

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)

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:

CCPC means the University Executive Curriculum and Course Planning Committee.

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.

Sydney Student means the University’s online student administration system.

Sydney Research Seminars	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.
Table A	means a list, specified in award course resolutions, of units of study, majors, minors and streams available to be taken in an award course.
unit of study master file	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.
USS	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](#);
[CCPC 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 an expression of interest or 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(6);
 - (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 submit an expression of interest to the CCPC before work commences on developing the new or changed course.
- (6) Expressions of interest must:
 - (a) explain the strategic rationale for the course or changed course;
 - (b) briefly outline the business case;
 - (c) identify potential issues which may arise in the development process; and
 - (d) be submitted in the form prescribed by the CCPC.

Note: [Expression of interest forms](#) are available from the staff intranet.
- (7) The CCPC will consider the expression of interest and determine whether to recommend it to the University Executive for endorsement.
 - (a) The CCPC may request a faculty representative to attend at a meeting of the CCPC explain the case for the new or changed course.
- (8) If the University Executive endorses the expression of interest, the faculty may then develop a full course proposal, using the template determined by the Academic Board for that purpose.

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 full proposal must then be submitted for review and endorsement to:
 - (a) the CCPC, and if endorsed
 - (b) the Undergraduate or Graduate Studies Committee (as appropriate) of the Academic Board.
- (11) 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.
- (12) 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;](#)
[CCPC 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) 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) **External reference points** will be obtained by participating in the Group of 8 Quality Verification System and through other benchmarking reports commissioned by faculties.
- (9) 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 Board Academic Standards and Policy Committee.
- (10) 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.
- (11) If a report does not identify issues warranting response or comment, the Academic Standards and Policy 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)
Administrator:	Academic Director, Education Policy and Quality
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



Provision	Amendment	Commencing
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
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

SCHEDULE ONE

Standards and methods for evaluating educational excellence

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

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

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

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

Quality Verification System Review Report	
Date:	
Unit of Study: Program Coordinator: Faculty: Associate Dean (Education): Head of School:	
Overall summary judgement of the subject (unit of study) by Go8 reviewer	
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>	
Overall response to the review	
Do you have any feedback on the review report?	
Review of Specified Learning Objectives	
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.	
Review of Assessment Tasks	
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.	
Action Plan for Changes in Response to QVS Review	
Further comments	
Identify how reviewer feedback could be used to enhance other educational offerings across the School or Faculty	
<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:

ASCED code	means the Australian Standard Classification of Education Code established by the Australian Bureau of Statistics
selective	means a unit of study which may be selected from a group of units within a major to fulfil requirements for the major.
Table A	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
Table S	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) 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.



- (3) 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](#).
- (4) 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.
- (5) 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.
- (6) 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.