

## Student Union Advocacy Service Report

April - June 2016

### Introduction

Historically the April to June quarter has been the quietest period of the year for the Service. Apart from coordinating the exam support stall and fielding enquiries regarding assessment, the demand on the Service for casework is usually fairly low. However this quarter has seen a swell of complaints regarding the new special consideration policy and procedures – representing more than double the proportion of casework compared to the equivalent time last year.

### Trends and Issues this Quarter

As the new special consideration policy and procedures came into action, we were very hopeful that the sorts of issues which normally occupy our caseload at this time of year might dissipate. In the past our special consideration caseload featured a certain number of students unsure how to apply or those with weak or borderline cases seeking advice regarding eligibility; a smaller cohort of students who had strong cases but needed help to document and argue their merit, and a number where students had simply fallen into the crack between special consideration and equitable adjustments.

While we have definitely seen altogether fewer of these sorts of cases, unfortunately I can't report that there has been an overall improvement. Every assessment period, and this has been no exception, students present in tears. This quarter however, the volume of distressed students has increased, often accompanied by irate parents, and we have also received a larger than usual volume of calls from very concerned health care professionals who are dismayed that their documentation is being disregarded by the University. We suggest that this is a major public relations issue for the University and, in some cases, a matter of potential legal risk as many of the issues these students are encountering fall squarely within the jurisdiction of disability discrimination legislation.

From our perspective, the theme which emerges in the case studies set out below is that, rather than assisting and accommodating vulnerable students, the implementation of the current process has a compounding and amplifying effect. Specifically the cases below illustrate a number of ways that the process forces unwell, and frequently exhausted, students to jump through a myriad of documentary hoops. These requirements are overly onerous, and/or not clearly justified. Below is a non-exhaustive selection of case work which provides some examples of the continuing problems with the system.

#### ***The constantly Kafkaesque world of special consideration***

##### ***When too much documentation is never enough***

The recurrent theme in almost all of the presenting cases this quarter was that of students who applied for special consideration, seemingly fulfilling all elements of eligibility, who were simply informed that they were ineligible due to insufficient documentation. This was despite the fact that some students had produced numerous HPR forms, letters from health care practitioners and medical certificates. More perplexing still, many of these students are registered with Student Equity and Disability Services (SEDS) and have detailed Disability Impact Statements which already attest to the circumstances which may warrant special consideration from time to time.

The new policy was seen as a leap forward for this reason. We had hoped it would prevent the cycle of students being caught between chronic conditions and acute exacerbations (see previous Quarterly Reports on this problem in the past). The latest special consideration policy purports to provide a single gateway for equitable accommodation for students with a disability; however we have seen the University deem many students ineligible where have requested special consideration in the context of an existing and well documented disability, seemingly because they failed to produce documentation which covers every single day of an affected period. This resulted in situations where some students were granted supplementary assessment or an extension for one piece of assessment, and not another in the same assessment period, depending on the documentation dates.

This evidences a level of inflexibility and rigidity which is not appropriate to this sort of decision making. When students have sought a review of the original decision, they have been asked for further documentation, however in some cases this is simply not possible retrospectively, or else the additional documentation has been discounted because it is not a first-hand observation of the student's condition. Life does not always fall neatly into documented packages. The sort of decision making in this space needs to be nuanced and responsive to reality. The decision must balance regard for academic integrity with compassion and make logical determinations based on all of the circumstances.

We note that the Student Lifecycle Review of 2013 identified Special Consideration as a significant "pain point" for students and recommended that the University take action to address in both the operation of the process and the way in which it has been conceived. Since 2013 Special Consideration policy and procedure has been subject to review and change; however, for many students the issues that gave rise to the 2013 recommendations remain, or indeed have become worse.

I have mentioned the Kafkaesque quality of the experience for many students, their families and their health care practitioners; and by this I mean the process is both opaque and characterised by an extreme asymmetry of information and power. As the examples below illustrate, it is a process which demands detailed information and extensive documentation from students, yet it yields only generic one line reasons for negative decisions. Similarly, the deadline for lodging applications is strictly and authoritatively enforced, yet many, many students have reported that outcomes have been well beyond the stated 5 working day turnaround, often requiring multiple contacts or attendances in person before they are advised. Some are still waiting.

We are of the view that this situation is not due to the policy itself being misconceived, but rather it reflects a lack of resources. The system lacks capacity to provide an appropriate experience to students. If the maintenance of academic integrity is as important to the University as it purports it is, it needs to understand that facilitating this process properly is fundamental to that goal. The current implementation lacks an appreciation that the importance of assessment to most students is proportionate to its importance to the University. The current process seems to regard special consideration as an optional extra, whereas we are of the view it is as critical to academic integrity as invigilation and marking.

### **Recommendation**

The University needs to ensure there are sufficient resources to enable sensitive and appropriate decision making with respect to special consideration. Additionally we strongly recommend a review of the assumptions underpinning the current approach. Specifically that, in the absence of evidence that students are actively attempting to abuse the process to obtain an unfair advantage, the process should be based on a good faith relationship with students. There seems to be a double standard when it comes to accepting documentary evidence from students compared to the process for staff sick leave, where presumably health practitioner statements are accepted in good faith.

### ***Special consideration – late withdrawal eligibility***

Another change which caught us off guard this semester was a new system where students apparently can request late withdrawal when they apply for special consideration. This introduces a range of unnecessary complexities and is not consistent with the policy. We are of the view that late withdrawal is an outcome of special consideration where the opportunity to take supplementary assessment is unavailable due to the student's condition continuing through the special exam period. It appears that allowing students to request late withdrawal has introduced another anomaly –a new threshold for the assessment of late withdrawal applications. This 'test' for eligibility appears to be a complete reversal of the previous requirement, as well as being the opposite of the requirements for fee remission.

Previously students were eligible for late withdrawal without academic penalty if the circumstances preventing successful completion of the subject only presented after the relevant date, or else there was an unforeseen exacerbation of the pre-existing circumstances after the deadline for timely withdrawal *and* supplementary assessment was not appropriate or available in the circumstances. This semester we were presented with this:

Unfortunately, your application for special consideration has been assessed as ineligible. **There is no evidence to support any inability to withdraw prior to last date to withdraw.** [my emphasis]

Consequently we found that a significant number of students who had adduced ample evidence of their condition and how it manifested to make them incapable of completing their subjects, were now required to produce further evidence as to the **impossibility** of withdrawing prior to 6 May. In response to the flurry of very distressed students who had been deemed ineligible for late withdrawal, we began instructing students that they should request a review of these decisions by stepping through the exact course of events to show why they did not elect to withdraw on or prior to 6 May.

We were baffled to see many of these reviews confirming the original decision, despite clear timelines being provided, totally comprehensive personal statements being included which unequivocally demonstrated how the new threshold had been met, and further documentary evidence being produced by psychiatrists and other medical professionals. In some cases the goalposts changed after review, for example originally the decision regarding ineligibility was based on the student failing to demonstrate why they did not withdraw before the relevant date, however on review of documentation and a clear statement as to why the student only sought to withdraw post the deadline, the reason given was that he failed to produce medical documentation which covered the entire semester end to end.

I cannot overstate the aggravating effect this process has on students who are often suffering severe incapacity, many of them living with chronic mental health conditions such as depression and anxiety. Some students appeared to be experiencing the onset of psychosis in the midst of their dealings with the University, becoming increasingly paranoid and feeling that the unreasonableness of the decision making was a conspiracy against them.

I am sure it is not the intention – but the University needs to be aware that its processes are making unwell students very sick.

At the time of writing, several of these matters had been escalated to as formal complaints and resolved in the students' favour. There are likely to be quite a few more to be dealt with in this way.

## **Recommendation**

The policy should be implemented in a way that does not give students the choice of late withdrawal, but rather applies it as an outcome appropriate to the circumstances. Where it is deemed late withdrawal is an appropriate outcome, the documentary evidence required should be consistent with that required for remission of fees.

### ***Special Consideration – faculty decisions regarding outcomes***

A number of students have contacted the Service concerned that they still had no outcome for their special consideration applications on the eve of the special exam period. We have been contacting SEDS to seek clarification of the status of these applications on behalf of students. In some cases we were advised that the application had been deemed eligible by SEDS and was awaiting an outcome from the Faculty, sometimes because the Faculty had questioned the supporting documentation which had already been approved by SEDS. The guidelines on determining outcomes for special consideration indicate that impact assessment is the responsibility of the healthcare practitioner completing the supporting documentation:

#### **Impact Assessment**

Impact assessment is done by the person providing the evidence submitted by the student (e.g the medical practitioner).

**Staff are not expected to second-guess the integrity of the assessment of documentary evidence submitted by the student.** If there is evidence that the documents submitted themselves may be fraudulent, this should be dealt with as student misconduct. [my emphasis]

The question then is why is this documentation being subjected to multiple reviews? What is the point of assessment and approval by SEDS if the faculties can then effectively veto those decisions? How is compliant with the University with the *Information Privacy Act* and the *Health Records Act* when it is allowing very sensitive information a wider than necessary audience?

## **Recommendation**

There should be only one point where documentation is assessed for eligibility and that is with SEDS. The Faculty should only be involved where there is a legitimate question of how a given outcome is practical or appropriate in terms of academic integrity.

### ***Special Consideration – when the reviewer is the original decision maker***

The final example in this non-exhaustive outline of issues concerns the implementation phase of special consideration process - where eligibility has been confirmed at the central decision making point in SEDS - and the decision regarding implementation has been handed over to the academic staff responsible for the subject in question. In this context we were concerned to find that decisions regarding the length of extension for assignments were turning on a requirement that the student provide documentary evidence of incapacity for every single day requested in the extension period. This was despite documentation of circumstances throughout the period which clearly indicated the condition was not resolved in the interim periods. More concerning still, we discovered when the student submitted a review of the original decision, that decision was reviewed by the original decision maker. This is a clear breach of procedural fairness which affords a right to an unbiased decision maker. One of these matters is currently on foot in an appeal to the Academic Board.

## **Recommendation**

Procedural fairness requires an unbiased decision maker – that requires that the same person should not be reviewing their own original decisions, even at an informal level. The University should make clear that reviews of original decisions, where offered, must be undertaken by an unbiased third party.

## **Overall Recommendation**

The University needs to invest significant resources in this area. It is simply not enough to provide a single access point with too few staff to manage the volume of transactions. It appears that decision making has been reduced to formulaic, rigid rule based approaches which have no regard to evidence or specific circumstances. This has effectively shifted the burden to our service, and in turn, put greater than necessary pressure on the central complaints process and ultimately the Academic Board Appeal process.

It is a matter of human rights that students with disabilities are provided with reasonable adjustments and accommodation of their circumstances. We are concerned that it is only a matter of time before a student initiates legal action against the University on this basis.

## ***Complex complaints, communication, and who is responsible?***

Although the central complaints process has been operative for some time, and we have found it to be highly efficient at resolving straightforward or uncomplicated academic and administrative complaints, we have seen a number of cases recently which have exposed gaps in the process. This has partly arisen due to the changes since the last iteration of the *Equal Opportunity Policy* (MPF1241) and the attendant *Discrimination, Sexual Harassment and Bullying Procedure* (MPF1230). Although the latter procedures still refer to a discrete process involving specialist advisers and a staged conciliation based procedure for both staff and students, it appears that many student complaints are being progressed under the *University Student Complaints and Grievances Policy* (MPF1066) and the *Student Complaints and Grievances Procedure* (MPF1067) if they involve a mix of academic and/or administrative complaints as well as a complaint which could be more properly addressed under the *Equal Opportunity Policy*.

The effect of this is that we now find ourselves routinely advising students on progressing sexual harassment, discrimination and bullying (Equal Opportunity) complaints, an area which was previously excluded from our ambit. More importantly, in this process we are seeing two undesirable outcomes: in some cases the more straightforward complaints are resolved relatively quickly, but the underlying or attendant Equal Opportunity complaints remain unaddressed or, the Equal Opportunity complaints may be diverted through the staff misconduct process; however the student is never informed and remains aggrieved.

In any event, the critical question is: who is responsible for consolidating information and communicating with the student in complex or multi-part complaints bridging different jurisdictions of complaint handling? Currently it is our experience in complex matters that communication with the student complainant is at best an afterthought and, at worst it is forgotten.

We recently tried to meet with staff from Safer Community Program to discuss some of these issues, the impact of student complaints about Equal Opportunity matters being dealt with via the *Student Complaints and Grievances Procedure* and the operation of the new *Appropriate Behaviour Policy* which is currently under consultation. Unfortunately that meeting was cancelled at short notice and we were not advised why. This is disappointing as we would like to collaborate with the University to enhance these critical processes for students. As with the risk of disability discrimination discussed above, we remain concerned that students will increasingly decide to lodge external complaints when internal processes remain flawed.

## **Recommendation**

The University should engage with the problems described above as a matter of urgency to resolve who is responsible for coordinating communication on complex matters involving multiple processes.

### ***Large 'A' versus small 'a' advocacy.***

When the University initiated its tender process to select a provider of student advocacy services in 2011, a component of the SSAF Funding Model included a prohibition on both UMSU and the Graduate Student Association from using any other SSAF funding towards the provision of Advocacy services, other than that provided by way of the successful tender.

Recent interactions with the GSA suggest that the GSA is using SSAF funds to employ staff to engage in activities that UMSU believes fall within the exclusive remit of the Student Union Advocacy Service; the provision of advice to elected student representatives in relation to the operation, review and development of University policy and procedure as they affect students.

The GSA maintains that this is a legitimate activity for its staff on the basis that it is small 'a' advocacy and that the exclusive funding arrangement is related to large 'A' advocacy; which they define as the provision of service to individual students. In a meeting with the UMSU General Manager and the President, the GSA suggested that the University had provided support for their view.

In this context we would welcome the Reference Group exercising its responsibility for the oversight of the operation of the University's contract with UMSU for the provision of advocacy services by providing some clarification for UMSU in relation to this issue.

UMSU's tender documents, submitted in 2012, make it explicit that the tender was based on a service delivery model that accounted for the provision of both forms of advocacy; that the capacity to provide elected student representatives with sound and informed advice was inextricably linked to a comprehensive understanding of the impact on students of the operation of university policy and procedure. The position was that these essentially represent core functions of a student representative organisation and that they could not, and should not, be separated.

UMSU recognised this in its tender submission, including representatives of the GSA in the suggested composition of the Reference Group so that they could contribute to the oversight of service delivery. The composition of the Reference Group was later varied on the basis that once the tender had been awarded to UMSU, the GSA continued to operate an Advocacy service (that was ultimately discontinued in early 2014).

Since awarding the contract for the provision of this service to UMSU we note that:

- Consistent with this understanding of the role of this service, the Provost requested that UMSU prepare and deliver Student Governance Training to **all** students participating in University Governance bodies and Discipline Committees;
- The Reference Group supported the application for additional funding for the Advocacy service in 2015 that was unambiguously based on ensuring that UMSU had the capacity to deliver both services to individual students, **and** provide advice to student representatives;
- The University approved this application and additional funding was provided to the UMSU for these purposes.

It remains our view that the University should make express its support for the critical nexus between the experience derived from the delivery of an advocacy service to students, and the provision of advice to student representatives.

UMSU seeks the Reference Group's affirmation of this position and requests that the University undertake appropriate communication with relevant stakeholders to ensure that student organisations comply with their obligations in relation to SSAF expenditure.

## **Programmes this Quarter**

### ***Exam Support Stall***

Training was provided to 21 volunteers who staffed the examination support stalls during the examination period. A total of 2136 students received a service from the stall over the three weeks of exams. Volunteers do two hour shifts, and set up and put away the marquee and table every day. Equipment is stored in the Royal Exhibition Building.

Volunteers answer a range of questions; provide directions on the location of facilities, and referral to discuss issues such as special consideration and academic misconduct. Those involved report that students appreciate the programme - at a time when many students need extra support because they are stressed and anxious.

The volunteers at the stall provide on-site information, advice, referral and support to students who sit exams at the Royal Exhibition Building in Carlton during the exam period (2-3 weeks in both June and November). The stall gives away water and sells assorted stationary, tissues and lollies for a nominal fee. Unfortunately the stall unexpectedly ran out of water in the second week and this is reflected in the significant dip in the graph above. Given the water is the single most requested item at the stall, we have been working on a way to provide water in reusable clear containers. However negotiations with the Royal Exhibition Building to allow a water cart on site have not been fruitful so far. Additionally students may borrow approved calculators and clear plastic bags for their pens etc. Signs are displayed reminding students not to inadvertently take their study notes or any unauthorised materials into the venue with them. The stall also has information about the Advocacy Service; an exam tips information card and information on other University services.

## **Statistics**

### ***April-June 2016***

157 students were provided a service resulting in 447 contacts with the service. Due to the higher demand on the service, the statistics accounting for the number of contacts remain incomplete and will be reported on in the next quarterly report.

### ***April-June 2015***

148 students were provided a service resulting in 563 contacts with the service.

Additionally, the Advocacy website received 5886 page views this quarter. There were over 1000 page views on the Special Consideration page, almost twice as many as the next most popular – 628 unique page views on Academic Misconduct. Other popular pages included information on exam tips, grievances and complaints, unsatisfactory progress and misconduct.

### ***Distribution by primary issue:***

The primary issue is generally identified as the university process to which the student's main concern or problem relates. Data is classified in this way because it provides a standardised and more meaningful breakdown which may be useful for tracking policy trends amongst other things. Additionally this classification system aligns with the general methodology employed by the service in providing advice and problem solving support to students. Specifically while students may express their issues in a multitude of ways, the primary issue is identified according to the policy or procedure by which the University provides possible resolutions.

**April-June 2016**

All Students			Graduate Coursework students			RHD students		
Special Consideration	58	35.62%	Special Consideration	19	38.78%	Supervision Problems	2	22.22%
Academic Misconduct - Plagiarism	22	13.39%	Assessment Dispute	9	18.37%	Progress - HDR	2	22.22%
Assessment Dispute	20	12.60%	Academic Misconduct - Plagiarism	9	18.37%	Assessment Dispute	2	22.22%
Academic Misconduct - Collusion	11	7.09%	Quality Teaching	3	6.12%	Enrolment problems	1	11.11%
Advance Standing Credit/RPL	5	3.15%	Course Unsatisfactory Progress Committee	2	4.08%			
Supervision Problems	5	3.15%	Supervision Problems	1	2.04%			
Course structure/changes	5	3.15%	Student complaint about uni staff	1	2.04%			
Equitable Accommodation (SEAP)	4	2.36%	Research Ethics	1	2.04%			
Student complaint about uni staff	4	2.36%	Equitable Accommodation (SEAP)	1	2.04%			
Student Admin - Enrolment problems	4	2.36%	Course structure/changes	1	2.04%			
Quality Teaching	4	2.36%	Advance Standing Credit/RPL	1	2.04%			
Progress - HDR	4	2.36%	Admission - Selection Appeal	1	2.04%			
Course Unsatisfactory Progress Committee	3	1.57%						
Other	3	1.57%						
Discrimination	1	0.79%						
Research Ethics	1	0.79%						
Admission - Selection Appeal	1	0.79%						
Scholarship Issues	1	0.79%						
General Misconduct	1	0.79%						

**April-June 2015**

All Students			Graduate Coursework students			RHD students		
Special Consideration	29	17.79%	Assessment Dispute	16	16.67%	Supervision Problems	6	42.86%
Assessment Dispute	24	14.72%	Academic Misconduct - Plagiarism	14	14.58%	Progress - HDR	6	42.86%
Academic Misconduct - Plagiarism	20	12.27%	Academic Misconduct - Collusion	9	9.38%	Student complaint about uni staff	1	7.14%
Academic Misconduct - Collusion	15	9.20%	Supervision Problems	7	7.29%	Assessment Dispute	1	7.14%
Course Unsatisfactory Progress	8	4.91%	Special Consideration	7	7.29%			
Supervision Problems	8	4.91%	Course Unsatisfactory Progress	6	6.25%			
Student complaint about uni staff	8	4.91%	Vocational Placement Problems	5	5.21%			
Academic Misconduct - Exam	8	4.91%	Academic Misconduct - Exam	4	4.17%			
Progress - HDR	6	3.68%	Equitable Accommodation (SEAP)	4	4.17%			
Equitable Accommodation (SEAP)	5	3.07%	Student complaint about uni staff	4	4.17%			
Vocational Placement Problems	5	3.07%	Student Admin - Enrolment problems	3	3.13%			
Discrimination, Bullying or Harassment	5	3.07%	Discrimination, Bullying or Harassment	2	2.08%			
Student Admin - Enrolment problems	4	2.45%	Not Specified	2	2.08%			
Not Specified	3	1.84%	Course structure/changes	2	2.08%			
Admission - Selection Appeal	3	1.84%	Quality Teaching	1	1.04%			
Incorrect Advice	2	1.23%	Admission - Selection Appeal	1	1.04%			
Course structure/changes	2	1.23%	Academic Misconduct - Falsified docs	1	1.04%			
Advance Standing Credit/RPL	2	1.23%	Student Admin - Remission of Fees	1	1.04%			
Quality Teaching	2	1.23%	Incorrect Advice	1	1.04%			
General Misconduct	2	1.23%						
Academic Misconduct - Falsified docs	1	0.61%						
Student Admin - Remission of Fees	1	0.61%						

### **Distribution by graduate/undergraduate status**

April-June 2016

Graduate	50	47.17%
Undergraduate	56	52.83%

April-June 2015

Graduate	84	56.76%
Undergraduate	64	43.24%

### **Distribution by International/Domestic Status**

April-June 2016

Domestic	83	78.30%
International	23	21.70%

April-June 2015

Domestic	99	66.89%
International	49	33.11%

### **Distribution of cases over all by Faculty/School – April-June 2016**

In order to make the following data more meaningful the relative weighting of faculties by enrolment has been included. While this is useful in partially normalising the data - it is not possible to draw conclusions as to *why* certain faculties may be over or under represented in presentations to this service. For example, high representation may reflect an active referral policy within that faculty or it may disclose certain procedural issues in that area.

	Number of cases and as a proportion of all cases.		Enrolments as a proportion of students enrolled at university	Indication of relative representation in Advocacy casework
Arts (UG) & (HDCW & HDR)	26	26.26%	10.97%	>>>
Architecture, Building and Planning (UG) & (HDCW & HDR)	16	16.16%	2.23%	>>>
Science (UG) & (HDCW & HDR)	14	14.14%	12.62%	>>
Graduate School of Education (HDCW & HDR)	7	7.07%	5.85%	>>
VCA & MCM (UG) & (HDCW & HDR)	1	1.01%	6.28%	<<<
Business and Economics (UG) & (HDCW & HDR)	8	8.08%	10.12%	<<
Faculty of MDHS (UG) & (HDCW & HDR)	12	12.12%	13.33%	<
Law School (HDCW & HDR)	2	2.02%	3.93%	<
Faculty of Agriculture & Veterinary Science (UG) & (HDCW & HDR)	3	3.03%	3.91%	<
Melbourne School of Engineering	5	5.05%	6.31%	<
Melbourne Business School (MBS)	4	4.04%	-	-
Melbourne Conservatorium of Music (MCM)	1	1.01%	-	-

## Commentary

The numbers of graduate students this quarter continues to exceed the proportion of graduates as enrolled students. This indicates that graduate students find and access the service in numbers which exceed their proportion of enrolments at the University.

The relative proportion of domestic to international students continues to be broadly consistent with the corresponding enrolment loads. The primary issue across all students this quarter was special consideration, followed by assessment disputes and plagiarism issues. Collusion was also well represented as an issue.

Among graduate coursework students, special consideration, assessment disputes and plagiarism represented over 60% of the presenting issues. For research higher degree students the presenting issues were more evenly spread than usual between supervision issues, progress and assessment disputes.

Presenting students came from 12 schools and faculties. Arts was the most frequently represented faculty, followed closely by ABP & MSD and Science.

The overwhelming majority of special consideration matters came from the Faculty of Arts. There were more than twice as many undergraduates than graduates having issues with special consideration this quarter, and more than six times more domestic students than international students seeking assistance.

### ***Special Consideration - By Faculty/School***

Faculty of Arts (UG)	12	41.38%
Faculty of Science (HDCW)	4	13.79%
Faculty of MDHS (HDCW & HDR)	3	10.34%
Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences (HDCW & HDR)	2	6.90%
Faculty of Architecture, Building and Planning (UG)	2	6.90%
VCA & Music (HDCW & HDR)	1	3.45%
Melbourne School of Engineering (HDCW & HDR)	1	3.45%
Melbourne Graduate School of Education (HDCW & HDR)	1	3.45%
Melbourne Business School (MBS)	1	3.45%
Faculty of Science (UG)	1	3.45%
Faculty of Business and Economics (UG)	1	3.45%

### ***Special Consideration – by Graduate/Undergraduate***

Undergraduate	20	68.97%
Graduate	9	31.03%

### ***Special Consideration – by International/Domestic***

Domestic	25	86.21%
International	4	13.79%

### ***Assessment Disputes - By Faculty/School***

Melbourne Graduate School of Science (HDCW & HDR)	3	18.75%
Faculty of MDHS (HDCW & HDR)	3	18.75%
Melbourne School of Engineering (HDCW & HDR)	2	12.50%
Faculty of Veterinary Science (HDCW & HDR)	2	12.50%
Melbourne Conservatorium of Music (MCM)	1	6.25%
Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences (HDCW & HDR)	1	6.25%
Faculty of Science (UG)	1	6.25%
Faculty of Business and Economics (UG)	1	6.25%
Faculty of Arts (UG)	1	6.25%
Faculty of Architecture, Building and Planning (UG)	1	6.25%

### ***Assessment Disputes – by Graduate/Undergraduate***

Graduate	11	68.75%
Undergraduate	5	31.25%

### ***Assessment Disputes – by International/Domestic***

Domestic	13	81.25%
International	3	18.75%

### ***Academic Misconduct- Plagiarism - By Faculty/School***

Faculty of Arts (UG)	4	23.53%
Melbourne School of Design (HDCW & HDR)	3	17.65%
Melbourne Graduate School of Education (HDCW & HDR)	3	17.65%
Faculty of Science (UG)	2	11.76%
Faculty of Business and Economics (UG)	2	11.76%
Melbourne School of Engineering (HDCW & HDR)	1	5.88%
Law School (HDCW & HDR)	1	5.88%
Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences (HDCW & HDR)	1	5.88%

### ***Academic Misconduct- Plagiarism – by Graduate/Undergraduate***

Graduate	10	58.82%
Undergraduate	7	41.18%

### ***Academic Misconduct- Plagiarism – by International/Domestic***

Domestic	6	35.29%
International	11	64.71%

## **Liaisons and involvement with the University Community**

The service is always keen for opportunities to speak to staff at the University to demystify our role and explain the services we provide and how we can work together to further student interests.

Staff in the Advocacy Service liaised with the University Community in the following ways over the period:

05-Apr-16	Combined training and development morning with staff from the Student Equity and Disability Support team. Session included a presentation by the Disability Discrimination Legal Service.	Level 2, 757 Swanston St
-----------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------

If you would like to arrange a time for Advocacy staff to speak at your staff meeting or other liaison opportunity, please get in touch.

The next Advocacy Service report will cover the quarter July to September 2016 and will be available in early October.

Phoebe Churches

**Manager, Advocacy & Legal**