

# LEARNING AND TEACHING PROCEDURES 2016

Issued by: Deputy-Vice Chancellor (Education)  
Dated: 29 June 2016 (commencing 26 July 2016)  
Last amended 4 June 2019 (commencing 1 July 2019)  
12 March 2020 (administrative amendments)  
8 July 2021 (commencing 12 July 2021)  
16 November 2021 (commencing 22 November 2021)

Signature:

Name: Professor Philippa Pattison, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)

---

## 1 Purpose and application

- (1) These procedures are to give effect to the [Learning and Teaching Policy 2019](#) (“the policy”).
- (2) These procedures apply to the learning and teaching in coursework award courses.

## 2 Commencement

These procedures commence on 26 July 2016.

## 3 Interpretation

- (1) Words and phrases used in these procedures and not otherwise defined in this document have the meanings they have in the policy.

**Note:** See clause 6 of the policy.

- (2) In these procedures:

**change** in relation to an award course or unit of study, includes an amendment to, or deletion of, the award course or unit of study.

**Group of 8 Quality Verification System** means the system for benchmarking student achievement and assessment, conducted by the Group of 8 (Go8) universities.

**Quality Unit** means the team in the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) Portfolio responsible for quality assurance.

<b>SCSPC</b>	means the University Executive Strategic Course and Student Profile Committee.
<b>SFS</b>	means Sydney Future Students which is the unit within the Vice Principal (External Relations) Portfolio responsible for recruiting and admitting domestic and international students across all programs and courses.
<b>Sydney Student</b>	means the University's online student administration system.
<b>Sydney Research Seminars</b>	means units of study involving a cross-disciplinary group of students and staff in exploration of an interdisciplinary issue, challenge or problem approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.
<b>Table A</b>	means a list, specified in award course resolutions, of units of study, majors, minors and streams available to be taken in an award course.
<b>unit of study master file</b>	means the central computerised repository of details of all units of study offered by the University in a given year, which is compiled and maintained by the office of the Executive Director, Student Administrative Services.
<b>USS</b>	means Unit of Study Survey.

#### 4 Process for approving new or changed courses

- (1) No new or changed course may be advertised or offered until approval or preliminary approval has been obtained, as specified in this clause.
  - (a) It is the responsibility of the relevant Deans and faculty managers to ensure that necessary approvals are obtained in good time to meet any applicable external or internal deadlines.
 

**Note:** Meeting schedules are available on the relevant committee websites  
[Academic Board meeting dates](#);  
[Academic Board committee dates](#);  
[SCSPC meeting dates](#);  
[UE meeting dates](#).
  - (b) Key dates include:
    - (i) cut off dates for notifying Year 10 students of changes that may affect HSC subject selection;
    - (ii) cut-off date for the Universities Admissions Centre Guide for admissions in the subsequent calendar year;
    - (iii) deadline for publication of the faculty handbook for the subsequent year; and
    - (iv) finalisation date for the units of study master file for the subsequent year.
- (2) The Academic Board may provide a preliminary approval for new or changed courses before the required endorsements are obtained if the new or changed course may affect students' subject choices for Year 11 and Year 12 (for example, the establishment of a pre-requisite).

- (3) Faculties proposing new or changed courses must provide notice of the proposed change to any other faculty or school which might be affected by it **before** submitting a proposal (as appropriate).
- (4) Faculties wishing to make a minor change to an existing course are not required to comply with subclauses 4(3) to 4(7) inclusive, but may instead:
  - (a) develop a full proposal as required by subclause 4(8);
  - (b) submit it to the relevant Academic Board committee; and then
  - (c) follow the remainder of the process set out in this clause.
- (5) Faculties wishing to introduce a new course or to make a major change to an existing course must prepare a high-level outline describing the proposed change and obtain support from the Head of School or Department.
- (6) The faculty curriculum manager will then submit the outline to the any or all of the Dean's Executive Committee, School Leadership Group, or Faculty Education Committee (as appropriate) for endorsement.
- (7) The faculty curriculum manager will contact the Curriculum Management Advisory Group to establish a course proposal working group to develop an initial proposal document for endorsement by the faculty Education Committee and the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education).
- (8) The course proposal working group will develop a full course proposal that is submitted to faculty Education Committee for endorsement, and then to the faculty Board for approval.

**Note:** [Course proposal forms](#) are available from the staff intranet

- (9) Proposals for changed courses must include details of transitional arrangements to ensure that students already enrolled in the course are not disadvantaged.
- (10) The SCSPC will consider the full course proposal and determine whether to recommend it to the University Executive for endorsement.
  - (a) The SCSPC may request a faculty representative to attend at a meeting of the SCSPC explain the case for the new or changed course.
- (11) If the University Executive endorses the full course proposal, the full course proposal must then be submitted for review and endorsement as appropriate to:
  - (a) the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies; and
  - (b) the Undergraduate or Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board.
- (12) Once the endorsement of the Undergraduate or Graduate Studies Committee has been obtained, the full proposal may be submitted to the Academic Board for approval.
- (13) In considering proposals for new or amended courses, the chairs of committees whose endorsement is sought may form small working parties to consider proposals and report on them.

## **5 Matters to be considered in relation to proposals for new or changed courses**

- (1) Decision makers must take the following matters into consideration before endorsing or approving a new award course or changes to an existing award course:
  - (a) the academic need for, and merit of, the proposed course or change;



- (b) the aims of the course, including how it will meet faculty and University goals;
- (c) whether, and how, the proposed course or change will maximise internal collaborations;
- (d) the learning outcomes, and the effectiveness of plans for their development and assessment;
- (e) alignment of the learning outcomes with the graduate qualities, and the effectiveness of plans for developing and assessing achievement of the graduate qualities;
- (f) the extent and effectiveness of consultation undertaken with relevant faculties and schools, and where appropriate, external accreditation bodies;
- (g) consistency with University policies and procedures, and any applicable external requirements;
- (h) potential resource impacts, including:
  - (i) workload implications;
  - (ii) financial sustainability;
  - (iii) impact on University libraries;
  - (iv) impact on information and communications technology;
  - (v) impact on physical spaces and learning environments; and
  - (vi) impact on resources of other faculties, schools and departments;
- (i) the availability and appropriateness of mechanisms for evaluating and, if necessary improving:
  - (i) quality;
  - (ii) delivery; and
  - (iii) academic outcomes.

## 6 Process for approving new or changed units of study

- (1) No new or changed unit of study may be advertised or offered until approval has been obtained, as specified in this clause.
  - (a) It is the responsibility of the relevant Deans and faculty managers to ensure that necessary approvals are obtained in good time to meet any applicable external or internal deadlines.

**Note:** Meeting schedules are available on the relevant committee websites.  
[Academic Board meeting dates;](#)  
[Academic Board committee dates;](#)  
[SCSPC meeting dates;](#)  
[UE meeting dates.](#)
  - (b) Key dates include:
    - (i) deadline for the publication of the faculty handbook for the subsequent year;
    - (ii) finalisation date for the units of study master file for the subsequent year; and
    - (iii) deadlines set by faculties for the approval of units of study.

- (2) Faculties, or where relevant the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), proposing new or changed units of study must:
  - (a) provide advance notice of the proposed change to any faculty or school which might be affected, particularly those offering award courses in which the unit of study is listed in the unit of study table, before seeking approval; and
  - (b) submit proposals for approval in the relevant faculty-approved template.
- (3) Proposals for new or changed units of study which are, or are proposed to be, under the faculty's academic direction in a degree of the faculty must be:
  - (a) approved by the faculty; and
  - (b) where the changes result in a change to award course requirements or the table of units of study for an award course, approved by the Academic Board.
- (4) Proposals for new or changed units of study which are, or are proposed to be, under the faculty's academic direction in the shared pool of units of study available across all Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees must be:
  - (a) endorsed by the unit of study co-ordinator, or in the case of new units of study, the relevant head of school;
  - (b) approved in terms of rationale, curriculum, assessment and learning outcomes by the faculty; and
  - (c) approved for inclusion in the shared pool by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.
- (5) Proposals for new or changed units of study which are not, or are proposed not to be, under a faculty's academic direction but will be included in the shared pool of units of study available across all Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees must be:
  - (a) endorsed by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education); and
  - (b) approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.
- (6) Units of study which are, or are proposed to be, included in the open learning environment, Sydney Research Seminars, or interdisciplinary units of study available across all Liberal Studies Bachelor Degrees, or offered to all students as specified in the degree resolutions, must be:
  - (a) endorsed by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) or the faculty; and
  - (b) approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.
- (7) Faculties and the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies (as appropriate) must report approved new or changed units of study to the Undergraduate or Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board (as appropriate) at least annually.

## **7 Award course resolutions**

- (1) Award course resolutions must specify, as a minimum:
  - (a) the course code;
  - (b) attendance patterns;
  - (c) requirements for admission to candidature;
  - (d) requirements for the award course including credit point values, units of study that may be taken for credit and mandatory units of study;



- (e) streams available in the award course;
- (f) programs available in the award course;
- (g) majors available in the award course;
- (h) minors available in the award course;
- (i) requirements for streams, programs, majors, minors and, where appropriate, the degree core;
- (j) progression rules;
- (k) restrictions on enrolment;
- (l) time limits, if different from those specified in the faculty resolutions or the [University of Sydney \(Coursework\) Rule 2014](#);

**Note:** Award course resolutions may not extend the maximum time for completion of a coursework degree, which is provided in the [University of Sydney \(Coursework\) Rule 2014](#)

- (m) cross institutional study and exchange, if not as specified in the faculty resolutions;
- (n) requirements for admission to, and for the award of honours, if available;
- (o) award of the degree including grades of the degree or grades of honours that may be awarded; and
- (p) any transitional arrangements relating to the resolutions.

## 8 Faculty resolutions

- (1) Faculty resolutions may include resolutions about:
  - (a) course enrolment, including enrolment restrictions, time limits, suspension, discontinuation and lapse of candidature and recognition of prior learning;
  - (b) unit of study enrolment, including cross-institutional study and international exchange;
  - (c) study and assessment, including attendance and participation, late submission, and arrangements, if any, for re-assessment;
  - (d) progression and award including satisfactory progress, awards, award and grades of honours, medals and weighted average marks used in addition to the provisions of the [Coursework Policy 2014](#); and
  - (e) transitional arrangements.

## 9 Faculty handbooks

- (1) Faculty handbooks must specify:
  - (a) a description of the faculty structure, including schools, disciplines and departments;
  - (b) the faculty teaching calendar for the year;
  - (c) any local provisions in the faculty;



- (d) in relation to each award course offered by the faculty:
  - (i) the award course resolutions;
  - (ii) any applicable faculty resolutions;
  - (iii) the intended learning outcomes and graduate qualities;
  - (iv) the approved minimum learning commitments;
  - (v) the approved learning experiences;
  - (vi) the assessment process and standards; and
  - (vii) expected prior learning;
- (e) in relation to each unit of study offered by the faculty:
  - (i) a brief description;
  - (ii) assessment summary;
  - (iii) pre- and co-requisites; and
  - (iv) the relationship of the unit of study to the overall learning outcomes and experience for the award course.

## **10 Unit of study outlines**

- (1) Unit of study outlines must contain:
  - (a) a concise statement of the learning outcomes;
  - (b) a list of objectives, expressed in terms of how that knowledge will be assessed;
  - (c) a concise statement of the links between the learning outcomes and the graduate qualities;
  - (d) a brief description of the contribution of the unit to the different award courses in which the students may be enrolled;
  - (e) information about academic integrity and the checking of written assignments through similarity detection software;
  - (f) links to compulsory modules relating to academic honesty;
  - (g) advice on:
    - (i) attendance and class requirements;
    - (ii) the methods of assessment to be used; and
    - (iii) the weighting of each assessment;
  - (h) names and contact details of relevant teaching and administrative staff.
- (2) Unit of study outlines may also contain, where appropriate, assignment questions and assessment tasks.
- (3) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) may prescribe a template for unit of study outlines, in which case the template must be used for all unit of study outlines.

## 11 Learning management systems

- (1) An LMS website must contain:
  - (a) an introduction and rationale for the unit of study;
  - (b) the aims and learning outcomes;
  - (c) the contribution that the aims and learning outcomes of the unit make to learning outcomes and graduate qualities for the award course;
  - (d) an outline of the curriculum for the unit and a schedule of learning activities (lectures, seminars, tutorials, workshops, practicals, laboratories, online learning, field trips, work placement, independent study or other);
  - (e) minimum learning commitments and attendance requirements for learning activities, and guidelines on time to be allowed for private study and assessment preparation;
  - (f) the assessment process, standards and criteria, including a detailed breakdown of each assessment task, its contribution to the final mark, deadlines and closing dates for submission of work;
  - (g) any relevant expectations relating to group work, professionalism in work-integrated learning situations and other matters;
  - (h) any penalties that apply for poor attendance or late submission;
  - (i) mandatory or recommended prior learning;  
**Note:** This information should also be provided to prospective students as early as possible, through the University's "[Find a Course](#)" website.
  - (j) reference and links to relevant University policies, including, as a minimum the [Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015](#) and the requirements for special consideration in the [Coursework Policy 2014](#) and [Assessment Procedures 2011](#);
  - (k) a notification to students indicating that participation in the unit of study permits de-identified information about their learning experience and interaction with learning resources to be used for the purpose of improving the student experience of learning;
  - (l) information, where relevant, about the recording of lectures delivered and automatically captured in University-owned lecture theatres;
  - (m) the use of the text-matching tool on the University's LMS for student text-based assignments;
  - (n) details of changes made to the unit as a result of student feedback and student experience from the previous time the unit was offered.
- (2) Each LMS must be designed to include the capacity for:
  - (a) submitting written assignments online; and
  - (b) for text-based assignments, checking submitted work with similarity detection software.
- (3) Read-only access to the LMS site for a unit of study must be provided to:
  - (a) students;
  - (b) unit of study co-ordinators;
  - (c) all teachers and tutors in the award course;





- (d) relevant library staff, for the purpose of facilitating availability of relevant library resources;
  - (e) relevant educational integrity co-ordinators, for the purposes of conducting an investigation into suspected academic dishonesty;
  - (f) relevant staff of the Disability Support Office, for the purposes of recommending adjustments for students registered with that office; and
  - (g) any other member of staff to whom the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) directs that such access should be provided.
- (4) Editing access to the LMS site for a unit of study must be provided to the unit of study co-ordinator and any other person nominated by the unit of study co-ordinator.

## **12 Academic records on graduation**

- (1) An academic transcript is a complete record of the student's studies at the University and must state:
- (a) the graduate's name;
  - (b) the award course;
  - (c) any specialisation, stream, major or minor achieved;
  - (d) each unit of study attempted with:
    - (i) the semester and year of the attempt;
    - (ii) the credit point value;
    - (iii) the mark; and
    - (iv) the grade.
- (2) A certificate of graduate status must list the degree name and the graduation date but not the units of study.
- (3) A degree statement (testamur), is the legal statement of the student's attainment of the degree, and must state:
- (a) the degree or degrees awarded;
  - (b) the authority under which it is awarded;
  - (c) the title of the award;
  - (d) the name of the student to whom it is awarded;
  - (e) the date of conferral;
  - (f) any stream, program or major (with a maximum of two majors); and
  - (g) where relevant, the honours discipline and grade of the degree or honours awarded.
- (4) For a Liberal Studies Bachelor Degree:
- (a) the title shown on the testamur and transcript must include:
    - (i) the stream; or
    - (ii) if no stream, the program; or
    - (iii) if neither, the Table A major; and
  - (b) any second major; and

- (c) must be styled as: Bachelor of [insert title], (insert stream, program or Table A major), (insert any second major).
- (5) For any degree combined with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies:
  - (a) the title shown on the testamur and transcript must include:
    - (i) the stream; or
    - (ii) if no stream, the program; or
    - (iii) if neither, the Table A major; and
  - (b) the second major; and
  - (c) must be styled as: Bachelor of [insert title] / Bachelor of Advanced Studies (insert stream, program or Table A major), (insert second major).
- (6) Any degree combined with the Bachelor of Advanced Studies with honours must be styled as: Bachelor of [insert title] / Bachelor of Advanced Studies ([insert discipline] honours, [insert second major]).

**Note:** See also Part 19 of the [Coursework Policy 2014](#).
- (7) A single testamur will be issued for combined degrees, including vertically-integrated degrees, unless otherwise required by the relevant award course resolutions.
- (8) Separate testamurs will be issued for each degree for double degrees, unless otherwise required by the award course resolutions.

### 13 Quality assurance and evaluation

- (1) **Excellence of the student experience** is evaluated through surveys of the student experience at two levels:
  - (a) the degree or program level; and
  - (b) the unit of study level.
- (2) Degree or program level feedback is captured from both current students and recent graduates through external surveys. Educational data analytics from these surveys are reported by the Education Portfolio Quality and Analytics Team to the wider university community, including, but not limited to:
  - (a) University Executive Education and Research Education Committees;
  - (b) Academic Board;
  - (c) Graduate Studies Committee of Academic Board;
  - (d) Undergraduate Studies Committee of Academic Board;
  - (e) The Academic Quality Committee of the Academic Board;
  - (f) Faculty Deans, Associate Deans and appropriate faculty boards and committees.

- (3) Unit of study level feedback is captured through the Unit of Study Survey (USS).
  - (a) The USS is administered online, using Sydney Student data to generate the list of units of study to be surveyed each teaching session, and to access the contact details of students enrolled in them.
  - (b) The USS includes six common quantitative items, and two common qualitative items and up to four faculty specific quantitative items and one qualitative item.
  - (c) For each unit of study, a faculty administrator is responsible for:
    - (i) checking that the unit of study co-ordinator details are correct;
    - (ii) setting appropriate open and close dates for the survey; and
    - (iii) indicating which faculty specific variant of the USS is to be used.
  - (d) Unit of study co-ordinators must check the details of the survey (sent as a pre-notification email two weeks prior to the survey open date). Changes should be requested through the faculty administrator.
  - (e) Students are emailed an invitation to participate in the USS on the survey open date. A reminder email will be emailed to all students who have not already completed the survey one week after the survey opens.
  - (f) Teachers may allow time in class for students to complete the survey on their smartphone, tablet or laptop.
  - (g) Unit of study co-ordinators will receive an email notification on the survey open date, and then an update one week later.
  - (h) Results are made available to the unit of study co-ordinators, the Dean, the Associate Dean, Education and other nominees of the Dean via the [USS results portal](#).
  - (i) Results are made available to students (quantitative results only) via an email notification containing a link to their personalised survey portal. Co-ordinators can write a comment in response to the ratings and comments given by their students before results are released to students.
  - (j) Changes made to the unit of study as a result of student feedback and student experience from the previous time the unit of study was offered must be included in the LMS website for the unit of study.
- (4) Quality assurance processes at all levels are summarised in Schedule One.
- (5) **Reviews of faculties and academic units** will be jointly overseen by the Academic Board and University Executive, and will include a focus on teaching and learning, including curriculum development and research training.
- (6) The review process will consist of the following stages:
  - (a) initiation of the review;
  - (b) appointment of a review panel;
  - (c) review visit preparation;
  - (d) submission of faculty self-evaluation report;
  - (e) review panel meetings:
    - (i) preliminary;
    - (ii) consensus;
    - (iii) review;

- (f) preparation of review panel report by the office of the Provost, in consultation with the review panel;
  - (g) development of implementation plan.  
**Note:** Further information about faculty review visits is available from the [Academic Board website](#).
- (7) The terms of reference for review panels are set out in Schedule Two.
  - (8) **Course quality reviews** will be conducted every seven years or less, as appropriate, by Program Directors.
  - (9) The course quality reviews will consider, but are not limited to:
    - (a) the quality of the learning and teaching in the course;
    - (b) the course structure and learning outcomes;
    - (c) student performance and student experience; and
    - (d) the academic and strategic rationale for offering the course.
  - (10) The course quality review and reporting process is set out in Schedule Five.
  - (11) **External reference points** will be obtained by participating in the Group of 8 Quality Verification System and through other benchmarking reports commissioned by faculties.
  - (12) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) must:
    - (a) provide Group of 8 Quality Verification System reviewer reports to the relevant unit of study coordinators, Heads of School and Associate Deans; and
    - (b) table the reports at the University Executive Education Committee and the Academic Quality Committee.
  - (13) The Associate Dean Education in relevant faculties is responsible for responding to Go8 Quality Verification System reviewer reports by completing the template in Schedule Three and, where appropriate, implementing action to address issues identified in the report.
  - (14) If a report does not identify issues warranting response or comment, the Academic Quality Committee may waive the requirement for a faculty response.

## 14 Educational environments

The quality of educational environments will be measured through student and teacher evaluations of learning spaces.

**Note:** Standards (for learning environments) are monitored by the DVC (Education) Portfolio and are set by CIS in conjunction with ICT. The Learning Space Design Standard is available [here](#).

## NOTES

### Learning and Teaching Procedures 2016

- Date adopted: 29 June 2016
- Date commenced: 26 July 2016
- Date amended: 27 October 2016 (administrative amendment)  
10 October 2016 (administrative amendment)  
28 November 2017 (commencing 1 January 2018)  
4 June 2109 (commencing 1 July 2019)  
12 March 2020 (administrative amendment)  
8 July 2021 (commencing 12 July 2021)  
16 November 2021 (commencing 22 November 2021)
- Original Administrator: Registrar and Academic Director (Education)
- Current document owner: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)
- Review date: 29 June 2021
- Related documents: *University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2014*  
*University of Sydney (Policies Development and Review) Rule 2011*  
*Learning and Teaching Policy 2019*  
*Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015*  
*Student Charter 2020*  
*Coursework Policy 2014*  
*Academic Honesty Procedures 2016*

## AMENDMENT HISTORY

Provision	Amendment	Commencing
Various	Renumbering of clauses 6 – 12	26 July 2016
4(7); 4(8); Schedule One	References to Senior Executive Group (SEG) changed to University Executive (UE)	27 October 2016
13(2)(a)	Reference to Senior Executive Group (SEG) Research Training Committee changed to University Executive (UE) Research Education Committee	27 October 2016
Various	Typographical errors amended; administrative amendment only	27 October 2016
4(1)(a); 6(1)(a); 13(6)(g)	Hyperlinks amended; administrative amendment only	27 October 2016
12(1)	Removal of clause referring to the Australian Higher Education Graduation Statement (AHEGS); subsequent clauses renumbered.	10 October 2017
6	Amended definition of “faculty”	1 January 2018
6	New definitions added: “Group of 8 Quality Verification System” and “Table A”	1 January 2018
4(1)(a); 6(1)(a)	“Meeting schedules are available on the relevant committee websites” moved to note below clauses.	1 January 2018
7(1)(l)	Inserted “award” before “course”	1 January 2018
12(3)(a)	Inserted “or degrees” between “degree” and “awarded”	1 January 2018
12(3)(f)	Inserted “(with a maximum of two majors)” after “major”	1 January 2018
12(3)(g)	Inserted “honours disciplines and” between “the” and “grade”	1 January 2018
12(4) – 12(5); 13(8) – 13(11)	New clauses added	1 January 2018
14	Note moved to after clause	1 January 2018
Schedule 2; Schedule 3	New schedules added	1 January 2018
3	Remove definition of faculty	4 June 2019

<b>Provision</b>	<b>Amendment</b>	<b>Commencing</b>
3	Replace Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar) with Executive Director, Student Administration Services	
12(6)	Remove 'where honours is taken in the discipline of a Table A major and insert Note.	4 June 2019
1(1)	Amending date of Learning and Teaching Policy from 2015 to 2019	12 March 2020
4(1)(a) note; 4(6)(d) note; 4(8) note; 6(1)(a) note; 13(6)(g) note	Hyperlinks amended; administrative amendment only	12 March 2020
Notes	In Related documents - Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 replaced with Learning and Teaching Policy 2019; Code of Conduct for Students replaced with Student Charter 2020	12 March 2020
3(2)	Replace CCPC with SCSPC	12 July 2021
4(1)(a); 6(1)(a)	Administrative amendment only	12 July 2021
4(4) – 4(11)	Replace clauses which are no longer correct	12 July 2021
Notes	Replace Academic Director, Education Policy and Quality with Registrar and Academic Director (Education)	12 July 2021
Schedule 4	New clause added	12 July 2021
3	New definitions for 'Quality Unit' and 'SFS'	22 November 2021
13(8)-(10)	New subclauses regarding the course quality reviews.	22 November 2021
13(12)(b); 13(14).	Removal of 'Academic Standards and Policy Committee'.	22 November 2021
Schedule 5	New schedule added.	22 November 2021
4	Removed separate references to 'University schools'	22 November 2021

## SCHEDULE ONE

### Standards and methods for evaluating educational excellence

Level	Standards	Responsibility	Evaluation method
Unit of study	<b>Educational outcomes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple data</li> <li>• Easy visibility at faculty level</li> <li>• Generated by results data</li> <li>• Determined by faculty</li> <li>• Alignment with award/ standard</li> <li>• Graduate qualities</li> </ul>	<b>Educational outcomes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unit of study co-ordinator assesses that outcomes are meeting requirements, including academic integrity</li> <li>• Faculty determines standards with reference to the discipline level</li> </ul>	<b>Educational outcomes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student surveys</li> <li>• University rubric to measure against graduate qualities</li> </ul>
	<b>Educational experience</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student experience of learning and teaching</li> <li>• Peer observation of teaching</li> </ul>	<b>Educational experience</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• University sets agreed standards and targets</li> <li>• Unit of study co-ordinators are responsible for providing students with feedback through the closing the loop process</li> </ul>	<b>Educational experience</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student surveys</li> <li>• Results are included in report to students/ faculty</li> </ul>
	<b>Educational environment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning space</li> <li>• Virtual environment</li> <li>• Formal and informal</li> </ul>		<b>Educational environment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standards for physical learning space</li> <li>• Evaluation of learning spaces</li> <li>• Effective use of existing resources (to teach units of study)</li> </ul>



Level	Standards	Responsibility	Evaluation method
Curriculum/ qualification	<b>Educational outcomes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualifications</li> <li>• Meet accreditation requirements</li> <li>• Alignment with institutional, industry, professional and community expectations</li> </ul>	<b>Educational outcomes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standards and outcomes are determined by the faculty and managed by the Academic Board</li> </ul>	<b>Educational outcomes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student survey results are averaged over faculty-administered units of study and used to set agreed standards and targets</li> <li>• Benchmarking and alignment with standards across the faculty, and other comparable institutions, and with professional, disciplinary and industry expectations.</li> </ul>
	<b>Educational experience</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thematically coherent program</li> </ul>		<b>Educational experience</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student surveys</li> <li>• Reported to faculty board; reports made public</li> </ul>
	<b>Educational environment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal and informal</li> <li>• Community of scholars within discipline/ degree program</li> </ul>		<b>Educational environment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standards for physical learning space</li> <li>• Evaluation of learning spaces</li> <li>• Effective use of existing resources</li> </ul>

Level	Standards	Responsibility	Evaluation method
<b>University</b>	<b>Educational outcomes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graduate qualities</li> <li>• Prepared for learning, life and work experiences</li> <li>• Success in accessing further study opportunities</li> <li>• Rewarding career paths</li> <li>• Contributing to the community</li> </ul>		<b>Educational outcomes, experience and environment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student survey results used to set targets and benchmark at faculty and University level</li> <li>• Meets requirements for accreditation at discipline/ professional level</li> <li>• Meets requirements for Australian Qualifications Framework</li> <li>• Meets requirements for Higher Education Standards</li> <li>• Meets requirements for professional regulatory bodies e.g. Australian Health Practitioners Regulatory Authority</li> <li>• Cycle of Academic Board/ UE faculty reviews, including learning and teaching processes and practices</li> <li>• Meets standards set by Group of Eight (Go8) universities and benchmarked in the Go8 Quality Verification Scheme</li> </ul>
	<b>Educational experience</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engagement and enquiry to challenge students with novel problems and issues at every stage of the educational process</li> </ul>		
	<b>Educational environment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Physical spaces and equipment</li> <li>• Virtual learning environment</li> <li>• Supports working together</li> </ul>		

## **SCHEDULE TWO**

---

### **TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR ACADEMIC UNIT REVIEW PANELS**

#### **OBJECTIVES**

Reviews of academic units aim to ensure their capacity to deliver teaching and learning, research and the best outcomes for society at the highest possible standard, and in a manner that is academically and financially sustainable and aligned with the University's strategic goals.

#### **ROLE OF PANEL**

To achieve the objectives, the panel will:

- (a) review and report on the academic unit's goals, strategy and achievements in relation to:
  - (i) teaching and learning, including curriculum development and research training;
  - (ii) research and development;
  - (iii) external relations;
  - (iv) equity issues; and
  - (v) internationalisation;
- (b) assess and report on the alignment of the unit's goals with the University's strategic plan;
- (c) assess and report on the allocation resources within the unit, and its strategies for managing and improving its financial performance in relation to:
  - (i) teaching;
  - (ii) research;
  - (iii) other sources of income; and
  - (iv) controls on expenditure;
- (d) assess and report on the effectiveness of the unit's organisational structure in delivery its strategy and achieving its goals;
- (e) make recommendations for optimising teaching, research and benefit to society, in relation to the unit's goals, strategy, resource allocation and sustainability;
- (f) assess and make recommendations for the unit's course profile, in terms of academic excellence, demand, quality and sustainability.

#### **MEMBERSHIP OF PANEL**

- (1) Panel members are appointed jointly by the Provost and the Chair of the Academic Board, each of whom may choose to sit on a review committee or nominate a representative to do so.
- (2) Review panels will consist of five members, plus a chair. If appropriate, an additional two members may be appointed.



- (3) Review panels will be comprised of at least:
- (a) three senior academics with disciplinary or management knowledge relevant to the unit under review, and at least two of whom should be external to the University;
  - (b) a senior academic from within the unit under review, who is neither a dean or associate dean; and
  - (c) a member of the Academic Board nominated by the Chair of the Academic Board.

## SCHEDULE THREE

### Group of Eight (Go8) Quality Verification System (QVS) Review Report

<b>Quality Verification System Review Report</b>	
Date:	
Unit of Study:	
Program Coordinator:	
Faculty:	
Associate Dean (Education):	
Head of School:	
<b>Overall summary judgement of the subject (unit of study) by Go8 reviewer</b>	
The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate. <i>Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment.</i>	
The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate. <i>HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations.</i>	
There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed. <i>These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review.</i>	
<b>Overall response to the review</b>	
Do you have any feedback on the review report?	
<b>Review of Specified Learning Objectives</b>	
Could the scope and/or clarity of the learning objectives be improved based on QVS feedback?	
If so, how should the course learning objectives be amended to reflect the intended outcomes of the unit and its contribution to course learning outcomes, including the University's graduate qualities?	
Response to comparison of learning objectives at other Go8 universities.	
<b>Review of Assessment Tasks</b>	
Response to suitability of assessment tasks – could assessments be modified to better align with unit learning outcomes?	
Could the assessment requirements, standards and rubrics be made clearer to students?	
Are assessment tasks, criteria and rubrics appropriate to measure unit learning outcomes.	



Response to comparison of assessment tasks and marking criteria with other Go8 universities.	
<b>Action Plan for Changes in Response to QVS Review</b>	
<b>Further comments</b>	
<b>Identify how reviewer feedback could be used to enhance other educational offerings across the School or faculty</b>	
<i>To be completed by faculty Associate Dean (Education)</i>	

**Information for Program Coordinators and Associate Deans**

The Go8 QVS Review Report aligns with the feedback provided in the attached review. Program coordinators are asked to provide a response to the feedback in the review, and identify (if possible) ways in which the feedback could be incorporated in future offerings of the unit (or similar units of study).

Where a course review section receives a grade of 'Completely' or no explanation is provided in the feedback box below ('please list up to three reasons for making this rating') a response is not required. Program coordinators are also asked to develop an action plan for implementing changes based on feedback in the review, which will be provided to the University Executive and Academic Board.

## SCHEDULE FOUR

---

### Guidelines for Majors

In these guidelines:

<b>ASCED code</b>	means the Australian Standard Classification of Education Code established by the Australian Bureau of Statistics
<b>selective</b>	means a unit of study which may be selected from a group of units within a major to fulfil requirements for the major.
<b>Table A</b>	means a list, specified in award course resolutions, of units of study, majors, minors and streams available to be taken in an award course. Unless otherwise specified, Table A for an award course, is only available to students enrolled in the award course, except by special permission of the unit of study coordinator
<b>Table S</b>	means a list, specified in award course resolutions, of units of study, minors and majors common to all Liberal Studies degrees and some specialist and generalist degrees, which are available to be taken in an award course.

**(1) Purpose of the major.** The major should:

- (a) develop depth of expertise in a coherent field of study that is associated with an identifiable community of scholars and is recognised as comprising a distinct and valuable body of scholarship;
- (b) be supported by demonstrated expertise and staff capacity in the area of the major;
- (c) be characterised by a distinctive set of learning outcomes, among which should be depth of disciplinary expertise;
- (d) develop the graduate qualities.

**(2) Table A and Table S majors and minors.**

- (a) A major or a minor which is offered in more than one table of units or degree must be identical in all the tables or degrees in which it is offered. This is to enable Committees of the Academic Board to oversee the inclusion of new programs, majors and minors in degrees with a shared curriculum, and changes to units of study tables in approved shared curriculum components (except core units of multidisciplinary majors and minors) without the involvement of the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.
- (b) If a faculty wishes to offer a different version of a major or minor in a Table A and Table S, each version will need a different name and the listing of the Table S version will need to be approved by the Board of Interdisciplinary Studies.



- (3) Overlap of core units and selectives within different majors.**
- (a) Core units that are common to two majors may overlap within the first year of majors (up to 12 credit points) without additional scrutiny by the faculty beyond that which is normally given to ensure cohesion, rigour and appropriate development and alignment of the learning outcomes for the major.
  - (b) Where overlap within the major core occurs beyond first year, this should be for sound disciplinary reasons. The decision to do so should be made on the basis of an argued case presented to and considered by the faculty, in order to ensure its necessity and that the major retains distinctiveness. With this caveat, both core and selective units offered within majors may overlap.
  - (c) For students, while a single unit of major 'core' may be counted against two majors, selective units may not be double counted in this way. A student wishing to complete two majors with overlapping core must choose unique selectives in order to complete the credit point requirements of those majors.
- (4) Overlaps between major and stream**
- (a) Units of study may count towards both the requirements of a stream and the requirements of the major, provided that the major meets these guidelines and requirements of the [Learning and Teaching Policy 2015](#).
- (5) Pre-requisites and assumed knowledge.**
- (a) Units of study within a major must not have pre-requisites for units outside the major that would effectively require a student to complete more than 48 credit points to complete requirements for the major.
    - (i) Where a major is offered in Table S, units within the major must not have pre-requisites for units outside the major.
    - (ii) Where a major is offered in Table A for a degree, or only to students in a particular stream, a unit within the major may have a pre-requisite outside the major, provided those units are core units for the degree or stream;
  - (b) Units of study within a major may specify assumed knowledge outside the major.
- (6) The 3000 level (or higher for 192 credit point professional or specialist degrees) Project unit**
- (a) Projects should be designed to explore challenging problems that arise in realistic settings with solutions of clear impact on issues of importance to partners in the project.
  - (b) The problems on which projects are built should be authentic and offer a rich context that may, depending on the project, also invite interdisciplinary perspectives.
  - (c) The project should be conceived of as an integrative experience that draws together disciplinary knowledge and demonstrates the learning outcomes of the major in a real-world application. Disciplinary expertise demonstrated in the project should reflect the standards expected in the major.
  - (d) The project should form the focus of the entire 6 credit point unit and develop graduate qualities.





- (e) Where the project is interdisciplinary, it is recommended that enrolment be through a shell unit specific to each major to enable the appropriate flow of funds to the school or discipline, appropriate ASCED code and a contact point in the discipline.
- (f) A single shell unit in the major may be used for both disciplinary and interdisciplinary projects (including multi-faculty projects) to simplify the unit structure.
- (g) Interdisciplinary learning is greatly enriched by involving students from other faculties. The Education, Enterprise and Engagement unit in the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) portfolio brokers projects with external partners suitable to students from multiple faculties and assists in managing the projects.

**(7) Unit requiring application of disciplinary expertise in an interdisciplinary context**

- (a) Disciplinary knowledge developed in a major involves an understanding of disciplinary assumptions, methodologies and foundational knowledge and an ability to apply that to solve problems encountered within the discipline.
- (b) The interdisciplinary unit should provide an opportunity for students to apply disciplinary knowledge to problems, work or communicate with people with different disciplinary expertise and demonstrate interdisciplinary effectiveness.
- (c) 'Interdisciplinary' should be understood in an inclusive sense. It may involve any or all of:
  - (i) the integration of knowledge, methods and skills of two or more disciplines;
  - (ii) the application of skills, knowledge and methods of two or more disciplines to the components of a problem without necessarily integrating them (sometimes called multi-disciplinary);
  - (iii) the integration of disciplines into a common framework that transcends any one discipline; or
  - (iv) the interactions between disciplines and society (sometimes called transdisciplinary).

The interdisciplinary unit may be the project unit.

## **SCHEDULE FIVE**

---

### **COURSE QUALITY REVIEWS**

#### **REVIEW PREPARATION**

- (1) In October, faculty Curriculum Managers, the Quality Unit and SFS will confirm the courses for review in the following year.
- (2) After the courses for review have been confirmed:
  - (a) the Curriculum Managers will notify the Program Directors of the courses selected for review; and
  - (b) the SFS will write the required market analysis for each course.
- (3) In January, the Quality Unit will send Curriculum Managers an information pack which contains:
  - (a) SFS's market analysis;
  - (b) the student experience survey dashboard;
  - (c) the student and course information dashboard;
  - (d) a course review form which includes instructions for Program Directors, the terms of reference and minimum panel membership; and
  - (e) an exemplar course review.
- (4) Curriculum Managers will use this information to populate the course review form with relevant data and return the form to the Program Director.
- (5) The Program Director will organise the Course Quality Review Panel.

#### **COURSE QUALITY REVIEW REPORT – PROCESS AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

- (1) The Program Director will:
  - (a) provide analysis and narrative relating to the data in the course review form;
  - (b) prepare an initial report without recommendations; and
  - (c) provide the initial report to the Course Quality Review Panel.
- (2) The Course Quality Review Panel is responsible for:
  - (a) reviewing the data in the initial report;
  - (b) interviewing stakeholders, which may include:
    - (i) staff and students on the course;
    - (ii) alumni; and
    - (iii) employers.
  - (c) completing the initial report; and
  - (d) drafting recommendations for the course quality review report.
- (3) The Course Quality Review Panel will:



- (a) meet with wider University stakeholders to discuss the draft recommendations. Depending on the recommendations, relevant stakeholders may include:
    - (i) the Head of Curriculum Management and Strategy in the DVC (Education) portfolio;
    - (ii) a representative from SFS;
    - (iii) a member of the Dean's Executive Committee;
    - (iv) a member of the faculty Education Committee;
  - (b) complete the course quality review report, including:
    - (i) recommendations; and
    - (ii) an implementation plan; and
  - (c) provide the report to the faculty Education Committee.
- (4) The faculty Education Committee is responsible for:
- (a) reviewing the course quality review report and its recommendations;
  - (b) if appropriate, endorsing the recommendations; and
  - (c) submitting the course quality review report to the Dean's Executive Committee.
- (5) The Dean's Executive Committee is responsible for:
- (a) reviewing the course quality review report and its recommendations;
  - (b) if appropriate, recommending that the Dean signs off on the recommendations; and
  - (c) submitting the report to the Faculty Board.
- (6) The Faculty Board is responsible for:
- (a) reviewing and, if appropriate, endorsing the course quality review report and its recommendations;
  - (b) submitting the report and recommendations to the Academic Quality Committee.
- (7) The Academic Quality Committee is responsible for:
- (a) reviewing and, if appropriate, endorsing the course quality review report and its recommendations; and
  - (b) submitting the course quality review report to the Academic Board.
- (8) The Academic Board is responsible for noting the course quality review report and its recommendations.
- (9) The Quality Unit is responsible for:
- (a) monitoring the faculty's progress in implementing the course quality review report's recommendations; and
  - (b) reporting to the Academic Quality Committee about implementation of the course quality review report's recommendations.
- (10) The implementation report required by subclause 9(b) will be submitted to the Academic Quality Committee three months after the course quality review report's approval by the Academic Board.