RESEARCH SCHOOL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE (RSCS)  
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE  

Meeting No.4/2016 of the RSCS Curriculum Development Committee will be held on  
Thursday 30 June 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>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. | Minutes  
*Recommendation: That the Committee confirm the minutes of the meeting 3/2016.*  
Attachment:  
Appendix 2A: Minutes of RSCS CDC Meeting 3/2016  
Appendix 2B: Minutes of RSCS CDC Meeting 3/2016 extension | For decision | 3 |
| 3. | Matters Arising from Minutes and Action Items  
Attachment:  
Appendix 3A: Action Item list of RSCS CDC Meetings | For information | 3 |
| 4. | Confidential Items | For information | 3 |

**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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part 3 – Curriculum Proposals**  

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7. | Curriculum Proposals  
*Recommendation: That the Committee review the attached proposals and endorse them for submission to the College Education Committee.*  
Attachment: Appendix 7A – RSCS Curriculum Proposals | For decision | 15 |

---
Part 4 – Education Policy and Related Issues

8. Graduate Exit Levels
   For discussion

9. Student Critical Incident Policy and Procedure Review
   Recommendation: That the Committee provide feedback to elizabeth.nunrom@anu.edu.au by no later than 11 July 2016 on the proposed revisions to the Student Critical Incident Policy and Procedure.
   School Response
   School Response 26

10. Threshold Standards AQF+1 Requirement
    Recommendation: That the Committee provide feedback to elizabeth.nunrom@anu.edu.au by no later than 11 July 2016 on the proposed Qualification Requirements for Teaching Staff policy and procedure (Appendices E and F) for the AQF+1 requirement specified in the Threshold Standards.
    School Response
    School Response 41

Part 5 – Items of other business

11. Meeting Dates
    For information 57

12. Other business and question time
    For discussion 57
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 3/2016 held on 14 April 2016 and the extension meeting held on 29 April 2016 are to be confirmed.

Recommendation

That the Committee confirm the minutes of the meeting 3/2016.

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.

Item 4 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.
Meeting No. 3/2016 of the Research School of Computer Science Curriculum Development Committee was held on Thursday 14 April 2016 at 2pm in Room B123, RSISE Building (115).

Present: Shayne Flint, Lynette Johns-Boast, Eric McCreath, Paul Melloy, Ramesh Sankaranarayana, John Slaney, Qing Wang.

In Attendance: Mrs Elizabeth Nunrom.

Absent: Tom Gedeon, Tony Hosking, Alistair Rendell, Alexander Richardson, Dirk Pattinson, Klaus Weber

PART 1 – PROCEDURAL MATTERS

ITEM 1 WELCOMES, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND APOLOGIES

1.1 Welcomes and Apologies

Apologies were received from Tom Gedeon, Tony Hosking, Alistair Rendell, Dirk Pattison and Klaus Weber.

1.2 Announcements

There were no announcements

ITEM 2 MINUTES

The Committee resolved to confirm the minutes of meeting 2/2016 of the RSCS Curriculum Development Committee held on 24 March 2016.

ITEM 3 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES AND ACTION ITEMS

The Chair gave and received updates on the current action item list. The updated list is attached to these Minutes.

ITEM 4 CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

There were no confidential items
PART 2 REPORTS

ITEM 5 REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

The Chair informed the Committee that a new Wattle site was in development where resources would be available for course convenors, including a forum where relevant issues could be discussed. Once resources had been added to the site, a notification would be sent out.

**Action:** Ramesh Sankaranarayana to add Natalie Young and Elizabeth Nunrom to the Course Convenor Wattle site.

**Resolution:**
The Curriculum Development Committee resolved to note the report and associated actions.

ITEM 6 REPORT FROM THE PROGRAM CONVENORS

6.1 Lynette Johns-Boast – Postgraduate Convenor

- There was some confusion regarding dates for COMP8440, however this seems to resolve itself without major issues
- There were lower than usual numbers in COMP8440. This could be due to:
  - The late availability of the course for enrolment through ISIS
  - Students being concerned that they wouldn’t graduate on time
  - Fewer than usual students dropping COMP6320 and COMP8650 and picking up COMP8440 as a substitute

**Action:** Lynette Johns-Boast to investigate the possibility of co-teaching the existing Masters courses with undergraduate versions.

6.2 John Slaney – Honours convenor

- 3 students to submit in May
- Approximately 20 students are enrolled, which is normal for this program
- Looking at entry requirements, which is proving to be confusing

**Resolution:**
The Curriculum Development Committee resolved to note the reports and associated actions.
PART 3 CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

ITEM 7 CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

The following curriculum proposals were endorsed subject to the stated amendments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7706 | Master of Computing          | - Program requirements updated to reflect new individual Computing project course  
|      |                              | - Learning outcomes to be checked and updated to remove any references to Engineering  
|      |                              | - Remove all changes to the Admission requirements                               |
| 6706 | Graduate Diploma of Computing| - Remove the statement beginning with the word ‘ideally’ from the Admission requirements|

Action: Lynette Johns-Boast to provide further study plans for the Master of Computer Science to Student Services. Students Services will put these on the program Commencers page and refer students to it via a note under ‘Additional Information’.

New Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| COMP 87XX   | Individual Computing Project | - Update of first learning outcome, removing ‘in computing’  
|             |                              | - Clarification with Weifa Liang whether undertaking the course over two semesters would be possible |

The following curriculum proposals were discussed by the Committee and the following amendments proposed. The proposals are to be recirculated for further feedback:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3701 | Bachelor of Information Technology | - Update of program requirements to reflect correct names and codes and the inclusion of a STAT course to reflect the same list of MATH/STAT courses in the BAC/BSEng  
|      |                              | - Learning Outcomes to reflect the Undergraduate Education Working party document |
| 4716 | Bachelor of Advanced Computing (Hons) | - Update of program requirements to reflect correct names, codes and removal of the word ‘research’ from specialisation.  
|      |                              | - Honours project unit value needs to be considered, whether a 12 unit option should be made available  
|      |                              | - EA and ACS advice need to be received regarding accreditation |
| 4717 | Bachelor of Advanced Computing (R&D) (Hons) | - Update of program requirements to reflect correct names, codes and removal of the word ‘research’ from specialisation.  
|      |                              | - EA and ACS advice need to be received regarding accreditation |
The following curriculum proposals were referred to the Committee for feedback:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4708 | Bachelor of Software Engineering (Hons)       | - Program requirements to be updated to reflect new 12-unit individual research project course (name to be reconsidered in line with 4th year project name)  
|      |                                               | - Study plan to be updated with respect to COMP2550                                         |
|      |                                               | - To be recirculated for feedback                                                              |

**New Subplan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Data Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors</td>
<td>HCC</td>
<td>This proposal will not be going forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialisation</td>
<td>Intelligent Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Specialisation | Theoretical Computer Science | Add MATHS3343 to the specialisation  
|              |                        | - COMP4630 to be renamed, removing the word ‘overview’ and reflecting the advanced nature of the course |

**Subplan Amendment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMS-MAJ</td>
<td>Computer Systems</td>
<td>The proposal to offer COMP3300 and COMP3310 every year to be discussed and confirmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMS-SPEC</td>
<td>Computer Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFS-MAJ</td>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFT-MAJ</td>
<td>Software Development</td>
<td>Add COMP3900 to list</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The following curriculum proposals were referred to the Committee for feedback:**

**Subplan Disestablishment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CENG - MAJ</td>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMP 2420</td>
<td>Introduction to Data Management, Analysis and Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP 37XX</td>
<td>Individual Research Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Course Amendments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ANUC 1100   | Introduction to Programming and Algorithms/(Advanced)  
| COMP 1100   | Changes as a result of the Undergraduate Review                                                                       |
| COMP 1130   |                                                                                                                                     |
The Committee resolved to:

1. Endorse the proposals for Master of Computing, Graduate Diploma of Computing and the new course 'Individual Research Project', subject to the state conditions, for transmission to the College Education Committee
2. Request that all other proposals be re-circulated to the Committee for feedback due 19 April to Ramesh.Sankaranarayana@anu.edu.au.

### Course Inactivation – For discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMP 1510</td>
<td>Introduction to Software Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGN 8100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP 2140</td>
<td>Java Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP 2500</td>
<td>Software Construction for Software Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP 3420</td>
<td>Advanced Databases and Data Mining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP 6700</td>
<td>Introductory Programming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resolution:**
The Committee resolved to:

1. Endorse the proposals for Master of Computing, Graduate Diploma of Computing and the new course 'Individual Research Project', subject to the state conditions, for transmission to the College Education Committee
2. Request that all other proposals be re-circulated to the Committee for feedback due 19 April to Ramesh.Sankaranarayana@anu.edu.au.
PART 6 ITEMS OF OTHER BUSINESS

ITEM 17 MEETING DATES
The Committee noted the Meeting dates for 2016

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

Items of other business were not considered due to lack of time

The meeting closed at 4:30pm

EJN 15/04/2016
RESEARCH SCHOOL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Meeting No. 3 (Continued)/2016 of the Research School of Computer Science Curriculum Development Committee was held on Friday 29 April 2016 at 2pm in Design Studio, Ian Ross Building (115).

Present: Shayne Flint, Lynette Johns-Boast, Eric McCreath, Paul Melloy, Ramesh Sankaranarayana, John Slaney, Qing Wang, Alexander Richardson, Tony Hosking, John Slaney, Tom Gideon

In Attendance: Mrs Sandra Harrison.

Absent: Alistair Rendell, Dirk Pattinson, Klaus Weber

PART 3 CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

ITEM 7 CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

The following curriculum proposals were endorsed by the Committee for transmission to the College Education Committee subject to the following amendments proposed.

Program/Plan Amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4708</td>
<td>Bachelor of Software Engineering (Hons)</td>
<td>- To be recirculated for feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Summary wording to be reduced &lt;100 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Learning outcomes approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- ATAR set at 87 – should be 90 – Action Alistair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Remove Prog 0 from pattern – Action Shayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Rename COMP3500/COMP4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Update study pattern tables – Action Shayne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Subplan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Data Science</td>
<td>Learning outcomes – To be recirculated and reworded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prerequisites – To be confirmed. Action Qing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialisation</td>
<td>Intelligent Systems</td>
<td>Summary to be edited – Action Marcus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add ECON2141 to course list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add ENGN4520 to course list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialisation</td>
<td>Theoretical Computer Science</td>
<td>Add MATHS3343 to the specialisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMP4630 to be renamed, removing the word ‘overview’ and reflecting the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>advanced nature of the course – Action John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add COMP3610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Subplan Amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMS-MAJ</td>
<td>Computer Systems</td>
<td>The proposal to offer COMP3300 and COMP3310 every year confirmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edit Description – Action Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edit Learning Outcomes – Action Lynette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add COMP2400?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMS-SPEC</td>
<td>Computer Systems &amp; Architecture</td>
<td>Remove COMP2400? Further consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edit Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edit Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFS-MAJ</td>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>Edit first two learning outcomes – Action Shayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFT-MAJ</td>
<td>Software Development</td>
<td>Add COMP3900 to list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edit Learning Outcomes, combine #1 and #2 – Action Shayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add COMP3900 to list of Core Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Move COMP3530 to electives list</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMP 2120</td>
<td>Software Engineering</td>
<td>Refine Course Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add indicative assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prerequisites: PROG3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning outcomes – Correct spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP 2420</td>
<td>Introduction to Data Management, Analysis and</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes to be refined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>COMP2400 – too much overlap?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP 3770</td>
<td>Individual Research Project</td>
<td>No changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Course Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANUC 1100</td>
<td>Introduction to Programming and Algorithms(Advanced)</td>
<td>No changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP 1100</td>
<td></td>
<td>No changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP 1130</td>
<td></td>
<td>No changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANUC 1110</td>
<td>Introduction to Software Systems</td>
<td>No changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP 1110</td>
<td></td>
<td>No changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP 1140</td>
<td></td>
<td>No changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP 6710</td>
<td></td>
<td>No changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP 2100</td>
<td>Software Construction</td>
<td>Approved subject to learning outcomes being modified – Action Tony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP 6442</td>
<td></td>
<td>No changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP 2130</td>
<td>Software Analysis and Design</td>
<td>No changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP 6311</td>
<td></td>
<td>No changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion of the following curriculum proposals was postponed until further notice:

**Resolution:**
The Committee resolved to:
1. Endorse the curriculum proposals above, subject to the stated conditions, for transmission to the College Education Committee;
2. Postpone discussion of possible course disestablishments until further notice.

*Course Disestablishment – For discussion*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMP 1510</td>
<td>Introduction to Software Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGN 8100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP 2140</td>
<td>Java Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP 2500</td>
<td>Software Construction for Software Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP 3420</td>
<td>Advanced Databases and Data Mining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP 6700</td>
<td>Introductory Programming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resolutions:
The Committee resolved to:
1. Endorse the curriculum proposals above, subject to the stated conditions, for transmission to the College Education Committee;
2. Postpone discussion of possible course disestablishments until further notice.

The meeting closed at 5:20pm

SH 1/05/2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSCS</td>
<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>Not set</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>RSCS</td>
<td>4/2015</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Position Descriptors to be completed</td>
<td>Ramesh Sankaranarayana</td>
<td>Not set</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCS</td>
<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>22-Jun-16</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>John Slaney to write a short description of the process for distribution to CDC members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCS</td>
<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>Not set</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Any changes to be submitted by 29 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCS</td>
<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>Not set</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCS</td>
<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>Not set</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCS</td>
<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>Not set</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCS</td>
<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>Not set</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCS</td>
<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>Not set</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCS</td>
<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>10-Mar</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCS</td>
<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>10-Mar</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCS</td>
<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>15-Mar</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCS</td>
<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>School</td>
<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>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCS</td>
<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>RSCS</td>
<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>Not set</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCS</td>
<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>Not set</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCS</td>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>The Curriculum Development Committee resolved that a review would be undertaken of Postgraduate programs</td>
<td>Ramesh Sankaranarayana</td>
<td>Not set</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCS</td>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>The Committee resolved that an internal review would be conducted of COMP1730/3610/8705</td>
<td>Ramesh Sankaranarayana</td>
<td>Not set</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCS</td>
<td>2/2016</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Paul Melloy to provide accurate enrolment numbers for the R&amp;D program</td>
<td>Paul Melloy</td>
<td>Not set</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCS</td>
<td>2/2016</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>The Curriculum Development Committee resolved to note the discussion and convenors encouraged to implement methods to address Ghost Writing within the School</td>
<td>Committee members</td>
<td>18-Apr</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCS</td>
<td>3/2016</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>New Wattle Site - Ramesh Sankaranarayana to add Natalie Young and Elizabeth Nunrom to the Course Convener Wattle site.</td>
<td>Ramesh Sankaranarayana</td>
<td>Not set</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCS</td>
<td>3/2016</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>PG Program Convener Report - Lynette Johns-Boast to investigate the possibility of co-teaching the existing Masters courses with undergraduate versions.</td>
<td>Lynette Johns-Boast</td>
<td>Not set</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCS</td>
<td>3/2016</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lynette Johns-Boast to provide further study plans for the Master of Computer Science to Student Services. Students Services will put these on the program Commencers page and refer students to it via a note under ‘Additional Information’.</td>
<td>Lynette Johns-Boast; CEC Student Services</td>
<td>Not set</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 3 – Curriculum Proposals

Item 7  Research School of Computer Science

Purpose
To review curriculum proposals from the Research School of Computer Science submitted to the Committee for their endorsement

Recommendation
That the Committee review the below proposals and endorse them for submission to the College Education Committee.

ACTIONS REQUIRED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For discussion</th>
<th>For decision</th>
<th>For information</th>
<th>School response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

New Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>COMP 3000</td>
<td>Innovation, Commercialization and Entrepreneurship in Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>COMP 3001</td>
<td>Green IT: Evaluating and reducing computer energy use, carbon emissions and e-waste</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sponsor
Associate Director of Education, Research School of Computer Science

Appendices

Appendix 7A – RSCS Curriculum Proposal forms
Academic Course Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEC Document Number</th>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Approved</th>
<th>Course Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Type</th>
<th>Amendment Type</th>
<th>Amendment Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Course</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Long Course Title</th>
<th>Short Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course to provide recognition of the work of students undertaking entrepreneur programs such as Innovation ACT.</td>
<td>Innovation, Commercialization and Entrepreneurship in Technology (100 characters)</td>
<td>Innovation Tech (30 characters)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACADEMIC USE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To Take Effect From</th>
<th>Course Minimum Unit Value</th>
<th>Course Maximum Unit Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/07/2017</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does this course have an UG / PG Equivalent?</th>
<th>UG / PG Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you want this course to be offered as a variable unit course?</th>
<th>Proposed Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposer Name</th>
<th>Primary Convenor's Email</th>
<th>Primary Convenor's Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Worthington</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tom.worthington@tomw.net.au">tom.worthington@tomw.net.au</a></td>
<td>Tom Worthington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation requires the ability to recognize the opportunities provided by technology and know how to exploit them in business. The aim is more efficient and effective organizations, be they for-profit or not, existing or new start-ups. This requires documented investigation, analysis and review. A methodical investigation of functions and processes, requirements, costs, sustainability and business benefits is needed, with specifications and acceptance criteria. Twelve weekly topics introduce the materials to students with interactive quizzes and forums to help build the skills needed for assignments. The student can undertake this course in parallel with Innovation ACT, or another entrepreneur program, and submit artifacts from that program for assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Structure and Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The course consists of two parts, corresponding to the skills:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. An Introduction to Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Business Model Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stakeholder Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Business analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Concept Generation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Value Capture
6. Documenting

Learning Outcomes

After completing this course, student will be able to:

1. Innovate: Prepare a plan to exploit business opportunities provided by technology, for more efficient and effective performance of an existing or new businesses,

2. Analyze: Document an analysis of a business in terms of functions and processes, by identifying and quantifying improvements to reduce costs and enhance sustainability.

The learning objectives are based on the Skills Framework for the Information Age (SFIA) skills definitions: “Innovation” and “Business analysis”, as used by the Australian Computer Society (ACS) for accreditation.

Workload

To complete the subject you will need to spend 8-10 hours each week reading, communicating with colleagues and tutors, and preparing assignments.

Prescribed Texts (Reading to Support the Course)


Preliminary Reading


Indicative Reading List


### Assumed Knowledge, Required Skills and Recommended Courses (not prerequisites)

It is assumed the student is familiar with basic computing concepts, from a course such as The Craft of Computing (COMP1040), Introduction to Programming and Algorithms (COMP1100) or Business Information Systems (INFS1001). The student will need to be able to use a computer and the Internet to complete this on-line course and be familiar with academic writing and referencing to undertake assignments.

### Requisite Statement for Course (includes Corequisite/Prerequisite and Incompatibility)

Incompatible with COMP7310

### Indicative Assessment

There are two areas of assessment in the course:

1. Weekly Assessment (20%): Contributions to weekly discussion forums (10%) and completion of a weekly quiz (10%),
2. Assignments (80%): mid course (40%) and at the end (40%).

To pass the course at least 10/20 for Weekly Assessment and 40/80 for Assignments is required. Grades of 70% and higher (Distinction and High Distinction) are based only on Assignments.

### Assessment Rationale

The questions each week are on topics to be covered in the assignments, allowing students to build their skills. Each major assignment correspond to a learning objective for the course: 1. Innovate: Prepare a plan to exploit business opportunities provided by technology, for more efficient and effective performance of an existing or new businesses, and, 2. Analyze: Document an analysis of a business in terms of functions and processes, by identifying and quantifying improvements to reduce costs and enhance sustainability.


### Additional Assessment | Learning Outcomes

### Mode of Delivery

Online

### Quality Assurance Arrangements

The course learning objectives are based on the Skills Framework for the Information Age (SFIA) skills definitions. SFIA is used by the Australian Computer Society (ACS) in accrediting ANU computing degrees. The course format is based on COMP7310, which won the Education Category of the ACS Canberra ICT Awards 2010 and a national ACS Gold 2015 award in the ICT Higher Educator category.

### Transitional Arrangements (if applicable)

### Relevant ANU internal and external consultation

Philippe Kruchten, designer of Universally of British Colombia (UBC) "New Venture Design" course (APSC 486) and Joanna Mills, Deputy Director, Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning, Judge Business School, University of Cambridge, Vicki Stanley, Innovation ANU, consulted. Review of innovation courses and programs at ANU and University of Canberra undertaken before designing this course.

### Intended Market and work undertaken to

The course is intended for students interested in start-ups and innovation. This is expected to
evaluate the market appeal to students beyond the usual demographic for IT courses. The course has a management, rather than technical focus and will therefore appeal to business studies students.

**Estimated Enrolment Numbers and rationale**

Estimated fifty students per year. However, as an on-line course, it can be run with a smaller number of students than a lecture based or blended course. An undergraduate version of the course can be run alongside the postgraduate version by the same staff at the same time, without the need for "co-teaching".

**Areas of Interest**

- Information Technology
- Business Administration

**Is this required on a Sub-Plan?**

Please specify Major / Minor / Spec

---

**ADMINISTRATION USE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible College</th>
<th>ANU College of Engineering and Computer Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Send Notifications To</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Elizabeth.Nunrom@anu.edu.au">Elizabeth.Nunrom@anu.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean / Dean/ College Dean</td>
<td>Associate Professor Jochen Trumpf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Consent Required to Enrol?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility for Graduate Studies (Graduate Coursework Only)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Studies Classification 1</td>
<td>Graduate Studies Classification 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of course topics (Topics are descriptors on course names) (30 character limit each topic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Organisation (Offered by)</td>
<td>07345 Research School of Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Group</td>
<td>ENGIT (ANU College of Eng &amp; Comp Sci)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Career</td>
<td>UGRD (Undergraduate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times may this course be repeated after successful completion?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Grading Basis</td>
<td>GRD (Graded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a work experience or course internship?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Work Experience course are where student learning and performance is not directed by the university)
**Quota**

**Proposed Scheduling (for the next three years)**
Semester 2 2017, Semester 2 2018, Semester 2 2019

**Does this course have more than one owner?** No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Split Ownership</th>
<th>Academic Organisation</th>
<th>Percentage EFTSL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COURSE FEES**

**Field of Education Code** 029999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Per Unit ISF</th>
<th>Per Unit DTF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fee rate is same as existing course**

**Department ID** CE200

Submit by Email to Course Registry
Academic Course Form

CEC Document Number

Subject Area COMP Catalogue Number 3001

Date Approved

Course Status Not Approved

Request Type New Course

Amendment Type None

Amendment Description

Rationale Undergraduate version to be offered alongside (not co-taught) existing postgraduate course COMP7310

Long Course Title Green IT: Evaluating and reducing computer energy use, carbon emissions and e-waste

Short Course Title Green IT

ACADEMIC USE

To Take Effect From 01/01/2017

Course Minimum Unit Value 6

Course Maximum Unit Value 6

Does this course have an UG / PG Equivalent? Yes

UG / PG Equivalent COMP7310

Do you want this course to be offered as a variable unit course? No

Proposed Date

Proposer Name Tom Worthington

Primary Convenor's Email tom.worthington@tomw.net.au

Primary Convenor's Name Tom Worthington

Course Description Green IT teaches the evaluation and analysis of the energy use, carbon emissions and e-waste from computers and telecommunications in an organization, in accordance with international standards for greenhouse gas and energy audit. Students then learn to generate a sustainability strategy for IT, to reduce consumption of energy and materials, helping to reduce carbon emissions. Twelve weekly topics introduce the materials to students with interactive quizzes and forums to help build the skills needed for assignments.

Course Structure and Content The course consists of two parts, corresponding to the learning outcomes, with one topic per week:

Sustainability Assessment

1. The Politics, Science and Business of Sustainability
2. The Global ICT Footprint
3. Energy Saving - Data Centres and Client Equipment
4. Materials Use
5. Compliance Audit
6. Methods and Tools

Sustainability Strategy
Learning Outcomes

After completing this course, students will be able to:

1. Evaluate the sustainability of IT services, devices and day-to-day operations of an organisation, including the carbon footprint and e-waste.
2. Prepare a sustainability strategy for IT in an organisation, covering both energy and materials use.

The learning objectives are based on the Skills Framework for the Information Age (SFIA) skills definitions: "Sustainability assessment" and "Sustainability strategy", as used by the Australian Computer Society (ACS) for accreditation.

Workload

To complete the subject you will need to spend 8-10 hours each week reading, communicating with colleagues and tutors, and preparing assignments.

Prescribed Texts (Reading to Support the Course)


Preliminary Reading


Indicative Reading List


**Assumed Knowledge, Required Skills and Recommended Courses (not prerequisites)**

It is assumed the student is familiar with basic computing concepts, from a course such as The Craft of Computing (COMP1040), Introduction to Programming and Algorithms (COMP1100) or Business Information Systems (INFS1001). The student will need to be able to use a computer and the Internet to complete this on-line course and be familiar with academic writing and referencing to undertake assignments.

**Requisite Statement for Course** (includes Corequisite/Prerequisite and Incompatibility)

Incompatible with ICT Sustainability (COMP7310)

(For more information please refer Requisite Design Guide)

**Indicative Assessment**

There are two areas of assessment in the course:
1. Weekly Assessment (20%): Contributions to weekly discussion forums (10%) and completion of a weekly quiz (10%),
2. Assignments (80%): mid course (40%) and at the end (40%).

To pass the course at least 10/20 for Weekly Assessment and 40/80 for Assignments is required. Grades of 70% and higher (Distinction and High Distinction) are based only on Assignments.

**Assessment Rationale**

The questions each week are on topics to be covered in the assignments, allowing students to build their skills. Each major assignment correspond to a learning objective for the course: 1. Evaluate the sustainability of IT services and, 2. Prepare a sustainability strategy.


**Additional Assessment | Learning Outcomes**

Mode of Delivery

Online

**Quality Assurance Arrangements**

The course learning objectives are based on the Skills Framework for the Information Age (SFIA) skills definitions: "Sustainability assessment" and "Sustainability strategy". SFIA is used by the Australian Computer Society (ACS) in accrediting ANU computing degrees. The graduate course this undergraduate version is based on won the Education Category of the ACS Canberra ICT Awards 2010 and a national ACS Gold 2015 award in the ICT Higher Educator category.

**Transitional Arrangements (if applicable)**

The course was originally commissioned by the Australian Computer Society for postgraduate professional training to meet the requirements for certification of computer professionals.

**Intended Market and work undertaken to evaluate the market**

The course is intended for undergraduate students interested in environmental issues. This is expected to appeal to students beyond the usual demographic for IT courses. The course has a management, rather than technical focus and will therefore appeal to business studies students.

**Estimated Enrolment Numbers and rationale**

Estimated fifty students per year. However, as an on-line course, it can be run with a smaller number of students than a lecture based or blended course. The undergraduate version of the course can be run alongside the postgraduate version by the same staff at the same time, without the need for "co-teaching".
Areas of Interest
Environmental Science
Environmental Studies
Computer Systems

Is this required on a Sub-Plan?
Please specify Major / Minor / Spec

ADMINISTRATION USE

Responsible College
ANU College of Engineering and Computer Science

Send Notifications To
elizabeth.nunrom@anu.edu.au

Associate Dean / Dean/ College Dean
Associate Professor Jochen Trumpf

Is Consent Required to Enrol?
No

Eligibility for Graduate Studies (Graduate Coursework Only)
No

Graduate Studies Classification 1
Graduate Studies Classification 2

List of course topics (Topics are descriptors on course names) (30 character limit each topic)

Academic Organisation (Offered by)
07345 Research School of Computer Science

Academic Group
ENGIT (ANU College of Eng & Comp Sci)

Academic Career
UGRD (Undergraduate)

How many times may this course be repeated after successful completion?
0

Course Grading Basis
GRD (Graded)

Course Component
CRS (Course Enrolment Only)

Is this a work experience or course internship?
No

If yes, to a work experience course, will the learning and assessment be directed by the ANU?

Quota

Proposed Scheduling (for the next three years)
Semester 1 2017, Semester 1 2018, Semester 1 2019

Does this course have more than one owner?
No

Split Ownership

Academic Organisation

Percentage EFTSL

RSCS Curriculum Development Committee Agenda 4/2016
### COURSE FEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Education Code</th>
<th>029999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Per Unit ISF</th>
<th>Per Unit DTF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fee rate is same as existing course

Submit by Email to Course Registry

Department ID: CE200
Item 9: Student Critical Incident Policy and Procedure Review

Purpose
To undertake a review of the Student Critical Incident Policy and Procedure as required under the policy framework every 3 years.

Recommendation
That the Committee provide feedback to elizabeth.nunrom@anu.edu.au by no later than 11 July 2016 on the proposed revisions to the Student Critical Incident Policy and Procedure.

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

Executive Summary of Issues
Policies and procedures are required to undergo a full review every three years. The Student Critical Incident Policy and Procedure were originally approved on 30 April 2009, were reviewed and revised in January 2013 and are again now due for review. The review identified that the procedure was out of date due to references to a position (Director, Residential and Campus Communities) role and a business unit (International Student Services) that were disestablished as part of a change management process in 2014.

It should be noted that this year the policy and procedure have been used in relation to two student fatalities. As a result of the most recent tragedy, Division of Student Life has a review process underway to meet with stakeholders, internal and external, to assess whether the procedures are clear, fit for its intended purpose, and allow for effective implementation of response. It is anticipated that at the conclusion of this review process recommendations will be made regarding the future management of student critical incidents.

Alignment with ANU by 2020
ANU by 2020 indicates that “Effective organisations need efficient organisational structures and clear policies and procedures to underpin their activities.” In relation to student critical incidents, having clear procedures will allow ANU to respond in an effective, consistent, compassionate, and timely manner.

Background
Last reviewed and approved in April 2013, the Student Critical Incident Policy (Appendix A) and Procedure (Appendix B) are due for review.

In undertaking the review, four key criteria were applied:
1. Clarity and relevance of purpose: the policy is aligned with University and Federal strategy and standards;
2. Clarity and succinctness of expression: the policy provides a clear statement of principles, and the associated procedures inform readers who will implement the policy and how they will implement it;
3. Consistency: the policy and associated procedures are in alignment with other University and Federal policies, procedures and rules;
4. Sustainability: the policy and procedures reflect a regard for the regulatory burden on groups and individuals across the University.

Clarity and relevance of purpose: the policy is aligned with University and Federal strategy and standards
The revised policy (Appendix C) and procedure (Appendix D) are clearly aligned with the relevant standards including the ESOS Act and National Code. No amendments were required as a result of these items of legislation.

Clarity and succinctness of expression: the policy provides a clear statement of principles, and the associated procedures inform readers who will implement the policy and how they will implement it
Definitional items were taken out of the procedure. Extra steps were added to the sections on missing
students and deceased students. This has assisted with clarifying roles and responsibilities.

Consistency: the policy and associated procedures are in alignment with other University and Federal policies, procedures and rules

The policy and procedure ensures consistency with the following:

- Standard 6.4 of the National Code “The registered provider must have a documented critical incident policy together with procedures that cover the action to be taken in the event of a critical incident, required follow-up to the incident, and records of the incident and action taken”; and
- Privacy Act 1998

Sustainability: the policy and procedures reflect a regard for the regulatory burden on groups and individuals across the University.

The revised procedure accurately reflects current practice but now provides clear guidelines for staff to follow when dealing with a critical incident involving a student of the Australian National University.

Other documents attached to the policy and procedure need consideration.

- The International Student Critical Incident Form: disestablish (Appendix E) and replace with Student Critical Incident Form (Appendix F)
- The Student Critical Incident Map: revise (Appendix G). Once the feedback on the policy and procedure is received, DSA and DSL will produce a Student Critical Incident Response Quick Reference, modelled on that used by Griffith University (Appendix E).

Due to the size of the changes and the number of items moved to difference sections, the revised versions of the policy and procedure have been presented as clean copies without track changes. A copy with track changes can be made available.

Sponsor
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)

Author
Deputy Director Student Experience, Division of Student Life
May 2016

Appendices
Appendix A: Current Student Critical Incident Policy
Appendix B: Current Student Critical Incident Procedure
Appendix C: Revised Student Critical Incident Policy
Appendix D: Revised Student Critical Incident Procedure
Appendix E: Current International Student Critical Form
Appendix F: Revised Student Critical Incident Form
Appendix G: Student Critical Map
Appendix H: Griffith University International Student Critical Incident Management Policy and Procedure
Appendix C:

Policy: Student critical incident

Purpose

The policy acknowledges the need for the University to have clear decision-making and processes for managing and reporting on student critical incidents to ensure that each case is managed effectively, consistently, compassionately, and expeditiously.

Overview

This policy provides staff, students and visitors with guidance as to the appropriate action to be taken in the event of a critical incident that occurs on or off campus at any time that involves enrolled students of the Australian National University.

Scope

This policy applies across the University. The policy does not cover students taught through off-shore partnership arrangements.

Policy statement

1. The University asserts its reasonable support for students, staff and, where appropriate their families, who may be affected by a student critical incident leading to death, injury or the inability to undertake research, teaching, study or administration.

2. A ‘critical incident’ is a traumatic event, or the threat of such (within or outside Australia), which causes extreme stress, fear or injury. A critical incident may include:
   a. Death
   b. Attempted suicide
   c. Serious injury/ illness
   d. Sexual and/or physical assault, domestic violence
   e. Missing student
   f. External emergencies (e.g., infectious diseases, war, coup) and natural disasters
   g. Perpetrating or victim of crime-related incidents
   h. Serious threats of violence to students and/or staff
   i. Mental health issues impacting on safety of self and others
j. Severe verbal or psychological aggression
k. Drug or alcohol abuse
l. Other traumatic events or serious threats

3. Overseen by the Registrar, Student Life, the University’s response will be adapted, within the parameters of this policy and the Privacy Policy, to meet the needs of each incident.

4. The Privacy Act 1988 (Cth) permits the University to disclose personal information about someone to a party outside the University where, inter alia:
   a. a person consents in writing to their personal information being disclosed; or
   b. the University believes on reasonable grounds that the disclosure is necessary to prevent or lessen a serious and imminent threat to the life or health of the individual concerned or of another person.

5. This policy ensures compliance with the Education Services for Overseas Students (Act) 2000 (ESOS Act) in relation to critical incidents involving international students.

6. In the event of a student critical incident on campus, this policy will be read in conjunction with Emergency Response procedure and the Reporting work health and safety hazards and incidents at ANU procedure.
Appendix D

Procedure: Student critical incident

Purpose

These procedures provide clear processes for decision-making and managing critical incidents involving students of the University in an effective, consistent, compassionate, and timely manner.

Definitions

1. ‘Primary Contact’ is the person nominated by the student on the Interactive Student Information System (ISIS) as their Primary Contact, or where that person is unavailable, next-of-kin, family, or other person if appropriate.
2. ‘Personal representative’ is the legal personal representative of a deceased student who may be the Primary Contact or an Executor or Administrator of the student’s estate. Contact the Legal Office where there is need for confirmation of the identity of the appropriate personal representative.

Procedure

Initial response, follow-up actions, and reporting

3. Where someone on campus is aware of a death, an immediate threat to the life of a person or a serious threat to property (such as a fire), call 000 and report the incident to Australian Federal Police or one of the emergency services. Following that, report the incident to ANU Security [(02) 6125 2249].
4. Where a critical incident involving a student of the Australian National University is identified by an internal party (i.e., student, staff or visitor) or an external party (e.g., the Australian Federal Police), contact ANU Security [(02) 6125 2249].
5. ANU Security notifies the Registrar (Student Life) or nominee of the student critical incident.
6. On notification of a student critical incident, the Registrar (Student Life) or nominee:
   a. Requests that the appropriate delegate complete the critical incident report template and submit other relevant documentation.
   b. Reviews background details of the critical incident to create a clear understanding of the known facts.
c. Assesses the severity of the situation. Separate procedures are followed for a missing student or a deceased student.

d. Accesses student record to verify student details, and gathers relevant information, including address, email, phone numbers, nationality, primary contact, sponsor or agent, religion, etc.

e. Plans and coordinates the ongoing management of the critical incident.

f. Delegates, if required, a nominee to manage and report on the critical incident.

g. Contacts relevant internal and external stakeholders and allocates to them roles and responsibilities, including the provision of counselling support to those directly affected by the incident. If deemed necessary, convenes a meeting of relevant stakeholders to discuss the actions taken or to be taken.

7. Depending on the severity of the incident, the Registrar (Student Life) or nominee:

   a. Informs the Office of the Vice-Chancellor of the nature of the critical incident and of the initial response.

   b. Informs the Director, Strategic Communication and Public Affairs, in case the circumstances of the critical incident result in media attention.

   c. Informs the primary contact. However, if the incident involves the death of a student, Australian Federal Police is responsible for informing the family or next of kin.

   d. Briefs the Dean and General Manager of relevant College(s) to carry out the necessary internal communications.

   e. Liaises with doctors, hospital, government departments, Embassy or Consulate.

   f. Notifies sponsoring agent if student sponsored.

   g. Notifies Registrar (Student Administration) to ensure the student record is updated accordingly and that the student’s tuition fees for that study semester are refunded where studies are unable to be continued as a direct result of the incident.

8. Where the critical incident involves an international student, where the Primary Contact has already been informed, the Registrar (Student Life) or nominee, where appropriate:
a. Liaises with the Embassy or Consulate to request appropriate support be provided to family overseas;

b. Hires independent interpreters;

c. Liaises with Academic Standards and Quality Office to advise Department of Immigration and Border Protection if studies interrupted and to enter information into PRISMS.

9. The Registrar (Student Life) or nominee briefs relevant stakeholders throughout the management of the critical incident.

10. The Registrar (Student Life) or nominee manages the student critical incident to its conclusion.

11. There can be costs associated with a student critical incident. Where the student’s personal insurance does not cover costs associated with the incident, the student and/or family will need to meet those costs. In exceptional circumstances, the Vice-Chancellor may approve financial assistance to assist direct family with travel, accommodation, and other arrangements.

**Missing Student**

12. When a student is reported to an academic College or to a Hall of Residence, the appropriate staff member will gather information, make an initial assessment, and report on that to the Registrar (Student Life).

13. In assessing whether a student is missing, University staff cannot disclose the student’s personal information to any third party, including family or friends.

14. If the person reporting a student as missing has serious concerns about the student’s personal and mental welfare, encourage the person to contact the Australian Federal Police.

15. To make an initial assessment where the academic College or Residence suspects a student is missing, the appropriate staff member:
   a. Accesses the student record to verify details and to gather information, including address, email and phone numbers.
   b. Establishes whether the student has been attending classes, submitted assignments, used WATTLE, engaged with supervisor, or had recent contact with classmates, staff, and/or administrators.
   c. Confirms that the student has not applied for leave of absence or cancelled their enrolment.
   d. Confirms with ANU Security the student’s building access activity around campus.
e. For residential students, confirms if the student has been seen in or around the residence.

f. For international students, determines whether they are sponsored or on exchange.

g. For an international student, requests Academic Standards and Quality Office check immigration records to see whether they have left the country.

h. Ascertains whether the student has recently accessed services from the Counselling Centre and/or the Dean of Students.

i. Contacts the student (University and other email address, telephone/SMS) to advise that concerns have been expressed about their personal welfare and that if they do not respond within 2 working days, the Registrar (Student Life) will be notified, as will, under the provisions of the student critical incident procedure, their Primary Contact.

j. Summarises information, including the contact details of the person who reported the student as missing, and reports on actions to Registrar (Student Life).

16. If the student reported missing replies within 2 days of the initial contact from the Student Administration Manager, the student will be requested to make an appointment with the College(s) to determine whether further support is required.

17. If the student does not reply to the initial email and phone call within 2 days, the Registrar (Student Life) or nominee:
   a. Informs the Primary Contact.
   b. Requests the Australian Federal Police to do a welfare check.

18. In the event that the Australian Federal Police confirm that the student is missing, the Registrar (Student Life) or nominee notifies:
   a. The Office of the Vice-Chancellor.
   b. College Dean.
   c. The Legal Office.
   d. Head of Hall, if appropriate.
   e. Registrar (Student Administration).
   f. And other stakeholders, including government departments and the Embassy or Consulate.
**Death of a Student**

19. Where a student dies on campus, call 000 immediately and notify the Australian Federal Police and emergency services. Following that, call ANU Security ((02) 6125 2249).

20. Where the Australian Federal Police or one of the emergency services identifies a student death, they should contact ANU Security. ANU Security notifies the Registrar (Student Life) or nominee.

21. The Registrar (Student Life) or nominee assists the Australian Federal Police to confirm the identity of the student and, once confirmed, assist them and/or the Embassy with the notification of the death to the family, next of kin or Primary Contact.

22. The Registrar (Student Life) notifies:
   
   a. Work Environment Group, Human Resources, within 4 hours of being informed, for mandatory Comcare reporting.

   b. Office of the Vice-Chancellor. They send a letter of condolence, to be translated if required.

   c. Director, Strategic Communications and Public Affairs. They coordinate all external communications in the event of a student death and are consulted on internal communications going to large groups.

   d. The Legal Office. They are responsible for liaising with external agencies (e.g., AFP, Coroner), assessing external agency requests for information, acting as conduit for preparing documents for external agencies, and providing advice on privacy.

   e. The College Dean(s) and College General Manager(s). They remove the student’s name from class lists, inform relevant staff and students, coordinate all internal communications, send a letter of condolence, and determine whether it is appropriate for the student to receive a posthumous award.

   f. Relevant Head of Hall.

   g. Head, Counselling Centre. They coordinate counselling support for affected students and staff.

   h. Registrar (Student Administration). They update the student record accordingly to prevent any automatic correspondence, update the record as ‘Deceased, student withdrawn from all courses’, set course status to ‘discontinued’. 
i. Financial and Business Services to ensure that automatic debtor notices are not sent.

j. University Librarian to ensure that automatic requests for return of library materials are not sent.

k. Information Technology Services to request that all electronic access is withdrawn.

23. Where the deceased student is a residential student, the Head of Hall:
   a. Locks down the student’s room and liaises with Australian Federal Police and/or ambulance services.
   b. Ensures all belongings are returned to the student’s personal representative.
   c. Where required and after consultation with the police, ensures that an appropriate member of staff is available to escort the personal representative to the room if they choose to collect the belongings in person.
   d. Following official confirmation from the Australian Federal Police and/or Embassy that next of kin has been informed, notifies students within the Hall of the student’s death in a sensitive manner.
   e. Identifies the students in the deceased student’s residence and friendship groups to whom the offer of support from the Counselling Centre should be made.
   f. Consults with Head of Counselling regarding the management of information to the student residential community and measures, including psychological interventions that may assist with the expression of a community acknowledgement and possible resolution of grief.
   g. Plans a memorial service, in consultation with Chaplains and consistent with the student’s religious and cultural background.
   h. Requests the Administration Manager to ensure no further accommodation related correspondence is addressed to the student, to cease immediately all automated financial processes, and process all possible refunds after receiving instructions from the personal representative as to the correct account details.

24. Where the deceased is an international student, the Registrar (Student Life) or nominee notifies:
a. Registrar (Student Administration) to inform Department of Immigration and Border Protection before reporting in PRISMS.

b. Embassy or Consulate.

c. Where the death is of an exchange student, the Registrar (or equivalent) of the home institution to determine the appropriate way to contact next of kin.

d. The family or personal representative to assist with funeral/repatriation arrangements, the return of personal effects, insurance, travel and accommodation, meet them on arrival, and arrange for them to meet with relevant staff and/or students.

e. ANU Chaplains or other religious clergy/representatives for funeral/memorial services in accordance with the wishes of family or their personal representative.

25. The Office of the Vice-Chancellor has the authority to approve financial assistance to the family with travel, accommodation, and other arrangements.

Conclusion and review

26. At the conclusion of a student critical incident, the Registrar (Student Life), or nominee:

   a. Arranges access to appropriate counselling support for the staff involved in the management of a student critical incident.

   b. Reviews with relevant staff involved the management and responses to the student critical incident, with a view to identifying improvements to the procedure and to the future management of student critical incidents.

   c. Updates the critical incident report, documenting actions taken and outcomes.

27. Annually, the Registrar (Student Life) reports to University Education Committee on the management of student critical incidents.
### SECTION 1: BACKGROUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Incident</th>
<th>:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time of Incident</td>
<td>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Incident</td>
<td>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Student</td>
<td>Name, Student ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Person</td>
<td>Name, Student ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANU Staff - reporting Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact No.</td>
<td>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of Incident:
| □ Disaster - e.g., natural, (fire/flood) physical, (gas leak, burst water main) |
| □ Missing student |
| □ Death |
| □ Student suicide attempt |
| □ Allegation of Sexual Harassment/Sexual Assault |
| □ Mental health issues impacting on student’s safety and/or others |
| □ Serious medical / injury / health emergency |
| □ Intruders |
| □ Police - action taken or likely by Police - attendance, notified by phone, advice sought. |
| □ Physical violence |
| □ Threat of physical violence to a student |
| □ Other. Please Specify: ____________________________________________________________ |

**SECTION 2: INCIDENT**

**Concise Description of the Incident:**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SECTION 3: ACTION TAKEN**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## SECTION 4: FOLLOW UP (Post Incident)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## SECTION 5: REPORTING STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported By</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position/ Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: Student Critical Map

Critical response and emergency safety management guide for domestic and international students.

1. **Critical Incident Occurs (STAY CALM)**

2. **Call 000 /112**
   - For Medical/ Emergency assistance
   - Call Ext 52249
   - ANU Security

3. **Record the Names and contact details of the witnesses** of the incident

4. **If appropriate another staff member should stay with the rest of the group. Make sure everyone is CALM and safe.**

5. **Contact Registrar Student Services or delegate**
   - 0434 689 904
   - +61 434 689 904

6. **Critical Incident Report** compiled and issued to all key stakeholders.

   All relevant stakeholders will be kept updated in relation to the incident.
Item 10: Threshold Standards: AQLF+1 Requirement

**Purpose**
To consider a University policy and procedure addressing the AQLF+1 Requirement specified in the Higher Education Threshold Standards.

**Recommendation**
That the Committee provide feedback to elizabeth.nunrom@anu.edu.au by no later than 11 July 2016 on the proposed Qualification Requirements for Teaching Staff policy and procedure (Appendices E and F) for the AQLF+1 requirement specified in the Threshold Standards.

**ACTION REQUIRED**
For discussion □  For decision □  For information □  School response ☑

**Executive Summary of Issues**
The Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) contain requirements pertaining to the qualifications of teachers and supervisors, and TEQSA has released a guidance note indicating that it is expected that providers will have a policy and procedure governing any reliance on professional equivalency. The proposed policy and procedure addresses the standard and the expectation.

**Alignment with ANU by 2020**
ANU by 2020 envisions that ANU will perform above the Go8 average in national course and university surveys related to teaching and learning outcomes (Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ), or successor, survey results averaged across the Good Teaching, Overall Satisfaction and Generic Skills scales). A robust and flexible framework which demonstrates and ensures that ANU teachers and supervisors are appropriately qualified is necessary to support this endeavour.

**Background**
The current Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) and the framework that will be in force from 1 January 2017 indicate that “staff with responsibilities for academic oversight and those with teaching and supervisory roles in programs or courses are equipped for their roles, including having...a qualification in a relevant discipline at least one level higher than is awarded for the course of study, or equivalent relevant academic or professional or practice based experience and expertise, except for staff supervising doctoral degrees having a doctoral degree or equivalent research experience” (3.2.3.c).

TEQSA has also recently released a guidance note on some approaches that would satisfy this requirement. The guidance note is contained in Appendix C.

Appendix D details information on institutions that have a policy and procedure in place.

At ESQC 4/2015 the Committee was asked to provide feedback on the strategies employed to ensure the quality of teaching in instances where teaching staff may not have a qualification one AQLF level higher than the courses they were teaching. Feedback is incorporated in Appendix B. From the feedback, two Colleges indicated the benefits of introducing a policy framework based on Melbourne’s. There were also a number of instances demonstrated of initiatives to ensure the quality of the educational experience for students. Given that compliance with the threshold standards is mandatory ESQC agreed that a policy and procedure be drafted based on agreed principles.

At ESQC 2/2016 the Committee was asked to discuss the use of students and PhD candidates as teachers. The Committee overwhelming supported the prioritisation of PhD candidates when employing students in teaching roles, and emphasised the importance of professional development support and supervision.

The Committee is asked to provide feedback on the proposed Qualification Requirements for Teaching Staff policy and procedure in Appendix E and Appendix F which have been developed based on the principles agreed by ESQC.

**Implementation**
The development of a policy, procedure and guidelines will be implemented to take effect from 2017.
Consultation and Discussion Record

Education Standards and Quality Committee, 18 April 2016

That the Education Standards and Quality Committee:

1. Discuss placement of ANU students in teaching roles, including identification of skills for high-quality student teachers and utilisation of HDR students as teachers.
2. Note the Academic titles conferral policy and procedure as an example framework for assessing equivalence.

Education Standards and Quality Committee, 8 October 2015

That the Committee provide feedback to policy regs@anu.edu.au by no later than 1 February 2016 on:

1. The proposal to develop a policy and procedure for the AQF+1 requirement specified in the Threshold Standards; and
2. The proposed principles to form the framework for the procedure.

Education Standards and Quality Committee, 27 July 2015

That the Education Standards and Quality Committee provide feedback to policy regs@anu.edu.au by Monday 14 September 2015 on the following items:

1. A maximum 200-word summary of where teaching staff (including tutors) for a course might not have a qualification one AQF level higher than the students they are teaching; and
2. Methods utilised to ensure the quality of teaching in these instances.

Sponsor
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)

Author
Senior Policy Officer, Academic Standards and Quality, Division of Student Administration
Assistant Registrar, Academic Standards and Quality, Division of Student Administration
April 2016
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Appendix A: Feedback and Amendment Schedule following ESQC 5/2015
Appendix B: Feedback from Colleges following ESQC 4/2015
Appendix C: TEQSA Guidance Note: Equivalence of professional experience to academic qualifications
Appendix D: Teacher Qualification Equivalence Process across selected Australian Universities 2015
Appendix E: Proposed Qualification Requirements for Teaching Staff policy
Appendix F: Proposed Qualification Requirements for Teaching Staff procedure
### Appendix A: Feedback and Amendment Schedule following ESQC 5/2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The ANU College of Business and Economics (CBE) would like to offer the following comments in response to the request, made at ESQC 5/2015, that Colleges provide feedback on the proposal to develop a policy and procedure for the AQF+1 requirement specified in the Threshold Standards, and the proposed principles to form the framework for the procedure. The College supports the proposal to develop a policy and procedure. Comments on Table 1: Qualification Requirements for Teaching Staff:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The second dot point in the Tutor requirements should be changed to say 'a qualification or enrolment at the same level as the program and in receipt of professional development support and supervision'</td>
<td>This does not appear to be consistent with guidance from TEQSA that students are entitled to expect that they are being taught by a person who is qualified at a level more advanced than the level of the program being taught. Given the high value placed on tutoring in assisting students to achieve learning outcomes, it does not appear appropriate to exclude tutoring from this expectation. Current admission requirements would make it possible for Bachelor Degree graduates with no teaching or professional experience to tutor Masters Degree students and for tutors with no formal qualifications or experience to tutor Bachelor Degree students. The case requested can be handled through refinement in the procedure.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The Lecturer requirements need to include dot point 2 and 3 from the Course Convenor requirements.</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>There were particular concerns raised by one school, RSM, who have a number of tutors who are professionally experienced and who achieve very high SELT scores, but who do not meet the AQF+1 standard. RSM values tutors who have industry experience in areas such as management, marketing and project management. All new tutors in RSM are screened by the Deputy Director (Education) for suitability, mentored by the DD(E) or course convenors, and encouraged to complete the Foundations of Teaching program offered by CHELT. This is in addition to participating in CBE's tutor induction program.</td>
<td>This is commendable practice and is not inconsistent with the principles that experience be an assessable factor.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. CECS supports the development of a policy and procedure; however, agreed that an institutionally-endorsed narrative covering: - -

6. the employment of staff deemed (by the ADE) as possessing an AQF+1 professional equivalent combination of qualifications and experience; and Agreed. Course Convener dot points 2 and 3 to be included in Lecturer requirements.

7. at-AQF-level (e.g. senior Undergraduate and Postgraduate and HDR students) needs to be developed to allow Colleges to continue to meet teaching, support and supervision requirements and also provides valuable educational and professional development opportunities that enhance student’s experience by employing them in an official capacity within courses. Agreed. It is intended that the requirements will enable this. No change.

8. CECS supports the principles provided in the ESQC documentation forming the framework for the procedure. Support noted. No change.

9. The ANUCoL has now conducted an audit to establish teaching staff qualifications and compare those against the AQF + 1 requirement. As suspected, that audit revealed that we have a significant number of staff teaching in our programs who do not satisfy the +1 requirement (in terms of formal qualifications). The problem increases with our graduate programs as we rise to higher AQF levels. For example in the LLBH program (level 8) approx. 80% of permanent teaching staff convening courses satisfy the requirement in terms of formal qualifications and we are confident that the remaining 20% would satisfy equivalency criteria. In the LLM, it appears that approx. 55% of convenors satisfy the requirement in terms of formal qualifications. Given such figures, ANUCoL continues to support a policy and procedure that allows for equivalencies based upon teaching, research or professional experience. Thank you very much for undertaking this work which gives a solid foundation to the variable mechanisms beyond simply qualifications we use to ensure the quality of our teaching practice. The ANU policy and procedure will recognise professional expertise alongside formal qualifications. No change.

10. In light of the above, we support the principles of the framework in the proposal, subject to the following feedback and requests for clarification: - -

11. Still need to clarify the meaning of “a qualification in a relevant discipline” under the proposed new standards. This implies the qualification does not need to be in THE discipline. Perhaps some guidelines Expertise in the assessment of what disciplines may be relevant to a given teaching role resides in the academic area. We do not wish to preclude these decisions or inadvertently restrict opportunities No change.
on what amounts to “relevant” could be useful; for staff who would otherwise be appropriate.

12. We would like further discussion/guidelines on what amounts to “professional development, support and supervision” beyond that given in the current Principle 5, including whether it means undertaking formal higher level study within the discipline (we assume this is not required based on the current phrasing in principle 5). We seek further discussion in particular, on what is required at the level of “tutor”;  
Agreed. Guidance to be included within the procedure.

13. As noted above, “equivalency” will be very important for our teachers in light of the audit we have done across our programs; we support the current proposal that AD(E)s and College Deans will assess and approve equivalency or exemptions. Obviously processes must be created to record the necessary equivalency assessment for audit purposes. We note that consideration of equivalency is relevant to recruitment and teaching allocation decisions and needs to be built into both processes at the College level;  
Agreed. No change.

14. the inability for those at AQF=0 or at <AQF=0 to finalise marks is a problem for us in a number of programs (esp LLM and JD) where the course convenor is more likely to be at <AQF=0; perhaps a supervisory approval process could be established at the level of Head of School or Director of Legal Workshop (or others with appropriate qualifications)?  
A fundamental principle of this framework is that the individual ultimately responsible for the teaching provided in a particular course is qualified at AQF +1 or equivalent. Deferring to qualifications and/or experience of individuals not directly involved in the teaching activities of a course would not be consistent with the threshold standards or guidance provided by TEQSA. No change.

15. the current ESQC paper does not suggest that equivalencies are possible for PhD research supervision but ANUCoL would argue that such equivalencies are possible and should be included. Staff with high research outputs and demonstrable experience in research are suitable supervisors even if they do not themselves hold PhDs.  
Agreed. Staff who demonstrate significant disciplinary expertise but do not hold a PhD are able to provide valuable supervisory contributions to HDR candidates. Requirements must be consistent with those specified in the Research Awards Rule. HDR supervision requirements to be consistent with the Research Awards Rule.

16. The previous feedback from CMBE/CPMS was:  
A few areas in Science employ tutors or demonstrators at the same AQF level as the students they are teaching. Most often it is a third or fourth year student teaching  
This does not appear to be consistent with guidance from TEQSA as it will allow a tutor to hold a lesser AQF qualification, or no qualification, and no prior experience. Given current admission requirements, it would  
No change. Peer Assisted Learning to be excluded from requirements in the policy and
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A first or second year group. In all cases the tutor/demonstrator is mentored by the course convener, the teaching is supervised by an academic and any assessment is moderated by the course convener. Another situation is the Science Peer Assisted Learning (PAL) scheme that we operate in many of our first year courses. In PAL the mentors may only be one year ahead of the undergraduates they are 'tutoring'. However these sessions do not "teach" course content but focus on mentoring and individual learning methods and their application to course content.

Tutors and demonstrators undergo training organised at the College level, School level or, in some cases by the course convener. Most course conveners meet regularly with tutors and demonstrators. In Chemistry mentors of the first year peer assisted learning program (an earlier version of PAL) are employed in third year as demonstrators under close supervision and mentoring. In the PAL scheme, mentors have an initial training session and then ongoing training and mentoring by Senior Mentors throughout the semester. The PAL co-ordinator oversees all teaching and mentors the Senior Mentors.

We support the proposal to develop a policy and procedure for the AQF +1 requirement but have some concerns about the proposed principles due to issues around tutors and demonstrators as described above.

### 17. In reading the Provider Course Accreditation Standards it is clear that the document makes a distinction between “teaching” and “tutoring” (Clause 4.1). The AQF+1 standard in Clause 4.2- talks about “teaching” only, but the proposed ANU principles include an AQF+1 requirement for tutoring. We do not see that an AQF+1 requirement for tutors is necessary or sufficient (removes the need for professional development and supervision). We would support a proposal that requires professional development, training and supervision for tutors without the AQF+1 alternative.

Guidance provided by TEQSA is clear that students are entitled to expect that they are being taught by a person who is qualified at a level more advanced than the level of the program being taught. Given the high value placed on tutoring in assisting students to achieve learning outcomes, it does not appear appropriate to exclude tutoring from this expectation. Removing the AQF+1 requirement and retaining only a professional development, training and supervision requirement would necessitate highly qualified and experienced teaching staff undertaking unnecessary professional development, training and supervision while tutoring.

No change.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>18.</strong></td>
<td>In science we make a clear distinction between the roles of a tutor and a demonstrator. Demonstrators are not mentioned within the framework. We do not propose that an AQF+1 requirement is applied, but would support the inclusion of the category “demonstrator” and a requirement for professional development, training and supervision.</td>
<td>In cases where an AQF+1 qualification is not regarded as sufficient, additional professional development, training and/or supervision may still be required as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is not clear that separate tutor and demonstrator roles are necessary for the purposes of these requirements. Removing the AQF+1 requirement and retaining only a professional development, training and supervision requirement would necessitate highly qualified and experienced teaching staff undertaking unnecessary professional development, training and supervision while demonstrating. In cases where an AQF+1 qualification is not regarded as sufficient, additional professional development, training and/or supervision may still be required as appropriate.</td>
<td>Rename Tutor role to “Tutor/Demonstrator”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19.</strong></td>
<td>The alternative to an AQF+1 requirement for a tutor is an AQF at level plus professional development. In science, honours students may tutor (or demonstrate) for undergraduates in earlier years of their degree. This principle, applied strictly as stated, would cause inequity between honours students in 4 year degrees and those in a 3+1 degree combinations. This may become an issue also for vertical double degree students? As stated above we propose the removal of an AQF level requirement for tutors.</td>
<td>It is anticipated that courses which involve a demonstrator would be considered professionally oriented for the purposes of satisfying the third Tutor criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is anticipated that courses which involve a demonstrator would be considered professionally oriented for the purposes of satisfying the third Tutor criterion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20.</strong></td>
<td>The framework should reconsider the clause for HDR students: a) The research awards rules specify the requirements for HDR supervision b) This is the only clause that mentions a specific award (PhD) as the requirement rather than an AQF level. There are acceptable alternatives to a PhD at the same AQF level (e.g research based Professional Doctorate) which may be appropriate for some HDR awards (e.g MPhil). c) The term supervisor has been expanded and a differentiation made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The term supervisor has been expanded and a differentiation made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreed. Requirements must be consistent with those specified in the Research Awards Rule.</td>
<td>HDR supervision requirements to be consistent with the Research Awards Rule.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between primary supervisor and associate supervisors: an AQF10 requirement does not universally apply to all supervisors.

| 21. | The CASS CEC requests further clarification to ensure that the term “professionally oriented” includes practitioners in the CASS disciplines (such as languages, art, music etc), not just professionally accredited professions. Otherwise, the paper is supported. | Given the breadth of courses offered across and within programs with a professional orientation or otherwise, the Associate Dean should determine whether a given teaching role is professionally oriented. | Responsibility of Associate Dean to be included in the procedure. |
### ANUCoL

The ANUCoL is sorry to report that it has not conducted a thorough audit of our current compliance with the “AQF+1 requirement” across all of our programs. Therefore, we do not have a clear picture of how to draft 200 word responses on compliance with the AQF+1 rule at the program (or individual teacher) level. This also seems to be a requirement dictating listing of qualification on ANU Academic Activity Statements where teaching data (such as it is) is recorded at the ANU level.

Since moving to an LLB(Hons) Level 8 qualification this year, and relevant to current practice and future plans to teach AQF Level 9 extended JDC and JDO programs, we expect there is an ever greater level of non-compliance with the AQF+1 rule at the ANU College of Law compared to other ANU Colleges. This may be due to the reality that many ANUCoL staff do not hold a PhD in law, and many staff do not hold an LLM in law; despite demonstrable academic, professional practice, research and teacher level. This may be due to the reality that many ANUCoL staff do not hold a PhD in law, and many staff do not hold an LLM in law; despite demonstrable academic, professional practice, research and

### CAP

The schools have stated that submitting a 200 word summary for each academic staff member would be a significant burden. CAP also seeks clarification on the terminology used within the Threshold standards, in particular is the requirement that academic staff have a qualification one level higher than the end result of the course being taught. For example, a PhD student tutoring coursework Masters students will have a qualification (equivalent H1 Honours) higher than the students being taught (having achieved a Bachelor degree) but not necessarily a qualification one level higher than the program being taught.

We seek clarification of this point, particularly as providing a 200 word outline for each academic staff member is a resource heavy task.

### CASS

CASS Education Committee recommends adopting the approach of the University of Melbourne, however noting that it is important that the definition of “demonstrated equivalent experience” appropriately covers the requirements of CASS disciplines such as art, music, languages, creative writing, and museums and heritage studies.

Some schools within the ANU College of Business and Economics (CBE) meet the AQF+1 requirement whilst others do not. As per your request and by way of example, following is a case study from the Research School of Finance, Actuarial Studies & Applied Statistics (RSFAS), who do not meet AQF+1 requirements:

Due to the number of students and resultant large number of tutorials on offer within Research School of Finance, Actuarial Studies & Applied Statistics (RSFAS), it is not feasible that all tutors satisfy the AQF+1 threshold standards requirement. Specifically, within RSFAS there are 218 tutorials (112 tutorials at the undergraduate level which are instructed by 31 tutors and 106 tutorials at the postgraduate level which are instructed by 23 tutors). This results in a number of situations where 3rd year bachelor students tutor a first year course, honours students tutor a bachelor course and PhD student teach masters students.

Some RSFAS staff who are studying for their PhDs and

### CBE

Some schools within the ANU College of Business and Economics (CBE) meet the AQF+1 requirement whilst others do not. As per your request and by way of example, following is a case study from the Research School of Finance, Actuarial Studies & Applied Statistics (RSFAS), who do not meet AQF+1 requirements:

Due to the number of students and resultant large number of tutorials on offer within Research School of Finance, Actuarial Studies & Applied Statistics (RSFAS), it is not feasible that all tutors satisfy the AQF+1 threshold standards requirement. Specifically, within RSFAS there are 218 tutorials (112 tutorials at the undergraduate level which are instructed by 31 tutors and 106 tutorials at the postgraduate level which are instructed by 23 tutors). This results in a number of situations where 3rd year bachelor students tutor a first year course, honours students tutor a bachelor course and PhD student teach masters students.

Some RSFAS staff who are studying for their PhDs and

### CECS

There are some cases in the undergrad programs where later year students tutor early year students (e.g. third/fourth year tutoring a first/second year). This is carefully managed by the Convenor responsible for the course (with support from School administration) and conflicts of interest are avoided.

Amongst other things, this enhances the learning experience of the later-year students and allows for interactions between early year and later year students, which is important.

In the postgrad programs, PhD students (many of who hold a Masters/AQF 9 qualification) do tutor postgrad coursework students. This is an important learning experience for the PhD students, particularly those seeking a career in academia.

The appointments are made at the School level, after a careful check of all interested applicants and Course Convenors supervise the tutors. The tutors do not deliver any lectures, but only run tutorials and lab sessions for

### JCoS

A few areas in Science employ tutors or demonstrators at the same AQF level as the students they are teaching. Most often it is a third or fourth year student teaching a first or second year group. In all cases the tutor/demonstrator is mentored by the course convener, the teaching is supervised by an academic and any assessment is moderated by the course convener. Another situation is the Science Peer Assisted Learning (PAL) scheme that we operate in many of our first year courses. In PAL the mentors may only be one year ahead of the undergraduates they are “tutoring”. However these sessions do not “teach” course content but focus on mentoring and individual learning methods and their application to course content.

Tutors and demonstrators undergo training organised at the College level. School level or, in some cases by the course convener. Most course conveners meet regularly with tutors and demonstrators. In Chemistry mentors of the first year peer assisted learning program (an earlier version of PAL)
This means that our College would suggest that an ANU policy and procedure on the AQF+1 rule is likely to be needed from our perspective. The ANU should not simply rely on the fact that the university as a whole has a high rate of PhD-qualified teaching staff compared with other institutions. Our need to argue equivalencies via teaching, research or “professional experience” is clear to us now, even without conducting a detailed program-by-program or teacher-by-teacher audit. Non-compliance is known for a range of ANUCoL staff who teach into our LLB(Hons) program without an LLM or higher qualification. This non-compliance would also be the case for many external national and external international staff who teach as casual sessionals into our LLM program with PhD in Law qualifications.

We wonder what role HEA fellowships via EFS modules or other teaching qualifications should play in equivalency regimes. At the moment, the assumption is that merely holding an AQF+1 qualification in the content to be taught ensures teaching competency at the required AQF level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSCS Curriculum Development Committee Agenda 4/2016</th>
<th>Page 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tertiary teaching experience.</td>
<td>are instructing honours and masters students (these staff meet the Actuaries Institute requirement that staff teaching the Control Cycle courses must be Actuarial Fellows). Following are a number of initiatives implemented by RSFAS to ensure the quality of tutorial teaching:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This means that our College would suggest that an ANU policy and procedure on the AQF+1 rule is likely to be needed from our perspective. The ANU should not simply rely on the fact that the university as a whole has a high rate of PhD-qualified teaching staff compared with other institutions. Our need to argue equivalencies via teaching, research or “professional experience” is clear to us now, even without conducting a detailed program-by-program or teacher-by-teacher audit. Non-compliance is known for a range of ANUCoL staff who teach into our LLB(Hons) program without an LLM or higher qualification. This non-compliance would also be the case for many external national and external international staff who teach as casual sessionals into our LLM program with PhD in Law qualifications.</td>
<td>When new tutors are hired, they undergo a formal interview process which includes them demonstrating how they would answer questions in a mock tutorial scenario;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We wonder what role HEA fellowships via EFS modules or other teaching qualifications should play in equivalency regimes. At the moment, the assumption is that merely holding an AQF+1 qualification in the content to be taught ensures teaching competency at the required AQF level.</td>
<td>Both new and existing tutors are required to attend an RSFAS Tutor Training Program at the start of each semester;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The convenor of the RSFAS Tutor Training Program (Dr Jenni Bettman) then sits in one of the tutorials offered by each tutor early in the semester and gives them feedback on their demonstration and the learning quality in the tutorial;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support is then provided to tutors where issues have been identified;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow up attendance at these tutorials then occurs later in the semester;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the benchmarking done with other providers, the approach taken by UMelb seems sensible and realistic (i.e., ensuring course coordinators have AQF+1 or equivalent but allowing tutors etc. possibly being only at +0 but enrolled in a +1 qualification at the time of the teaching). The UMelb equivalency table is also a good place to start for any ANU policy/procedure in this area.

- Tutors who are PhD students are strongly encouraged to attend the CBE Tutor Quality Program.

At the College level, CBE runs a tutor induction program and a tutor quality program. All our new tutors participate in the tutor induction program as part of the teaching training. Some new tutors also participate in the tutor quality program and selected experienced tutors serve as facilitators to guide new tutors.
### Appendix D: Table 1: Teacher Qualification Equivalence Process across selected Australian Universities 2015

Table prepared by Jan O’Sullivan, University of Wollongong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Minimum qualification requirement</th>
<th>Equivalence process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Program coordinator, Major coordinator, and Course Convenor at one AQF level higher Tutors, guest lecturers, etc. same AQF level qualification</td>
<td>Course and Subject Delivery Policy sets out minimum qualification requirements specific to roles; Guidelines for Assessing Equivalent Experience provides examples of acceptable equivalent experience for each role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Same AQF level qualification</td>
<td>Recognition of Equivalence in Academic Staff Qualifications and Experience Policy sets out criteria for assessment based on number of years of experience. Assessment signed off by Dean and recorded by HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Sturt</td>
<td>Same AQF level qualification</td>
<td>Academic Staff Teaching Qualifications and Equivalent Professional Experience Policy includes guidelines on equivalence similar to those of Canberra and Deakin – assessment signed off by Exec Dean or Head of School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deakin</td>
<td>Same AQF level qualification</td>
<td>Academic Staff Qualifications and Equivalence Guidelines sets out criteria for assessment similar to above – though more detailed and refers to type of experience and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Same AQF level qualification</td>
<td>Coursework Program Teaching Qualification Guidelines differentiate between different teaching roles with those responsible for primary delivery of courses must have AQF+1 or equivalent exp. as approved by Faculty PVC while those who support delivery must have at least same level. No evident guidance on how assess equivalence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMIT</td>
<td>PhD (Level A can be enrolled in a PhD) Exceptions only granted with VC approval</td>
<td>Staff Qualification Equivalence Process – involves submission of an Application for Equivalence to the relevant Deputy PVC for a decision on equivalence, prior to sign-off by VC. Applicant must address RMIT’s Professional Experience Criteria (not publicly available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UniSA</td>
<td>PhD for Level B and above (exceptions only granted with VC approval)</td>
<td>Minimum Qualifications for Academic Staff prescribes minimum qualification requirement for Levels A-E and distinguishes between Research, R&amp;T and Teaching only staff. Appointment without a doctoral degree at Level B or above requires approval by Faculty PVC and VC. Equivalency assessed by PVC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy: Qualification Requirements for Teaching Staff

Purpose
To set out the University's policy in relation to qualification requirements for teaching and supervisory staff.

Overview
Teachers, supervisors and staff who oversee teaching and supervisory activities must be appropriately qualified in the relevant discipline in order to provide excellence in education.

Scope
This policy applies across formal teaching and supervisory roles.

Policy Statement

1. Teachers, supervisors and staff who oversee teaching and supervisory activities are appropriately qualified in the relevant discipline to provide excellence in education for the level of the Award being undertaken.

2. Doctoral candidates are prioritised where the University’s students are employed as teachers in order to maximise opportunities for development of skills which will enable candidates to be high-quality teachers in their future careers.

3. The policy and procedure are consistent with:
   a. The Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF);
   b. The Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards); and
   c. The University’s Research Awards Rule.
Appendix F

Procedure: Qualification Requirements for Teaching Staff

Purpose
To describe the University's qualification requirements for teachers, supervisors and staff who oversee teaching and supervisory activities.

Procedure

Role Qualifications

1. Primary supervisors of higher degree research candidates are qualified by:
   a. A completed Doctor of Philosophy in a relevant discipline; or
   b. A combination of qualifications and demonstrated experience in a relevant discipline equivalent to an AQF Level 10 Doctoral Degree.

2. Program Conveners are qualified by:
   a. A completed qualification in a relevant discipline one AQF Level higher than the program; or
   b. A combination of qualifications and demonstrated experience in a relevant discipline equivalent to one AQF Level higher than the program; or
   c. Demonstrated experience in a relevant discipline equivalent to one AQF Level higher than the program.

3. Major, Minor, or Specialisation Coordinators/Conveners are qualified by:
   a. A completed qualification in a relevant discipline one AQF Level higher than the program in which the major, minor, or specialisation is offered; or
   b. A combination of qualifications and demonstrated experience in a relevant discipline equivalent to one AQF Level higher than the program in which the major, minor, or specialisation is offered; or
   c. Demonstrated experience in a relevant discipline equivalent to one AQF Level higher than the program in which the major, minor, or specialisation is offered.

4. Course Conveners are qualified by:
   a. A completed qualification in a relevant discipline one AQF Level higher than the program in which the course is offered; or
   b. A combination of qualifications and demonstrated experience in a relevant discipline equivalent to one AQF Level higher than the program in which the courses is offered; or
c. Demonstrated experience in a relevant discipline equivalent to one AQF Level higher than the program in which the course offered.

5. Lecturers (principal teachers) are qualified by:
   a. A completed qualification in a relevant discipline one AQF Level higher than the program in which the course is offered; or
   b. A combination of qualifications and demonstrated experience in a relevant discipline equivalent to one AQF Level higher than the program in which the course is offered; or
   c. Demonstrated experience in a relevant discipline equivalent to one AQF Level higher than highest-level program in which the course is offered.
   d. A qualification in a relevant discipline at the same AQF Level as the program in which the course is offered, and in receipt of professional development support and supervision that assures high-quality teaching; or
   e. For professionally-oriented instruction, demonstrated specialist expertise or experience where that instructor will be teaching on that area and in receipt of professional development support and supervision by the Course Convener that assures high-quality teaching.

6. Tutors/Demonstrators (supporting teachers) are qualified by:
   a. A qualification in a relevant discipline one AQF Level higher than the program; or
   b. A qualification or the equivalent of a qualification in a relevant discipline at the same level as the program and in receipt of professional development support and supervision that assures high-quality teaching; or
   c. Demonstrated achievement of the learning outcomes for the course to an exceptional level, or demonstrated specialist expertise or experience where that instructor will be teaching on that area, and in receipt of professional development support and supervision by the Course Convener that assures high-quality teaching. This includes Doctoral candidates teaching in their area of study.

7. Guest lecturers and peer-assisted learning partners do not require a minimum qualification.

8. Exceptions to these role qualifications are approved by the College Dean.

9. Equivalencies for the Primary Supervisor of higher degree research candidates are approved by the Delegated Authority.

10. Equivalencies for roles other than Primary Supervisor of higher degree research candidates are approved by the Associate Dean.

11. The Associate Dean determines if a course is professionally oriented for the purpose of role qualification requirements.
Final Assessment

12. Staff required to undertake professional development to satisfy the role qualification requirement either:
   a. do not mark the final assessment; or
   b. have their marking moderated by the Course Convener.

Professional Development, Support and Supervision

13. Professional development comprises a combination of the following:
   a. Required concurrently undertaking a formal or non-formal teaching and learning/supervisory training/quality program; and/or
   b. Prior demonstration of skills in a moderated tutorial or mock tutorial at an appropriate standard.

14. Support and supervision comprises a combination of the following:
   a. Regular monitoring of teaching and the provision of feedback for continuous improvement; and/or
   b. Opportunities for co-teaching alongside more experienced teachers; and/or
   c. Regular peer discussions facilitated by a more experienced teacher.
Part 5 – Items of other business

Item 11 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 RSISE B123</th>
<th>Notes and Deadlines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 12 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