A meeting of the FAO/Subdeans Group will be held on Friday 8 June 2007 in the Senate Room from 9.30 to 11.00am.

AGENDA

1. **Update from Counselling and Psychological Services**

   Janet Renner, Co-ordinator, Counselling and Psychological Services will attend to discuss new procedures regarding students requesting special consideration (this is not affected by the current review of the form), management of critical incidents, priority appointments and crisis services.

2. **ipoint. UWAs new enquiry management service for current students.**

   Peter Cottam will present ipoint. The Enquiry Management project is designed to prove that implementation of sophisticated enquiry management software can contribute to a significant improvement in the capacity of staff to effectively manage the range and rapidly increasing volume of enquiries. The 12 month pilot project is based in Student Administration. The aim is to direct a higher proportion of current student interaction online and, through a combination of best practices and new technologies, deliver significant service improvement.

3. **International Issues The National Code**

   David Norman will lead a discussion on measures required in order that the University comply with the National Code.

   1. Institutional documented procedures for monitoring a students workload to ensure that at all times the student is in a position to complete within the expected duration as registered on CRICOS, and a system for recording reasons for course load variations that may affect the students expected course duration, so that a visa extension may be given if required. Essentially someone will have to monitor each Student Visa holder to ensure that they are enrolled 100%, as an indication that they can complete in the standard course duration, and if they are not the reasons will have to be recorded.
   2. A procedure to ensure that no more than 25% of the total course is studied by distance or online learning, and that there is at least one face-to-face unit per teaching period. This is probably best managed at the faculty level, as unit codes gives no indication of the mode of study.
   3. The National Code provides that international students must be permitted to appeal their results and allows them 20 working days in which to do so. This is not in accordance with our Appeals Process in the case where there is dissatisfaction with an assessment result and/or progress status. Our policy provides for appeals to be submitted within 12 University working days of the release of results. There are good reasons for limiting this period to 12 University working days, not least because of the need to finalise the appeal prior to the commencement of the following semester in order that a
student may progress if the appeal is upheld.

However, we are bound by this National Code and must comply. What is proposed is to amend the twelve University working day period to a twenty University working day period with a footnote that students should submit an appeal as soon as possible because of the need to finalise the procedure prior to the commencement of the next semester.

This is not an optimum position, but one over which we currently have no control.

Attached is a copy of the appeals policy with highlighted sections where the changes would be made changes are made only where absolutely necessary in order to comply with the National Code.

4. Procedure for intervention for students at risk of failing to achieve satisfactory course progress to be activated, at a minimum, when they have failed or are deemed not yet competent in 50% or more of their enrolled units in any study period and which includes: procedures for contacting and counselling identified students, strategies to assist identified students to achieve satisfactory course progress, and the process by which the intervention strategy is activated. The SIMS Team can do part of this, but there is still a need for faculties to determine the strategies they will use to assist identified students.

Tanya Aquino will also attend for this discussion the following is suggested:

As you know, it was agreed some time ago at the FAO/Sub-Dean Group to introduce a new progression rule "Fail more than 49% credit points attempted in current progression period" to be checked for ALL students at mid-year. This rule would result in the automatic application of an INTERVENE outcome.

It is now clear that offshore students need not be considered for an INTERVENE outcome under the ESOS act. This leaves only the onshore, international students who are not clear pass each year who must be considered. Hopefully, there won't be a many students in this category to consider. This being the case, although it is late in the piece, an alternative to using a new rule on everyone is suggested.

The alternative would be that we don't change the process from that followed last mid-year in terms of the rules checked and the WARNING outcome. However, another progression outcome of INTERVENE will be created, but not attached to any rule. The Register now displays an indicator for all international students. Faculties would be able to use the international indicator to easily determine if a student is not a domestic student and the course location to determine if they are onshore. If faculties determine that an intervene is warranted they could add an INTERVENE outcome by annotating the Register. Faculties could either waive the automatically approved WARNING outcome if they wished, or leave it and simply add another INTERVENE outcomes if they felt they wanted both kinds of tracking on a student.
Identifying whether a person requires an intervene will be a manual process using this method.

Your feedback is requested.

4. **Update on Academic Council**

Trudi will provide an update on the Academic Council meeting of 6 June.

5. **Any other business**