability to be released from work commitments was unforeseen at time of enrolment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cases where a student is absent to attend a cultural event evidence must demonstrate that attendance could not have been anticipated, avoided or guarded against by the student; and that the student’s attendance is warranted. Pre-booked holidays will not routinely be considered unavoidable absences or commitments by the University.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cases where a student is required to attend an event such as a funeral or wedding, the evidence must demonstrate that the event prevented attendance on the day of the assessment task or impacted on study for three or more days.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or automobile accidents. Wedding or funeral of a family member or close friend.

**Others authorities that may provide relevant supporting evidence:**
- Employer
- Religious leader
- Coach
- Transport authority
- Police
- NRMA
- Government agency
- Sheriff’s office OR

A Statutory Declaration

| Disruption during a final examination or an invigilated assessment for example: SuddenFire alarm or sudden illness or fire alarm. | A Examination or assessment room report. Professional Authority Form is the preferred form in cases of evidence for disruptions related to health conditions/sudden illness. Health documents that confirm the impact of a sudden illness or exacerbation of health condition during the exam will also be considered as evidence. When a student is taken ill during a final examination he or she should be accompanied by a member of staff to attend a medical practitioner of the Campus Medical Service. Students are not expected to notify the University of a disruption in cases where an assessment task is interrupted by a disruption such as a fire alarm. This notification will be made on their behalf by the assessment supervisor via an examination or assessment room report. Examination or assessment supervisor. Health professionals that are registered with a professional body such as:
  - Medical practitioners
  - Psychiatrists
  - Physiotherapists
  - Counsellors
  - Social workers
  - Psychologists, OR
  a member of Macquarie Campus Wellbeing & Support Services. |

| Ongoing disruption during the semester for example: Glandular fever or ongoing grief. | Documentary evidence must indicate an acute episode of the condition that is directly related to a student’s capacity for effective completion of an assessment. A Professional Authority Form can be submitted where there is evidence of an exacerbation of an ongoing health condition. A Professional Authority Form can be completed by:
  - a health practitioner that is registered with a National Board of Australia that is accredited by the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency (AHPRA); |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical practitioners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical Radiation Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Midwifery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteopathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podiatry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatrists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsellors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers, OR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students experiencing ongoing disruptions should be referred to Campus Wellbeing and Support Services.

In cases where a student cannot complete replacement assessment tasks, the disruption should be managed by the withdrawal without penalty procedure.
### 3 NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>Contact Officer</th>
<th>Chair, Senate Learning and Teaching Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Implementation Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Approval Authority / Authorities</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Date Approved</td>
<td>Academic Senate 12 November 2013 and University Council 5 December 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Date of Commencement</td>
<td>3 March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Date for Review</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Documents Superseded by this Schedule</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Amendment History</td>
<td>July 2015 – alignment with new Policy Framework template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Policy Authorisation</td>
<td>Disruption to Studies <a href="#">Policy</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISRUPTION TO STUDIES SUPPORTING EVIDENCE SCHEDULE

1 PURPOSE

This Schedule provides guidance to administrators and academic staff engaged in the process of determining whether a serious and unavoidable disruption to a student’s study should be regarded as being serious and unavoidable under the Disruption to Study Policy.

It also establishes minimum standards in regard to the documentary evidence required to substantiate such cases.

2 SCHEDULE

Under the Disruption to Study Policy the University deems a disruption to studies to be serious and unavoidable if it arises from a set of circumstances that:

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

The University does not regard conditions or circumstances that exist prior to commencing a unit of study as being serious and unavoidable disruptions, except in the event of unanticipated deterioration of that condition or circumstance. However, the University does provide for the ongoing support of students who experience acute adverse conditions, circumstances or disabilities. This planned support may be sought by contacting Campus Wellbeing and Support Services.

Disruption to Studies notifications that are intended to document a serious and unavoidable disruption must be supported by specific evidence as described below.

General Evidence Requirements:

Evidence must demonstrate that substantial disruption has been caused to the student’s capacity for effective study during an event critical study period and include:

- beginning date and duration of the effect of disruption; and
- a statement confirming that the student:
  - was unable to complete an assessment task scheduled for a specific date (e.g. final examination, in class test/quiz, in class presentation) because of the effect of the disruption; and / or
  - had their preparation for an assessable task affected for not fewer than three (3) consecutive days duration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Disruption</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| medical / psychological / mental health | A Professional Authority Form is the preferred form of evidence for disruptions related to health conditions. A **Professional Authority** Form can be completed by a health practitioner that is registered with a National Board of Australia that is accredited by the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency (AHPRA):  
  - Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Practice  
  - Chinese Medicine  
  - Chiropractic  
  - Dental  
  - Medical  
  - Medical Radiation Practice  
  - Nursing and Midwifery  
  - Occupational Therapy  
  - Optometry  
  - Osteopathy  
  - Pharmacy  
  - Physiotherapy  
  - Podiatry  
  - Psychology  
  - Social workers, OR a member of Macquarie Campus Wellbeing & Support Services  

  Health documents that clearly indicate the duration and specific nature of impact on studies will also be considered as evidence. |
| compassionate grounds | Documentation that confirms the death or serious injury/illness and their relationship to the student  
  Letter from relevant professional  
  A Statutory Declaration  
  Professional Authority Form  

  In all cases where the disruption is indirect, the documentary evidence must state the effect of the disruption on the student. It is not sufficient to only supply a medical certificate pertaining to a friend or family member. |
| hardship or trauma | Police event number and a Statutory Declaration  
  Professional Authority Form  
  Letter from relevant professional acknowledging impact of disruption on student  

  In cases where other documentary evidence could not be obtained a statutory declaration may be used. Any available |
natural disasters, or imprisonment. | evidence, such as a flight itinerary or a death notice, should accompany this statutory declaration.

unavoidable absence or commitments for example: Unavoidable work commitments. Cultural or religious commitments, such as weddings or funerals (of close family members) or significant religious festivals. Unexpected training or competition attendance demands placed upon an elite athlete. Transportation problems such as late trains, car breakdowns or automobile accidents. Wedding or funeral of a family member or close friend.

Letter from a relevant professional acknowledging impact of disruption on student and requirement to attend the unavoidable commitment, or explanation of unavoidable absence.

Documentary evidence from employer must clearly state that the inability to be released from work commitments was unforeseen at time of enrolment.

In cases where a student is absent to attend a cultural event evidence must demonstrate that attendance could not have been anticipated, avoided or guarded against by the student; and that the student’s attendance is warranted. Pre-booked holidays will not routinely be considered unavoidable absences or commitments by the University.

In cases where a student is required to attend an event such as a funeral or wedding, the evidence must demonstrate that the event prevented attendance on the day of the assessment task or impacted on study for three or more days.

Others authorities that may provide relevant supporting evidence:
- Employer
- Religious leader
- Coach
- Transport authority
- Police
- NRMA
- Government agency
- Sheriff’s office

disruption during a final examination or an invigilated assessment for example: Sudden illness or fire alarm.

A Professional Authority Form is the preferred form of evidence for disruptions related to health conditions / sudden illness.

Health documents that confirm the impact of a sudden illness or exacerbation of health condition during the exam will also be considered as evidence.

When a student is taken ill during a final examination he or she should be accompanied by a member of staff to attend a medical practitioner of the Campus Medical Service.

Students are not expected to notify the University of a disruption in cases where an assessment task is interrupted by a disruption such as a fire alarm. This notification will be made on their behalf by the assessment supervisor via an examination or assessment room report.
ongoing disruption during the semester for example: Glandular fever or ongoing grief.

Documentary evidence must indicate an acute episode of the condition that is directly related to a student’s capacity for effective completion of an assessment.

A Professional Authority Form can be submitted where there is evidence of an exacerbation of an ongoing health condition. A Professional Authority Form can be completed by:

- a health practitioner that is registered with a National Board of Australia that is accredited by the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency (AHPRA):
- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Practice
- Chinese Medicine
- Chiropractic
- Dental
- Medical
- Medical Radiation Practice
- Nursing and Midwifery
- Occupational Therapy
- Optometry
- Osteopathy
- Pharmacy
- Physiotherapy
- Podiatry
- Psychology
  - Social workers, OR
  - a member of Macquarie Campus Wellbeing & Support Services

Students experiencing ongoing disruptions should be referred to Campus Wellbeing and Support Services.

In cases where a student cannot complete replacement assessment tasks, the disruption should be managed by the withdrawal without penalty procedure.

3 NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>Contact Officer</th>
<th>Chair, Senate Learning and Teaching Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Implementation Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Approval Authority / Authorities</td>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Date Approved</td>
<td>Academic Senate 12 November 2013 and University Council 5 December 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Date of Commencement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Date for Review</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Documents Superseded by this Schedule</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Amendment History</td>
<td>July 2015 – alignment with new Policy Framework template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Policy Authorisation</td>
<td>Disruption to Studies Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM 10.5    ALIGNMENT OF LAST DAY TO ADD INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL UNITS (SLTC)

For approval

Recommended resolution
Academic Senate resolve to approve that with effect from 1 January 2017, the last day to add external and internal units be made the same date; being at the end of Week 2 of each session, to ensure the alignment of internal and external enrolment dates.
ITEM 10.5 ALIGNMENT OF LAST DAY TO ADD INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL UNITS (SLTC)

Recommended Resolution
Academic Senate resolve to approve that with effect from 1 January 2017, the last day to add external and internal units be made the same date; being at the end of Week 2 of each session, to ensure the alignment of internal and external enrolment dates.

Summary
- The last day to add external units to a student’s program is currently at the end of week 1 each Session and the last day to add internal units to a student’s program is at the end of week 2 of each Session.
- The current policy surrounding final days to add units has not been updated alongside the changes in application format and content delivery to students, brought about by the use of modern technology.
- It is proposed that the last day to add external and internal units be merged into one date; namely, at the end of week 2 of each Session.

Background
Previously, when the university did not have the ability to receive electronic applications from students or deliver online content, conventional postal services had to be used to apply for external courses and also deliver course content to external students. As such, to allow for the additional processing time, External units had an earlier deadline.

The RIE team recommends that, to align with A Framing of Futures strategic priority 7, the University moves to simplify its calendar of administrative dates by consolidating enrolment for internal and external units.

Operational Impact
- Student Connect
- Student Administration
- All Faculties - Student Administration

Consultation Process
The following offices have been consulted prior to the submission of this paper:
- Faculty of Business and Economics Faculty Standards and Quality Committee (FSQC)
- Brad Windon (EO to DVC-S&R)
- Office of the Director of Student Services
- Associate Deans
- Professor John Simons (DVC –A)

Outcome to be communicated to
- All impacted offices/business units.

Submitted by: Professor Sherman Young – Pro Vice Chancellor (Learning and Teaching)

For enquiries contact: Neta Keyes
Student Administration Manager, FBE
Representing the RIE (Enrolment) team
ITEM 10.6: VICE-CHANCELLOR COMMENDATIONS: LIST OF RECIPIENTS

For approval

Recommended resolution

Academic Senate resolve to approve the award of Vice-Chancellor Commendations to the list of Master coursework graduands identified within the attached report.
ITEM 10.6: VICE-CHANCELLOR’S COMMENDATIONS – LIST OF RECIPIENTS

Recommended resolution
Academic Senate resolve to approve the award of Vice-Chancellor Commendations to the list of Master coursework graduands identified within the attached report.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Student name</th>
<th>Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43214363</td>
<td>ALLEN, Craig William</td>
<td>Master of Applied Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40906531</td>
<td>FRANKLAND, Andrew</td>
<td>Master of Clinical Psychology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Process: The Graduation Unit has reviewed the Potential VC Commendations report from AMIS and cross-checked with academic transcripts.

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 11.1 DELEGATIONS OF AUTHORITY

For discussion

Recommended Resolution

That Academic Senate resolve to:

i. establish a broad working group under the direction of the Chair of Academic Senate to consider and recommend to the Vice-Chancellor the specific role of Academic Senate in approving policy and acting as a consultative body to the University; and

ii. establish a working group comprising academic staff with experience of the University’s academic governance structures, faculties, staff from within the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) directorate and professional staff with relevant experience to recommend to Academic Senate and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) on:
   • The alignment of a shared responsibility model of academic governance with other initiatives under development, such as course review, course design and approval procedures.
   • The threshold standards and frameworks required to facilitate the progression towards a more mature shared responsibility model of academic governance.
   • The quality standards, including reporting and review provisions to enable Faculty Boards to discharge their authority appropriately.
   • The scaffolding required to deliver devolved-decision making to Faculty Boards.
ITEM 11.1 DELEGATIONS OF AUTHORITY

Recommended Resolution

That Academic Senate resolve to:

i. establish a broad working group under the direction of the Chair of Academic Senate to consider and recommend to the Vice-Chancellor the specific role of Academic Senate in approving policy and acting as a consultative body to the University; and

ii. establish a working group comprising academic staff with experience of the University’s academic governance structures, faculties, staff from within the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) directorate and professional staff with relevant experience to recommend to Academic Senate and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) on:

- The alignment of a shared responsibility model of academic governance with other initiatives under development, such as course review, course design and approval procedures.
- The threshold standards and frameworks required to facilitate the progression towards a more mature shared responsibility model of academic governance.
- The quality standards, including reporting and review provisions to enable Faculty Boards to discharge their authority appropriately.
- The scaffolding required to deliver devolved-decision making to Faculty Boards.

Background

In 2013, the University engaged Emeritus Professor Jane Morrison to develop a Delegations of Authority Framework (the Delegations Framework) comprising the Delegations of Authority Policy and the Delegations of Authority Register. The Delegations of Authority Register includes a category of delegations on Academic and Student Matters.

Since the initial approval of the Delegations Framework by Council in 2013, several significant initiatives have taken place, which have strengthened the University’s academic governance. These include:

- A broad review of the University’s Academic Rules, including a complete revision of the Academic Senate Rules;
- The establishment of the Faculty Rules, which have resulted in the creation of standardised Faculty Boards;
- The establishment of an Academic Board for the MGSM; and
- The creation of the Research and Research Training Committee.

Issue

These changes together with the review of the Delegations of Authority provide an opportunity for the University to move towards a more mature shared responsibility model of academic governance. This model would clearly define the role of Academic Senate as the approval authority for policy on academic matters vis-a-vis a consultative body for policy approval. It would also deliver a greater activation of Faculty Boards through devolved decision-making, supported by threshold standards, robust frameworks and annual reporting cycles established by ASQC and Academic Senate. Furthermore, this model would allow for ASQC to have capacity for higher-level oversight of quality and standards generally, and oversight over non-award programs and University-owned degrees. The proposed model is of particular relevance as the University prepares for the requirements of the National Threshold Standards for Higher Education Providers.
With the appropriate standards and frameworks in place, delegations to Faculty Boards could include:

- approval to suspend the General Coursework Rules for the purpose of saving a student from course requirements (i.e. invoking the Saving Clause);
- approve the designation of units as PACE, and Capstone units;
- approve a new Major for a Faculty named degree;
- approve decisions relating to RPL for People and Planet units; and
- approve significant changes to the delivery of a program, such as a change in mode of delivery or language of delivery.

Consultation Process

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

- Executive Dean, Faculty of Science and Engineering
- Executive Dean, Faculty of Human Sciences
- Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching)
- Chair of Academic Standards and Quality Committee
- Chair of Senate Learning and Teaching Committee
- Deputy Chair of Academic Senate

Submitted by: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and Chair of Academic Senate

For enquiries contact: Zoe Williams, Head of Governance Services
E: zoe.williams@mq.edu.au
ITEM 11.2 ACADEMIC SENATE: PURPOSE AND COMPOSITION

For discussion

Recommended resolution

Academic Senate resolve to:

i. approve the establishment of a working group to develop the scope, timing and methodology to review and define the purpose of Academic Senate; and

ii. note that subsequent working groups will be established to define the purpose of Academic Senate and to align the categories and size of membership with the purpose of Academic Senate.
ITEM 11.2 ACADEMIC SENATE: PURPOSE AND COMPOSITION

Recommended resolution

Academic Senate:

i. resolve to approve the establishment of a working group to develop the scope, timing and methodology to review and define the purpose of Academic Senate; and

ii. note that subsequent working groups will be established to define the purpose of Academic Senate and to align the categories and size of membership with the purpose of Academic Senate

Summary

• The review of the Delegations of Authority and the proposed move towards a more mature shared responsibility model for academic governance, provides a timely opportunity to realign the role of Academic Senate and its responsibilities within the governance framework.

• The membership composition should also be reviewed to ensure fit for purpose within the scope of this review.

• Through conversations between Senators and the Chair of Senate, common themes have been identified in relation to the uncertainty of the roles and responsibilities of Senators and more generally, the role and identity of Senate. Other common issues raised included the opportunities to improve communication pathways to and from Senate, and increase engagement from within and outside Senate.

Background

Role and Purpose

The Academic Senate Rules articulate general functions of Academic Senate, including to advise the Council and the Vice-Chancellor on academic matters and related activities of the University. Academic Senate is also delegated to approve policy on academic matters, and to request, consider and take action on reports from Faculty Boards, and organisational units engaged in supporting the academic activities of the University.

The outcome and recommendations of the proposed working group to consider the shared responsibility model for Academic Governance, is tasked with considering and recommending the specific role of Academic Senate, in approving policy and acting as a consultative body to the University, will activate the broader discussions of Academic Senate’s role in the University. (Refer to Item 11.1, Delegations of Authority)

Current Membership Composition

Under the Academic Senate Rules, as at 1 January 2017 the composition of members will comprise the following:

• 18 ex-officio members
• 20 Academic staff elected representatives (from the five Faculties, MGSM and one non-Faculty electorate)
• Eight elected Student Representatives
• Two members appointed by Academic Senate

A benchmarking exercise has revealed the differences between the composition of Academic Boards and Senates within the sector in Australia. Details of two very different models are outlined in the following table:

---


2 ibid
The Academic Board at James Cook comprises:
• the Chair and Deputy Chair (both appointed by Council),
• the Chairs of Academic Board Sub-Committees,
• two students,
• six Academic experts and
• additional co-opted members as necessary.

Of note, the six Academic Experts are selected on skills and expertise in the following areas:
• engagement;
• research;
• teaching and learning;
• Indigenous education; and
• quality and scholarship.

Each Academic Expert is appointed on application and is selected by the Executive Committee of the Board
(Note: The Executive Committee consists of the Chair and Deputy Chair of Academic Board and the Vice-Chancellor).

The University of Melbourne continues the tradition of a Professorial Board. The members of the Academic Board comprise:
• Chancellor,
• Vice-Chancellor,
• Deputy Vice-Chancellors,
• Pro Vice-Chancellors,
• Senior Vice-Principal,
• University Librarian,
• Academic Registrar,
• University Secretary,
• Professors,
• full-time salaried Professorial Fellows,
• Deans of Faculties,
• Heads of Academic Departments,
• Heads of Schools,
• President and one Education Officer of the University of Melbourne Student Union,
• President and President nominee from the Graduate Student Association,
• two members elected by and from the Professional staff and
• any other persons whom the Board determines.

The three office-bearers of the Academic Board are:
• the President,
• Vice-President and
• Deputy Vice-President,
who are elected each year by the members of the Board.

It is expected that each of the office-bearers serve a two-year term in each of the three roles to allow for effective succession planning.

The working party that reviews Academic Senate’s membership should consider its current composition with respect to (but not exclusively):
• indigenous representation,
• academic staff from a non-Faculty area,
• non-academic staff and
• ex-officio representation relative to the role and responsibilities of Academic Senate.

Next Steps
It is proposed that the review of Academic Senate’s Purpose and Composition is undertaken in three stages:
1. A working group charged with developing the scope, timing and methodology to review and define the purpose of Academic Senate (recommendation above).
2. A larger working group be charged with defining the purpose of Academic Senate.
3. A final working group be tasked with aligning the categories and size of membership with the purpose of Academic Senate.

Consultation Process
The following offices have been consulted prior to the submission of this paper:
• Vice-Chancellor

Submitted by: Professor Mariella Herberstein, Chair of Academic Senate
For enquiries contact: Kerri Mackenzie, Project Officer to Academic Senate
kerri.mackenzie@mq.edu.au
ITEM 11.4 ACADEMIC INTEGRITY: WORKING GROUP PROGRESS REPORT

For discussion

Recommended resolution

Academic Senate:

i. discuss the progress report from the Academic Integrity Working Group; and

ii. resolve to approve the establishment of the Student Advisory Group on Academic Integrity, tasked with reviewing and advising on a number of recommendations within the report ‘Towards a Framework for Action’ (Terms of Reference Attachment 1).
ITEM 11.4  ACADEMIC INTEGRITY: WORKING GROUP PROGRESS REPORT

Recommended resolution

Academic Senate:

i. discuss the progress report from the Academic Integrity Working Group; and

ii. resolve to approve the establishment of the Student Advisory Group on Academic Integrity, tasked with reviewing and advising on a number of recommendations within the report 'Towards a Framework for Action' (Terms of Reference Attachment 1).

Summary

The Academic Integrity Working Group, comprising a broad group of staff drawn from across the breadth of the University, (the Working Group) met on 21 September and 25 October 2016.

At its meeting held 25 October, the Working Group endorsed an initial prioritisation plan (Attachment 2) that places each of the existing 32 recommendations from the Report 'Towards a Framework for Action' (the Report) (Attachment 3) in to one of the following categories:

• Short (1 – 6 months);
• Medium (6 – 12 months);
• Long term (12 months – 5 years); and
• Recommended for removal.

However, it has been identified that before informed recommendations regarding the above categories can be made to Academic Senate and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), critical pieces of work must first be completed, including:

1. The development of the ‘positively framed statement of values, rights and responsibilities in relation to academic integrity, to apply equally to all members of Macquarie’s academic community (students and staff)’.

   The Working Group considered the development of the statement as critical in being able to identify and adequately address the next steps required in establishing an Academic Integrity Framework. It is proposed that:

   i. the Student Advisory Group on Academic Integrity consider and provide a draft statement from the student perspective; and

   ii. Student and Staff Focus Groups be held in early 2017 to produce an Academic Integrity Statement.

2. An assessment of both live and draft policies and statements that relate to academic integrity be conducted, in consultation with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Student and Registrar). This will inform the most efficient approach with regard to developing ‘a new Academic Integrity Policy (or statement) and associated support materials. This should complement the Student Discipline Rules and Procedure, by articulating Macquarie’s shared academic integrity values and providing staff and students with greater detail in regard to the application of those principles.’

---

1 Professor Dominic Verity and Ainslee Harvey, Academic Integrity Report Towards a Framework for Action, April 2016, pg. 3.
2 ibid
Issue

Regulatory Requirements

Section 5.2 of the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015, provides detail in relation to Academic and Research Integrity, including:

1. **There are policies that promote and uphold the academic and research integrity** of courses and units of study, research and research training activities, and institutional policies and procedures address misconduct and allegations of misconduct.
2. **Preventative action is taken to mitigate foreseeable risks** to academic and research integrity including misrepresentation, fabrication, cheating, plagiarism and misuse of intellectual property, and to prevent recurrences of breaches.
3. Students are provided with guidance on what constitutes academic or research misconduct and the development of good practices in maintaining academic and research integrity.

Approach

As detailed within the Report ‘Ultimately, the academic integrity of our community will only be bolstered through a combination of strategic, integrated, and targeted measures that are promoted in every aspect of the academic enterprise’. A model currently under a discussion is following four pillars of approach to addressing the issue of academic integrity:

![Diagram showing four pillars: Culture and Values, Roles and Training, Processes: Rules and Policy, Identification and Quality Assurance.]

The categorisation of each of the recommendations in to one or more of the above pillars will assist in identifying the most appropriate operational structure to ensure its success.

Background

- The Report, prepared by Professor Dominic Verity, former Chair of Academic Senate was considered at the Academic Senate meeting in April 2016.
- At that time, Academic Senate discussed the 7 primary recommendations and resolved (Resolution 16/143) to refer the report to the Academic Senate Standing Committee for further consideration of its development.
- In September 2016, the Academic Integrity Working Group was established and tasked with:
  - Reviewing the recommendations outlined in the Report; and
  - Prioritising the recommendations in terms of short, medium and long term goals.

---


4 Professor Dominic Verity and Ainslee Harvey, Academic Integrity Report Towards a Framework for Action, April 2016, pg. 5
Academic Integrity Working Group

The Working Group is Chaired by Associate Professor Judi Homewood, Associate Dean (Higher Degree Research) and was attended by:

- Dr Benedicte Andre, Associate Lecturer, Faculty of Arts
- Professor Lorne Cummings, Associate Dean (Higher Degree Research), Faculty of Business and Economics
- Professor Mariella Herberstein, Chair of Academic Senate
- Professor Richie Howitt, Director, Macquarie-Ryde Futures Partnership
- Dr Mitch Parsell, Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching), Faculty of Human Sciences and Chair of Senate Learning and Teaching Committee
- Dr JoAnne Page, Executive Officer to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
- Dr Stephanie Russo, Lecturer, Faculty of Arts
- Cissy Shen, Student Representative of Academic Senate and Faculty of Human Sciences Faculty Board
- Associate Professor David Spence, Associate Professor, Faculty of Science and Engineering
- Adam Stepcich, Student Grievance and Disciplinary Manager, Governance Services
- Vanessa Todd, Learning Advisor, Library Access & Advisory Services
- Tessa Green, Manager Learning Skills Group, Library Access & Advisory Services
- Paul Roxanas, Project Officer, Macquarie University International College

Project timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>Q1, 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Update to Academic Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Group Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Jan, Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update to Academic Senate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 Feb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cont.</td>
<td>Cont.</td>
<td>Cont.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Advisory Group on Academic Integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electronic meetings</td>
<td>Feb / March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups to produce Academic Integrity Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb / March</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Process

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

- Orientation Office
- Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching)
- Internal Marketing

Outcome to be communicated to

- Academic Integrity Working Group
- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar)
- Governance Services

Submitted by: Associate Professor Judi Homewood (Chair of Working Group) and Professor Mariella Herberstein (Chair of Academic Senate)

For enquiries contact: Kerri Mackenzie, Project Officer to Academic Senate kerri.mackenzie@mq.edu.au
## Project Sponsor/s
Chair of Academic Senate, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar).

## Authority
Academic Senate (1 November 2016). *To be confirmed.*

## Issue/Background
The Report ‘Towards a Framework for Action’ was considered by Academic Senate in April 2016. A Working Group of Academic Senate, charged with identifying the short, medium and long term priorities identified the need to seek advice from a Student Advisory Group.

## Scope
Review the recommendations from the report ‘Towards a Framework for Action’ as directed.

## Membership
- Student Representative from the University Hearing Committee
- International (coursework) student
- Representative/s from the Student Representative Committee
- Chinese Philosophy/Popular Culture Representative
- Representative/s from Academic Senate
- Student Mentors
- Student Representative/s from RRTC /PhD Candidate
- Student Representative/s from MUIC
+ expert advice invited as required

## Timeframe
- Nominations sought and memberships established: November 2016
- Working Group meetings:
  - December (scoping meeting held electronically)
  - February/ March 2017
- Focus Group: March 2017
- Progress Report to AI Working Group: February & March 2017
- Report of AI Working Group & the Student Advisory Group to Academic Senate: 11 April 2017

### Recommendations in scope for action or advice

| 1.2  | **Develop** a positively framed statement of values, rights and responsibilities in relation to academic integrity, to apply equally to all members of Macquarie’s academic community (students and staff). |

<p>| 2.7  | <strong>Review and recommend on:</strong> Encourage greater openness in regard to academic integrity and disciplinary processes. This might include the |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>frequent and prominent publication of aggregate statistics on the numbers of cases notified and penalties applied, how those notifications were handled, ways in which technology is used to detect cheating, proactive steps taken by Faculties to apply educational strategies that encourage ethical practice, and how data on cases is collected, stored and used.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td><strong>Review and recommend on:</strong> Ensure that academic integrity is given a prominent place in all student matriculation and orientation ceremonies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment 2: Initial Prioritisation of Recommendations from the Report ‘Towards a Framework for Action’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Detailed Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Develop a positively framed statement of values, rights and responsibilities in relation to academic integrity, to apply equally to all members of Macquarie’s academic community (students and staff).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What is academic integrity?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Implement a systemic process to develop and agree upon a commonly held interpretation of the term “Academic Integrity”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Develop a positively framed statement of values, rights and responsibilities in relation to academic integrity, to apply equally to all members of Macquarie’s academic community (students and staff).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Evolving our Academic Integrity Culture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 Establish a high profile, on campus, annual festival to raise the profile of Macquarie’s academic integrity values and to introduce new members of the University to Macquarie’s academic integrity community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Establish a rolling campaign of positive academic integrity messaging on campus, using mechanisms such as banners, information screens, lab screensavers, e-mail newsletters, and the University website / social media spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Engage all members of the University community (students, academics and professional staff) in an ongoing effort to eliminate inappropriate messaging on campus and in our online spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Develop and distribute advisories to assist students in distinguishing between ethical educational service providers and fraudulent providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: To be incorporated with Recommendation 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 Add explicit mention of Macquarie’s academic integrity values to all mission statements, unit guides, and marketing material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6 Make discussion and analysis of academic integrity values and challenges a standing item on the agendas of Academic Senate, its key Committees, and all Faculty Boards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7 Encourage greater openness in regard to academic integrity and disciplinary processes. This might include the frequent and prominent publication of aggregate statistics on the numbers of cases notified and penalties applied, how those notifications were handled, ways in which technology is used to detect cheating, proactive steps taken by Faculties to apply educational strategies that encourage ethical practice, and how data on cases is collected, stored and used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Develop and implement an institutional strategy for academic integrity education, to encompass a coherent and sustainable program to design and deploy educational modules, learning resources, and staff training materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal academic integrity education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Develop and implement an institutional strategy for academic integrity education, to encompass a coherent and sustainable program to design and deploy educational modules, learning resources, and staff training materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Redesign the University’s academic integrity educational modules to de-emphasise their focus on plagiarism and to concentrate instead on community building, the value of academic integrity, and a broader range of environmental challenges (contract cheating, essay mills, and so forth).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Scale the AWE module so that it may be applied to all students found culpable of a breach of academic integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Ensure that academic integrity is prominently featured in all of the support materials delivered to students as they settle into the University community. In particular, ensure the student “getting Started” homepage and ‘Orientation’ pages clearly articulate academic integrity as a shared value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Devote at least one lecture and/or tutorial to the topic of academic integrity in every first year (undergraduate and postgraduate) unit. Introduce mechanisms to encourage student engagement through the assessment of their understanding of academic integrity principles and practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Establish a prominent single-point-of-truth web resource to deliver information and advice, contemporary research findings, and support materials to inform staff and student understanding of academic integrity issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who should take responsibility?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Appoint an “Academic Integrity Tsar” reporting to the DVC-A and responsible for promoting academic integrity values and co-ordinating academic integrity initiatives across the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Appoint an “Academic Integrity Tsar” reporting to the DVC-A and responsible for promoting academic integrity values and co-ordinating academic integrity initiatives across the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Develop and publish a stakeholder matrix documenting responsibilities of all staff in regard to contributing to academic integrity values and initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Ensure that academic integrity is given a prominent place in all student matriculation and orientation ceremonies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Ensure that induction processes prominently feature academic integrity as a core Macquarie value: “This is just what we do!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling students to lead</td>
<td>Staff support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Renew the University’s commitment to the AIMI society and implement a support plan to ensure its sustainability. This would include consideration of how we might ensure it is supported by an appropriately expert and committed staff sponsor.</td>
<td>6. Appoint work loaded Academic Integrity Champion(s) within each department, who would be responsible for discharging minor breaches, supporting the preparation of cases for referral to discipline committees, assisting staff in implementing educational and assessment processes, liaison with AIMA members and support of AIMA sponsored activities, and promoting positive academic integrity culture within departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Renew the University’s commitment to the AIMI society and implement a support plan to ensure its sustainability. This would include consideration of how we might ensure it is supported by an appropriately expert and committed staff sponsor.</td>
<td>6.1 Appoint work loaded Academic Integrity Champion(s) within each department, who would be responsible for discharging minor breaches, supporting the preparation of cases for referral to discipline committees, assisting staff in implementing educational and assessment processes, liaison with AIMA members and support of AIMA sponsored activities, and promoting positive academic integrity culture within departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Support AIMI through the provision of Academic Integrity mentorship training.</td>
<td>6.2 Develop protocols to ensure that casual and sessional staff are trained to act as academic integrity leaders, primed to recognise and respond appropriately when they report suspected breach cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macquarie's shared academic integrity values and providing staff and students with greater detail in regard to the application of those principles.</td>
<td>7.2  Establish protocols to ensure that academic integrity is an explicitly considered factor in all learning and teaching policy development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Invest in a record keeping system, with appropriate access control and permissions, which can scale to a distributed misconduct handling regime.</td>
<td>To be advised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be advised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Primary Recommendations

1. Develop a positively framed statement of values, rights and responsibilities in relation to academic integrity, to apply equally to all members of Macquarie’s academic community (students and staff).

2. Establish a rolling campaign of positive academic integrity messaging on campus, using mechanisms such as banners, information screens, lab screensavers, e-mail newsletters, and the University website / social media spaces.

3. Develop and implement an institutional strategy for academic integrity education, to encompass a coherent and sustainable program to design and deploy educational modules, learning resources, and staff training materials.

4. Appoint an “Academic Integrity Tsar” reporting to the DVC-A and responsible for promoting academic integrity values and co-ordinating academic integrity initiatives across the University.

5. Renew the University’s commitment to the AIMA society and implement a support plan to ensure its sustainability. This would include consideration of how we might ensure it is supported by an appropriately expert and committed staff sponsor.

6. Appoint work loaded Academic Integrity Champion(s) within each department, who would be responsible for discharging minor breaches, supporting the preparation of cases for referral to discipline committees, assisting staff in implementing educational and assessment processes, liaison with AIMA members and support of AIMA sponsored activities, and promoting positive academic integrity culture within departments.

7. Develop a new Academic Integrity Policy (or statement) and associated support materials. This should complement the Student Discipline Rule and Procedure, by articulating Macquarie’s shared academic integrity values and providing staff and students with greater detail in regard to the application of those principles.
Introduction

In common with many Australian Universities, Macquarie is currently undertaking a major review of its approach to the question of Academic Integrity. The University has just completed a top-to-bottom overhaul of all of the it’s student discipline policies and processes. It is now critical that we turn our attention to the broader issue of how best to set, communicate and reinforce positive messages in regard to the ethical behaviours we expect all University citizens to model.

Higher education institutions are facing significant challenges in regard to academic honesty and ethical behaviour throughout assessment practice. Importantly, one should note that these issues extend far beyond our age old worries about plagiarism and collusion. Certainly the recent MyMaster events have served to remind the University community of the growing threat of contract cheating, organised essay mills and ghost writing of assignments. Other less well known forms of cheating, such as deception, impersonation, and sabotage are also on a rapid rise.

The recent MyMaster case, and associated press coverage, has galvanised all Australian institutions, with most now reporting substantial reconsideration of their academic honesty and integrity frameworks and processes. However, anecdotal evidence presented at a recent National Meeting of Chairs of Academic Boards, held as a satellite meeting of the 2016 Universities Australia Conference, would indicate that this event has already wrought a substantial negative impact on the perception of Australian Higher Education overseas. Where in the past Australian Universities have been seen as leaders in this space, we are now generally regarded as lagging behind our competitors in the US and the UK.

We must also confront the fact that it is not students alone who engage in academic fraud on an industrial scale. Indeed, this reality has led a growing number of journals to introduce policies which call for the routine application of plagiarism detection software, such as iThenticate, to article submissions. The evidence appears to indicate that plagiarism, self-plagiarism, fabrication, and duplicate submission is common in journal articles, with 1 in 3 editors surveyed\(^1\) reporting that they encountered plagiarism regularly. In 2011 the journal Nature reported a 10-fold increase in retractions over a decade\(^2\) with 44% of those being made on the grounds of researcher misconduct (plagiarism and fabrication). If academic integrity is becoming less of a valued commodity in our own work, and we are more willing to justify corner cutting as a transactional convenience in an increasingly competitive publish or perish environment, then how can we expect our students to adhere to codes of good practice that we ourselves find it increasingly difficult to model.

---


There exists no silver bullet, no panacea to solve this complex and multi-faceted problem. It is not even the case that we may take comfort from the traditional refuge of formal examinations. These too are increasingly subject to routine identity fraud and the use of ubiquitous, sophisticated and easily concealed electronic communications and data storage devices. In a highly publicised, 2015 survey of student behaviour by the UK website The Student Room\(^3\), researchers found that 1 in 10 students admitted to cheating in exams. The same survey found that while most cheating involved low-tech approaches, such as sneaking in notes, or in one case writing on a tampon in Morse code, a significant and growing minority involved the use of high-tech methods such as UV light pens, smart watches, wireless video cameras, and concealed headphones. This is a level of examination cheating comparable to reported levels of cheating in other assessment types, which might lead us to ask whether exams are as robust an assessment mechanism as we might assume.

A wholesale shift back to assessment regimes weighted predominantly to formal examinations may just have the undesired effect of fuelling greater technical innovation in the exam cheating space. In this regard we might ponder our experience of antibiotic resistant bacterial strains, whose evolution has been largely driven by the selection pressure provided by the indiscriminate use of common antibiotics. Is it wise to re-apply an exam focused assessment regime, which would act as a further encouragement to a technological arms race in the use of mobile devices as an aid to cheating in examinations? Might that not simply render our examination processes, the antibiotic of assessment, almost as open to cheating as other assessment forms?

Ultimately, the academic integrity of our community will only be bolstered through a combination of strategic, integrated, and targeted measures that are promoted in every aspect of the academic enterprise. Indeed, one of our strongest defences may well be a simple matter of the educator’s art. Taking the time to explain what it means to be an ethical University citizen, why behaviours like plagiarism damage the individual and the University community, and how acting with integrity will benefit our students in their lives beyond the University.

Academic Integrity is a core value of our University, and cornerstone of our intellectual community; we are all responsible for ensuring that it is preserved and propagated.

**How big is the market in academic cheating?**

As an indication of the size of these emerging threats we might consider only one of the newcomers on the cheating block, that being the contract

\(^3\) [http://www.thestudentroom.co.uk/content.php?r=17147-Exam-cheat-survey-making-headlines-everywhere](http://www.thestudentroom.co.uk/content.php?r=17147-Exam-cheat-survey-making-headlines-everywhere)
The term cheating market. This is a relatively new phenomenon that has been extensively studied by Lancaster and Clark\(^4\) over the past 10 years. This term is now used exclusively to refer to a form of academic cheating, unfortunately now common in IT, Engineering and Business disciplines, in which students obtain solutions to assignments by putting them out to tender on freelance auction websites.

In 2006 Lancaster and Clark found that around 12.3% of all contracts fulfilled on the then popular website Rent-A-Coder, now a subsidiary of Australian freelance website giant Freelancer.com, were requests for the fraudulent completion of student assignments. Their more recent estimate of the minimum size of the market for assignments on Freelancer.com itself, completed in 2013, put it at around 1% of all the business transacted on that site. It is a matter of public record that Freelancer.com transacted 6.9M projects in 2014, so 1% of that business would represent around 69,000 contract cheating instances in that year, with the majority of these being commissioned by students in the USA, UK and Australia.

Lancaster and Clark\(^5\) also found that the average value of each such contract was approximately AU$250, valuing the size of this market on Freelancer.com alone at a minimum of AU$17.25M in 2014. They also point out that the known and well documented prevalence of this activity on Rent-A-Coder would tend to indicate that this valuation is very much a minimum, and they express the opinion that the size of this market on Freelancer.com is probably many times this baseline estimate.

This is the minimum size of just one paid cheating activity on a single Australian website, albeit quite a large one. Unfortunately, however, such documented evidence of the size of this market as a whole is hard to come by. That being said, the Lancaster and Clark analysis combined with widely referenced estimates of the size of the UK market contract cheating market, placing it at £200M as long ago as 2006, clearly points to an international market worth billions of dollars today and to an Australian market whose size is certainly numbered in the tens of millions of dollars annually.

In a recent economic study of this activity, Rigby et al\(^6\) found that of 90 students presented with 8 opportunities to engage in contract cheating (across 3 UK institutions) 45 students expressed a willingness to engage in contract cheating at least once and 7 professed that willingness on all opportunities. It is, of course, unwise to rely solely on generalisations made from such a small sample, and willingness alone does not predict action. The decision to cheat is also informed by cost, perceived quality of the product

---


being purchased, push factors in the assignment process, personal circumstances and so forth. However, this work would tend to indicate that, amongst our cohort of 42,500 students, we might expect to find as many as 40,000 instances over a year in which our students were willing to consider contract cheating in an assessment and, presumably, a handful of thousands of those in which this actually took place. We are certainly not detecting and prosecuting anywhere near that number of such cases, all of which would be considered to be serious breaches in our discipline framework.

Unfortunately, many of the assignment solutions bought in the contract cheating market are original works of the contractors. Consequently, they are unlikely to be picked up by any plagiarism detection software, and are very likely to sail unnoticed past all but the most vigilant of assessors. This is not a threat that we can address simply by redoubling our detection efforts.

Of course, that doesn’t mean that we can afford to be any less than vigilant in regard to plagiarism detection. Nor does it mean that detection mechanisms, automated or otherwise, can play no part in addressing the challenge of contract cheating. We are certainly engaged in an escalating war against forces that are large, well organised, agile and technologically sophisticated. As they refine their evasion mechanisms we must continue to enhance and invest in our detection capabilities. Ultimately, however, this will always be a matter only of keeping up; to paraphrase André Weil\(^7\) it is a necessary hygiene, not a food to sustain the academic integrity of our community.

The Higher Education Standards

At this point, it is worth reminding ourselves of our regulatory responsibilities in regard to academic integrity. Indeed, the new Higher Education Standards, with which we are expected to comply with from the start of 2017, devotes the entirety of its section 5.2 to articulating the obligations of higher education providers (HEPs) in regard to integrity matters. The key clauses\(^8\) for any discussion of Academic Integrity in our teaching programs are:

1.4(3) Methods of assessment are … capable of confirming that all specified learning outcomes are achieved and that grades awarded reflect the level of student attainment.

5.2(1) There are policies that promote and uphold the academic and research integrity of courses and units of study, research and research training activities, and institutional policies and procedures address misconduct and allegations of misconduct.

\(^7\) “If logic is the hygiene of the mathematician, it is not his source of food; the great problems furnish the daily bread on which he thrives,” André Weil, Amer. Math. Monthly (1950)

\(^8\) Higher Education Standards Framework 2015, Federal Register of Legislative Instruments F2015L01639. 
5.2(2) Preventative action is taken to mitigate foreseeable risks to academic and research integrity including misrepresentation, fabrication, cheating, plagiarism and misuse of intellectual property, and to prevent recurrences of breaches.

5.2(3) Students are provided with guidance on what constitutes academic or research misconduct and the development of good practices in maintaining academic and research integrity.

7.3 Information systems and records are maintained, securely and confidentially as necessary to:

(b) prevent unauthorised or fraudulent access to private or sensitive information, including information where unauthorised access may compromise academic or research integrity

(c) document and record responses to formal complaints, allegations of misconduct, breaches of academic or research integrity and critical incidents

B1.2(9) The higher education provider has systematic, mature internal processes for quality assurance and the maintenance of academic standards and academic integrity.

Academic Integrity Workshops

On 19-20th November 2015, the Chair of Academic Senate hosted a two-day academic integrity workshop which were co-facilitated by academic integrity experts and international research leaders:

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

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

The purpose of the workshops was to provide a forum to encourage staff and students to think about how we might embed a renewed culture of personal integrity and ethical good practice throughout Macquarie’s undergraduate and postgraduate coursework programs. Research integrity was not in scope for these workshops, although a significant body of work in this regard is already in train and is being led by the Pro-Vice Chancellor (Research and Integrity).

The workshops canvassed the following topics:
• Creating a campus culture of personal integrity and ethical good practice
• Policy responses and record keeping
• Educating & engaging students
• Professional development and support for staff

The workshops were open to all, and widely advertised. Beyond that general call, around 250 individuals were also explicitly invited to attend. This guest list was largely drawn from lists of individuals who had taken part in academic integrity training, academic discipline committees / processes, development of academic integrity training materials, or had participated in funded research in this broad area. It also included a wide range of academic leaders from across the university, who had been selected on the basis of expressed interest or long term experience in academic integrity matters.

So this was a largely self selected and very well informed group, the great majority of whom had been either active participants in discipline committees at Faculty and University level over many years, had engaged in the development of resources to support academic integrity education, or had participated in OLT funded research on some aspect of this question.

The recommendations arising out of the workshops, and documented below form “A Framework for Action”, for consideration and endorsement by Academic Senate. It is hoped that this Framework will provide a solid foundation for ensuring that academic integrity remains a strategic priority for 2016 and beyond.

The Chair of Academic Senate would like to acknowledge and thank Dr Bretag and Dr Fishman who contributed greatly to the discussion and encouraged participants to think very broadly about the issues involved and the range of measures that could be adopted.

What is academic integrity?

The workshops commenced with an exercise to examine what the term academic integrity meant to the Macquarie community, and to interrogate the role of this concept as a keystone of our academic practice. Given the very wide range of (sometime conflicting) interpretations expressed, it quickly became clear that great value could be derived from the University collaboratively developing and adopting a common, and widely agreed, definition of this term and an associated statement of core principles.

The International Centre for Academic Integrity defines academic integrity as “a commitment, even in the face of adversity, to six fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage.” From these
values flow principles of behaviour that enable academic communities to translate ideals to action.

Macquarie does not currently define the term ‘Academic Integrity’ in its policy base or glossary. Academic Honesty, however, is defined in the Macquarie Glossary as ‘a fundamental principle that all staff and students act with integrity in the creation, development, application and use of ideas and information.’ The absence of a definition provides an excellent opportunity for the University to re-think and agree on a definition that embodies what the concept means to Macquarie.

Working in groups, participants at the workshop were asked to define academic integrity in a maximum of two sentences. The following are some of the responses:

- **Academic integrity is the ethical foundation of our academic community**
- **The academic learning and intellectual development of individuals and communities matter to society. This requires broad values and active practice of responsibility, respect, honesty and ethical behaviour, generosity, acknowledgement of others and accountability.**
- **Academic integrity is an informed choice about how to behave with honesty, responsibility, respect, and fairness in an academic community**
- **Academic integrity is a matter of personal responsibility and open engagement between members of our academic community, whose purpose is to foster the interpersonal trust upon which all collaborations are founded. It is typified by principles of personal responsibility, community, fairness, honesty and ethical good practice.**
- **Academic integrity is about practising the shared values of the academic community. These include respect, trust, justice, honesty and responsibility, and these values are learned and developed over time.**

While the above definitions may provide a good starting point, it is important to note that the purpose of this exercise was not to commit the University to any particular definition at this stage. Instead, workshop participants were of the view that the development of a commonly held definition, and an associated statement of academic integrity principles and responsibilities, was an activity which should encompass the whole academic community of the University, students and staff. Indeed, if carefully designed this process could form a crucial first step in a broad campaign to improve shared community awareness of the importance (and utility) of academic integrity and the challenges we all face.
This conversation about the meaning of academic integrity to our community needs to start at the university level, and extend downwards into departments and beyond into the classroom. Provided it does so, this will allow genuine and coherent commitment to academic integrity amongst Macquarie’s stakeholders.

Recommendations:

1. Implement a systemic process to develop and agree upon a commonly held interpretation of the term “Academic Integrity”.
2. Develop a positively framed statement of values, rights and responsibilities in relation to academic integrity, to apply equally to all members of Macquarie’s academic community (students and staff).

Evolving our Academic Integrity Culture

Much of the discussion on the first morning of the workshops concentrated upon the challenges of evolving our academic integrity culture to meet rapidly changing environmental challenges. It was generally acknowledged that over the past decade Macquarie had tended to focus on the punitive rather than educative or community aspects of academic integrity. Participants expressed the view that it was common for first punitive interaction with a discipline process to be the first point at which students had come into contact with the academic integrity expectations of the University.

It is clear that most students know that cheating is forbidden and that activities such as plagiarism can attract some form of sanction. It was commonly held, however, that few possessed a nuanced view of why academic integrity was regarded as such an important issue and, despite our focus on detection and punishment, fewer still were aware that breaches can attract penalties as severe as unit failure or exclusion from enrolment. Participants expressed the view that many students had incomplete and naïve views of what might be regarded as an inappropriate act, and that it was common for them to fall foul of the University’s discipline process as a result of that lack of understanding.

It was observed that a number of online modules had been developed to educate students and staff in academic integrity matters. As a secondary concern these had been framed in a manner that increase ethical sensitivity, and influence behaviour. However, they have been limited in their effectiveness and reach, largely due to the fact that they are voluntary. Interestingly, it has been reported that workshops on ‘how to avoid plagiarism’ are far better attended than workshops on ‘academic integrity’. This may be
attributed to a lack of understanding of what academic integrity means and why it is important.

After much discussion, workshop participants concluded that our primary cultural challenge in regard to academic integrity is that of embedding awareness of academic integrity as an explicit consideration into all of the University’s activities (pedagogical, pastoral, and operational). It is imperative that academic integrity simply becomes ‘just a part of what we do’ as an institution, not an added extra or afterthought to briefly entertain incoming students or members of discipline panels.

A first step in this direction might simply be to ‘piggy-back’ a conversation about academic integrity onto regular meetings or planning days. In another form, it could be included in the induction of new staff members, going beyond the HR portal and the phone directory to familiarise new members of our academic community with the University’s statement on academic integrity.

We must all take a far more active part in highlighting the importance and benefits of good ethical behaviour, both at university and beyond the campus. As educators we must seek to place the emphasis back on teaching, and on encouraging engagement with academic integrity principles, in preference to simply policing breaches:

“In our stampede to fight what The New York Times calls a "plague" of plagiarism, we risk becoming the enemies rather than the mentors of our students; we are replacing the student-teacher relationship with the criminal-police relationship... Worst of all, we risk not recognizing that our own pedagogy needs reform. Big reform.

…All those who worked to get advanced academic degrees in order to police young adults, please raise your hands. No hands? Then let’s calm down and get back to the business of teaching.”

For our students, this change is best wrought by active reinforcement of positive messages on campus and by the conscious removal of all inappropriate communications from public spaces (real and virtual). These activities might include an ongoing, rolling series of engaging and amusing re-enforcement messages on banners, information screens, and lab screensavers, and a week devoted to a celebration of Macquarie’s academic integrity culture. These should be grasped as an opportunity to explain how academic integrity is key to the value of the degrees that students are working towards, and to articulate the benefits of ethical practice in our educational and professional lives.

---

On the verso, in recent years we have become more vigilant in the removal of inappropriate marketing posts from our social media spaces. That being said, we cannot become complacent in this area; those delivering these posts become more sophisticated by the day and we must keep up with them. We have not, however, been quite so vigilant in tracking down similar marketing posted on physical bulletin boards, in bathroom spaces, in classrooms, or on lighting posts on and in the environs of our campus. What is more it being not quite good enough to simply remove these messages, we also must pause to articulate why the messages we are removing are contrary to good academic practice. We cannot, and should not, simply assume that everyone in our community can innately sift ethical wheat from the chaff, so we must act deliberately in training them to make those fine distinctions.

In brief, Macquarie must make integrity central to every function of the university, from marketing and recruitment through to graduation and absolutely everything in between. Importantly, our mission should be visible to staff, students and the wider community. Academic integrity should be front and centre in, but not limited to, our mission statement, unit guides, orientation information, classrooms, and on-boarding activities.

Figure “Embedding and extending exemplary academic integrity policy and support frameworks across the higher education sector”, OLT project 2015, A/Prof. Tracey Bretag et. al. https://lo.unisa.edu.au/course/view.php?id=6751&section=3.

Recommendations:

1. Establish a high profile, on campus, annual festival to raise the profile of Macquarie’s academic integrity values and to introduce new members of the University to Macquarie’s academic integrity community.
2. Establish a rolling campaign of positive academic integrity messaging on campus, using mechanisms such as banners, information screens, lab screensavers, e-mail newsletters, and the University website / social media spaces.
3. Engage all members of the University community (students, academics and professional staff) in an ongoing effort to eliminate inappropriate messaging on campus and in our online spaces.
4. Develop and distribute advisories to assist students in distinguishing between ethical educational service providers and fraudulent providers.

5. Add explicit mention of Macquarie’s academic integrity values to all mission statements, unit guides, and marketing material.

6. Make discussion and analysis of academic integrity values and challenges a standing item on the agendas of Academic Senate, its key Committees, and all Faculty Boards.

7. Encourage greater openness in regard to academic integrity and disciplinary processes. This might include the frequent and prominent publication of aggregate statistics on the numbers of cases notified and penalties applied, how those notifications were handled, ways in which technology is used to detect cheating, proactive steps taken by Faculties to apply educational strategies that encourage ethical practice, and how data on cases is collected, stored and used.

**Formal academic integrity education**

Workshop participants spent a little time surveying the current state of the University’s programs to provide formal academic integrity training. Primary issues identified included a lack of a coherent strategy, inadequate provision of training resources, underfunding of existing programs, and a lack of integration with the broader curriculum.

Historically, much of the formal academic integrity training provided to students by the University has been delivered by the learning skills team of the Learning and Teaching Centre. Initially this activity focussed upon workshops which, while stressing the broader importance of academic integrity, concentrate largely upon developing skills to assist students in understanding plagiarism and writing to avoid related breaches. These workshops have always been voluntary in nature and, as a result, participant numbers have varied widely over the years, following no predictable pattern and leading to compromised effectiveness of the program. Indeed, anecdotal evidence provided by those running these workshops indicates that students generally attended when they felt they were at risk of being caught in a plagiarism breach or, indeed, after they had been notified that they were being investigated for such.

More recently the learning skills team, working in collaboration with a network of interested academic staff, has developed a pair of online academic integrity training modules for staff and students. These modules are designed to raise student and staff awareness of responsibilities and rights in regard to academic integrity, and to provide some guidance in regard to acceptable and unacceptable academic practice. While this may be beneficial and informative for students, it was acknowledged that this module largely confines itself to instructing students what to avoid rather than on assisting them to create a
collaborative academic integrity culture. Likewise, the staff module has been largely built only to support staff in interpreting and implementing policy.

While the completion of the student module is not a compulsory requirement, all new students are automatically enrolled into it when they join the University. The module itself was largely designed only as a learning resource, rather than as an assessed activity, and the University has not implemented an effective mechanism to assess outcomes or monitor student completion. Consequently, it is hard to gauge the extent of its positive influence on the broad student body.

In passing we might note that a fully assessed variant of this module, called AWE (Academic and Workplace Ethics), was developed early in 2015. This work was undertaken in response to the discipline cases arising out of the MyMaster case, and successful completion of this AWE module is now required of all students found culpable of an academic integrity breach by the University Student Discipline Hearing Panel. As things stand, however, the delivery of AWE is a labour intensive process and it is not suited for scaling beyond participation rates of 200-300 students per year.

It is also worth observing that at various times individual Faculties have also developed and applied their own academic integrity training modules. While these have seen some significant local successes, this dispersed activity has often been hard to sustain. Certainly none of these have led to wider institutional initiatives, and the University has found it difficult to sustainably capitalise upon these investments.

Workshop participants concluded that these initiatives were valuable, but that they had all suffered from a lack of effective, strategically motivated institutional buy in and direction. They had often been developed and run by local enthusiast teams, and had not been supported by strategies and policy to encourage students and staff to use the resources provided. Furthermore, a lack of overall coherence had led to some doubling up and waste of already scant resources.

Beyond problems identified in the delivery of these dedicated programs, a far greater issue appears to be a lack of routine integration of academic integrity education into the broader curriculum. It was a commonly held experience that students, at all levels, knew little about academic integrity beyond a passing acquaintance with plagiarism. Appreciation of academic integrity as a positive value appears to have taken second fiddle to a pragmatic appreciation of adverse consequence avoidance. This response clearly indicates that we have been far less than effective at articulating this key value as a routine part of our academic programs, that we have tended to focus that training on a functional appreciation of the single issue of plagiarism, and that the coverage of this training is by no means universal.
However, workshop participants were not generally in favour of addressing this lack of universal educational coverage through the imposition of a requirement to complete a one-size-fits-all academic integrity module. Instead, most felt it would be more effective to mandate that all programs meet a minimum standard of academic integrity training, supported by the provision of centrally developed resources and training materials. Not only would that approach ensure that this training could be adapted to local discipline conditions, but it would also ensure that a much wider group of staff were actively engaged in academic integrity education.

**Recommendations:**

1. Develop and implement an institutional strategy for academic integrity education, to encompass a coherent and sustainable program to design and deploy educational modules, learning resources, and staff training materials.
2. Redesign the University’s academic integrity educational modules to de-emphasise their focus on plagiarism and to concentrate instead on community building, the value of academic integrity, and a broader range of environmental challenges (contract cheating, essay mills, and so forth).
3. Scale the AWE module so that it may be applied to all students found culpable of a breach of academic integrity.
4. Ensure that academic integrity is prominently featured in all of the support materials delivered to students as they settle into the University community. In particular, ensure the student “getting Started” homepage and ‘Orientation’ pages clearly articulate academic integrity as a shared value.
5. Devote at least one lecture and/or tutorial to the topic of academic integrity in every first year (undergraduate and postgraduate) unit. Introduce mechanisms to encourage student engagement through the assessment of their understanding of academic integrity principles and practice.
6. Establish a prominent single-point-of-truth web resource to deliver information and advice, contemporary research findings, and support materials to inform staff and student understanding of academic integrity issues.

**Enabling students to lead**

One of the most stimulating sessions of the workshops was that devoted to the topic of student engagement in academic integrity matters. In analysing the current position at Macquarie, participants agreed that students had been regarded only as passive recipients of academic integrity education or as recidivist offenders. As we reconsider the University’s approach to Academic
Integrity, it is the perfect opportunity to begin listening to students, partnering with them, and empowering them to lead cultural change within their networks.

It was noted that the research corpus in this area strongly supports the thesis that active engagement in, and leadership of, community academic integrity values and processes is a strong predictor of behavioural improvement. It was agreed that Macquarie should move decisively to encourage students to be partners in, rather than passive recipients of, academic integrity education, values and processes.

One should note that this position is also implicitly mandated by the University’s new Learning and Teaching Strategy, which insists that students should be made partners and co-creators in their learning. Consequently, we should ensure that students are given an opportunity to contribute to the academic integrity conversation, that they are empowered to influence policy on academic integrity, and that they are given a key role in shaping the academic integrity culture on campus. They should also be invited to contribute to discipline processes, through routine membership of hearing panels and involvement in the departmental processes that apply to more minor breaches.

In a move towards greater student partnership, the University established the Academic Integrity Matters Ambassadors (AIMA) in February 2014. This is a student led society which aims to improve academic integrity culture and to empower students to lead in this space. Funding for this group was initially provided under the auspices of an OLT funded academic integrity research project hosted at Macquarie University and led by A/Prof. Abhaya Nayak of the Department of Computing. Under this project Ambassadors were supported to conduct surveys, create and share academic integrity resources, develop awareness campaigns, and assist in community outreach and education before new students arrive at University.

Much of this activity was led by Ms Sonia Saddiqui in the Learning and Teaching Centre, who provided day-to-day support to the student ambassadors and conducted much of the research associated with those activities. While honour codes and societies are common on US campuses this was, and still is, the only student led academic integrity society at an Australian University. As such it has received a fair amount of, highly positive, national press attention. We are also aware of a number of other institutions who are currently well advanced examining the practicalities of supporting the establishment of similar societies on their campuses and of networking those across Australian Universities.

Despite best efforts, however, the AIMA program has struggled to sustain itself beyond the end of the OLT grant, and with the closure of the Learning and Teaching Centre it has now lost its primary sponsor. The research
literature, including that arising from Macquarie’s own OLT project, clearly indicates that such activities can only thrive if supported by staff sponsors with an active interest in academic integrity and closely integrated with other student mentoring activities. In the past 6 weeks, we have initiated a process to integrate AIMA more closely with the Mentors@Macquarie program but without expert and committed sponsorship it is likely to lose its focus and identity within the larger mentor pool.

Beyond Mentors@Macquarie, AIMA members should also be supported to take a more influential role in student and academic governance. Indeed, AIMA members are already demonstrating their commitment to our community by standing for election to groups such as the Student Representative Committee. They have also shown a great willingness to contribute actively in peer to peer communication of academic integrity values, an extremely powerful driver of student behaviour. To do this effectively, however, our student leaders need to be supported and trained and staff need to take the lead in this.

Recommendations:

1. Renew the University’s commitment to the AIMA society and implement a support plan to ensure its sustainability. This would include consideration of how we might ensure it is supported by an appropriately expert and committed staff sponsor.
2. Support AIMA through the provision of Academic Integrity mentorship training.
3. Commit strategically to developing close relationships between AIMA and other student leadership groups such as Mentors@Macquarie and the Student Representative Committee.
4. Provide AIMA with regular opportunities to address academic governing bodies at University and Faculty levels and to contribute to the work of those bodies.
5. Engage AIMA in the development and execution of the on-campus and online campaigns discussed above.
6. Appoint Academic Integrity student class representatives in all departments and sign them up to AIMA.
7. Ensure that every discipline panel includes a student member, preferably drawn from the membership of AIMA. Also encourage collaboration between Academic Integrity class representatives and those executing department level discipline processes.

Who should take responsibility?

Cultural change cannot be achieved without everyone taking responsibility and ownership for making it happen. Too often we view academic integrity as
the student’s problem, without considering how other stakeholders might play a role, either in the problem or in its potential solution. This is also not just an issue to be pursued by academic staff, the University is a single community in which every part carries responsibility for upholding our shared values.

“Academic communities of integrity rest upon foundations of personal accountability coupled with the willingness of individuals and groups to lead by example, uphold mutually agreed-upon standards, and take action when they encounter wrongdoing…

Responsibility for upholding the values of integrity is simultaneously an individual duty and a shared concern. Every member of an academic community – each student, faculty member, and administrator – is responsible for safeguarding the integrity of its scholarship, teaching and research…. Shared responsibility both distributes and magnifies the power to effect change.”

(Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity 2nd Ed, ICAI 2013)

For example, those who tend our grounds and buildings should also see it as part of their role to be active in the removal of inappropriate advertisements from walls, lamp posts and public notice boards. In a similar fashion, those who develop and manage our web and marketing presence should be proactive in countering postings from essay mills and promulgating messages that promote ethical practice. Ultimately, by raising the profile of academic integrity as a central Macquarie value, we might hope to encourage everyone to ask how they might contribute to upholding that value.

In her keynote address10 at the 7th Asia Pacific Conference on Educational Integrity, and in her recent presentation to Academic Senate, A/Prof. Tracey Bretag identified several ways to promote shared responsibility:

As an institution:

- Make integrity central to every function of the university, from marketing and recruitment through to graduation and absolutely everything in between.
- Identify key stakeholders, both internal and external, to be champions of academic integrity.
- Induct, orient and train students in values of honesty, trust, respect, fairness and responsibility.
- Do the same for all staff – administrators, managers and academics.
- Commit real resources to teaching - it’s the heart of what we do.

10 “Who is responsible for educational integrity?”, A/Prof. Tracey Bretag, 7th Asia Pacific Conference on Educational Integrity
• Provide pedagogic professional development to teachers – use peer review, performance management and promotion to reward good teaching, particularly in relation to academic integrity.
• Establish academic integrity policy and procedures based on best practice recommendations (see www.unisa.edu.au/EAPI)
  o Consistently follow through on all breaches of academic integrity.
  o Publicise outcomes of breaches to enhance community awareness & confidence.

As teachers/academics:

• Take teaching seriously
• Take advantage of professional development opportunities.
• Commit to transparent and consistent assessment processes.
• Be available to your students: be interested in their world.
• Remind yourself that not every student is a “cheater”
• Model ethical practice (eg. how you use and cite sources)
• Utilize widely available resources on teaching academic integrity (eg www.aisp.apfei.edu.au and www.unisa.edu/EAPI)
  o Make academic integrity the focus at key assessment points
  o Don’t be afraid to (consistently) address academic integrity breaches.

Beyond the need for everyone to play a serious role in promoting academic integrity, there is also a clear need for the University to ensure that these distributed responsibilities and activities are centrally sponsored and co-ordinated. An increasingly popular model in this regard is the appointment of “Tsars”, at faculty or university level, to co-ordinate and promote academic integrity initiatives.

For example, the University of Sydney taskforce on academic misconduct and plagiarism, chaired by its Vice-Chancellor, has recently recommended the appointment of such an individual, at the university level. Its report11 suggests tasking that individual with responsibilities including to:

• 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.**

The University of Sydney has also appointed the outgoing Chair of its Academic Board to head its educational directorate, in which role he will carry responsibility for implementing the recommendations outlined in that report.

Workshop participants concluded that the appointment of an academic role of this kind was also a high priority for Macquarie. Its view was that such an individual should report to the DVC (Academic) and would carry the responsibilities outlined above. It was felt that such an appointment would also have a subsidiary benefit as a concrete totem of the University’s ongoing commitment to academic integrity as a core value.

**Recommendations:**

1. Appoint an “Academic Integrity Tsar” reporting to the DVC-A and responsible for promoting academic integrity values and co-ordinating academic integrity initiatives across the University.
2. Develop and publish a stakeholder matrix documenting responsibilities of all staff in regard to contributing to academic integrity values and initiatives.
3. Ensure that academic integrity is given a prominent place in all student matriculation and orientation ceremonies.
4. Ensure that induction processes prominently feature academic integrity as a core Macquarie value: “This is just what we do!”

**Staff support**

Our primary task in supporting staff is to assist them in translating existing, strongly held values of academic integrity into action in the classroom and on campus. Of course, the great majority of staff already model good practice to their students, adhere to high standards themselves, and take the time to reinforce the importance of good ethical practice in tutorials and lectures. They have, however, often done so without clear and explicit support, and they often find it difficult to know how to respond effectively when issues arise.

The under-reporting and under-detection of breaches of academic honesty remains a challenge for all Universities. In the introduction to this report we considered some of the baseline statistics in regard to the numbers of cases of cheating we might expect from a student body of 42,500. Those numbers
compare quite starkly to the total number of discipline cases reported and prosecuted each year. For example, in 2015 the total number of discipline cases reported and heard at Macquarie, either at Faculty or University level, was a relatively modest 523, of which 84 were general conduct or forgery breaches largely unrelated to academic conduct. It should be said that this number encompasses all breaches pursued in that year, not just those of a serious nature. In other words, with only 1.1% of the student population interacting with the discipline process in a given year, and given the statistics we have seen in regard to baseline levels of misconduct, we might conclude that academic cheating is a relatively cost free activity. Under current circumstances we might worry that the probability of being caught cheating is far too low, rendering our discipline processes only a weak deterrent.

The reasons for this under-reporting appear to be many and varied. There are, of course, technical limitations to detecting breaches; no software for this purpose is perfect. Unfortunately, we do not routinely analyse statistics on the use of the Turnitin software, but we do know that its use is certainly far from ubiquitous and we know that the reports that it generates are open to a wide variety of interpretations and responses. Those serving on discipline committees will be very aware that in some parts a similarity rating of 30% is regarded as a major breach whereas in others ratings as high as 50% are routine.

When participants in the workshops were asked to identify reasons for under-reporting, their concerns centred on the ways in which staff were supported to undertake detection and reporting activities. Many quoted additional workload concerns, lack of support from those in leadership roles, or lack of understanding/knowledge of university policies and practices. They identified consistency in the application of these policies as a major issue, with a lack of broader discussion of shared values and aspirations driving significant differences in reporting practice from department to department and unit to unit.

It was observed that some of these issues could be addressed through the provision of formal training and professional development. However, participants questioned the effectiveness of such programs, citing the common experience of self-selected, enthusiast attendance in existing L&T training programs and a lack of coverage of the casual and sessional workforce. As our classrooms shift further and further into the era of casualization, this itinerant workforce has become the primary academic integrity frontline and it demands the greatest level of (work loaded) support.

Discussions and training in regard to academic integrity need not be formal; indeed, there exists substantial evidence to support the thesis that it is more effective to build this in as part normal faculty and departmental business. This requires approach no extra (explicit) time commitment from staff, encourages strong faculty ownership of integrity, and protects academic
integrity from being seen as a burdensome compliance issue. The challenge in this approach, however, is that of identifying and empowering local academic champions, in faculties and departments, to keep the academic integrity discourse alive and to act as source of advice, support and expertise.

Discipline processes themselves remain a significant disincentive to reporting. Many staff report significant stress arising from the management of academic misconduct cases, and they find that this role is at odds with their role as pedagogue and mentor. Committee processes are a relatively heavyweight mechanism to apply to more minor first offences, and the preparation of such cases imposes a significant workload on unit convenors. Consequently, it is often argued that such minor cases should simply be handled through educative means, which generally go unmonitored by our formal processes. In the minds of many students this approach can translate to a belief that blind eyes will be turned to offences so long as they are “relatively minor”. Experiential and research evidence, however, clearly demonstrates that early engagement with a formal discipline process and the imposition of a clear, but nevertheless relatively minor, penalty for a first offence acts as by far the most effective disincentive to future breach behaviour.

The University's new discipline process allows for minor offences to be handled at departmental level, so long as a student is a first offender who agrees to accept a penalty for a minor misdemeanour. That procedure calls for appropriately trained staff in departments to undertake investigations into such minor cases, to interview students and to agree penalties. Those staff, however, have not as yet been identified and appropriate training programs have not been rolled out. This is an intensive, specialist activity that needs to be appropriately supported and work loaded.

To address these dual issues of minor breach handling and the local promotion of academic integrity culture and expertise, the University should consider appointing Academic Integrity Champions / Officers in each department. These individuals would act as a common point of department level advice and expertise in the handling of discipline cases, and would be responsible for encouraging and assisting unit convenors in the detection of breaches and the preparation of cases. Dually these officers would also be tasked with advising lecturers and tutors on methods to “cheat proof” assessments, apply plagiarism detection software, restructure units to reduce the stresses that can drive undesirable behaviour, and so forth. They would also be expected to act as “chalk face” champions of the Macquarie culture of academic integrity. They might also be tasked with sponsoring the integration of AIMA initiatives into departmental activities and with mentoring AIMA members in their department’s student cohort. These champions would be networked across the University, to share best practice and ensure consistency of decision making, and would have a dotted reporting line to the Academic Integrity lead in the DVC-A office.
Some of those who spoke at the workshop were also concerned that the reporting of academic integrity breaches could be viewed in some quarters as evidence of poor teaching performance. To counter this perception, it is important for the University to acknowledge openly that academic dishonesty is ubiquitous and that high reporting rates are more likely to indicate vigilance rather than poor teaching. Indeed, in our quality assurance framework it would be prudent to red-flag large units that are not reporting cases of suspected academic misconduct.

Recommendations:

1. Appoint work loaded Academic Integrity Champion(s) within each department, who would be responsible for discharging minor breaches, supporting the preparation of cases for referral to discipline committees, assisting staff in implementing educational and assessment processes, liaison with AIMA members and support of AIMA sponsored activities, and promoting positive academic integrity culture within departments.

2. Develop protocols to ensure that casual and sessional staff are trained to act as academic integrity leaders, primed to recognise and respond appropriately to undesirable academic behaviours, and are appropriately supported when they report suspected breach cases.

3. Incorporate information on academic integrity breaches into the quality assurance processes for units and programs, and establish standards that call for further investigation when these numbers are abnormally low or high.

Policy responses

It is very important to have a policy base that is carefully designed to underpin and safeguard academic integrity and to articulate shared values. Macquarie’s current policy base is more focused on the punitive aspects of student discipline, rather than on communicating positive messages in regard to the ethical behaviours that we expect all University citizens to model. Workshop participants were strongly of the view that that negative language featured far too prominently in our current academic integrity policy base. Those policies that attempt to articulate these values are often inconsistently worded, poorly articulated and lacking in clear guidelines for application.

Academic Integrity needs to be embedded in every aspect of University life, and academic integrity should be made a key focus in the review and development of any Learning and Teaching policy. Over the past year we have already made important to strides in that direction and, significantly, the Assessment Policy has just completed a major review which explicitly acknowledged, and responded to, the significant role that good assessment design and implementation plays in promoting academic integrity. University
Council and Academic Senate have also completed a thorough overhaul of Student Discipline rules and procedures, to streamline processes and ensure a level of robustness to legal challenge.

The Academic Honesty Policy is now the next chicken to be pulled from the policy coop (or battery barn). Workshop participants concluded that the introduction of a separate rule base to govern discipline process made this the ideal time to evolve this into a positive statement of academic integrity values. That would then become the cornerstone expression of our shared academic integrity values, and could then be used as a key document in on-boarding, induction, and matriculation processes, for example.

*Exemplary policy is not enough. Policy requires constant revision based on an institutional commitment to academic integrity. It requires feedback from breach data, academic integrity breach decision makers, appeals committee, senior managers, teaching staff, students and policy makers in other functional areas.*

Currently, Macquarie does not have a central data repository that could be accessed routinely and directly by hearing committees and academic integrity champions. Information about proven breaches is stored on student records and Governance Services maintains a database of those cases considered by hearing committees, but it unlikely that these mechanisms can scale to a regime that incorporates department level decision making. These technological limitations make it very difficult to gain a complete and accurate understanding of how students are performing in their program of study. Effective recordkeeping and a searchable database are essential parts of ensuring that cases of repeated misconduct are detected and dealt with appropriately.

**Recommendations:**

1. Develop a new Academic Integrity Policy (or statement) and associated support materials. This should complement the Student Discipline Rule and Procedure, by articulating Macquarie’s shared academic integrity values and providing staff and students with greater detail in regard to the application of those principles.
2. Establish protocols to ensure that academic integrity is an explicitly considered factor in all learning and teaching policy development.
3. Invest in a record keeping system, with appropriate access control and permissions, which can scale to a distributed misconduct handling regime.

---

ITEM 13.1: ACADEMIC SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE

For noting

Attached is the report of the Academic Senate Standing Committee meeting held by circulation on 22 September 2016.

Recommended resolution

Academic Senate note the report of the Academic Senate Standing Committee meeting held by circulation on 22 September 2016.
ITEM 13.1: REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING BY CIRCULATION ON 22 SEPTEMBER 2016

Recommendation
Academic Senate note the report of the Academic Senate Standing Committee meeting held by circulation on 22 September 2016.

The key item and resolution of this meeting are outlined below.

ITEMS FOR NOTING
Review of the Department of Economics: Terms of Reference and Panel members
Members approved the terms of reference and review panel membership for the review of the Department of Economics.

Resolution 16/46
That Academic Senate Standing Committee resolved to:

i. note the Department of Economics Review Panel members; and
ii. confirm the approval of the Terms of Reference for the Review of the Department of Economics.

Professor Mariella Herberstein
Chair, Senate Standing Committee
ITEM 13.2: ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND QUALITY COMMITTEE

For approval and noting

Attached are the reports of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee meetings of 20 September and 18 October 2016.

Recommended resolution

Academic Senate resolve to:

i. approve the academic case for the Doctor of Medicine (Global MD), effective 1 January 2018 (refer to Item 10.1);
ii. approve the academic case for the Graduate Diploma of Physical Health (Exit Award), effective 1 January 2017 (refer to Item 10.2);
iii. approve the discontinuation of the Master of Applied Finance (Dual Degree program with East China Normal University (ECNU) Shanghai) from 31 December 2016 (refer to item 10.3); and
iv. note the reports of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee meetings of 20 September and 18 October 2016.
ITEM 13.2 REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND QUALITY COMMITTEE
MEETING OF 20 SEPTEMBER 2016

Recommendation
That the Academic Senate note the report of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee meeting of 20 September 2016, and, where appropriate, be adopted as recommended.

ITEMS FOR APPROVAL BY ACADEMIC SENATE

1 Retrospective Program Approval (Confidential) (refer to Agenda Item 15.2)
ASQC considered a confidential report and recommends it to Academic Senate (Resolution (ASQC) 16/152).

ITEMS FOR NOTING

2 Retrospective Changes
ASQC approved (Res ASQC 16/150) retrospective changes to option sets for the following programs due to unit recoding (PSYC) for the following: Bachelor of Science – Psychology; Bachelor of Arts – Psychology; Bachelor of Psychology (Honours); Bachelor of Business Administration with the degree of Bachelor of Arts – Psychology; Bachelor of Business Administration with the degree of Bachelor of Psychology Honours.
ASQC approved (Res ASQC 16/151) retrospective changes for the following: Counselling Theory and Principles Major; Mechanical Engineering Major; Bachelor of Business Analytics with the degree of Bachelor of Security Studies; Bachelor of Security Studies; Bachelor of Security Studies OUA; Bachelor of Security Studies with the Bachelor of Laws; Data Science Major; and Mechanical Engineering Major).

3 2017 Schedule of Articulating Postgraduate Award Sets
ASQC approved (Res ASQC 16/153) the 2017 Schedule of Articulating Postgraduate Award Sets.

4 2017 Schedule: Programs Changes - for approval
ASQC approved (Res ASQC 16/154) program changes to the following programs, effective from 1 January 2017: Bachelor of Security Studies; Bachelor of Security Studies with the Bachelor of Laws; Bachelor of Business Analytics with the Bachelor of Security Studies; Bachelor of Marine Science; Bachelor of Medical Sciences.

5 2017 Schedule: Program Changes - for noting
ASQC noted and ratified action (Res ASQC 16/155) taken under executive authority by the Chair of the Academic Standards and Quality for the following 2017 programs: Graduate Diploma of Politics and Applied Social Research; Master of Criminology; Graduate Diploma of Creative Writing and Master of Creative Writing

6 2017 Schedule: Late Changes - Majors
ASQC approved (Res ASQC 16/156) changes to the following majors, effective 1 January 2017: Screen, Sound, Performance Major; Community Services Major; Greece and Rome Major; Media, Culture and Communication Major; Data Science Major; Environmental Humanities Major; Human Biology Major; Language and Professional Communication Major.

7 2017 Schedule: Late Changes - Specialisations
ASQC approved (Res ASQC 16/157) changes to the following specialisation, effective 1 January 2017: Environmental Science Innovation Specialisation

8 2017 Schedule: Late Changes - PACE and Capstone
ASQC approved (Res ASQC 16/158) the following PACE and Capstone units effective from 1 January 2017: POIR 333 Local and Global Practice (Capstone); LING389 Advanced Communication in Social Institutions (PACE & Capstone); COGS399 Cognitive Science in the Real World (PACE and Capstone); and MHIS306 Practising Public History: Modern History PACE (PACE)

9 2017 Schedule: Late Changes – Offerings
ASQC approved (Res ASQC 16/159) late changes to the following, effective 1 January 2017: Bachelor of Actuarial Studies; Master of Accounting; Master of Banking and Finance; Master of International Business; Graduate Certificate of Editing and Electronic Publishing

10 2017 Schedule: Late Changes – Admission Requirements
ASQC approved (Res ASQC 16/160) changes to the admission requirements for the following, effective 1 January 2017: Graduate Certificate of Sustainable Development; Graduate Diploma of Sustainable Development; Master of Clinical Audiology; Master of Speech and Language Pathology
11 Aligning Articulation Arrangements for Pathway Students into Macquarie Degrees (OUA Non-Award and Next Step)
ASQC approved (Res ASQC 16/162) a proposal from the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) to align articulation arrangements for Open Universities Australia (OUA) students and on-campus students into the Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Security Studies.

12 Course Transfer Requirements
Following review and update of internal undergraduate course transfer criteria by all Faculties for 2017, ASQC considered changes to the course transfer criteria for 2017 (as required by the Course Transfer policy), and approved (Res ASQC 16/163) the 2017 Course Transfer Criteria Table. [Note: An error in name of one program within the Course Transfer Requirements was subsequently identified and corrected, with the action to be formally ratified at the 22 November 2016 ASQC meeting.]

13 2016 Schedule: MUIC Program Changes
ASQC approved (Res ASQC 16/165) the following program changes: the Diploma of Accounting, Commerce and Business Administration; and the Diploma of Information Technology.
ASQC noted and ratified (Res ASQC 16/166) actions taken under executive authority by the Chair of the Academic Standards and Quality for the following: the Diploma of Information Technology; and the Diploma of Media and Communication.

14 Co-taught units 2017 – Seeking Approval for Non-Compliant Exceptions
A representative from the Faculty of Arts will be invited to speak to a revised paper at the next ASQC meeting on the proposal to co-teach PHL260 Bioethics and Biotechnology with CBMS807 Bioethics and Biotechnology. The Principles of Shared Teaching will be updated to include a requirement for Faculties to provide ASQC with an Annual Summary Report on evaluation of the student experience for all approved co-taught units, with particular focus on undergraduate with postgraduate co-taught units.

OTHER MATTERS CONSIDERED BY ASQC

- 2018 Academic Program Timeline
ASQC noted the 2018 Academic Program Timeline provided by Curriculum and Planning detailing the procedures and timetable for handbook deadlines, and requested that the document include time frames for academic and business decisions and brought back to the next meeting.

- Expressions of Interest
ASQC appointed Dr Margie Borschke and Professor Tony Parker as critical friends to assist in the development of the Graduate Certificate in Innovation and Transformation.
ASQC also appointed Dr Anne-Louise Semple as a critical friend to assist in the development of the Bachelor of Actuarial Studies with the degree of Bachelor of Professional Practices.

- Issues Paper on Saving, Deeming, Other cases – Update
ASQC endorsed recommendation of the Working Group detailed in their report of initial review of saving and deeming provisions and practices. The proposals align with the Academic Progression Policy, with a need to replace “readmission” with the term “return to study” or similar. Close management may still be required for those students who return after absences who may require a saving case to return them to their program. The Admission (Coursework) Policy is still being reviewed.

- Identification of Professional/Accredited Programs of Study
Governance Services have contacted Faculties to identify all professional/ accredited programs that may have currency requirements which impact on the development of a Schedule to be attached to the Academic Progression Policy.

- Revised Attendance and Study Load Policy (MUIC)
The Attendance and Study Load Policy for Programs delivered by MUIC were developed to comply with ESOS requirements. ASQC endorsed (Resolution (ASQC) 16/167) an amendment to Attendance Warnings, and requested that proposed changes to Appeals be further developed and provided to the 18 October 2016 meeting for endorsement, with a view to recommending the Policy to Academic Senate for approval.

- A Individual Case Report from the Faculty of Human Sciences was noted.

A copy of the minutes of the 20 September 2016 meeting will be available via this link following the next meeting to be held on Tuesday 18 October 2016.

Submitted by: Associate Professor Pamela Coutts, Chair of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee
ITEM 13.2 REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND QUALITY COMMITTEE
MEETING OF 18 OCTOBER 2016

Recommendation
That the Academic Senate note the report of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee meeting of 18 October 2016, and, where appropriate, be adopted as recommended.

ITEMS FOR APPROVAL BY ACADEMIC SENATE

1 2017 Schedule: Program for Approval – Graduate Diploma of Physical Health (Exit Award)
The proposed program is an exit award of the Doctor of Physiotherapy. Refer Academic Senate agenda item 10.2.
Recommendation
That Academic Senate approve the academic case for the Graduate Diploma of Physical Health (Exit Award), effective 1 January 2017.

2 2017 Schedule: Program for Discontinuation – Master of Applied Finance (ECNU)
The Dual Degree program with East China Normal University (ECNU Shanghai) is being switched from the Master of Applied Finance to the new Master of Banking and Finance. The Faculty of Business and Economics (owning department is the Applied Finance Centre) has indicated that the last cohort for the Bachelor of Applied Finance is 2016; with a new cohort for the Master of Banking and Finance from 1 January 2017. There are no outstanding offers for the program. Refer Academic Senate agenda item 10.3.
Recommendation
That Academic Senate approve the discontinuation of the Master of Applied Finance East China Normal University (ECNU) Shanghai from 31 December 2016.

3 2018 Schedule: Program for Approval – Doctor of Medicine (Global MD)
The Executive Dean of the Faculty of Medicine and Health Services provided a presentation on proposed program. ASQC endorsed the academic case for the Doctor of Medicine (Global MD) noting that the business case will shortly be submitted to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) for approval. Refer Academic Senate agenda item 10.1.
Recommendation
That Academic Senate approve the academic case for the Doctor of Medicine (Global MD), effective 1 January 2018.

ITEMS FOR NOTING

4 Retrospective Changes
ASQC approved retrospective changes for the Master of Commerce - Accounting Specialisation; Master of Advanced Professional Accounting; and Bachelor of Engineering – Mechanical Engineering Major.

5 2017 Schedule: Changes to Majors
Changes to the following majors were approved:
- Bachelor of Arts - Society and Culture Major;
- Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Arts with the Bachelor of Education (Secondary), and Bachelor of Commerce - International Business Major;
- Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Media - Digital Design Major;
- Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Media - Journalism and Non-Fiction Writing Major

6 2017 Schedule: Changes to Offerings
ASQC approved changes to offerings for the Master of Commerce and Finance Specialisation, and Master of International Business.

7 Amendment to 2017 Course Transfer Schedule – inclusion of the Bachelor of Clinical Science
ASQC approved that the course transfer requirements provided by the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences for the Bachelor of Clinical Science be included in the 2017 Course Transfer Schedule

8 Changes to the Ratification of Results Quality Assurance Framework
ASQC approved amendments to the Ratification of Results Quality Assurance Framework, which included a revised approach to manage Out of Sequence Results.
9 Academic Progression Policy
Under the authority provided to it from Academic Senate, ASQC approved the draft Academic Progression Policy Schedule of Programs (Schedule of Professional Accredited Programs, and the Schedule of Programs with Currency Requirements); and the Academic Progression Procedure Chart (which maps the process outlined in the Academic Progression Identification and Support Model).

10 Principles of English Language Statement
The English Language Policy was rescinded at the 26 July 2016 Academic Senate meeting. ASQC endorsed two of the four draft principles detailed in the draft ‘Principles of English Language’ statement provided by the Chair of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC). SLTC will continue to develop the statement to address the matters identified by ASQC, with a view to providing an updated version to Academic Senate in December. Following endorsement of the Principles Statement, the existing Quality Assurance Principles for Programs Taught in Languages Other than English (LOTE) will be reviewed in 2017 to align with the Principles Statement.

OTHER MATTERS CONSIDERED BY ASQC

- 2018 Academic Program Timeline
  The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) provided an oral report on activities to identify time frames for academic and business decisions to inform the 2018 Academic Program Timeline. An update will be provided at the November meeting.

  Cathy Rytmeister, Quality Assurance and Professional Development Lead provided an update on the Faculty Level Quality Indicators Matrix for Learning and Teaching(which included an overview of the mapping of proposed Learning and Teaching risk framework elements), and a progress report on Institutional Quality Indicators for the Learning and Teaching Project

- Macquarie University International College (MUIC) Subcommittee
  ASQC noted the report of the 7 September 2017 MUIC Subcommittee meeting which included a grade distribution report on the Term 5 2016 Foundation and Diploma results.

- Individual Cases
  ASQC noted summaries of individual case reports provided by the Faculty of Arts (August 2016) and the Faculty of Science and Engineering (August 2016 report and September 2016 report). An update on the review of the process supporting Saving, Deeming and Other cases will be provided to at the November 2016 meeting.

- 2017 Co-Taught Units 2017
  Representatives from the Faculty of Arts were invited to address ASQC on their submission to seek approval for a non-compliant exception from the categories of the Principles of Shared teaching for PHL260 and CBMS807 Bioethics and Biotechnology. Following very useful discussion, ASQC agreed that the units were co-located rather than co-taught. The Faculty will review the assessment aspects of the two units after this decision.

- Accreditation matters – Engineers Australia
  ASQC noted a verbal report that following the recent accreditation visit from Engineers Australia, retrospective changes may be required in relation to majors. The Faculty of Science and Engineering is awaiting the written report before it can address any matters requiring action.

- 2017 ASQC meeting cycle
  The 2017 ASQC meeting dates will be provided to the November meeting.

A copy of the minutes of the 18 October 2016 meeting will be available via this link following the next meeting to be held on Tuesday 22 November 2016.

Submitted by: Associate Professor Pamela Coutts,
Chair of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee
ITEM 13.3 RESEARCH AND RESEARCH TRAINING COMMITTEE

For approval and noting

Attached is the report of the Research and Research Training Committee meeting of 25 October 2016.

Recommended resolution

Academic Senate resolve to:

i. note the preliminary response to the MRes review recommendations (refer to Item 5.2); and

ii. note the report of the Research and Research Training Committee meeting of 25 October 2016.

Recommended resolution

Academic Senate resolve to:

i. note the preliminary response to the MRes review recommendations; and

ii. note the report of the Research and Research Training Committee meeting of 25 October 2016.

The key items and resolutions of this meeting are outlined below.

ITEMS FOR NOTING

Review of the Master of Research: Report and Recommendations (refer to Agenda Item 5.2)

The Committee resolved to

i. endorse the preliminary response to the MRes review recommendations; and

ii. recommend that Academic Senate note the preliminary response to the MRes review recommendations.

Detailed Information on New Arrangements for Research Block Grants

As previously foreshadowed in the Review of Research Policy and Funding Arrangements, the Australian Government’s funding of research will be rationalised to two programs: the Research Support Program (RSP) and the Research Training Program (RTP). On the 11th of October the Department of Education and Training released Detailed information on new arrangements for research block grants (detailed information on new arrangements for Research Block Grants). This document outlined the arrangements for the new Research Support Program, which will replace the current JRE, RIBG and SRE Government funding schemes and the arrangements for the new Research Training Program which will replace the current RTS, APA and IPRS funding schemes. The Committee noted that, as the implications of the changes become clear, both in terms of changes Macquarie University will need to implement in order to comply with the new guidelines and in terms of the strategies adopted by other Australian universities, the relevant Macquarie University committees – Higher Degree Research Management Committee (HDRMC), Research Management Committee (RMC) Research and Research Training Committee (RRTC), Academic Senate, and Executive Group will be informed and involved as necessary.

International Research Training Partnerships Framework

The Committee noted a draft ‘green’ paper on the proposed International Research Training Partnerships Framework noting that it will clarify existing processes at the University, and enhance the synergistic relationship between the Pro Vice-Chancellor International and the Macquarie International team, and the Director of the Higher Degree Research Office and the International Research Training Partnerships team. The key objectives in the Framework will be to:

- Develop, maintain and partner with leading international research training programs to ensure outstanding experiences;
- Attract, develop and retain international HDR candidates of the highest quality;
- Develop, secure and maintain international research training partnerships with world-leading research institutions;
- Expand and diversify funding sources for international research training.

The International Research Training Partnerships Framework stems from, and is part of the implementation of, Macquarie’s current 10-year Strategic Research Framework (World-leading research – World-changing impact) and will complement Macquarie International’s strategic plan.

Research Commercialisation, Innovation and Impact Framework

The Committee noted a draft ‘green’ paper on the proposed Research Commercialisation, Innovation and Impact Framework, which stems from, and is part of the implementation of, Macquarie’s current 10-year Strategic Research Framework (World-leading research – World-changing impact). The Research Commercialisation, Innovation and Impact Framework will complement the Corporate Engagement strategic plan, align with the University’s Innovation Statement, and balance the strategic plan (which is
being developed) of Access Macquarie. The key priorities of the Research Commercialisation, Innovation and Impact Framework will be to:

- Foster and embed a culture that appreciates the value of world-leading research that translates into world-changing impact and innovative solutions;
- Build and sustain solution-seeking and mutually-beneficial industry research collaborations in areas of current and emerging strength;
- Encourage and support student entrepreneurship and develop the next generation of Macquarie innovators;
- Establish an integrated network of resources that facilitates and enables innovative and collaborative endeavour with world-changing impact and commercial potential.

Members noted that the Framework was drafted in the context of the Australian Government’s Innovation strategy and the Australian Research Council’s intention to assess research engagement and impact in the ERA 2018 Round. The Committee discussed amending the Framework to encompass research impact and outcomes from non-commercial areas – a working party has been established to action this.

Data Science and eResearch Platform Strategy
The Committee noted a report from Professor Peter Nelson, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research Performance and Innovation) on the proposed Data Science and eResearch Platform Strategy. The Strategy recommends the University focus on the following areas:

1. Best practice in data management to support data sharing, re-use and collaboration; to ensure Macquarie is compliant with funding body requirements; and to harness the latent opportunities for discovery in areas such as medical health data research;
2. Capacity building through underpinning leadership, systems, processes, policy and support structures that enable researchers to ‘focus on what they alone can do’;
3. Staff and student capability development through a strong data science learning culture, contributing to Macquarie University as a destination of choice for researchers and higher degree research candidates;
4. A vibrant and active community of practitioners to enable opportunities for cross-disciplinary research that lead to novel and diverse solutions to problems;
5. Research career pathways and data science research careers, attraction and retention strategies.

Update on Cross-Disciplinary Working Group
The Chair of the Cross-Disciplinary Working Group, Professor Amanda Barnier, provided an update on the working group. The group is currently collating data to understand the current status of cross-disciplinary research at the University, collecting case studies of successful cross-disciplinary projects and identifying a list of barriers to successful cross-disciplinary research. The Committee also noted that the ARC has issued a Statement of Support for Interdisciplinary Research.

MQ Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research: Update on Process and Progress
The Committee noted a report summarising the first two years of operation of the Macquarie University Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research and the work of the Research Integrity Office.

Research Active Definition
The Committee noted that work is under way to update the Research Active Definition which was last updated in 2009. The revised definition will provide a University-wide baseline (in line with the rest of the university sector), but will still allow for faculty and discipline specific definitions of research activity and research productivity.

Revision of HDR Examination Policies, Procedures and Guidelines
The Committee noted that the Thesis Examination Subcommittee (TESC) is proposing to review the HDR Examination Policies, Procedures and Guidelines and is considering the option to create a single policy.

Election of Deputy Chair
The Committee noted Professor Amanda Barnier has been elected unopposed as Deputy Chair of the Research and Research Training Committee.
Reports of the meetings of the Thesis Examination Subcommittee (TESC) held 7 September and 5 October 2016

The Committee noted the reports of the Thesis Examination Subcommittee (TESC) held 7 September and 5 October 2016.

2017 Research and Research Training Committee meeting dates

The Committee noted the schedule of committee meeting dates for 2017 (refer to Agenda Item 16.1).

Professor Sakkie Pretorius
Chair, Research and Research Training Committee
ITEM 13.4 SENATE LEARNING AND TEACHING COMMITTEE

For approval and noting

Attached is the report of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee meeting of 19 September 2016.

Recommended resolution

Academic Senate resolve to:

i. approve the review of the:
   i. Unit Guide Policy and Procedure; and
   ii. Student Feedback on Learning, Teaching and Curriculum Policy;

ii. approve that with effect from 1 January 2017, the last day to add external and internal units be made the same date; being at the end of Week 2 of each session, to ensure the alignment of internal and external enrolment dates (refer to Item 10.5);

iii. approve the identified amendments to the Disruption to Studies Policy and Procedure and Supporting Evidence Schedule (refer to Item 10.4); and

iv. note the report of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee meeting of 19 September 2016.
ITEM 13.4 REPORT OF THE SENATE LEARNING AND TEACHING COMMITTEE MEETING OF 19 SEPTEMBER 2016

Recommended resolution

Academic Senate resolve to:

i. approve the review of the Unit Guide Policy and Procedure; and Student Feedback on Learning, Teaching and Curriculum Policy;

ii. approve that with effect from 1 January 2017, the last day to add external and internal units be made the same date; being at the end of Week 2 of each session, to ensure the alignment of internal and external enrolment dates (refer to Item 10.5);

iii. approve the identified amendments to the Disruption to Studies Policy and Procedure and Supporting Evidence Schedule with effect from 1 November 2016 (refer to Item 10.4); and

iv. note the report of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee meeting of 19 September 2016.

Summary

A meeting of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC) was held 19 September 2016. The key items, outcomes and resolutions of this meeting are outlined below. A copy of the full minutes will be available on Truth.

Items for approval by Academic Senate

Strategy and Policy

Following discussions at the 15 August 2016 meeting, the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee Projects and Priorities list was presented to SLTC for consideration. SLTC resolved to endorse the identified Project and Priorities.

A number of policies were identified as requiring review within the Projects and Priorities list. Noting that a number of key projects are close to completion or implementation phase, the SLTC resolved to seek Academic Senates approval to proceed with the following Policies:

i. Unit Guide Policy and Procedure: Minor amendments to the Policy have been identified to align with the new Assessment Policy.

ii. Student Feedback on Learning, Teaching and Curriculum Policy: The Policy overlaps with the Student Experience Surveying Policy, Procedure and Schedule approved in February 2016.

SLTC will seek nominations for a Working Group to review the Student Feedback on Learning, Teaching and Curriculum Policy.

Aligning Internal and External Enrolment Dates

Following a recent Rapid Improvement Event for Enrolment, the Committee resolved to endorse and recommend to Academic Senate that with effect from 1 January 2017, the last day to add external and internal units be made the same date; being at the end of Week 2 of each session.

Proposed amendments to the Disruption to Studies Supporting Evidence Schedule

Campus Wellbeing held a Professional Authority Form (PAF) training session with Student Administration Managers where procedural and interpretation differences in its application were identified.

The following were discussed in relation to highlighted amendments:

i. The Committee noted that by removing by documenting the PAF as the preferred form, this will rely on Campus Wellbeing to support and guide the student and Faculty through the application process.

ii. Carefully worded communication with health practitioners will be required to ensure that whilst details are sought, the students privacy rights remain paramount.

iii. The PAF can be reviewed and amended to ensure that it is as meaningful to the health practitioner as possible.

SLTC resolved to endorse and recommend to Academic Senate the identified amendments to the Disruption to Studies Policy and Procedure and Supporting Evidence Schedule.

Items for noting

Report from the Chair

The Chair provided a verbal report on the following matters:

i. The Committee noted matters approved by the Academic Senate at its meeting on 13 September, being:
• Recommendations arising from the Placement Co-ordination Task Force Report;
• Academic Progression Policy and Procedure; and
• The new clause to be added to Schedule 1: Grading Requirements of the Assessment Policy.

ii. **Graduate Capabilities**
The discussion paper proposing the removal of the University’s Graduate Capabilities was provided to the Faculty of Human Sciences Faculty Board who have endorsed the recommendations that faculties take responsibility for the articulation of skills and competencies and that skills are embedded through the Curriculum Standards Framework.

iii. **Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)**
The Chair thanked Professor John Simon who announced his retirement for his service to the University in both his roles within the Faculty of Arts and the leadership team.

**Report from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)**
Professor John Simons provided a verbal report on the following matters:

i. **Program Approval and Lifecycle**
Consultations are ongoing with the Executive Deans regarding a proposed new process which will engage the faculties further in relation to program approval. The lifecycle and review of programs are being considered with a focus on risk assessment, particularly when considering overseas offerings.

ii. **Widening Participation Strategy**
Consultations on the Strategy are underway and will establish required additional information for some (rural, remote and refugees) categories. The scaffolding will be detailed within the Strategy and will ensure that students’ development is supported throughout their studies.

iii. **QS World University and Employability Rankings**
Macquarie University achieved a respectable result within the employability rankings. Professor Sherman Young noted that the demographics of the rankings should be considered, that the QS Survey obtains data from graduates globally.

**General Business**
SLTC resolved to approve the Big Ideas Working Group Terms of Reference.

**Themed Discussion – Undergraduate Research/ Students as Partners**
Associate Professor Peter Keegan, Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching) from the Faculty of Arts facilitated the Themed Discussion on Undergraduate research/Students as Partners.

The Chair noted that there will be a large amount of undergraduate research being conducted at Macquarie. However, our inability to document such activities stems from the lack of definition or understanding of what is undergraduate research.

The Committee noted the following:

i. The use of the term ‘research’ is viewed within the University as working towards published research

ii. Challenges to changing existing cultures that perceives that students are lower on the academic hierarchical pyramid than academic staff.

iii. The boundaries attached to the definition of ‘Students as Partners’ refer to the embedded culture within all institutions.

iv. New terms such as ‘Scholars’ and ‘Scholarship’ could be adopted and encouraged.

v. The agility in approaching the Inherent Requirements Framework can be referred to when considering this challenge.

vi. As placed within the Learning and Teaching Strategic Framework, partnership with students will enhance employability.

The Chair noted the Committee’s high levels of interest in this area and that the thoughts presented provide a framework for continued discussion.

The next meeting of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee will be held on 14 November 2016.

**Submitted by:**
Dr Mitch Parsell
Chair of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee
ITEM 14.1  MACQUARIE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT (MGSM) ACADEMIC BOARD

For approval and noting

Attached is the report of the MGSM Academic Board meeting of 11 October 2016.

Recommended resolution

Academic Senate resolve to:

i. approve the appointment of Dr Kyle Bruce to fill a casual vacancy amongst additional academic staff members on the MGSM Academic Board for a period of membership expiring 31 December 2017;

ii. refer the following nominations for membership on the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee to the Academic Senate Standing Committee:
   - Dr Andrew Heys, as the nominee of the Dean; and
   - Dr Matthew Keblis, as the nominee of the Faculty Board; and

iii. note the report of the MGSM Academic Board meeting of 11 October 2016.
ITEM 14.1 REPORT OF THE MGSM ACADEMIC BOARD MEETING OF 11 OCTOBER 2016

Recommended resolution

Academic Senate resolve to:

i. approve the appointment of Dr Kyle Bruce to fill a casual vacancy amongst additional academic staff members on the MGSM Academic Board for a period of membership expiring 31 December 2017;

ii. refer the following nominations for membership on the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee to the Academic Senate Standing Committee:
   - Dr Andrew Heys, as the nominee of the Dean; and
   - Dr Matthew Keblis, as the nominee of the Faculty Board; and

iii. note the report of the MGSM Academic Board meeting of 11 October 2016.

ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

1. Change to membership of MGSM Academic Board

There is currently one ex-officio position and one appointed position vacant within the membership of the MGSM Academic Board. The MGSM Academic Board seeks approval of Academic Senate to appoint Dr Kyle Bruce to the vacancy listed as item 6 within the MGSM Academic Board Terms of Reference for a period of membership expiring 31 December 2017:
   - Up to six (6) additional academic staff members drawn from within the MGSM, of which one may be (but is not required to be) an adjunct lecturer.

2. MGSM nominations for Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC)

Following recent approval for two representatives of MGSM to sit on Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC), Acting Dean Norma Harrison is nominating Dr Andrew Heys (MBA Director) and the MGSM Academic Board is nominating Dr Matthew Keblis (Master of Management Director) for these positions.

ITEMS FOR NOTING

1. Ratification of Term 3 2016 Examination Results

The MGSM Academic Board considered the report of the MGSM Examiners Committee and ratified all grades submitted for all units in Term 3 2016. In accordance with the Quality Assurance Framework, a Pro Forma D report will be submitted to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee for consideration.

2. Reports from Subcommittees

The MGSM Academic Board considered reports from the MGSM Standards and Quality Committee, MGSM Research Management Committee, MGSM Business Operations Committee and MGSM Accreditation Steering Committee.

Submitted by: Professor Robert Spillane
Chair MGSM Academic Board
ITEM 14.2  FACULTY OF HUMAN SCIENCES FACULTY BOARD

For noting

Attached are the reports from the Faculty of Human Sciences Faculty Board meetings held on 13 September and 18 October 2016.

Recommended resolution
Academic Senate to note the reports of the Faculty of Human Sciences Faculty Board meetings held on 13 September and 18 October 2016.
ITEM 14.2  REPORT OF THE FACULTY OF HUMAN SCIENCES FACULTY BOARD MEETING OF 13 SEPTEMBER 2016

Recommendation
Academic Senate to note the report of the Faculty of Human Sciences Faculty Board meeting of 13 September 2016.

Summary
A meeting of the Faculty of Human Sciences Faculty Board was held 13 September 2016. Key items, outcomes and resolutions of the meeting are outlined below.

ITEMS FOR NOTING

Membership
Faculty Board resolved to co-opt Dr Tim Doyle from the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences to the Faculty of Human Sciences Faculty Board for a period of not exceeding one year in accordance with Part 3, Rule 9(6) of the Faculty Rules.
Professor Lori Lockyer who recently left the University was thanked for her leadership as the Vincent Fairfax Family Foundation Chair.
Professor Mary Ryan, the new Head of Educational Studies will join the Faculty on 10 October.

Academic Prizes
Faculty Board resolved:

i. To ratify the Cochlear Prize for Introduction to Cognitive and Brain Sciences being awarded to the recipient identified.

ii. To award the Department of Psychology Prizes to the four recipients identified.

The new University Medal Policy and Procedure was noted by the Faculty Board and that this Policy will seek nominations from the Heads of Departments twice in the academic year.

Policy and Procedure
Faculty Board noted the following:

i. Nicole Gower, Director of Human Resources, provided an update of the new promotions policy.

ii. Academic Senate has rescinded the existing Placements Policy and approved a Procedure and suite of documentation.

Review and Survey
The well received Department of Linguistics Review was held from 15-17 August 2016 with the report to be finalised in the near future. The Psychology Review is scheduled for early December.
The Faculty achieved an 82% response rate to the recent Your Say Survey. Associate Professor Barbara Griffin, as the Faculty Champion, was thanked for promoting the importance of the Survey.

Graduate Capabilities
Dr Mitchell Parsell, Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching) and Chair of Senate Learning and Teaching Committee, confirmed that the current proposals were in the first phase and that this would encourage a move of responsibility to the Faculty and program level.
Faculty Board resolved to support the recommendations provided, being:

i. That Faculties take responsibility for the articulation of skills and competencies expected of Macquarie University graduates.

ii. That these be embedded through the Curriculum Standards Framework via the development of specific and focused program learning outcomes.

iii. That the University maintains a central outline of these competencies that will, for example, serve as a data point for the peer review of programs.
Report from the Chair
The Chair provided a verbal report on the following matters:

i. **Centres of Excellence**
   The Faculty submitted two bids for the ARC Centres of Excellence, however neither bid was successful. Out of the 20 bids that were interviewed, 9 centres were successful. The Faculty will consider all plans for the centres in consultation with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) and bring the research to fruition.

ii. **Strategic Initiatives**
   The following Faculty strategic initiatives were approved by the Executive Group:
   - Faculty Leadership Plan
   - Translation Office
   - Professional Development Program – Schools Engagement

iii. **MQHealth**
   Launched on 12 September, MQHealth will provide collective expertise in addressing clinical and research questions in Health across the University.

Report from the Faculty General Manager
Sheryl Magtibay, Portfolio Partner to the Faculty presented on the recent narrative designed for student recruitment and confirmed that collaboration from the Faculty will be sought. The Chair noted that the key messages must not be weakened through the process of consultation.

The next meeting of the Faculty of Human Sciences Faculty Board will be held on Tuesday 18 October 2016.

Submitted by:
Professor Simon Handley
Executive Dean and Chair of Faculty of Human Sciences Faculty Board
ITEM 14.2 REPORT OF THE FACULTY OF HUMAN SCIENCES FACULTY BOARD MEETING OF 18 OCTOBER 2016

Recommendation
Academic Senate to note the report of the Faculty of Human Sciences Faculty Board meeting of 18 October 2016.

Summary
A meeting of the Faculty of Human Sciences Faculty Board was held 18 October 2016. Key items, outcomes and resolutions of the meeting are outlined below.

ITEMS FOR NOTING
Membership
Professor Mary Ryan was welcomed as the new Head of Educational Studies.
The Faculty Board also welcomed and co-opted Jennifer Martin as the Faculty’s new Student Administration Manager and Kylie Coaldrake, as the acting Faculty Administrator, Learning, Teaching and Quality Support.

Policy and Procedure
Faculty Board noted the following:
  i. The Placement Co-ordination Task Force recommendations approved by Academic Senate at its meeting of 13 September 2016; and
  ii. The revised University Medal Policy and Procedure, in particular the introduction of two nomination rounds from 2017.

Faculty Learning and Teaching Strategy
Dr Mitchell Parsell, Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching) advised that the draft strategy has received broad endorsement across the Faculty.

Report from the Chair
The Chair provided a verbal report on the following matters:
  i. Cochlear Ltd
     The Faculty noted that an MoU has been signed between Macquarie University and Cochlear Ltd to develop a more substantial relationship between the two parties, with the Faculty of Human Sciences playing a key role in developing this partnership.
  ii. Recruitment
     External search firms have been engaged to recruit two new Professors (including the Vincent Fairfax Family Foundation Chair) in the department of Educational Studies and the Head of Psychology position.

The next meeting of the Faculty of Human Sciences Faculty Board will be held on Monday 12 December 2016.

Submitted by:
Professor Simon Handley
Executive Dean and Chair of Faculty of Human Sciences Faculty Board
ITEM 14.3 FACULTY OF MEDICINE AND HEALTH SCIENCES FACULTY BOARD

For noting.

Attached is the report from the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences Faculty Board meeting held on 26 September 2016.

Recommended resolution

Academic Senate to note the report of the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences Faculty Board meeting held on 26 September 2016 and approve the recommendations of the Faculty Board where appropriate.
ITEM 14.3  REPORT OF THE FACULTY OF MEDICINE AND HEALTH SCIENCES FACULTY BOARD MEETING OF 26 SEPTEMBER 2016

Recommended resolution
Academic Senate resolve to note the report of the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences Faculty Board meeting held 26 September 2016.

Summary
A meeting of the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences Faculty Board was held 26 September 2016. The key items, outcomes and resolutions of this meeting are outlined below.

Items for noting
Faculty Board resolved to endorse:
- The Faculty Research Strategy.
- The Doctor of Medicine (Global MD) and recommend the program to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee.
- And recommend to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) the:
  i. Graduate Diploma of Physical Health;
  ii. addition of the new unit HSYP809 Advanced Research Methodologies in Health Research to the Master of Public Health;
  iii. changes to option sets in the Master of Public Health specialisations; and
  iv. change to MPH (Research) course transfer requirements to make transfer to students in second year available by course transfer.

Faculty Board noted the following updates on matters arising from Academic Senate:
- The draft Academics Appeal Policy and Procedure with the request for feedback to the Chair of Academic Senate.
- Academic Senate’s decision to rescind the existing Placements Policy and approve a Procedure and suite of documentation.
- Academic Senate’s approval of the University Medal Policy and Procedure.

Faculty Board resolved to ratify the executive action taken by the Chair of Faculty Board on 10 August 2016 for selected submitted unit grades.

Graduate Capabilities
Faculty Board considered the paper submitted by the Chair of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee and authorised the Faculty Education Committee to provide feedback on Faculty Board behalf.

Programs and Units
Recommended to ASQC:
- Doctor of Medicine (Global MD)
  The Program proposal was presented and recommended to ASQC. In addition to the full program specifications, an overview of the program structure including unit offerings as well as the expected archetypal student enrolment and activities was provided. Finalisation of entry requirements and pre-requisites are in process. Accreditation with the Australian Medical Council (AMC) is progressing.
- Amendments to the Master of Public Health unit structure, options sets specialisations and course transfer requirements.
- The Graduate Diploma of Physical Health [formally proposed to be the Master of Health (Exit Award)] has been established as an exit award for students who may be experiencing placement difficulties, or when on placement have determined that the course is no longer suitable. When the Doctor of Medicine is established, there may be an opportunity to review and align all of the Faculty’s exit awards.
Unit matters approved by Faculty Board:

- resting of MEDI831, Medical Education for 2016;
- changes to GPA requirements, and inclusion of Psychology as a relevant discipline for Recognition of Prior Learning in the Master of Public Health;
- changes to MEDI742, Research Rotation 2;
- change of title of unit HSYP806 from Understanding Health Systems to Systems Science in Healthcare;
- change of title of unit HSYP804 from Health Law, Governance and Policy to Health Law, Economics and Policy;
- endorse the change of title of unit HSYP807 from Leadership, Innovation and Teamwork to Innovation in Leadership, Teamwork and Advocacy.

Higher Degree Research and Research

- The Faculty Research Strategy has been finalised and was commended by the Chair for the thoroughness of the document, noting that it successfully incorporates strategy, change in culture and research support.
- There are 123 enrolled HDR students reflecting a significant enrolment growth. The growth is attributable to the integration of AIHI and MRes cohort enrolment growth.
- The MRes program is undergoing a review for 2018 with consideration given to how the program will suit the first Bachelor of Clinical Science cohort. A workshop was held to envision the program’s potential. A report from the workshop will be produced soon.
- The Faculty is piloting the ‘PURE’ University Research system. The Associate Dean of Higher Degree Research and Research, Professor Roger Chung expressed confidence in the system’s capabilities.
- Discussions round the Macquarie Park Innovation District as well as the University’s innovation agenda are ongoing. Health is one of the three key themes.
- Changes to the Faculty Higher Degree Research and Research Committee memberships were approved to include Early Career Researchers and the MRes Director.

Report from the Executive Dean

The Chair provided a verbal report on the following Faculty Leadership updates:

- Professor Kirsty Forrest resigned and recruitment is underway for the new Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching). Professor Catherine Dean is currently acting in this role.
- Professor John Boyages resigned from his role as Associate Dean (International and Engagement). The Chair noted his thanks to Professor Boyages for his contributions in this role. Recruitment for a Director of Engagement is underway.
- Professor Roger Chung will step down from his role as Associate Dean Higher Degree Research once an Associate Dean for that portfolio is appointed, but continues in his role as Associate Dean Research. The Higher Degree Research and Research portfolio has increased in size and warrants two leadership positions. An internal expression of interest has been announced.
- Professor Cliff Hughes AO is currently President of the International Society for Quality in Health Care, will join AIHI in October 2016.

General

Professor Catherine Dean, Acting Associate Dean Learning and Teaching will be chairing a Working Group to review the Institutional Quality Indicators, sponsored by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) portfolio.

The next meeting of the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences Faculty Board will be held on 26 September 2016.

Submitted by

Professor Patrick McNeil
Executive Dean and Chair of Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences Faculty Board
ITEM 14.4  FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING FACULTY BOARD

For noting

Attached is the report from the Faculty of Science and Engineering Faculty Board meeting held on 20 September 2016.

Recommended resolution

Academic Senate to note the report of the Faculty of Science and Engineering Faculty Board meeting held on 20 September 2016.
ITEM 14.4 REPORT OF THE FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
FACULTY BOARD MEETING OF 20 SEPTEMBER 2016

Recommendation
Academic Senate to note the report of the Faculty of Science and Engineering Faculty Board meeting of 20 September 2016.

Summary
A meeting of the Faculty of Science and Engineering Faculty Board was held 20 September 2016. The key items, outcomes and resolutions of this meeting are outlined below.

ITEMS FOR NOTING
The new University Medal Policy and Procedure was noted by the Faculty Board and that this policy will seek nominations twice in the academic year. Faculty Board agreed to advise the Academic Senate that the University Medal Criteria Working Group should ensure there is adequate opportunity for staff to provide feedback and comment on the process for awarding the University Medal and the criteria used for assessing nominations.

Faculty Board ratified the revised grades submitted for COMP115, Introduction to Computer Programming.

Guidelines for Marks Handling
The guidelines reiterate the processes that need to be followed in accordance with existing policies, procedures and guidelines. The matter was discussed at the Dean’s Advisory Committee (DAC). Faculty Board endorsed the guidelines.

Faculty Research Committee
Members expressed concern with the Faculty Research Productivity Definition and Productivity Targets as to how achievable they were; particularly for certain disciplines. Members were requested to submit feedback, supported by data, to Professor David Coutts, Associate Dean of Research.

Faculty Board resolved to approve the Faculty Research Committee Terms of Reference.

Graduate Capabilities
The Chair noted the paper suggests utilising the Curriculum Standards Framework and that faculties are required to develop specific program learning outcomes based on the Framework’s principles. Faculty Board endorsed the proposal and resolved to support the recommendations:

i. That faculties take responsibility for the articulation of the skills and competencies expected of graduates;
ii. That these are embedded through the Framework; and
iii. That the University maintain a central outline of these competencies.

Faculty Quality and Standards Strategic Plan Progress
Members noted variations in academic performance based on the admissions pathway used, noting that students admitted via the Academic Entry Program performed well.

Dean’s Report
The Deputy Dean provided a verbal report on the following matters, on behalf of the Dean:

i. Events
   The Chair reported on the opening of the Synthetic Biology Lab, and other Macquarie University events and Faculty activities.
   The review of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, the administration review and Faculty Town Hall will be held later in October.

ii. Faculty Strategy
   The faculty has received Strategic Innovation Funding (SIF) grants for the:
   • Optus Macquarie University Cyber Security Hub;
• MQ-Wide Approach to the Management of Hazardous Materials and Dangerous Goods (Sciquest); and
• Acceleration of the Expansion of Engineering (Teaching and Research) ‘Towards a School of Engineering’.

iii. **Staffing**

The new Head of the Department of Computing will be announced soon.

The next meeting of the Faculty of Science and Engineering Faculty Board will be held on Tuesday 13 December 2016.

**Submitted by:**
Associate Professor Michael Hitchens
Associate Dean (Quality and Standards) and Acting Chair of Faculty of Science and Engineering Faculty Board
ITEM 16.1 2017 SCHEDULE OF MEETING DATES FOR ACADEMIC SENATE AND ITS COMMITTEES

For noting

Recommended resolution
Academic Senate to note the 2017 schedule of meeting dates for Academic Senate and its committees.
ITEM 16.1  2017 SCHEDULE OF MEETING DATES FOR ACADEMIC SENATE AND ITS COMMITTEES

Recommendation
Academic Senate to note the 2017 schedule of meeting dates for Academic Senate and its committees.

2017 Schedule of Meeting Dates
The schedule of meeting dates for Academic Board, the Academic Standards and Quality Committee, the Research and Research Training Committee and the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee are set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC SENATE</th>
<th>ASQC</th>
<th>RRTC</th>
<th>SLTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TUESDAY 9:30 am – 12 pm</td>
<td>TUESDAY 10 am – 12 pm</td>
<td>TUESDAY 10 am – 12 pm</td>
<td>MONDAY 10 am – 12 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 February</td>
<td>28 February</td>
<td>14 February</td>
<td>13 February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 March</td>
<td>14 March</td>
<td>6 March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 May</td>
<td>16 May</td>
<td>9 May</td>
<td>8 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 June</td>
<td>13 June</td>
<td>5 June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 August</td>
<td>1 August</td>
<td>7 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 September</td>
<td>12 September</td>
<td>19 September</td>
<td>11 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 October</td>
<td>10 October</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 November</td>
<td>14 November</td>
<td>14 November*</td>
<td>13 November</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The RRTC meeting on 14 November will be held from 2 pm to 4 pm.

Venues are still to be finalised, and members of Academic Senate and the standing committees will be sent meeting invitations once these are confirmed.

Submitted by: Zoe Williams
Head of Governance Services

For enquiries contact: Megan Kemmis
Ext: 7316
ITEM 16.2 ACADEMIC SENATE ELECTIONS UPDATE

For noting

Recommended resolution
Academic Senate to note the report on the election of academic staff from Faculties to Academic Senate.
ITEM 16.2  ACADEMIC SENATE ELECTIONS UPDATE

Recommendation
Academic Senate note the update on Academic Senate elections.

Elections for Academic Senate
A Notice of Election was published on 4 October 2016 for elected representatives on Academic Senate. At the time and close of nominations, the following eligible nominations were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Staff Member on Senate Elections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four (4) members from the Faculty of Arts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Antonina HARBUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Paul FORMOSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Kathryn MILLARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Natalie KLEIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor Andrew GILLET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Sean Scott BRAWLEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Frank CARRIGAN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Four (4) members from the Faculty of Business and Economics** |
| **Candidate** | **Position** | **Department** |
| Professor Lucy TAKSA | Associate Dean, Research | Business and Economics Administration |
| Dr Yvonne BREYER | Director Learning & Teaching | Business and Economics Administration |
| Associate Professor Anne COOPER | Centre Director, MAFC | Department of Applied Finance & Actuarial Studies |
| Dr Timothy KYNG | Senior Lecturer | Department of Applied Finance & Actuarial Studies |
| Professor Elisabetta MAGNANI | Head of Department | Department of Economics |

| **Four (4) members from the Faculty of Human Sciences** |
| **Candidate** | **Position** | **Department** |
| Dr Kerry-Ann O'SULLIVAN | Senior Lecturer | Department of Education / Educational Studies |
| Professor Amanda BARNIER | ARC Future Fellow | Department of Cognitive Science |
| Associate Professor Barbara GRIFFIN | Associate Professor | Department of Psychology |
| Professor Manjula WANIGANAYAKE | Professor | Institute of Early Childhood / Educational Studies |
| Dr Dean DUDLEY | Senior Lecturer | Department of Education / Educational Studies |
| Dr Peter ROGER | Senior Lecturer | Department of Linguistics |

<p>| <strong>Four (4) members from the Faculty of Science and Engineering</strong> |
| <strong>Candidate</strong> | <strong>Position</strong> | <strong>Department</strong> |
| Associate Professor Ayse BILGIN | Associate Professor | Department of Statistics |
| Professor Jim DENIER | Head of Department | Department of Mathematics |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Ian Colin MARSCHNER</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Department of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Neil SAINTILAN</td>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>Department of Environmental Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary GIURIATO</td>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>Department of Chiropractic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Judith DAWES</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Department of Physics and Astronomy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Two (2) members from the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Catherine DEAN</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching</td>
<td>Department of Health Professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Enrico COIERA</td>
<td>Director of the Centre for Health Informatics</td>
<td>Australian Institute of Health Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Dane KING</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Department of Biomedical Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**One (1) member from the MGSM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**One (1) member from the non-Faculty electorate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Florence CHIEW</td>
<td>Head, HDR Learning Skills</td>
<td>Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) - Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In accordance with the Academic Senate Rules\(^1\), of the members elected from each Faculty electorate: 

*at least one must be a Head of Department or Professor; and*

*members must be from different departments.*

As the number of nominations received exceed the number of positions vacant in all Faculty electorates an election will be held in accordance with Schedule 1 Procedures for Election, of the Macquarie University By-law.

Voting will open on Tuesday 1 October 2016 and will close on Tuesday 15 November 2016.

As the nominations received did not exceed the number of positions vacant in the non-Faculty electorate, the following nominee is duly elected:

- Dr Florence Chiew, Head, HDR Learning Skills

**Submitted by:** Deidre Anderson  
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar) and Returning Officer

**For enquiries contact:** Zoe Williams, Head of Governance Services  
Ext: 4322  
election@mq.edu.au

---

\(^1\) Academic Senate Rules 2016, Part 3 Substantive Provisions, p.5.  
[www.mq.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0005/203927/Academic_Senate_Rules_Approved_07042016.pdf](http://www.mq.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0005/203927/Academic_Senate_Rules_Approved_07042016.pdf), Viewed 24 October 2016