1. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY**

A meeting of the Academic Senate commenced at 9:32 am with Dr Peter Roger acknowledging the traditional custodians of the land. The Chair invited members to volunteer to give the acknowledgement of country at the next meeting of Academic Senate.

2. **WELCOME AND APOLOGIES**

The Chair welcomed Gail White, the Executive Director, Student Engagement and Registrar, noting that she is the Secretary to Academic Senate under the Academic Senate Rules. She also welcomed four co-opted student members: Aadidev (Faculty of Arts), Yvette Noble (Faculty of Business and Economics), David Thomson (Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences) and Bhavana Balkatta Murlikrishna (Postgraduate Coursework).

The Chair also noted the apologies listed above and reminded those present of their role and purpose as members of the Academic Senate.

3. **ARRANGEMENT OF AGENDA**

3.1 Disclosure of conflicts of interest

There were no disclosures of conflicts of interest.

3.2 Adoption of unstarring items

No additional items were starred.

**Resolution 18/20**

Academic Senate resolved that the items not starred for discussion (Items 9, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 10.5, 10.6, 11.3, 11.5, 13, 14.1, 15.1, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 15.5, 16.1, 16.2, 16.3 and 17.1) be noted and, where appropriate, be adopted as recommended.
The Chair sought and received approval from members to deal with item 12.3 together with items 10.7 and 10.8.

4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 Resolution 18/21
Academic Senate resolved to approve the minutes of the meeting held 20 February 2018 as a true and correct record.

5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

5.1 Faculty of Science and Engineering: Engineering Curriculum
The Chair advised members that she and Associate Professor Lavermicocca had met with the Executive Dean of Science and Engineering, Dean of the School of Engineering and the Associate Dean, Standards and Quality to discuss matters raised in the Executive Dean’s report to the last meeting of Senate. The group has agreed to develop a pipeline to support the initial planning of the Engineering curriculum and ensure appropriate timelines are met.

Resolution 18/22
Academic Senate resolved to note the update on Engineering curriculum.

5.2 Approval of New Programs 2016 and 2019
Associate Professor Lavermicocca presented data on program approval, noting average timeframes for internal processing in faculties and for progressing proposals through the ASQC and Senate and that relatively few proposals were returned to faculties for further information. It was suggested that future reports on these data could provide statistical distributions.

Resolution 18/23
Academic Senate resolved to note the data on timeframes for the approval of new programs between 2016 and 2019.

5.3 Review of Academic Quality Assurance and Quality Enhancement
At the last meeting of Senate, it was resolved that the desk audit of the University’s for Academic Quality Assurance and Quality Enhancement be noted. Senate had agreed that the report should be considered in detail by the Chair and Professor Jameson and had charged them with developing an action plan. That plan was now presented to Senate, with the Chair particularly highlighting the issue of department reviews. Members noted that such reviews will not be mandated in 2018, but could be conducted if faculties wished to do so. The Chair undertook to provide regular updates on the action plan.

Resolution 18/24
Academic Senate resolved to note the update on the review of academic quality assurance and quality enhancement.

Other matters arising
Professor Mansfield provided a brief update on the HDR Supervision Policy and Procedure. Further feedback has been received since the last Senate meeting and the final version of the policy and procedure will be submitted to the next meeting of Senate.

The Chair advised members that following feedback on the Co-op Standards Flowchart, a revised version has been included in agenda item 14.1.

Dr Frank Carrigan arrived at 9:50 am

6. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

The Chair reported briefly, focussing on issues with the University’s current curriculum and complexity is impacting on the student experience. She emphasised the need for the University executive and Academic Senate to work together to address this issue as a matter of urgency.

7. VICE-CHANCELLOR ORAL UPDATE

The Vice-Chancellor spoke briefly on the following matters:

- **Brand campaign:** a new campaign will be launched next week and will be implemented for student recruitment in Session 2 2018 and Session 1 2019. Nine different stakeholder categories have been consulted, and the concepts have been thoroughly tested. The Vice-Chancellor particularly stressed the need for the University to counter the erosion of its brand in the Sydney market.
- **Lighthouse:** a new website ([https://lighthouse.mq.edu.au/](https://lighthouse.mq.edu.au/)) went live yesterday which will provide a portal for showcasing the University’s research and is designed to provide media outlets with easy access to research stories;
- **Student admissions:** the Vice-Chancellor advised that a final report on S1 2018 admissions is still being finalised, but while student load is up from the same period in 2017 it is lower than projected for both domestic and international students. This trend is reflected in the sector nationally.
- **Curriculum and programs:** the Vice-Chancellor noted the Chair’s comments on the complexity of the
University’s curriculum model, adding his support for the need for a review and emphasising the need for the University to be more agile and responsive to the market. He added that the University must also be more disciplined about determining which programs should no longer be offered, and encouraged the Chair and Professor Jameson to work together to develop a plan for reviewing curriculum architecture through the lens of student experience, for implementation in 2020;

- Finances: following the freeze in Commonwealth grants funding, the University has made some adjustments to the 2018 budget, but he urged members to counter any suggestions that the University is in financial crisis. The changes to the University budget have safeguarded faculties as the University’s frontline in teaching and research as much as possible, as well as protecting HDR scholarships and research grants, and despite the Commonwealth cuts the University will still be spending $50 million more than in 2017. The University’s commitment to significant capital works will also proceed.

8. QUESTION TIME

The following questions were asked of the Vice-Chancellor:

- Curriculum review: the Vice-Chancellor was asked to comment on how national and community interests would be taken into account in reviewing the University’s curriculum framework, and he responded that such interests must be taken into account if the University is be an agency of community within which it is established. He was further asked to comment on how the University compares with competitors with respect to the student:staff ratio, and he acknowledged there was room for improvement in some areas. The Vice-Chancellor added that there is no benchmark standard for how the ratio should be calculated, and that there are other aspects, such as learning technology and flipped classrooms where the University also needs to improve;

- Brand campaign: the Vice-Chancellor was asked if different campaigns have been developed for domestic and international student markets. He advised that Macquarie International was significantly involved in developing the campaign which has been designed to be tailored to specific markets. He added that the campaign is broader than student recruitment but also aims to build the University’s reputation;

- International student numbers: figures were requested for the fall in international student admissions from China for 2018, with Professor Jameson advising there had been an almost 30% drop off. Nature and size: in response to a request for an update and timeline for this project, the Vice-Chancellor advised that the curriculum review discussed at the meeting would be a major part of this project. While it had been planned that a draft would be released in the second quarter of this year, it will now be issued in the second half of 2018.

At this point the meeting moved to item 12.3

9. STUDENT LED BUSINESS

There were no items of student led business.

10. ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

10.1 Academic Senate Committees: Amendments to Membership

Resolution 18/25

Academic Senate resolved to approve:

i. the re-appointment of Dr Mitch Parsell as Chair of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee from 1 February 2018 to 31 January 2020;

ii. the appointment of Associate Professor Panos Vlachopoulos as Chair of the MUIC Subcommittee from 1 March 2018 to 29 February 2020; and

iii. the co-option of Nicole Brigg, Pro Vice-Chancellor, International to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee for a period expiring 31 July 2018.

10.2 Academic Senate: Co-option to Membership

Resolution 18/26

Academic Senate resolved to approve the co-option of the following persons to membership of Academic Senate:

i. Dr Mitch Parsell (as Chair of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee), for a period of membership from 1 February 2018 to 31 January 2020;

ii. Aadidev (as an undergraduate student representative from the Faculty of Arts) from 4 April to 31 May 2018;

iii. Yvette Noble (as an undergraduate student representative from the Faculty of Business and Economics) from 4 April to 31 May 2018;

iv. David Thomson (as a student representative from the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences) from 4 April to 31 May 2018; and

v. Bhavana Balkatta Murlikrishna (as a postgraduate coursework student representative) from 4 April to 31 May 2018; and

note that Gail White (Executive Director, Student Engagement and Registrar), will attend meetings of
Academic Senate in her formal capacity as Secretary to Academic Senate.

10.3  Exemption from Assessment Policy: Publication of Examination Papers on Library Website (ASQC)

**Resolution 18/27**
Academic Senate resolved to approve a partial exemption from the requirement of Schedule 4 of the Assessment Policy to publish final examination papers on the University Library website for LING390 Current Issues in Phonology.

10.4  2018 Schedule: Late and retrospective changes: IELTS requirements (ASQC)

**Resolution 18/28**
Academic Senate resolved to approve the change to IELTS to 6.5 overall with a minimum of 6.0 in each band for the following programs:
- Master of Translation and Interpreting Studies
- Master of Advanced Translation and Interpreting Studies
- Master of Translation and Interpreting Studies with the degree of the Master of Applied Linguistics and TESOL
- Master of Translation and Interpreting Studies with the degree of Master of International Relations
- Master of Conference Interpreting

for the Session 2 2018 intake, excluding the Master of Conference Interpreting which only has a first semester intake.

**Resolution 18/29**
Academic Senate resolved to approve changes to IELTS requirements to 6.5 overall with a minimum 6.0 in each band or equivalent for the following programs, effective 1 January 2019:
- Master of Disability Studies
- Master of Special Education
- Master of Early Childhood
- Master of Education
- Master of Educational Leadership
- Graduate Certificate of Education Studies
- Graduate Certificate of Higher Education

10.5  2019 Schedule: Programs for disestablishment (ASQC)

**Resolution 18/30**
Academic Senate resolved to approve the disestablishment of the Graduate Diploma of Children’s Literature and the Master of Children’s Literature, effective 31 December 2018.

10.6  Proposal for a Joint PhD Program with Technical University Munich (RRTC)

**Resolution 18/31**
Academic Senate resolved to approve the proposed Joint PhD program with Technical University Munich in Germany.

10.7  Master of Research (MRes) Thesis Examination (RRTC)

The Chair advised members that this item and agenda item 10.8 have been discussed in depth by both the Thesis Examination Sub-committee (TESC) and the Research and Research Training Committee (RRTC). Professor Mansfield explained that this item recommends the retention of two external examiners for Master of Research (MRes) theses. He added that the Angus Review of the MRes in 2016 had recommended the University consider using one internal examiner, and that this option has been discussed by TESC on a number of occasions, but members recommended retaining the current system to minimise the potential for conflicts of interest and to maintain the quality of the examination process. Members approved the proposal.

**Resolution 18/32**
Academic Senate resolved to endorse the decision of the Research and Research Training Committee to maintain the current practice of appointing two external examiners for Master of Research (MRes) theses.

10.8  Master of Research (MRes) Thesis Examination Outcome after Revision and Re-examination (RRTC)

Professor Mansfield advised members that a small number of MRes theses each year are revised and re-examined. If an examiner recommends the thesis be revised and re-examined it will automatically be referred to a third examiner, and only if the third examiner supports the recommendation will it be sent back to the candidate for revision. When a revised thesis is re-examined, examiners had been asked to provide a grade but the process for reconciling these grades with those given for the original version of the thesis were not clear. It is recommended that in cases where a thesis is revised and re-examined that that revised thesis be marked as pass/fail and that the original grades be used to determine the final MRes mark.

Members discussed the purpose of revision and re-examination of MRes theses with Professor Mansfield explaining that it provided the candidate with an opportunity to complete the program and graduate. He was also questioned about the impact of this change on students wishing to proceed to a higher research degree at another institution, with Professor Mansfield advising that the admission requirements for other universities was out of scope. He added that the sub-committee has attempted to balance providing candidates with an
opportunity to complete the program with the need to not unduly disadvantage other candidates who do not get the option to revise and resubmit. It was also suggested that the proposal should be amended to clarify that a revised thesis is sent back to the original examiners (subject to their agreement). The proposal was approved with one member abstaining.

**Resolution 18/33**

Academic Senate resolved to:

i. endorse the decision of the Research and Research Training Committee to amend the process for marking a Master of Research (MRes) thesis following revision and re-examination; and

ii. note that Schedule 4 (HDR Thesis Re-examination) of the HDR Thesis Preparation, Submission and Examination Policy is to be amended to reflect this decision.

11. **ACADEMIC SENATE PROJECTS**

11.1 **Fitness to Practice Procedure: managing the progression of students enrolled in practical, clinical and professional programs**

The Chair welcomed Dr Rod Lane (Educational Studies) and Angela Stark (Physiotherapy) and invited Dr Brad Windon to present the item. Dr Windon provided an outline of the Fitness to Practice procedure, noting that it sits within a suite of student support instruments, including the Academic Progression Policy and Procedure. The procedure is intended to ensure students know what is required for their chosen program, how students at risk of not meeting requirements will be identified, notified and supported, and how they be assisted to remediate any identified issues. A first draft of the procedure had been circulated with the agenda he invited feedback from members.

Dr Lane outlined how the process would operate in his department, noting that it will allow students to self-assess against the legislative requirements for accreditation as a teacher as early as possible to identify any potential issues. If issues are identified, a form is completed which outlines the issue, how it can be remediated, the support available and the timeline for addressing the issue.

Members made the following comments regarding the draft procedure:

- the Vice-Chancellor emphasised the need for the Office of General Counsel (OGC) to be involved with finalising the procedure and was assured the OGC has been consulted;
- members noted the importance of developing discipline-specific guidelines for the procedure and the tensions between ensuring a consistent application of the procedure while allowing for discipline-specific approaches;
- the relationship between inherent requirements (communicated prior to admission) and the Fitness to Practice procedure (communicated following enrolment) was discussed and it was noted that communication plans and exemplars are under development.

The Chair advised that a post-implementation review of the procedure would be used to identify any inconsistencies in application between discipline areas and reminded members that any further feedback is to be sent to either the Senate email account or Dr Windon.

**Resolution 18/34**

Academic Senate resolved to note the report on the Fitness to Practice procedure to manage the progression of students enrolled in practical, clinical and professional programs.

11.2 **Progress Report: Assessment, Unit Guide and Grade Appeal Policy Reviews**

Dr Parsell spoke to this item, noting that this project fits into the broader aim of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee to reduce the overall number of policies in the area of learning and teaching. In this case, the policy reviews recommend amalgamating the three policies by:

- rescinding the Unit Guide policy and making it a schedule of the Assessment Policy;
- rescinding the Grade Appeal policy and adding a Grade Review schedule to the Assessment Policy; and
- making other minor amendments to the Assessment Policy to address post-implementation issues.

The Unit Guide Policy review also recommends the formation of a working group to annually review the Unit Guide.

The review of the Grade Appeal Policy has been more complex. The working group recommends that there be a right to a review (currently referred to as a faculty-level appeal), and that students be allowed to appeal the review outcome under the Academic Appeal Policy. Three grounds of appeal are recommended:

- an administrative error occurred in the calculation of the final grade;
- the outcome of an approved special consideration application was not correctly applied; and
- a student was not afforded the same opportunity to demonstrate the learning outcomes as their cohort due to the conduct of their assessment task or exam being different from that of the cohort (the wording of this ground is still to be finalised).

Finally, the post-implementation review of the Assessment Policy recommends the following amendments to the policy:

- some minor wording changes, and the inclusion of revised definitions and examples;
- a new definition of the Fail Absent (FA) grade;
• the second attempt at a Hurdle task shall be graded Pass/Fail;
• allow Faculty Boards to approve exemptions to providing a 50% individual component to group-work. Faculty Boards will provide a biannual report to ASQC listing exemptions that have been granted.

Members raised the following issues in discussion:
• changes were suggested to how individual components of group work are assessed, but Dr Parsell pointed out that this should be held over to the full review of the policy in two years’ time;
• it was suggested the third ground of appeal for grade appeals be amended to state “a student was treated differently from other students in their cohort...” or similar wording and Dr Parsell agreed to discuss this further;
• the definition of Fail Absent (FA) was discussed in depth, with some members suggesting only one fail grade (F) be used. Professor Jameson pointed out that the university needs better data on student progression, which may not be provided by only one fail grade.

The Chair thanked Dr Parsell for his presentation.

**Resolution 18/35**

Academic Senate resolved to note the progress of the
i. Post-implementation Review of the Assessment Policy
ii. Review of the Unit Guide Policy
iii. Review of the Grade Appeal Policy

At this point, the meeting moved to deal with item 12.2.

**11.3 Post-implementation Review of the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) 2013**

**Resolution 18/36**


**11.4 Purpose and Composition of Academic Senate**

This item was held over to the following meeting.

**11.5 Developing a Model for Shared Responsibility of Academic Governance**

**Resolution 18/37**

Academic Senate resolved to note the progress on Phase 2A: the development of operational resources, establishing required quality assurance mechanisms and development of training and capacity building of the project to develop a model for Shared Academic Governance.

**12. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

**12.1 Faculty of Human Sciences**

This item was held over to the following meeting.

**12.2 Vertical Double Degrees**

Professor Brawley noted that a paper on this proposal was included in the agenda and had also been circulated for feedback prior to the meeting. An additional page of feedback and responses to the circulated paper was tabled at the meeting (attached at the end of these minutes). He added that guideline 1b has been amended to add the word “normally” at the suggestion of one member.

Members discussed the proposal and commented as follows:
• Professor Brawley confirmed that vertical double degrees would be available to international, as well as domestic, students and could be offered across faculties;
• concerns were raised that the proposed structure might not be attractive to some employers, with Professor Brawley noting it would be up to faculties to determine whether or not the structure is suitable for a specific discipline area;
• the risk framework received positive comment, and members noted that this model could address concerns with volume of learning at AQF Level 9;
• student members raised some issues related to admission requirements and the ability to transfer into a vertical double degree;
• it was noted that a vertical double degree could be deemed to allow a graduate to enter the second year of an MRes, but there was no intention to advertise such a package at this point.

Professor Brawley acknowledged further work is required on the structure of the undergraduate component of the proposed framework, and that it would be up to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee and Academic Senate to determine the timelines for approval of any proposals using the framework. Members expressed support for the proposal and approved the draft guidelines.

**Resolution 18/38**

Academic Senate resolved to approve the Guidelines on Vertical Double Degrees.

At this point the meeting moved to deal with item 12.4
12.3 Master of Research (MRes) Thesis Examination Result Statistics 2014-17

Professor Mansfield presented an analysis of MRes thesis examination results from 2014 to 2017, noting that this represented approximately 1000 completions since the introduction of the program. He particularly highlighted the increasing proportion of candidates whose work is deemed to indicate an aptitude for PhD studies. The report also included data on the use of third examiners to reconcile disparities between examiners’ marks, and he advised that the Thesis Examination Subcommittee is concerned with the number of times a third examiner is invoked.

Members suggested using the examiners’ comments where there is a disparity in marking, with Professor Mansfield advising this is done, but often does not assist in reconciling the marks. It was also suggested that examiners be encouraged to consult if their marks are widely different, and Professor Mansfield advised that examiners are reluctant to do this but he would discuss it further with the subcommittee.

Resolution 18/39

Academic Senate resolved to note the report on Master of Research (MRes) thesis examination results from the period 2014 to 2017.

At this point the meeting returned to item 10.7.

12.4 University Membership in the Magna Charta Observatory

The Vice-Chancellor advised members that Macquarie University has been invited to join the Magna Charta Observatory of Fundamental Values and Rights (based at the University of Bologna). The organisation was established to promote the fundamental values of academic freedom, institutional autonomy and integrity in universities around the world. The Vice-Chancellor advised that the process for joining this organisation requires the University to obtain the approval of its academic governance body. Members were unanimous in supporting the proposal to join the Observatory.

Resolution 18/40

Academic Senate resolved to provide full support and approval of Macquarie University’s desire to become a signatory and member of the Magna Charta Observatory.

13. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

There were no questions on notice

14. ITEMS APPROVED BY THE CHAIR

14.1 Summary of items approved under Executive Action by the Chair

Resolution 18/41

Academic Senate resolved to ratify the following decisions made under executive action by the Chair of Academic Senate as follows:

i. the approval of the proposed academic and placement performance standards as the conditions that will apply to students who are awarded an Actuarial Co-op scholarship (a Cooperative Education Scholarship for the Bachelor of Actuarial Studies and Bachelor of Professional Practice);

ii. the approval of the Macquarie University Award for Academic Excellence to the coursework graduands as set out in the paper attached;

iii. the approval of an RPL articulation arrangement between the Bachelor of Economics, major in International Economics and Trade from Chiang’an University (China) and the Bachelor of Commerce (select majors), Bachelor of Applied Finance and Bachelor of Business Administration;

iv. the approval of an RPL articulation arrangement between the Bachelor of Management, major in Accounting from Chiang’an University (China) and the Master of Accounting (Advanced), with a specialisation in CPA Program; and

v. the retrospective changes to programs, majors and specialisations outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program/ Specialisation/Major</th>
<th>Rationale/ Request</th>
<th>Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Master of Chiropractic</td>
<td>Add CHIR923 and CHIR924 as alternates to required units CHIR921 and CHIR922 respectively.</td>
<td>Chair of Academic Senate 12/1/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 PACE</td>
<td>Recode COOP units to PROF and PACE as follows: COOP101 to PROF101 COOP201 to PACE201 COOP301 to PACE301 COOP302 to PACE302 COOP499 to PROF499</td>
<td>Chair of Academic Senate 12/1/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering (Honours) Bachelor of Engineering (Honours) with the degree of Bachelor of Arts Bachelor of Engineering (Honours) with the degree of Bachelor of Science Bachelor of Engineering (Honours) with the degree of Bachelor of Commerce</td>
<td>Remove MECH303 from mechatronic stream due to accreditation requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applied Mathematics Major Pure Mathematics Major</td>
<td>Remove new units from the structures at 100 level and replace with current (old) units at 100 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Social Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Combining 28cp and 4cp option set and changing the lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Management</td>
<td>Almost complete reworking of the structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. **REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

15.1 Academic Standards and Quality Committee
Academic Senate noted the reports of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) meetings of 27 February and 20 March 2018.

15.2 Research and Research Training Committee
Academic Senate resolved to note the report of the Research and Research Training Committee (RRTC) meeting of 20 March 2018.

15.3 Senate Learning and Teaching Committee
Academic Senate noted the report of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC) meeting of 26 March 2018.

15.4 University Medal Committee
Academic Senate noted the report of the University Medal Committee (UMC) meeting of 22 February 2018.

16. **REPORTS FROM FACULTY BOARDS**

16.1 Faculty of Business and Economics Faculty Board
Academic Senate noted the report of the Faculty of Business and Economics Faculty Board meeting of 5 February 2018.

16.2 Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences Faculty Board
Academic Senate noted the reports of the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences Faculty Board meetings of 5 February and 12 March 2018.

16.3 Faculty of Science and Engineering Faculty Board
Academic Senate noted the report of the Faculty of Science and Engineering Faculty Board meeting of 6 February 2018.

17. **UNIVERSITY HEARING COMMITTEE**

17.1 Summary reports of the meetings of 21 February and 7 March 2018
Academic Senate noted the summary report of the University Hearing Committee meeting of 21 February and 7 March 2018.

17.2 Update on planned workshops
This item was held over to the next meeting.

18. **OTHER BUSINESS**
There were no item of other business.

19. **NEXT MEETING**
The next meeting of the Academic Senate will be held on Tuesday 29 May 2018. Agenda Items are due by Tuesday 15 May 2018.
The meeting closed at 11:40 am.
**Item 12.2 Vertical Double Degrees: Tabled Paper**

Several staff and student senators expressed support for this proposal, whilst raising some suggestions for further detail that could be provided. A summary is below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>How this has been addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATAR</strong></td>
<td><strong>Entry requirements will be significantly higher than for the standalone undergraduate version of the program</strong>&lt;br&gt;Address how this will be handled for standalone degrees that already have very high ATAR requirements for entry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guideline 1B has had the word “normally” added to address this issue of existing programs with high entry requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Accreditation.</strong></td>
<td>Assess any impacts on degrees with external accreditation. E.g. Masters programs with particular requirements for entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is a decision for an accredited program to make. It may or may not be able to utilize this model. Monash have used the vertical double as a way to drive new relationships with accreditors eg Pharmacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure of Transition from BA to M</strong></td>
<td>Provide further detail on the structure of the transition from Bachelors to Masters, including how the different value credit points at each level (3 vs 4) is handled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside the guidelines the detail of what the transition core will look like will be a matter for the proposed program. The 3cp vs 4cp issue could be handled under existing curriculum administration processes or we could seek to follow the sector and conduct a bigger piece of work to remove 4cp at postgraduate coursework level and have standard 3cp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HECS HELP Liability</strong></td>
<td>Does the proposal address HECS HELP liability for students when discussing cost savings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes. Students places are CSP supported for the undergraduate and transition core components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employability</strong></td>
<td>Is there more evidence around employability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GDS data since 2012 shows that students who complete double degrees have a 5% better employability outcome. There is no data on vertical doubles available. We do know that credentialism and award inflation may be issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current MQ bachelors to masters conversion rate</strong></td>
<td>Is the MQ conversion rate data accurate, and include rates at peer institutions if available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The conversion data was supplied by SPAR. We do not have data for other institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration costs savings</strong></td>
<td>Is there more detail how cost savings would occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is not more detail available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HDR pipeline</strong></td>
<td>Is there a risk of losing students into the HDR pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes. As noted this is a risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogical benefit</strong></td>
<td>What are the pedagogical benefits of a vertical degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The integration of the two awards through the transition core should ensure a better alignment of content and learning outcomes for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market and Competitor Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Provide detail of any analysis of future trends in higher education in Australia, and of similar offerings at peer institutions, if available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The position paper provides detail as available on ANU and Monash. Other institutions are starting to explore individual program options in this space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Programs to consider</strong></td>
<td>Some suggestions were provided for additional combinations including:&lt;br&gt; - B. Teach/B.Sc. with a major in Applied Math (marketed towards potential senior secondary teachers)&lt;br&gt; B.Sc. (Stats major) with M. Biostats or M. Applied Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any suggested combinations would be a matter for Faculties to propose and Senate to approve.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Guideline 1B**: This table is a summary of the feedback received on the proposal for vertical double degrees. Each entry highlights the specific feedback provided and how it has been addressed in the guidelines. The table provides a structured overview of the key areas for consideration, including ATAR entry requirements, external accreditation, structure of transition from BA to M, HECS HELP liability, employability, and administration costs savings. The guidelines are designed to address the concerns raised by staff and student senators, ensuring that the proposal is well-informed and considered.