

9 July 2021

UMSU Advocacy Feedback

Overall, the Advocacy Service endorses the objectives set out in this proposed policy. However, we provide the following feedback for your consideration.

Unclear interaction with other policy

Section 5.48(b) provides that the CAPC must terminate the candidate's enrolment in the course where the committee determines they have failed to show cause as to why their enrolment should not be terminated and the candidate has reached the maximum time to submit and is unlikely to be able to complete within the next 6 months, where an additional 6 months does not exceed the maximum time to complete.

Two clarifications:

1. Is it intended that where the candidate has shown cause as to why their enrolment should not be terminated that they will be permitted to continue?
2. How does this provision interact with situations where, in extenuating circumstances, students may seek to have their maximum time to complete extended as part of a proposed plan to complete the course requirements? (i.e. ss 4.194 - 4.195 of the *Courses, Subjects, Awards and Programs Policy*)

Timeline for students to act

Section 5.51 provides 10 business days for students offered an opportunity to transfer to a masters course to accept. Firstly, this seems to be a very short timeframe to consider and respond to such a significant decision. Secondly, students have 20 business days to lodge an appeal. Even if an appeal is not decided in their favour, this would not prevent such a transfer being available to them as a potential outcome from an appeal. Therefore, we submit that it seems reasonable that students should also have 20 business days to accept an offer to transfer to masters.

Minor typographical issues

The policy refers to *Course Academic Progress Committees (CAPC)* – should be “Committee” in the singular.

At s 4.9 refers to the incorrect provision of the Academic Board Regulation – it should be section 35 (Academic progress committees) which provides for composition of the committee.

At s 4.10 it refers to section 4 of the Academic Board Regulation, should read subsection 4.

At s 5.15 “the advisor committee” should be “advisory”. There is inconsistent use of capitalisation in the use of advisory committee within the document.

At s 5.43 refers to ss 4.7 - 4.12 in respect of the constitution of the committee – however the constitution is described to s 4.15.