# RESEARCH SCHOOL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE (RSCS) CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Meeting No.2/2016 of the RSCS Curriculum Development Committee will be held on

Thursday 24 March 2016 at 12pm
in Room B123, RSISE Building (115).

Apologies and enquiries should be sent to: Elizabeth.Nunrom@anu.edu.au

## Agenda Summary

### Part 1 – Procedural matters

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Announcements and Apologies</td>
<td>For information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>For decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation: That the Committee confirm the minutes of the meeting 1/2016.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment: Minutes of RSCS CDC Meeting 1/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Matters Arising from Minutes and Action Items</td>
<td>For information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment: Action Item list of RSCS CDC Meetings</td>
<td>For information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Confidential Items</td>
<td>For information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 2 – Reports

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Report from the Chair</td>
<td>For information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Report from Program Convenors</td>
<td>For information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment: Appendix 6A - Written Reports from Program Convenors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 3 – Curriculum Proposals

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Program Reviews</td>
<td>For decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation: That the Committee review the Program Review documents and endorse them for transmission the College Education Committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment: Appendix 7A – Email regarding EFTSL targets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 7B – RSCS Program Review Forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 4 – Education Policy and Related Issues

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>CECS Internships Guidelines</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachments: Appendix 8A – Internship Guidelines</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 8B – Sub Dean of Engaged Learning Briefing for the CEC</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Ghost Writing</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachments: Appendix 9A – Assignment King and the associations with ANU</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. **Inherent Requirements**  
*Attachments: Appendix 10A – ESQC 5/2015 Inherent Requirements background paper*  
**For discussion**

11. **New Exam Policy**  
*Attachments: Appendix 11A – New Exam policy email*  
**For information**

12. **Recording of Lectures policy**  
*Attachments: Appendix 12A – ESQC 1/2016 Recording of Lectures background paper*  
**For information**

### Part 5 – Items of other business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Meeting Dates</th>
<th>For information</th>
<th>55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Other business and question time</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 1 – Procedural matters

* Item 1  Announcements and apologies

1.1 Apologies
To be received

1.2 Announcements

* Item 2  Minutes

The minutes of meeting of the RSCS CDC Committee 1/2016 held on 25 February 2016 are to be confirmed.

Recommendation

That the Committee confirm the minutes of the meeting 1/2016.

ACTION REQUIRED
For discussion ☐    For decision ☑    For information ☐    School response ☐

Item 3  Matters Arising from the Minutes

For the Committee to raise and note any matters arising from the Minutes.

    3.1 Action Item List

Item 5  Confidential items

Consistent with the policy and practice of Council, all matters in the agenda of the University Education Committee relating to individual persons, including appointments, enrolment, candidacy for degrees, personal details, performance and conduct are declared to be confidential. If any member wishes to raise a confidential matter in relation to any other item, he or she should do so under this Item. After consideration of the confidential items, observers will be admitted to the meeting.
RESEARCH SCHOOL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 1/2016 of the Research School of Computer Science Curriculum Development Committee was held on Thursday 25 January 2016 at 12pm in Room B123, RSISE Building (115).


In Attendance: Mrs Elizabeth Nunrom, Jochen Trumpf.

Absent: Alexander Richardson

PART 1 – PROCEDURAL MATTERS

ITEM 1 WELCOMES, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND APOLOGIES

1.1 Welcomes and Apologies
The Chair welcomed all members to the first meeting for 2016. He welcomed Tony Hosking who was replacing Mark Reid.

1.2 Announcements
There were no announcements

ITEM 2 MINUTES

The Committee resolved to confirm the minutes of meeting 4/2016 of the RSCS Curriculum Development Committee held on 24 September 2015.

ITEM 3 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES AND ACTION ITEMS

The Chair noted the Matters arising and updated the status of each item as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>DETAILS</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/2015</td>
<td>Director to consolidate feedback gathered on the “why, How, What” Discussion of the Grounding Principles and Graduate Attributes and appoint a group to review the efficacy of the current educational programs against the identified mission/values.</td>
<td>Alistair Rendell</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART 2 REPORTS

ITEM 4 REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

The Chair briefed the Committee on the following items:

**CAAC Item 7: International Coursework Admission Turnaround times** – Target turnaround times would be proposed, and it would be considered whether deferral requests could be managed by International Admissions. Paul Melloy was part of the working party and would keep the Committee updated. There is also a proposal to automate credit as far as possible via means of a database.

**CAAC Item 8: Review of Admission Requirements for Graduate Coursework Programs** – The proposal to set a default entry requirement of 5.0 for Masters and Graduate Diploma programs, with a default entry of a Bachelor pass degree for Graduate Certificates. Any deviation from this default would need to be justified on an annual basis. There was opposition to the GPA of 5.0, with the GPA of 5.5 being preferred by most Colleges. The paper would be amended for further discussion at CAAC.

**Accreditation** – the Engineers Australia report is now complete. This would be circulated and the Chair requested that members read it. The Australian Computer Society draft report was completed but feedback had to be given as there were a number of factual errors that needed to be corrected for the final report.

**Resolution:**
The Curriculum Development Committee resolved to note the report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/2015</td>
<td>Associate Director (Education) to annotate the Masters Working Group documentation with action items and circulate to the Committee for discussion and action.</td>
<td>Ramesh Sankaranarayana</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>A Postgraduate Coursework working party will be held after the Undergraduate Working Party has been completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2015</td>
<td>Feedback on common position descriptors to be sent to Ramesh Sankaranarayana by 29 September 2015</td>
<td>CDC Members</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ramesh to complete position descriptors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2015</td>
<td>Reviews be conducted of learning outcomes for all 3000 and 4000 series courses with feedback to Ramesh by 16 October 2015</td>
<td>CDC Members</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Bindi has confirmed that this has been completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2015</td>
<td>Report of external audit of Honours projects to be written and presented to CDC.</td>
<td>John Slaney</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>John Slaney to write a short description of the process for distribution to CDC members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2015</td>
<td>Student Services to be informed of any course which require course requisite changes</td>
<td>Ramesh Sankaranarayana</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Any changes to be submitted by 29 August</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM 6 REPORT FROM THE ASSOCIATE DEAN (EDUCATION)

The Associate Dean (Education) proposed a new more coordinated process for implementing major curriculum amendments. He noted that the external review process took place every 5 years, and these reports could now be used to satisfy ANU’s internal review requirements. He proposed that major curriculum amendments should be driven by these reviews, with changes made in response to review requirements/recommendations being implemented at the half-way point in the review cycle. He noted that this would allow sufficient time to plan and implement any necessary changes, and also to evaluate the result of said changes after implementation. This would also make the formulation of review submissions a much easier process.

He noted that as RSCS had just completed an external and internal review process, it should be planned that curriculum changes should be implemented approximately 2 years from now.

It was noted that the program review due date was the CDC Agenda deadline date of 15 March and that PPM were currently in the process of providing the statistics.

Resolution:
The Curriculum Development Committee resolved to note the report.

ITEM 7 REPORT FROM THE PROGRAM CONVENORS

The Chair noted that this would be a regular item on the agenda and that Convenors were requested to have their written reports in by the agenda deadline.

7.1 Eric McCreath – BAC (HONS) and BAC R&D
- There would be a welcome for BAC R&D students
- There appeared to be 40 students currently in the BAC R&D program, with 15 commencing students

Action: Jochen Trumpf to show Eric McCreath how to obtain student numbers through ANU Insight

7.2 John Slaney – Honours convenor
- Normal numbers
- A number of problems with students enrolling late and only finding out about them now
- Plans to set up a new application, similar to the one used in Science, where students apply quite some time in advance.
- It was noted that Science had a system for both internal and external Honours students

Action: John Slaney to obtain more information regarding the Science Honours application process

7.3 Lynette Johns-Boast – Postgraduate Coursework Convenor
- It would be beneficial for students to have access to similar facilities as the Honours students
- As a ‘transfer only’ entry program, the program can be somewhat invisible to students.
- The ‘transfer only’ entry process should be maintained as the easiest way to be sure of the quality of students entering the program.
- How do we identify students who are capable and/or interested in undertaking this degree?

Action:
- Lynette Johns-Boast to speak to Janette Rawlinson regarding the possibility of facilities for MComp (Adv) students.
- Paul Melloy to run report to identify students with 24 units remaining in the Master of Computing and a high GPA

7.4 Tom Gedeon – BIT and DipComp

- ANU College had a new lecturer for COMP1710, a former MPhil student, so a good working relationship has been formed
- There has been an issue where Computer Science convenors for courses which are also in the Diploma are not aware of the ANU College course. Communication in this area should be improved
- There is confusion regarding oversight/responsibilities of ANU College and ANU within the Diploma of Computing e.g. Should ANU College be using CECS labs?
- The Associate Dean (Education) noted that ANU responsibilities were:
  - To share all course materials with ANU College e.g. giving access to last year’s Wattle site
  - To assist with benchmarking by setting standards and looking over a few examples of marking
- ANU College should not be given access to College resources or help in setting up computing systems
- It was noted that the requests for ANU College to be given access to the labs came from CECS IT, and so this information has not yet been passed on to them.
- It was requested that further discussion be taken offline, and also to remember that, although taught and managed by ANU College, the students in this degree were CECS students.

Actions:
- Jochen Trumpf and Alistair Rendell to discuss this issue further

Resolution:
The Curriculum Development Committee resolved to note the reports and associated actions

PART 3 CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

ITEM 8 RESEARCH SCHOOL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

8.1 Master of Innovation and Professional Practice – This program is currently under development. Committee members were encouraged to review the proposal.

Action: Any feedback to be sent to Shayne.Flint@anu.edu.au by 10 March 2016

8.2 Bachelor of Data, Statistics and Society Honours Plan – This program has been developed as part of the accreditation requirements for the Bachelor of Data, Statistics and Society program. It follows the same model as the existing Bachelor of Philosophy, Politics and Statistics.

Action:
- Any feedback to be sent to Elizabeth.Nunrom@anu.edu.au by 10 March 2016
- John Slaney to review Bachelor of Data, Statistics and Society to ensure that the entry requirements for the Honours plan were satisfied
- John Slaney to review all Honours plan Admission requirements in order to ensure that all meeting the Honours Working Party requirements and report back to RSCS CDC 2/2016.

8.3 Master of Applied Data Analytics – This program was endorsed at the University Education Committee and will now go to Academic Board for approval.
8.4 Bachelor of Data, Statistics and Society – This program was endorsed at the University Education Committee, subject to conditions, and will now go to Academic Board for approval. The conditions are that third-party market research be provided and an Honours plan be proposed by UEC 6/2016.

Resolution:
The Curriculum Development Committee resolved to note the reports and associated actions

PART 4 EDUCATION POLICY AND RELATED ISSUES

ITEM 9 UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION WORKING PARTY UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

The Committee discussed the new undergraduate model, with discussion including the following points:

- Clarification that the diagrams on page 69 of the agenda show an alternative pathway for students with no background, rather than 5 courses in a semester
- That each degree would have different Graduate Outcomes but a common core which cover all of the ACM IEEE Tier 1 requirements plus many of the Tier 2 requirements
- Additional courses in the core for the 4 year programs will mean that it will cover all of the Tier 2 requirements as well for these programs
- Concerns that the optional major/specialisation may produce confusion amongst international students, causing them to miss out on accreditation
- Engineers Australia and the Australian Computer Society need to be consulted to ensure the new model meets accreditation requirements
- Are students able to undertake these degrees as a flexible double and still meet accreditation requirements?
- Pre-requisite pathway mapping needs to be done for specialisations
- Proposals, including programs, all new/amended subplans and/or courses, need to be submitted by 4 April, if the changes are to be implemented for 2017. Changes should be made at one time, not by increments.
- Transition and Compatibility arrangements should be developed for current students.

Resolution:
The Curriculum Development Committee resolved that:
1. Jochen Trumpf and Alistair Rendell discuss the proposal approval process
2. Any feedback be sent to Ramesh.Sankaranarayana@anu.edu.au as soon as possible.
3. Student Services would be requested to assist in providing proposal templates

ITEM 10 PRE-REQUISITES ON PROGRAMS & COURSES

The Committee discussed pre-requisites in the Masters program, with discussion including the following points:

- the difficulty of having a program which tried to cater to two very different cohorts
- the problem of ‘odds and evens’ where courses necessary to a specialisation were not offered when needed
- That a pre-requisite should be put on a course when, if the student doesn’t do the pre-requisite, the student will fail the subsequent course
• That pre-requisites may be necessary for one cohort of students and not for another depending on background, and that the design of the program should take this into account
• The responsibility to offer at least one specialisation that the student can complete, even if it isn’t the student’s chosen specialisation. However, it should be endeavoured to enable the completion of most specialisations.

Resolution:
The Curriculum Development Committee resolved that:
1. A review would be undertaken of Postgraduate programs
2. Enrolment data (timeline series) should be obtained for all postgraduate specialisations

ITEM 11 HONOURS COURSES: EMBEDDED AND 3+1
The Committee discussed Honours courses in embedded and 3+1 honours program, with discussion including the following points:
• That the same course, taught at the same AQF level 8, can be treated as a single cohort even if they have different codes for administrative reasons
• All course information for both courses must reflect the AQF level 8 status
• It was necessary to have the 4000-level code as students in a 3+1 Honours program must enrol in a 4000-level course
• The possibility of have an R&D student enrolling in a 4000-level course in their second or third year
• The possibility of just having 4000-level honours courses paired with 8000-level Masters courses, with the inactivation of the 2000-level honours courses.

Resolution:
The Curriculum Development Committee resolved that Elizabeth Nunrom would check with ASQO regarding the possibility of students taking 4000-level courses in their second or third years.

ITEM 12 SELS – COURSES UNDER 50% FOR THE SECOND TIME
The Committee noted the courses which had an overall satisfaction rate (OSR) of under 60% in Semester 2, 2015, and that the courses COMP4500 and COMP3100 received an OSR of under 50%, COMP4500 for the second time. It was noted that:
• COMP4500 and COMP3100 were co-badged courses along with COMP3500 and COMP3550, which received better results and that, if averaged across all four courses, the OSR would be above 50%.
• It was also noted that a new approach had been taken for these courses, which may have had an effect on the SELS results
• An internal survey conducted by the convenor, which had a higher response rate than the SELS survey, indicated a higher satisfaction rate

Resolution:
The Committee resolved that an internal review would be conducted of COMP4500/ COMP3100/ COMP3500 and COMP3550
ITEM 13 UEC SCOPING ITEM
The Chair noted that the list of ‘internationalisation’ topics to be discussed at UEC were in the agenda. Any comments or feedback could be directed to Jochen Trumpf.

Resolution:
That the Committee note the UEC discussion topics and any feedback be sent to Jochen.Trumpf@anu.edu.au before the relevant UEC meeting.

ITEM 14 REPORT OF THE INTERNSHIPS PROJECT MANAGEMENT GROUP
The Chair noted that this report was just for information and that a College-specific report was currently being developed and would be tabled at a later CDC meeting. Dr Shayne Flint, the CECS representative on the Internships Project Management Group, noted that the report would support the current CECS approach to Internships, with the benefit of added University Resources.

Resolution:
The Curriculum Development Committee resolved to note the report.

ITEM 15 ACADEMIC CALENDAR 2017, 2018, 2019
The Committee noted the new academic calendar dates for 2017 onwards.

Resolution:
The Curriculum Development Committee resolved to note the report.

ITEM 16 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2017 ACADEMIC CALENDAR
The Committee noted that the new 12-week academic calendar may require some revision to workload statements and other course information. The Associate Dean (Education) noted that Byron Vickers was working on a new course system which would make reviewing course information easier and push information into Programs and Courses and course outlines.

Resolution:
The Curriculum Development Committee resolved to note the report and that Byron Vickers would talk to all Program Convenors.

PART 6 ITEMS OF OTHER BUSINESS

ITEM 17 MEETING DATES
The Committee noted the Meeting dates for 2016, especially:
- April 4 – Deadline for Program Amendments, including any associated changes to courses or subplans
- 29 August – Deadline for changes to courses scheduled in Semester 1, 2017

Resolution:
The Curriculum Development Committee resolved to note the dates of the 2016 Curriculum Development and College Education Committee meetings.
ITEM 18 OTHER BUSINESS AND QUESTION TIME

18.1 Honours Calculation
The Committee discussed the calculation of the final Honour mark, noting:

- The Computer Science method of calculation had been brought in line with that of Engineering
- That for students receiving credit in first and second years, the weighting would be changed to reflect this
- The grade/mark calculation spreadsheet would be maintained by CECS Student Services and provided to convenors
- That there was a need for the method to be transparent to both students and markers

Shayne Flint registered his objection to the change. Further feedback can be directed to Paul.Melloy@anu.edu.au

Resolution:
The Curriculum Development Committee resolved to note the discussion

The meeting closed at 2.01pm

EJN 29/02/2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/2015</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Associate Director (Education) to annotate the Masters Working Group documentation with action items and circulate to the Committee for discussion and action.</td>
<td>Ramesh Sankaranarayana</td>
<td>4/2015</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>A Postgraduate Coursework working party will be held after the Undergraduate Working Party has been completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2015</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Position Descriptors to be completed</td>
<td>Ramesh Sankaranarayana</td>
<td>4/2015</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2015</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Report of external audit of Honours projects to be written and presented to CDC.</td>
<td>Ramesh Sankaranarayana</td>
<td>4/2015</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>John Slaney to write a short description of the process for distribution to CDC members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2015</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Student Services to be informed of any course which require course requisite changes</td>
<td>Ramesh Sankaranarayana</td>
<td>4/2015</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Any changes to be submitted by 29 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Jochen Trumpf to show Eric McCreath how to obtain student numbers through ANU Insight</td>
<td>Jochen Trumpf and Eric McCreath</td>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>John Slaney to obtain more information regarding the Science Honours application process</td>
<td>John Slaney</td>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Lynette Johns-Boast to speak to Janette Rawlinson regarding the possibility of facilities for MComp (Adv) students.</td>
<td>Lynette Johns-Boast</td>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Paul Melloy to run report to identify students with 24 units remaining in their Master of Computing and a high GPA</td>
<td>Paul Melloy</td>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Jochen Trumpf and Alistair Rendell to discuss issues surround the Diploma of Computing further</td>
<td>Jochen Trumpf and Alistair Rendell</td>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Any feedback on the Master of Innovation and Professional Practice to be sent to <a href="mailto:Shayne.Flint@anu.edu.au">Shayne.Flint@anu.edu.au</a> by 10 March 2016</td>
<td>Committee members</td>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>10-Mar</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>John Slaney to review Bachelor of Data, Statistics and Society to ensure that the entry requirements for the Honours plan were satisfied</td>
<td>John Slaney</td>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>10-Mar</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>John Slaney to review all Honours plan Admission requirements in order to ensure that all meeting the Honours Working Party requirements and report back to RSCS CDC 2/2016</td>
<td>John Slaney</td>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>15-Mar</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Due</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Any feedback on the Bachelor of Data, Statistics and Society (Honours) to be sent to <a href="mailto:Elizabeth.Nunrom@anu.edu.au">Elizabeth.Nunrom@anu.edu.au</a> by 10 March 2016</td>
<td>Committee members</td>
<td>10-Mar</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>The Curriculum Development Committee resolved that any feedback on the new undergraduate model be sent to <a href="mailto:Ramesh.Sankaranarayana@anu.edu.au">Ramesh.Sankaranarayana@anu.edu.au</a> as soon as possible</td>
<td>Committee members</td>
<td>As soon as possible</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>The Curriculum Development Committee resolved that Jochen Trumpf and Alistair Rendell discuss the proposal approval process</td>
<td>Jochen Trumpf and Alistair Rendell</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>The Curriculum Development Committee resolved that enrolment data (timeline series) should be obtained for all postgraduate specialisations</td>
<td>Ramesh Sankaranarayana</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6A – Report from Program Convenors

BAC Convenor report

- BAC R&D students welcome was well attended and went well.
- 8 Weihai 2+2 students in BAC failed a single course (COMP2310) in S2 2015, the plan is to meet with them individually to work out the best way forward.
Part 3 – Curriculum Proposals

Item 7 Program Reviews

Purpose
To review the Program Review documents from the Research School of Computer Science submitted to the Committee for their endorsement

Recommendation
That the Committee review the Program Review documents and endorse them for transmission the College Education Committee.

ACTION REQUIRED
For discussion ☐  For decision ☑  For information ☐  School response ☐

Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Review</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Software Engineering</td>
<td>4708</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Advanced Computing (R&amp;D) (Hons)</td>
<td>4717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sponsor
Associate Director of Education, Research School of Computer Science

Appendices
Appendix 7A – Email regarding EFTSL targets
Appendix 7B - RSCS Program Review Forms
Hi Kim, Klaus

That would suggest we have a strategic plan for student numbers.....)

No there is nothing I am aware of but what I suspect is that the plan is:

- to hold commencing and continuing numbers at a similar level to the current intake but endeavour to improve the quality of the student body through improved marketing and promotion, and improved student experience.
- to improve diversity in our undergraduate students - gender, Low SES, Indigenous, country diversity in international students
- to look for growth in graduate coursework initiatives rather than undergraduate

I think this is a view supported by the VC and Dean but isn't (yet)articulated in any plans I have seen. It might be ok just to include the above text in the document though they may then ask for targets against the gender etc initiatives.

We will find it difficult just to keep domestic numbers flat as computing improves in demand - there is a link between the two disciplines.

Hope this is of some help.

Paul

-----Original Message-----
From: Kim Pullen
Sent: Wednesday, 16 March 2016 9:00 AM
To: Paul Melloy
Subject: FW: urgent - EFTSL
Importance: High

Hi Paul,

I don’t suppose you know?

Thanks,

Kim

-----Original Message-----
From: Klaus Weber
Sent: Tuesday, 15 March 2016 10:02 PM
To: Robert Mahony; Kim Pullen
Subject: urgent - EFTSL
Importance: High

Hi,

does whether of you know or have access to the school’s EFTSL targets? See comment in doc. Also applies for BE R&D

Thanks
Klaus
Academic Award Review (Coursework)

How to use this form

To fill out this Microsoft Word Form, click underlined italicised grey text, e.g. 41T, then make a selection or enter text.

To edit the fields in the document headers or footers, first double click in the header area. Once edited, the field will be updated on all subsequent pages.

Long-answer text fields allow the use of standard formatting features, such as bullet points, and will span pages if necessary.

Program details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program name</th>
<th>Bachelor of Software Engineering (Honours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program code</td>
<td>4708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time duration in years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units required for completion</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQF level and type</td>
<td>Level 8 - Bachelor Honours Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Fee places available</td>
<td>Commonwealth Support, Domestic Tuition Fees and International Student Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External accreditation body (if any)</td>
<td>Engineers Australia and Australian Computer Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First accredited by ANU (if known)</td>
<td>41T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of last review (if known)</td>
<td>Pre-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data for this review correct at (date):</td>
<td>Wednesday 31 December 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Published Admission Requirements

- Refer to Policy: Academic Programs and Courses Accreditation for entry pathways and early exits.

- ATAR: 87
- QLD Band: 7
- International Baccalaureate: 32

ACT: Maths Methods major OR Specialist Maths (recommended)
NSW: Mathematics
SA/NT: Mathematics 1 (Single)
TAS: Mathematics Stage 2
VIC: Mathematical Methods 3 & 4 or Specialist Mathematics
QLD: Mathematics B or Mathematics C
WA: Applicable Mathematics and Calculus
IB: Mathematics (SL) or Mathematics (HL)

Published Cognate disciplines (Graduate Coursework only)

- List each discipline considered to be ‘cognate’ for the purposes of admission and credit on a new line.
Current Linked qualifications

- If this is a pathway or an exit qualification program, please name the program or programs that it is linked to. For information on pathways and exit qualifications, please see Policy: Academic Programs and Courses Accreditation

N/A

Plan details

Provide details of all academic plans included in this review
(Copy and paste fields in this section as required)

- Only plans of the same Australian Qualifications Framework level and type may be included. e.g. Bachelor of Art (Ceramics) and Bachelor of Art (Sculpture), not Bachelor of Genetics and Bachelor of Genetics with Honours.
- All plans must have the same 4-digit program code. e.g. 6789XABCD and 6789SWXYZ, not 6789XABCD and 6123XABCD.

Award or Augmentation name: Bachelor of Software Engineering
Academic plan code: 4708ASENG
CRICOS code (7 characters) if registered: 077948M

Double degrees

- Indicate if this plan is part of a double degree
  - □ Flexible Double Degree (Arts, Social Sciences, Sciences and Business 4 Year)
  - □ Flexible Double Degree (Arts, Social Sciences, Sciences and Business 5 Year)
  - ☑ Flexible Double Degree (Law, Engineering and Advanced Computing 6 Year)
  - □ Flexible Double Degree (Law)
  - ☑ Flexible Double Degree (Engineering and Advanced Computing)
  - □ Vertical Double Degree
  - □ Double Masters Degree

Published Learning outcomes

- Learning outcomes must align with the selected Australian Qualifications Framework qualification type. Refer to the embedded AQF learning outcome charts. Note that Graduate Certificate and Graduate Diploma are not included.

None published for the degree but will be developed in 2016 for UEC approval in 2017.

Governance

Responsible College: ANU College of Engineering & Computer Science
Who is the convener of the program?: Dr. Shayne Flint

Does this award have a dedicated governance committee or advisory board (i.e. other than College Education Committee)? If so, detail membership and frequency of meetings.
The Research School of Computer Science operates a Curriculum Development Committee (CDC). The membership consists of the Head of School, Associate Director Education (Chair), Associate Director (Education) from Engineering, the Convenors of each of the programs offered by the School (the BIT, BAC, BSEng, Honours and the MComp), three other academics from the School, the Manager (Student Services) or representative and a representative from the Information Systems group, CBE. The CDC meets at least twice per semester.

There is also an Industry Advisory Board that meets twice a year, which provides input into the programs run by the School, amongst other things.

Joint program responsibilities

Is this program offered in conjunction with another institution? In 200 words or fewer, describe how responsibilities for course delivery, fees, pre-enrolment engagement of students, student services and care and student visa requirements are shared.

No.

Delivery

Current Delivery mode(s): In person - 75% or more on campus, maximum 25% of courses online

☐ Off campus – this plan is administered and completed externally to the Acton campus.

☐ Intensive – this plan is to be completed by undertaking accelerated courses in a full-time block. Intensive plan duration in weeks (from commencement to submission of final assessment): 41T

☐ There is a compulsory work-based training of 41T hours per week for 41T weeks.

List all teaching periods in which students may commence study.

• i.e. Summer, First Semester, Autumn, Winter, Second Semester and/or Spring

• Note that international student visa holders must be able to complete within the normal duration of study without the need to underload or take leave.

Semester 1 or Semester 2

☐ International student visa holders are able to complete within the normal duration of study without the need to underload or take leave when commencing in all listed teaching periods.

ANU Graduate Coursework model (Graduate Coursework only)

☐ This Award is consistent with the University’s Graduate Coursework Model

☐ This Award requires approval as an exception to the ANU Graduate Coursework model.

• For low-enrolment Graduate Certificates and Graduate Diplomas, provide a strategic case for retention of this Award and attach all available evidence.
For Masters Degrees requiring more or less than 96 units, or with admission requirements other than a non-cognate Bachelor Degree, provide significant justification for creation of this Award (e.g. professional accreditation or international standards) and attach all available evidence.

Assessment alignment (Bachelor Honours Degrees only)

Provide an explanation of how the structure of assessment determines whether the Honours learning outcomes have been met.

The Engineering degrees at ANU are embedded honours 4 year programs. There is no distinct honours year but the program includes at least 48 units of AQF8 courses.

The learning outcomes of core courses have been designed to ensure that all graduates demonstrate competencies required by the accrediting authority, Engineers Australia, for honours level engineering degrees.

The Honours Mark is a weighted average percentage mark (APM) calculated by first calculating the average mark for 1000, 2000, 3000 and 4000 level courses. We denote these averages: A1, A2, A3, and A4 respectively. The averages are computed based on all units counted towards satisfaction of degree requirements, excluding non-COMP electives. Finally these averages are combined using the formula $\text{APM} = (0.1 \times A1) + (0.2 \times A2) + (0.3 \times A3) + (0.4 \times A4)$.

The APM will then be used to determine the final grade according to the ANU Honours grading scale.

Timing of Honours assessment (Bachelor Honours Degrees only)

Provide an explanation of how either: a minimum of 25% of the assessment which contributes to the final honours grade or; 15% of the assessment which contributes to the final Honours mark and formalised monitoring of progress by staff other than each student’s supervisor or Honours convener is completed in the first half (in terms of duration) of Honours study.

Determination of the Honours grade is as shown above.

Honours research training availability (Bachelor Honours Degrees only)

If Honours research training courses are available to students only once per calendar year, describe the strategies used to ensure that students who commence Honours in the Period in which these courses are not taught are not disadvantaged.

This is an embedded honours degree. Students develop research skills, methods and knowledge as part of the learning activities in five compulsory courses: COMP3120, COMP3500, COMP3530, COMP4130 and ENG3230. All students then undertake a substantial, 12 unit, 2 semester professional practice project or a 24 unit research project under the supervision of a research-active academic, in their final year.

Research component (Masters Degrees only)
Provide an explanation of and list of courses for how the AQF Level 9 Masters Degree (Coursework) requirement that graduates must be able to "plan and execute a substantial research-based project, capstone experience and/or piece of scholarship" is demonstrated.

N/A

Recommendations of last review

Recommendations of last review (if known):

41T

UEC Document Number or URL for review document (if known) 41T

Details of actions taken to address recommendations of last review

41T

Progress report on actions designed to address recommendations of last review

41T

Strategic contribution and market position

Academic merit and strategic alignment

• Give details of how this academic plan aligns with University and College strategy (see ANU by 2020) and contributes to the standing of the discipline or interdisciplinary area nationally and (if relevant) internationally (200 words or fewer)

The program aims to produce graduates who will work as Software Engineering professionals in industry and government sectors. It also provides a pathway to higher degree research.

The program was reviewed and re-accredited in 2015 by Engineers Australia (EA) and the Australian Computer Society (ACS). Both the ACS and EA in its commendations noted: The strong learning contributions arising from team-based, multidisciplinary industry project activity, (mimicking the processes and structures which would apply in an industry setting), as occurs in the 12-unit COMP3500 Software Engineering Project and COMP4500 Software Engineering Practice courses; the innovative development of TechLauncher opportunity for Software Engineering students to extend project development into a start-up company as an implementation of the 12-unit COMP4500 Software Engineering Practice project extension course; and the highly effective research/teaching integration.

Research Led Education

• Identify initiatives in this program that contribute to the University’s goal of offering research-led education (200 words or fewer)
Students are taught by research active staff, who incorporate research into their teaching. As commended by EA and ACS, there is good linkage between teaching and research. Students develop their own research skills and gain experience in applying foundational knowledge as well as current research results to analysing and designing solutions to complex problems in many courses including the TechLauncher group projects.

Market competition

- Identify a minimum of two competing programs in the sector nationally or internationally.
- Highlight the ways in which this academic plan is superior to competitor programs (200 words or fewer)

Our main competitors nationally are the other Go8 universities, all of which offer Software Engineering programs either as 4 year programs (UNSW, Sydney, Monash, Queensland and Adelaide) or bachelor/masters programs (UWA, Melbourne).

What distinguishes the ANU program is 1) the extent of industry engagement students experience through two year-long group projects with industry, 2) a focus on innovation and entrepreneurship through ENGN3230 and an option for students to work towards establishing their own startup (for credit), and 3) the development of a ‘systems’ and ‘design’ thinking culture through courses such as COMP3530, COMP3120 and the Group Projects (TechLauncher). This approach delivers unique problem solving, analysis and design skills which enables graduates to tackle a wider range of challenges in a rapidly changing environment, and provides them with a competitive edge compared to graduates from more traditional Software Engineering programs.

Targets and Performance

Demand and load trends

Annual commencing and continuing EFTSL from the year of last review or accreditation (whichever is later) to the current year.

Please use only official ANU statistical data (visit http://unistats.anu.edu.au/statistics/students/collections/).

Proposed targets for annual commencing and continuing EFTSL for the next five years or until the year of next review (whichever is sooner), and the actions that support the achievement of those targets (200 words or fewer)

A 5% increase in commencing EFTSL each year. Actions? Review/marketing?

Student retention
If the annual rate of student retention for the latest full year is not above 80 per cent, provide a justification. Note that this rate indicates students retained at ANU within the same career (i.e. undergraduate or graduate coursework), not necessarily in the same academic program/plan(s). Please use only official ANU statistical data (visit http://unistats.anu.edu.au/statistics/students/collections/).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>College response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMP4500 Software Eng Practice (2530)</td>
<td>These are year-long courses (hence the S2 SELS results provides a more accurate reflection of student response) which, with COMP3100 and COMP8715, are run as a single course, although COMP4500 maintains a focus on project management. The convener made some innovative changes to the running of these courses, which will take a few iterations to stabilize. The S2, 2015 SELS result for COMP3500 shows that the overall satisfaction has gone up from 40% to 83.3%, which indicates that the changes were well received. However, those for COMP4500 went down from 37.5% to 33.4%. An anonymous student survey for COMP3100/3500/4500 was run and had a much higher response rate than the SELS survey (86/128 responses). The response to a similar question to the overall satisfaction question in SELS found that around 66% of the respondents were satisfied with the course. Based on student feedback, there will be increased emphasis on peer assessment, since students are unhappy with under-performing team members and a hurdle may be considered at the end of S1, the role of reflective portfolios will be reconsidered and COMP4500 students will receive more help with project management and team leadership by providing a set of relevant lectures/workshops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These are year-long courses (hence the S2 SELS results provides a more accurate reflection of student response) which, with COMP3100 and COMP8715, are run as a single course, although COMP4500 maintains a focus on project management. The convener made some innovative changes to the running of these courses, which will take a few iterations to stabilize. The S2, 2015 SELS result for COMP3500 shows that the overall satisfaction has gone up from 40% to 83.3%, which indicates that the changes were well received. However, those for COMP4500 went down from 37.5% to 33.4%. An anonymous student survey for COMP3100/3500/4500 was run and had a much higher response rate than the SELS survey (86/128 responses). The response to a similar question to the overall satisfaction question in SELS found that around 66% of the respondents were satisfied with the course. Based on student feedback, there will be increased emphasis on peer assessment, since students are unhappy with under-performing team members and a hurdle may be considered at the end of S1, the role of reflective portfolios will be reconsidered and COMP4500 students will receive more help with project management and team leadership by providing a set of relevant lectures/workshops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMP3500 Software Engineering Project (2530)</td>
<td>The course was externally reviewed in S2, 2015 (reviewer from another Go8 uni). The course has been convened by an adjunct academic staff member, but will now be convened by an RSCS academic from S1, 2016. Please note that, as a result of changes made after the low SELS scores in 2014, the overall satisfaction rate increased from 0% in 2014 to 45.5% in 2015. The draft report from the external reviewer has been received and it states that the academic standard of the course offered is very high, and that no substantive changes to the course content are suggested. Based on a number of other recommendations from the review report, the following changes will be made this year, with all recommendations being fully implemented in 2017. These include aligning assessment and learning outcomes and promulgating these to the students at every opportunity, promoting the awareness of staff-student liaison committees and the names of representatives to students, explore using anonymous feedback mechanisms such as Piazza, using consistent marking guidelines and adequate exam paper moderation and better preparing students for the different teaching modes employed (normal vs intensive).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP4130 Managing Software Qual Proc (2530)</td>
<td>This is a co-taught course with COMP3100 and COMP3500. The average Overall Satisfaction Rate taken across all these courses is 53.5, putting it above the 50%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed actions for improvement of CEQ results

Semester based peer review of selected courses; running a number of College wide Teaching and Learning Seminars per semester; external auditing of at least one course per semester. Tutors are now required to complete tutor training in order to be able to work as tutors; this involves 6 sessions run by CHELT.

Student outcomes and further study

Annual Graduate Destinations Survey (GDS) employment rates from the year of last review or accreditation (whichever is later) to the current year. Please use only official ANU statistical data.

Proposed actions for improvement of GDS employment rates

Annual GDS Further Study rates (to higher AQF level) from the year of last review or accreditation (whichever is later) to the current year. Please use only official ANU statistical data (visit ).

Proposed actions for improvement of GDS Further Study rates (to higher AQF level)

The Bachelor of Software Engineering is a professional program and almost all students will end up working in the industry. Students planning to engage in further study seem to take the more recently established Bachelor of Advanced Computing (BAC). This would explain the drop to 0% in 2013 and 2014.
Recommendations – targets and timeframes for improvement

• Provide targets and implementation timeframes for all proposed actions
• This will be provided to UEC as the summary of the review.
• Please number each recommendation/response for future reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation Target</th>
<th>Implementation Actions</th>
<th>Completed By (Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review of all undergraduate programs offered by the School, including the BSEng program; submission of course and program level changes, including program learning outcomes, for approval by UEC in 2016</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Mid 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply the recommendations in the EA and ACS accreditation reports.</td>
<td></td>
<td>End 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Division of Student Administration use only

☐ All plans comply with Australian Qualifications Framework

If not compliant, give details:

41T

☐ All plans comply with National Code 2007

If not compliant, give details:

41T

☐ All plans comply with policy: Academic Programs and Courses Accreditation

If not compliant, give details:

41T

☐ All plan comply with other relevant University policies and standards (e.g. English Language requirements, Orders)

If not compliant, give details:

41T

☐ Australian Higher Education Graduate Statements for all plans are appropriate and accurate

If not appropriate/accurate, provide new AHEGS below (copy and paste for multiple plans as necessary). Duration is normally calculated as 46 weeks for the 1st year and 52 weeks per year thereafter (or part thereof), or the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHEGS (if changes required)</td>
<td>Specified duration of intensive plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan code: 41T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detail of Plan - Australian Higher Education Graduation Statement (AHEGS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Features - Australian Higher Education Graduation Statement (AHEGS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Pathway - Australian Higher Education Graduation Statement (AHEGS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Accreditation - Australian Higher Education Graduation Statement (AHEGS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**College Education Committee**

Date reviewed by College Education Committee (CEC): 41T

URL of review outcomes: 41T

CEC recommendation to UEC:
- [ ] Reaccredit with no conditions
- [ ] Reaccredit with conditions (specified below)
- [ ] Cease intake until conditions met (specified below)
- [ ] Disestablish program / academic plan(s) (list all academic plans below)

Note that a separate Award Disestablishment (Coursework) proposal must be completed and teach-out approved to affect disestablishment.

As approved by the Dean or delegated authority: 41T on 41T

**University Education Committee**

Date reviewed by University Education Committee (UEC): 41T
Document Number 41T

UEC recommendation to Academic Board
- Reaccredit with no conditions
- Reaccredit with conditions (specified below)
- Cease intake until conditions met (specified below)
- Disestablish program / academic plan(s) (list all academic plans below)
  Note that a separate Award Disestablishment (Coursework) proposal must be completed and teach-out approved to affect disestablishment.

41T

---

Academic Board

Date reviewed by Academic Board 41T

Document Number 41T

Academic Board decision
- Reaccredit with no conditions
- Reaccredit with conditions (specified below)
- Cease intake until conditions met (specified below)
- Disestablish program / academic plan(s) (list all academic plans below)
  Note that a separate Award Disestablishment (Coursework) proposal must be completed and teach-out approved to affect disestablishment.

41T
Part 4 – Education Policy and Related Issues

Item 8: CECS Internships Guidelines

Purpose: To discuss newly proposed deadlines for internships in CECS

Recommendations

That the Committee:
1. Discuss the Internships guidelines proposed in attachment 14A
2. Send any further feedback to Natalie.Young@anu.edu.au by 31 March

ACTION REQUIRED
For discussion ☑ For decision ☐ For information ☐ School response ☐

Background

As part of the focus on improving the student experience within CECS, a new set of guidelines for Internships have been developed. Please see attachment 14A.

Sponsor
Subdean, Engaged Learning
ANU College of Engineering and Computer Science

Author
CECS Student Services
29 February 2016

Appendices
Appendix 8A: Internship Guidelines
Appendix 8B: Sub Dean of Engaged Learning Internship Briefing for the CEC
Internship Guidelines for Employers

Why an ANU Intern?

The ANU is one of the world’s leading universities, recognised internationally for our teaching and cutting-edge research.

In the ANU College of Engineering and Computer Science (CECS), we have developed unique, multidisciplinary programs that prepare our students to be future leaders in their chosen discipline – be it Engineering, Software Engineering or Advanced Computing.

Students not only develop advanced theoretical knowledge, they are well-placed to establish valuable personal and professional skills, particularly in the areas of leadership, entrepreneurship, research and development and management that enable them to design, analyse and manage complex projects in the workplace.

Definition of a CECS Internship

An internship is a full time training position that allows students to gain hands-on experience in a workplace environment relevant to their area of future career interests and current academic studies. The ANU has intern partnership arrangements with national and international organisations, companies, government agencies, non-profit and other workplaces that will provide students a first-hand look at that a career in a particular area might be like.

Internships are typically offered on a 6 month, full time employment basis (equivalent to a full semester - 24 units- of academic study); however, the College welcomes opportunities for our students to engage with industry in a number ways so we encourage you to reach out to discuss what your company may be able to facilitate.

To be eligible for an internship placement, CECS Students in their later years of study must be able to demonstrate strong academic grades in addition to highly transferable skills and attributes, as well as engagement in co-curricular activities, ensuring high-achieving and well-rounded ANU representatives are matched with the requirements of our Industry Partners.

Internships for Academic Credit must satisfy the published Learning Outcomes for the course the student will be receiving credit for (and in the case of Engineering students, Engineers Australia Stage 2 Competencies). Students are also liable for course fees based on the number of units credited – as determined by the CECS Internship Convenor and the Program Convenor within the Research School.
Internship Benefits for Host Organisations

- A cost-effective opportunity to evaluate a potential future employee, a pipeline for candidates.
- Access to outstanding students with highly desirable skills and knowledge.
- A way to gain short-term talent to assist current employees with meaningful projects.
- Enthusiastic, innovative workers who can contribute new ideas based on their academic learning.
- The personal satisfaction of fulfilling a professional responsibility in helping students progress in their career path.
- Enhanced visibility for your organisation on our campus.
- A valuable pathway to establish research collaborations with ANU Academic staff.
- A mechanism to influence and provide feedback into teaching at ANU.

Internship Benefits for Students

- Provides a full and realistic view of the world-of-work.
- Provide students with the opportunity to trial a potential employer before applying for Graduate positions.
- Integrates academic preparation with practical application and skill development in the workplace.
- Acquire hands-on work experience.
- An opportunity to network with professionals in one's field of interest.
- A chance to explore career options and develop transferable skills.

Opportunities Not Considered an Internship

- Positions consisting primarily of clerical task. Clerical task should comprise no more than 20% of an internship.
- Jobs that provide little or no opportunity for students to gain practical experience that complement their academic learning.
- Jobs with little or no training, guidance and supervision.
- Unpaid or Volunteer positions.
Host Organisation’s Responsibilities when hosting an Intern

While hosting a student, we will require host companies to undertake the following:

- Clarify the student’s role and reporting structures. Identify the duties to be performed, level of knowledge and specific job skills required of the intern, desired class level, and the suitable academic majors needed to successful perform the internship.
- Providing information requested by the College so that a determination can be made about what kind of academic credit might apply. Typically, this would be limited to:
  - Internship Project Title
  - Field of the Project (e.g. Electrical Engineering)
  - Description of work and tasks
- Provide resources, supervision, mentoring and professional development opportunities to maximise the intern’s learning experiences by offering guidance and identifying developmental opportunities that strengthen and enhance the intern’s skills, strengths and performance.
- Offer challenging and meaningful projects that benefit your organisation while providing opportunities for interns to apply their academic knowledge and enhance and/or develop new skills.
- Keep in contact with the CECS Internship Convenor throughout the internship.
- Be available on at least one occasion for the CECS Internship Convenor to visit the Host’s premises to discuss the placement with the student and the student’s host company Supervisor.

*Evaluate the internship, including the student’s performance and accomplishments. At the conclusion of the internship, complete and submit the Internship Supervisor’s Report to the CECS Internship Convenor. A report template will be provided by the University.

Financial Matters

The Host is required to pay the student the appropriate minimum hourly wage as stipulated by law for time worked as a fixed-term employee. For more information, please see the Fair Work Ombudsman website.

Arrangements whereby companies pay the University an amount which can be offered to the student as a stipend can also be negotiated.

An internship should not be viewed as a form of “cheap labour” – ANU interns are expected to make real, meaningful contributions to the workplace by participating in supervised/supported industry-based projects.

Please contact the Internship Coordinator to discuss this if more convenient for your business. Apart from the payment of minimum wage, or equivalent stipend, there are no other fees associated with this program.

Contact Information

If you would like more information on offering internships to CECS Students or would like to discuss the opportunities your company can offer to Engineering and Computer Science students, please feel free to contact us directly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CECS Sub-Dean – Engaged Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt Doolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: <a href="mailto:Matthew.Doolan@anu.edu.au">Matthew.Doolan@anu.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Experience Convenor – Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Beck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: <a href="mailto:Fiona.Beck@anu.edu.au">Fiona.Beck@anu.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Experience Convenor – Computer Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Swift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: <a href="mailto:Ben.Swift@anu.edu.au">Ben.Swift@anu.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CECS Student Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: <a href="mailto:Natalie.Young@anu.edu.au">Natalie.Young@anu.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sub Dean of Engaged Learning Internship Briefing for the CEC

Context
Students within the CECS already undertake a range of different industry engagement activities as part of their program. These range from work placements required of all engineering students to tech-launcher offered by the School of Computer Science. The university is encouraging colleges to provide students with a range of industry interaction options that are being grouped under the term internship. For clarity the definition for internship used in this document is drawn from the current course offerings in both RSEng and RSCS. This means an internship is defined as an industry placement that a student will receive course credit for and therefore must meet school defined learning outcomes. In discussions with industry this would be most valuable when the students are involved in fulltime work for 6 months but the framework proposed aims to flexible to meet the needs of both industry and the schools.

Introduction
The following document outlines a proposed college internship framework with the intent of enabling the growth of internships for both of the schools within CECS. Each school within the college will need to drive the implementation of a program within the proposed framework. The goal of the framework is to clearly articulate the support and mechanisms for an internship program within CECS.

The proposed framework will consist of guidelines providing clear definition of the roles for each participant within the internship program. The aim of the guidelines is to enable the growth of the program and to realise a highly effective mechanism for supporting industry engagement.

Proposed framework would aim to grow an internship program as to provide students within the college with more engaged learning opportunities and to foster industry collaboration. Growth of an internship program will rely on leveraging current industry contacts of both RSEng and RSCS staff, as well as providing a professional and rewarding experience for the student and industry sponsor. The aim of the proposed framework is to help facilitate the experience for the student and industry sponsor and to provide the academic staff within the schools with the tools to initiate internships with their interested industry partners.

Roles

Academic:
This role is optional as if the industry sponsor approaches the school directly then CECS student services can fulfil this role.

- Initial point of contact for industry sponsor, providing basic information about the internship program (the industry guidelines circulated with the agenda form an example of this).
- Informs the course coordinator of the industry sponsor’s interest in pursuing an internship.
Course Coordinator:

These roles already exist within both schools. The roles would remain largely unchanged but student services would take responsibility for any contractual arrangements. The responsibilities would continue to be:

- identifying learning outcomes expected from the internships,
- identify that the internship is appropriate to offer credit for the student undertaking the work,
- define (in consultation with the ADE) appropriate course credit for the internship,
- define and undertake any formal assessment of the student’s progress, and
- provide the final mark for the student against the associated assessment criteria.

Industry Sponsor:

- Provide a clear statement of the work the intern is expected to undertake during the internship such that the course coordinator can make an assessment of the appropriateness of the internship.
- Agree to contribute to the assessment of the student as required.
- Identify the most appropriate intern from a list of possible interns provided by student services.
- Pay the intern appropriately (During the internship the intern is expected to make a substantial contribution to the company and therefore Fairwork requires that the internship be a paid placement).

CECS Student Services:

- Notify students of internship opportunities.
- With the guidance of the course coordinator provide a list of potential students to the industry participant.
- Arrange the contractual agreement between the college and Industry sponsor outlines the obligations and identifying the expected learning outcomes.

Student:

- Respond to the notification of internship opportunity from student services.
- Submit all assessment items to the course coordinator.
- Meet the obligations of the employment agreement between the student and industry sponsor.
Possible assessment schedule (taken from the Engineering Internship course):

- Internship Journal (e-Portfolio) and Reflection Items (20%)
- Internship Report (60%)
- Industry Supervisor Report (20%)

Ideal Internship

- 6 months fulltime work
- Substantial development opportunities for the student
- Undertake consequential work for the Industry Sponsor
- Allows students to learn new skills and put into practice their knowledge

Possible Benefits

- Increased industry engagement opportunities for the schools
- Increases the diversity of industry interaction opportunities for students
- Provides useful outreach materials
Item 9: Ghost writing

Purpose
For Committee members to note and discuss the methods of detecting and addressing ghost writing.

Recommendations
That the Committee:
1. Note and discuss the methods of detecting and addressing ghost writing; and
2. Promulgate the discussion on ghost writing through presentation of this paper at Curriculum Development Committees and other forums and provide feedback to Elizabeth Nunrom by 18 April on three methods each School will undertake to address the issue of ghost writing.

ACTION REQUIRED
For discussion ☒ For decision ☐ For information ☐ School response ☐

Background
Ghost writing in a university context is where students submit an assessment task or tasks that have been completed by another individual. Often this work is undertaken on a fee for service basis, with students paying another individual to write an assessment task which is then submitted by the student as their own work.

For the purposes of this paper, ghost writing is taken not to cover ghost sitting examinations which will be explored through another document which will also be presented at ESQC in 2016.

Ghost writing has received significant press over the past 12 months. In 2015, the Fairfax press exposed the use of the MyMaster website by students attending a broad range of higher education institutions. More recently, the press discussed Assignment King and the associations with ANU. An initial internal document in response to this is included at Appendix A.

These sites are only limited examples of a very broad industry that has emerged over the past 5 years. There are many websites that offer assignment writing services to students, with a 2 minute Google search uncovering multiple fee-for-service sites. In addition to the sites being readily available as a result of a Google search, ASQO has received a number of cases where these websites have proactively targeted students through their University email accounts as spam. The availability of ghost writing services now no longer requires proactive desperation close to a deadline but is being illegally distributed through the University’s sanctioned form of communication – email. Unfortunately email spam is a phenomenon which we are all susceptible to, and is not something the university can control.

The services often claim to provide 100 per cent non-plagiarised assignments and make assertions that all assignments are checked using plagiarism scanning software prior to being provided to the student. The cost listed on these sites for a 2000 word essay (8 pages) due 14 days from the date of order ranged from $88 to $152. Sites often engage with a tiered pricing system, with costs increasing the shorter the time period until the assessment is due, and the higher the desired final grade for the assessment piece.

The proliferation of websites means that identifying individual websites in an attempt to address the problem (no matter how satisfying) will not provide a solution but rather involve a cat and mouse game. For this reason, it is important that the University address ghost writing through enhanced detection methods, education and awareness for both staff and students, and preventative measures.

Methods of detection of ghost writing
Detecting instances of ghost writing is not necessarily easy, however there are a number of methods that can be used increase the likelihood of detection, including:

- Looking for consistency in the language used across a number of assessment tasks. Some education institutions utilise an in class assessment for the first assessment task, and build up a body of knowledge of the students’ prose and writing ability to then effectively evaluate later assessment tasks. Some work has also been undertaken in developing algorithms to streamline the comparison of a student’s work across a semester or degree, though this method is still in its infancy;
Looking for the use of concepts in assessment tasks that have not covered as part of the course, and looking for the use of generic responses to assessment questions or where assessment questions have not been answered. Often ghost writing services engage with questions at the most broad level, utilising non-disciplinary methodologies or broad statements that do not address a question in a specific required context. In addition, course-specific knowledge will not have been developed as would be expected from a student who has engaged with the course.

Reviewing the file properties of the submitted assessment task, such as the name of the first author, the name of the user who last saved the document, the title of the paper and the total editing time. A number of examples can be found where the file properties of a submitted assessment task identify an individual who is not the student, indicating that the drafting of the document was undertaken by another individual.

Undertaking a check on the bibliography through Turnitin. A correctly presented bibliography will normally return multiple colours and is known as a rainbow bibliography. Ghost written services may plagiarise their bibliography on the understanding that this is rarely checked, leading to a bibliography that may be a single colour. Another practice is to fabricate references, which may lead to no text match in certain portions of the bibliography, and in other instances, a single ‘source’ returning multiple colours as it involves the concatenation of two actual sources. Other services do not provide a bibliography at all, and put the responsibility for compiling the bibliography on the student. This can lead to the incorporation of publications that have no relevance to the assessment piece.

As is clear from some of these methods, each in isolation may not be sufficient to identify ghost writing, and ghost writing is instead often detected through a combination of these methods.

Methods for addressing ghost writing
There are a number ways to reduce the likelihood of students submitting ghost written work, including:

- The use of group work for assessment tasks;
- The use of multi-drafting processes for assessment tasks which stretch across a teaching period;
- The use of in class writing or in class assessment tasks to gain an understanding of students’ writing capabilities, and comparing these to assessment tasks submitted later in the course to identify any discrepancies;
- Changing assessment tasks each year to reduce the ease with which old assignments can be replicated by ghost writers;
- The use of multiple types of assessment for a course, including in class assessment, essays, examinations and/or oral presentations;
- Providing education to students on the negative outcomes both if they are caught submitting work written by a ghost writer, and the impact on their future career of failing to master course content;
- Providing information on the academic support services available to students for assistance with completing assessment tasks; and
- Requiring student to verbally demonstrate a coherent argument in relation to an assessment task. This could be utilised as part of the required assessment, or in the course of an investigation into a suspected case of ghost writing.

Members are asked to discuss the phenomenon of ghost writing and prevention and detection methods, to ensure awareness of the practice and consequences in both the staff and student bodies.

Sponsor
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Appendix 9A: Assignment King and the associations with ANU

The Assignment King website claims to offer students assistance with assignments, providing 100% non-plagiarised assignments, which are checked using plagiarism scanning software, presumably not Turn-it-in, as this would then create similarity matches.

They claim to be specialists “in providing academic help to the students” of Australian National University (ANU), https://myassignmenthelp.com/australia/expert-canberra-assignment-help.html (note this website is ‘My Assignment Help’ however links through from Assignment King) however also lists Universities from all over Australia, (and the world) including most of the G08. We have no records of any of the ANU “Assignment Experts” listed on the website having attended ANU. No students from ANU are “friends” with the Assignment King Facebook page.


Assignment King is one of many websites and Facebook pages which offer assignment writing and assistance. The list of sites that offer ghost-writing are extensive and constantly evolving, and as such cannot be eradicated. Others include - http://www.myassignmenthelp.net/australia/au/, http://www.livewebtutors.com/australia/universities/australian-national-university-assignment-help, http://australianassignmenthelp.com/, and if you search “Australian Assignment Help ANU” there are lots of links to similar providers. Rather than pursuing individual sites as they crop up, as they inevitably will, ASQO recommends consideration of university assessment methods including promoting group work, and the provision of training for staff on academic integrity and common ghost-writing indicators.
**Item 24: Inherent Requirements**

**Purpose**
To identify to the Committee the role of inherent requirements and provide a proposed process for programs that may need to implement them.

**Recommendation**
That:
1. The Education Standards and Quality Committee note the role of inherent requirements; and
2. That for programs that are identified as needing inherent requirements action is initiated through the draft proposed process.

**ACTION REQUIRED**
For discussion ☑  For decision ☐  For information ☑  College response ☐

**Background**
Inherent requirements are capabilities that students must possess in order to be able to undertake programs of study. The University of New England describes inherent requirements as:

>[T]he fundamental parts of a course or unit that must be met by all students. They are the abilities, knowledge and skills you need to complete the course. Students with a disability or chronic health condition can have adjustments made to enable them to meet these requirements. There may also be other considerations, such as cultural or religious considerations, that may impact your capacity to meet an inherent requirement and may require adjustments. However, any adjustments must not fundamentally change the nature of the inherent requirement.

The University of Western Sydney provided an in depth, but less transparent, definition in 2010:

>[T]he fundamental components of a course or unit, that are essential to demonstrate the capabilities, knowledge and skills to achieve the core learning outcomes of the course or unit, while preserving the academic integrity of the university's learning, assessment and accreditation processes.

Whilst institutions are required to make reasonable adjustments for students with disabilities, inherent requirements are those parts that are essential and as a result might not be able to be adjusted.

Examples of students not possessing inherent requirements have arisen in a number of cases both at ANU and across the sector. These increasingly where a program is intrinsically linked with professional accreditation requirements, such as medicine, engineering, and accounting. A number of cases have included:
- A rural veterinary science student with an extreme allergy to horses that precluded them from working with horses;
- A nursing student who was unable to work with bodily fluids;
- A medical student who refused to work with dead bodies; and
- A science student whose physical disability made it impossible for them to complete the practical lab component of their courses.

A number of institutions are moving towards developing, or have developed, inherent requirements for specific degrees, and in some instances, an inherent requirements statement for every degree. These statements fit within the following broad themes:
- Ethical Behaviour
- Behavioural Stability
- Communication
- Cognition
- Relational skills
- Reflective skills
- Legal
- Sensory ability
- Strength and mobility
Sustainable performance

ANU currently has general information available to students [here](#) but no details of what the inherent requirements of any of our programs or courses are.

Inherent requirements statements protect the University through providing information on what aspects of a course are fundamental and are unable to have adjustments made. They also assist students to be able to determine whether they have the skillset to undertake studies in a particular program.

**Development of Inherent Requirements**

An inherent requirement is typically outlined through the development of four key themes that relate to the requirement:

1. Description of what the inherent requirement is;
2. Explanation of why this is an inherent requirement;
3. The nature of any adjustments that could (and could not) be made to allow student to meet the requirement; and
4. Examples of things that students must be able to do to show that they have met the requirement.

Development of a set of inherent requirements is complex and requires an understanding of disciplinary requirements, relevant legislation, and a working knowledge of what adjustments are practised. Programs that are identified as needing inherent requirements as a first step should contact Access & Inclusion and the Legal Office to form a working group to look at what is required. The composition of the working group will involve:

- Legal Office staff member
- Access and Inclusion staff member
- College Associate Dean or nominee
- Disciplinary expert

On resolution of inherent requirements statements by the working group, and endorsement of them by the College Education Committee and University Education Committee, and approval by Academic Board, Access and Inclusion will work with the Academic Standards and Quality Office to develop an enhanced webpage for students and to represent the inherent requirements statements through the Programs and Courses website.

**Sponsor**
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“Inherent Requirements”
Determining the Inherent Requirements of Courses

Background:

The Disability Discrimination Act Education Standards (The Standards) sets out the obligations of education providers to facilitate access to education for students with disabilities. The legislation requires educational institutions to make “Reasonable Adjustments” to courses, facilities, assessment, etc. to address the effects of disabilities. The Standards apply in the following areas:

- Enrolment,
- Participation,
- Curriculum Development Accreditation and Delivery,
- The Provision of Student Services,
- The Prevention of Harassment and Victimisation.

There are a number of exceptions, requirements and processes that must be addressed by education providers to ensure that they meet their obligations under the Standards. Adjustments are to be provided in a reasonable time, must allow access “on the same basis” as other students and should not undermine the academic integrity of the course.

Inherent Requirements

There are several terms that are important for university staff to understand and comply with. One of the most significant for academic areas is the concept of the Inherent Requirements of a course. Inherent Requirements are not just compulsory or traditional requirements, but are those requirements that are fundamental or essential to the learning and assessment requirements of the particular course. In other words, the academic area should ask itself “What are we REALLY teaching and assessing here? What is it that is essential for the student to know to meet the requirements of the course?”

It is not enough to simply state that the requirements are inherent, nor is it appropriate to try to judge the potential employment outcomes of the student on completion of study. Judgements should be made on whether the student is able to meet the academic requirements only. One way to view the nature of inherent requirements is to say "Am I confident that I could defend the essential or fundamental academic nature of these requirements in a court of law?" “Have I examined all the possible alternative strategies and adjustments that could enable the student to meet the course requirements?” In other words, the decision on inherent requirements should be based on substantive, defensible academic rationales, not simply on traditional practices.

Where a student is able to meet the inherent requirements through alternative strategies for teaching, learning and/or assessment, through access to technology or other adjustments, the
university is obliged to make the appropriate adjustments or implement the strategies required.

This decision on inherent requirements may be further complicated in some circumstances by the requirements of external accreditation bodies. Where external accreditation and approval is essential to the teaching and learning practices and outcomes (such as the requirement for student registration with the NSW & ACT Medical Boards to be able to participate in clinical practice activities in hospitals for Bachelor of Medicine degrees) they may, in fact be viewed as inherent requirements. Where external accreditation may be necessary for employment in a particular field after graduation (such as Psychologist Registration Board) but not necessary to meet the academic requirements of the course, they would not be deemed to be inherent requirements. People choose to study particular courses for many reasons apart from direct employment outcomes, and the issue of external accreditation would be one for the accrediting body rather than the university in this case. The university is not allowed to refuse the enrolment or progress of a student on the basis of potential employment outcomes.

The application of the concept of Inherent Requirements is designed to ensure the academic integrity and rigour of courses are maintained, without imposing unnecessary barriers and impediments to study for people with disabilities.

For more information on the process for determining Inherent Requirements, go to: http://www.adcet.edu.au/ and search for “inherent requirements.”
From: Suzy Andrew  
Sent: Friday, 26 February 2016 3:11 PM  
To: Judy Luyt <Judy.Luyt@anu.edu.au>  
Subject: Framework for centrally administered examinations  

Dear all,

In February 2015, the Senior Management Group approved a formal coursework examination calendar and a framework for the delivery of these examinations.

The approved paper is attached for your reference. I want to draw your attention particularly to the following points.

Central examinations will only be run in Weeks 1, 7, 8, 10 and the approved end of semester exam period.

To be eligible for central examination support:
1. The examination must have a weighting of 20% or greater for the course;
2. The examination must involve a minimum of 20 students;
3. The examination must have a minimum duration of 90 minutes [cumulative of study period and writing time];
4. The number of examinations per course is to be restricted to a maximum of two [2] per semester/session [excluding special/deferred and supplementary examinations];
5. All mid-semester examinations must fall within a mandated examination period [this may only be waived by the Registrar where resource issues present, such as venue accessibility];

We have had multiple requests from Schools for centrally administered examinations that do not meet criterion 3. We will not support any requests that are for an examination that is of a duration of less than 90 minutes.

Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Kind regards,
Suzy

Suzy Andrew  
Deputy Manager I Examinations, Graduations and Prizes Office I Division of Student Administration  
Melville Hall (Building 12) I Ellery Cres I ANU I ACT  
☎️ +61 2 6125 3455  📞 +61 2 6125 2202  🌐 www.anu.edu.au

The Australian National University, Canberra | CRICOS Provider : 00120C | ABN : 52 234 063 906

This email message and any accompanying attachments may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, do not read, use, disseminate, distribute or copy this message or attachments. If you have received this message in error, please delete it immediately. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender, except where the sender expressly, and with authority, states them to be the view of The Australian National University.
Item 13: Recording of Teaching Activities Policy and Procedure

Purpose
To propose a Recording of Teaching Activities policy and procedure

Recommendation
That the Committee note the revised Recording of Teaching Activities policy and procedure (Appendices C and D).

ACTION REQUIRED
For discussion ☐ For decision ☐ For information ☑ School response ☐

Background
The Lecture Recording project was initiated to provide a service that enables academic staff to improve the delivery of their teaching services, enhance student learning and decrease the risk of lecture recording failures across the University.

ESQC 4/2015 discussed the principles of recording teaching activities and the feedback received by both students and colleges. In particular feedback from students highlighted the importance of recording activities to avoid students from being disadvantaged if they are unable to attend the class. Equally, staff identified that the policy needs to be balanced by a clear catalogue of acceptable reasons for opting out of recording, yet being aware that the University has accessibility obligations for students from varying backgrounds and levels of ability.

Principles to be used in the development of a recording of teaching activities policy and procedure were drafted and circulated to members for feedback. Following this extensive consultation process a policy and procedure were developed (Appendices C and D) and circulated for feedback.

ESQC 5/2015 members were asked to provide feedback to the draft policy and procedure for the recording of teaching activities. The revised Policy and Procedure (Appendices C and D) have been updated based on the feedback received.

Implementation
On endorsement from ESQC, UEC and AB, and approval from Vice-Chancellor, the policy and procedure will be implemented to take effect from Semester 2, 2016. Communications will be issued through ANU Online channels, including the Wattle Reference Group (WRG) and Wattle User Group (WUG), to advise staff of the revisions. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) will circulate a communication for College Associate Deans to provide to their College teaching staff.

ANU Online will monitor the effectiveness of the implementation of the policy. In 2017, a discussion will be held through ESQC on the implementation of the policy including information on the opt-out process.

Consultation and Discussion Record

Education Standards and Quality Committee, 06 October 2015
That the Education Standards and Quality Committee provide feedback on the recording of teaching activities policy and procedure to Stacey.desimone@anu.edu.au by no later than 1 February 2016.

Education Standards and Quality Committee, 27 July 2015
That the Education Standards and Quality Committee provide feedback on the principles for a recording of teaching activities policy and procedure to policy.regs@anu.edu.au by no later than 7 September 2015.

Education Standards and Quality Committee (ESQC), 1 June 2015
The Chair advised the Committee that the University is moving from DLD to ECHO360 for recording of teaching activities. The recording of teaching activates will remain as ‘opt out’, however the University is seeking feedback from Colleges on how best to communicate this to staff and what are considered reasonable grounds, university-wide, for opting out of recording teaching activities. The University needs be mindful that the facilitation of recordings is necessary to ensure we meet accessibility obligations for students from varying backgrounds and levels of ability.

The Committee discussed:
• That the Joint Colleges of Science have a protocol whereby lecturers are required to apply to the Director, Science Education to opt out of lecture recordings and that applications are on the grounds that the type of activity or venue of an activity are not suitable for recording;
• That students not turning up to lectures is not considered reasonable grounds for opting out of recording;
• That the paper be revised to state ‘where ECHO360 is available’, as there may be situations where staff wish to record a teaching activity but are unable to do so due to the technology not being available;
• That clarification of the process for rooms where ECHO360 is not available was required.

Resolved:
That the Education Standards and Quality Committee provide feedback on desired approaches to the governance of recording of teaching activities, and what information should be made available, to policy.regs@anu.edu.au by no later than 6 July 2015.

ANU Online Steering Committee, 22 April 2015
The committee endorsed the proposal for moving from an opt-in- to an opt-out process for automatically recording teaching activities, noting that not all teaching activities will be automatically recorded, only lectures, classes, large group teaching activities, studio activities and seminars. The Chair requested this item be sent to ESQC as this is a policy rather than technical decision.

University Education Committee, 27 November 2009
The Committee agreed (nem con) to adopt the following:
1. That, in the interest of the effective and equitable achievement of optimum learning outcomes for all ANU students, UEC recommends to the Vice-Chancellor the following minimum standards of flexible access to lecture material at the ANU:
   Lecturers to provide access to one or more of the following:
   i. Digital access to lecture recording made available on the learning management system site for that course for the duration of the semester; and/or
   ii. Appropriate lecture notes made available on the learning management system site for that course for the duration of the semester; and/or
   iii. Appropriate lecture slides made available on the learning management system site for that course for the duration of the semester.
2. That the UEC recommend that the Vice-Chancellor make an exception to current policy processes by adding the following to the Code of Practice for Teaching and Learning without further consultation:
   a. Principles
      Recognise the importance of flexible access to lecture content for the purposes of the University's equity targets and teaching objectives.
   b. Teachers should
      During semester
      Provide flexible access to lecture content by one or more of the following: digital recording of lectures for the duration of the semester, detailed lecture notes for the duration of the semester, detailed lecture slides for the duration of the semester. Recording, notes or slides are to be made available on the learning management system site for a course.

Sponsor
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)

Author
Senior Business Analyst, ITS
ANU Online Lead, ANU Online
February 2016

Appendices
Appendix A: SELT Feedback
Appendix B: Student Feedback via ANU Online Survey
Appendix C: Recording of Teaching Activities Policy
Appendix D: Recording of Teaching Activities Procedure
Appendix A: SELT Feedback

Withholding lecture recordings:

- According to the school policy, lecturers are supposed to record their lectures. However, the lecturer did not make the online lectures available on wattle, and students were unable to access the course material when there were interruptions, such as timetable clashes. I remain concerned at [lecturer’s] decision to withhold our access to the lecture recordings on Wattle unless 15 people attended the lecture (it is a course with very few students).

- [Lecturer’s] refusal to give students access to the resources (specifically the lecture recordings) of the course [edited] goes against the universities ideals of promoting flexible learning.

- The lack of audio recording of lectures had a direct impact upon my learning, although I attended lectures weekly, I often review the lectures at home, an opportunity denied because the lecturer was offended by other peoples lack of attendance.

Late release of lecture recordings:

- Extremely disappointed that the lecturer decided to not release lecture recording immediately because they "wanted lecture attendance" and believed "that we would learn better by attending the lecture in person". I personally listen and revise the lecture by listen to the recording everyday afterwards. I find it extremely difficult to catch up to the rest of week's materials after I have missed one.

- Put the lectures up as soon as the lecture has taken place, rather than waiting until the end of the week. As students may have clashing lectures with the first lecture of the week and can't catch up on it before the [next] lecture.

- I did not find it helpful that the lecture slides/recordings were posted on Friday afternoons- and I attended all but one lecture. In some instances where I found we went too quickly or I did not understand something in lecture- I could not go over it straight away afterwards, or later that day. I found when reviewing the material I did not understand on Friday afternoon, I had a lesser understanding of the other content which I previously understood, which made it harder for me to go over the parts I did not understand in class. I think it would be extremely helpful to put the recordings on the same day and I really do not see the point in putting it up on Friday afternoon. If people choose not to attend lecture, that is their problem, but I do not think that those who do attend, should be punished for that.

- Make the notes and recordings available straight after the lectures. Some people have lecture clashes or commitments which are out of their control, meaning they miss one of the lectures and not being able to access them until Friday each week makes learning very difficult. Also, one of my study techniques is to go over the notes and any parts of the lecture I didn't quite understand that afternoon but the formatting of the notes is difficult to follow and not being able to access them after the lecture makes this form of revision extremely difficult.
Appendix B: Student Feedback via ANU Online Survey:

- My mental health issues sometimes prevent me from attending lectures in person, and the recorded lectures are invaluable for helping me catch up on what I’ve missed. I like being able to pause to take notes or rewind to listen again to content I didn't understand the first time. The recordings are also a useful tool for revision, as they allow me to go back and listen again to any lectures that I want to hear again. I find the recordings are usually pretty good quality, and so far there have been no glitches or issues with the system not working the way DLD used to sometimes have, and the interface is easy to use.

- I like how the recording automatically occurs. This prevents the class not being recorded because the lecturer forgot to record the lecture. There have also been less instances where the microphone battery is flat.

- Echo360 makes sure the lecture is recorded regardless of the teacher's attention to press the "start" button.

- Some lecturers still manage to not stand in front of the microphones or place the wearable microphones too close to their mouth and ruin the audio recording. Some lecturers are still too lazy to learn how to use all of the lecture recording devices available i.e. they write on boards instead of using the overhead projector so their writing is recorded. I think the ANU should implement a university wide standard for recorded lectures so that all courses have useful lecture recordings.

- I have still had a lecture which was unrecorded and due to having a clash at this time this was a major inconvenience. I have also found that if lecturers go overtime the recording cuts out before the end of the lecture. The audio quality is not as good as the previous lecture recording system - it is too quiet to hear when the lecturer does not stand right next to the microphone however this was not (as much of) a problem previously. When watching online (not after downloading) it does not seem possible to make the video fullscreen and this sometimes makes the text on powerpoint slides difficult to read.

- Please never stop recording these lectures! It makes such a big difference for busy students who are taking heavy loads or when you are revising. Absolutely fantastic.

- As I work full-time Echo is an ideal way to catch up on any lectures I miss; I also use this resource to revise content previously covered. I occasionally find Echo more useful than attending lectures, particularly as I am able to pause and look further into content I don't understand.

- It allows students to rewatch, pause, rewind as many lectures as they want if they wish to revise or review a topic in the lectures. It makes uni more flexible and convenient that if there are clashes or previous arrangements students can watch the lectures online instead of relying on friends for notes.

- I find ECHO to be great especially for the audio files. I just put them on my phone and am constantly listening to the lectures for the whole semester. I find this allows me to memorise and understand content almost effortlessly. It also lets me know what I need to revise, because there are some things that I won’t understand without the slides there to reference, so I then know my weaknesses.

- How quickly lectures are posted on the site is extremely convenient. Often they are up only an hour after the actual lecture finishes. This is great for keeping on top of any clashes occurring on the same day.

- It is fantastic to be able to catch up on or review lectures. I really like having the slides and audio as one in the video function. It makes it so much easier to follow lectures.

- It is really great that if for some reason you need to miss the lesson you can still catch up in your own time, its also very useful for clashes and revision. I also like that you can access all the videos for the whole term.
Recording of Teaching Activities Policy

Purpose

To make the content of teaching activities available to students through a variety of mediums.

Overview

This policy describes the framework for exposing teaching activities to students who may have differing access requirements.

Definitions

Teaching Activity – an instance of a class being taught
Semester – Standard teaching periods Semester 1, Semester 2
Session – Summer session, Autumn session, Winter session, Spring session
Timetable – class timetable
The University supported system for recording of teaching activities is Echo360
The University supported Learning Management System (LMS) is Moodle
The University Central Timetabling System is Syllabus Plus Enterprise

Scope

This Policy applies to all teaching activities scheduled at the University.

Policy Statement

1. ANU ensures that students have access to teaching materials through a range of mechanisms that:
   a. Enhance the student learning experience;
   b. Provide additional access to education materials for students;
   c. Enable staff to improve the delivery of their teaching services; and
   d. Ensure compliance with obligations under relevant legislation including disability legislation and the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards)

2. These mechanisms recognise the diversity of student need and assist in the facilitation of education for:
   a. Students with disabilities
   b. Part-time students
   c. Remote location students
d. Students catching up on the occasional missed teaching event or clarifying content

e. Students with a clash in their timetable

f. Students with English as a second language

g. Students revising for exams and completing assignments

h. Students with significant commitments

i. Non-residential students
Appendix D

Recording of Teaching Activities Procedure

Purpose

This document provides support to Recording of Teaching Activities Policy and outlines the process for ensuring recording occurs.

Definitions

Teaching Activity – an instance of a class being taught
Semester – Standard teaching periods Semester 1, Semester 2
Session – Summer session, Autumn session, Winter session, Spring session
Timetable – class timetable
The University supported system for recording of teaching activities is Echo360
The University supported Learning Management System (LMS) is Moodle
The University Central Timetabling System is Syllabus Plus Enterprise

Procedure

1. Wherever possible recordings are the default means of capture for a teaching activity.

Automatic Pre-Scheduling of Recordings

2. All teaching activities scheduled in a venue with ANU recording facilities will be automatically recorded if, in the Central Timetabling System:
   a. The teaching activity is associated with a Course Code; and
   b. The teaching activity is not Hidden; and
   c. The teaching activity is associated with one of the following Activity types:
      i. Class
      ii. Large Group Teaching
      iii. Lecture
      iv. Seminar
   d. The teaching activity is not scheduled for more than 4 consecutive hours.

Recording activities which are not pre-scheduled
3. A staff member can request to have any other activity type automatically recorded for a given course and semester/session by contacting Wattle Support via the ITS Service Desk.

4. Additional activity types can be pre-scheduled if, in the Timetabling System:
   a. The teaching activity is scheduled in a venue with recording facilities; and
   b. The teaching activity is associated with a course code; and
   c. The teaching activity is not Hidden
   d. The teaching activity is not scheduled for more than 4 consecutive hours

Ad Hoc Recordings

5. An ad hoc recording may be used for any activity that is not pre-scheduled. This may include activities:
   a. Where a late change to venue has occurred;
   b. Where a recording for a teaching activity has not been pre-scheduled;

6. Ad Hoc recordings can only be initiated in venues with ANU recording facilities installed.

7. Ad Hoc recordings are initiated and controlled from the lectern computer within the venue.

Not Recording Teaching Activities

8. Where a staff member does not wish to automatically record teaching activities associated with a class, large group teaching, a lecture or seminar, and that course is scheduled in a facility with recording, the course convener for a course applies to the Associate Dean in writing.

9. Where a staff member is provided the option of a room with recording facilities and they decline to use that room and move to a room with no recording facilities, this is considered opting out of recording.

10. A request to opt out of pre-scheduled recording is per course, activity type and for a given semester or session.

11. The Associate Dean Education may approve a request to opt out if the teaching method is not conducive to recording.

12. Once approval has been obtained a request to opt out can be submitted to Wattle Support via the IT Service Desk.

13. Where an opt out is approved by the Associate Dean the Course Convener ensures that:
   a. Slides and notes. At least one of slides, notes or other learning materials are available on the Learning Management System for that course for the duration of the semester; and
   b. Subject to copyright requirements, materials handed out at the teaching event that support the teaching activity (e.g. handouts) are
made available on the Learning Management System for that
course for the duration of the semester; and
c. The Course Convener may also pre-record material and make it
available on the Learning Management System.

Management of Recordings

14. In accordance with the Timetable Policy, a pre-scheduled recording
commences at 5 minutes past the published start time and concludes at 5
minutes before the published end time.

15. Recordings that commence prior or finish after this schedule are manually
controlled.

16. Recordings produced by the ANU recording system are automatically
made available to enrolled students via their Course Site in the Learning
Management System (LMS).

17. Requests to postpone the publication of recordings to students is only
permissible with the written approval of the Associate Dean, on the
grounds that the recording contains inappropriate material.

18. Access to control a recording or to initiate an ad-hoc recording is given
to teaching staff listed for a course as recorded in the Student System.

19. Access for additional staff to control or initiate recordings requires prior
notification to Wattle Support via the ITS Service Desk.

Archiving

20. The original media file will be deleted after 120 days from the day the
recording was captured. Processed recordings will still be available for
streaming and download after this date, however it will not be possible toedit or reprocess recordings after this time.

Copyright, IP, and Privacy

21. The Copyright in the recordings of teaching activities is either owned
by or licensed to the ANU. Students may use the recording for personal
study only. No lecture may be communicated online, copied or shared,
without the prior permission of the ANU. This is in accordance with
‘Copyright in Lectures including recordings: a guideline’

22. Ownership of Educational Materials used in the teaching activity is in
accordance with the ANU Intellectual Property (IP) Policy.

23. The collection of student information through their use of the recording
system is in accordance with the Echo360 Privacy Statement.

24. Signage must be prominently displayed in venues where teaching
activity capture occurs to ensure that participants are aware that they may
be recorded.

25. Staff Course Conveners inform guest lecturers that the activity will be
recorded and the recording will be available to staff and students.
25.26. **Staff Lecturers** are responsible for ensuring that inappropriate material is not included in the recording. Inappropriate material includes but is not limited to:

a. Defamatory comments
b. Sensitive or personal information
c. Where there is no licence to use third party copyright Materials used in their Course Materials, where the use of the third party copyright work falls outside ‘fair use’.

26.27. Personal recordings by members of the audience are not permitted without the express written permission of the presenter.

**Feedback**

27.28. Feedback regarding ANU recording facilities is provided via the ANU Online Service Desk.
Part 5 – Items of other business

Item 13 Meeting Dates 2016

Purpose
To note the remaining meeting dates for 2016

Recommendation
That the Committee note the dates of the remaining 2016 meetings.

ACTION REQUIRED
For discussion ☐  For decision ☐  For information ☑  For School response ☐

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSE and RSCS CDC Agenda Deadline</th>
<th>RSCS CDC Meeting 12-2pm RSIE B123</th>
<th>Notes and Deadlines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 April</td>
<td>14 April</td>
<td>4 April - CDC DL for Program Amendments (CEC DL: 12 April)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 June</td>
<td>30 June</td>
<td>Final Deadline for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Amendments to UG Awards for 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Amendments to PG Awards for 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Creation of PG Awards for 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Disestablishment of PG Awards for 2017 (CEC DL: 7 July)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 August</td>
<td>8 September</td>
<td>CDC Deadline for amendments to courses which are scheduled for Semester 1, 2017 and Diploma of Computing Program Review (CEC DL: 22 September);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 October</td>
<td>20 October</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sponsor
Associate Director (Education)
Research School of Computer Science

*Item 14 Other business and question time

Purpose
For Committee members to ask questions and raise items of other business

Recommendation
That the Committee note the matters raised and the responses.

ACTION REQUIRED
For discussion ☐  For decision ☐  For information ☑  For School response ☐

Sponsor
Associate Director (Education)
Research School of Computer Science