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

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

She said that they were trying to reduce confusion so that things did not get lost between faculties and Student Services.

She urged faculties to send any students with problems to counselling if they thought it necessary. She said that at times students were unable to get appointments and the receptionist would suggest that the students return to the faculties.

There were however facilities for students to be seen urgently in times of crisis.

2. **ipoint: UWA’s new enquiry management service for current students**

Peter Cottam demonstrated 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 on-line and, through a combination of best practices and new technologies, deliver significant service improvement.

If a question is asked the system will suggest answers and then will ask if the student is happy that their question is answered. Any questions received that the system or Student Admin cannot answer will be referred to the faculties.

The system is available for current students who will be identified when they send their email question but anyone can access the database and so prospective students could use the system.

Peter asked for assistance with publicising the system. He said that bookmarks would be given to students taking examinations and he asked that faculties display posters and link to the ipoint site on their faculty web pages.


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

He said that the July 1 deadline was now more of a start date. There would be no need to have everything implemented but we should be able to show that we were in the process of implementation.

The issues had been set out on the agenda:

1. Institutional documented procedures for monitoring a student’s 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 student’s 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. However it was pointed that some reasons might need to be recorded on the TRIM student file rather than on Callista (eg the student was homesick and unable to cope with a full load).
Student visa requirements no longer require a full-load each semester, it is now calculated by standard length of course – a student must complete within this standard length or have good reasons for not doing so.

Some courses normally require full-time attendance, and as such there would not normally be any opportunity for a student to undertake the course part-time for example the MBBS, BDSc and BPodMed. Faculties will decide whether a student will be permitted to reduce below a standard load. The reason will be recorded on TRIM.

Faculties indicated that they did not want to be involved with visa issues as they did not have the expertise, they were willing to work in co-operation with the International Centre.

It was agreed that the need to maintain a standard full-time load would be stressed to international students at their orientation.

It was agreed that this matter would be looked at on a 6-monthly basis and that a letter would be sent to the student and the onus put on the student. David is to draft a standard letter to be used.

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 give no indication of the mode of study.

This was likely to be problematical to monitor.

Courses with more than 25% of units delivered via eLearning would not be registered for international students.

Deans have been asked to specify which units/courses are available on a non face-to-face basis.

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.

This change will be brought to Academic Council and Senate for approval of the changes to the regulations.

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.

The following had been identified:

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 that 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. However Mary Carroll indicated that Callista was being asked to automate this process but the earliest possible time when it might be in place was mid 2008.

4. **Update on Academic Council**

Trudi will provide an update on the Academic Council meeting of 6 June highlighting the supplementary assessment item and indicating that faculties needed to submit any cases for deviation from the University General Rules on supplementary assessment to Council as a matter of urgency.

5. **Any other business**

Supplementary Assessment:

The question as to how students who take units from outside their faculty are handled for the purposes of the award of supplementary assessment, ie a BE student might take PHYS1101 which is a FLPS unit. How will the BE Board of Examiners know which units provide supplementary assessment opportunities. There is no automatic process in place to identify these students. It seems that there had been no request that this functionality be included in Callista. Mary Carroll said that it could be in place by the end of the year. Faculties said that they had been asked to identify which units offered opportunities for supplementary assessment and understood that the process would be automated.

Mary Carroll and Harvey von Bergheim undertook to look at this matter.

Exam results:

Harvey asked that faculties ensure that results are submitted on time.
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