MINE4450
MINING RESEARCH PROJECT II

COURSE OUTLINE

SEMESTER 2, 2014
1. General Course Information

Course Details

Course Title: MINE4450  Mining Research Project II

Semester Offered: Semester 2

Level: Undergraduate

Number of Units/Credits: 6 UOC

Course Convenor:
Paul Hagan. Rm 159D, First Floor, Old Main Building.
Phone: 9385 5998, email: p.hagan@unsw.edu.au

Contact Hours per Week:
The course involves a self-directed project. The student should allow a minimum time of eight hours in total to work on their project. It is suggested the student liaise with their Project Supervisor each week.

To at least satisfactorily complete the course, the student will be required to expend a total of approximately 150 hours during the semester in a combination of direct contact time and other activities.

Learning Guide:
Detailed information related to the course including assessment requirements can be found in the Learning Guide: Mining Research Project.

Learning & Teaching Management System (LTMS):
The Learning & Teaching Management System (LTMS) used with this course is MOODLE.

For up to date information on lectures and workshops, see the Calendar section in LTMS and the School Noticeboard.
Support material for this course including, copies of lecture notes, recommended readings, assignments and results for assignments etc whenever available can be found in LTMS.

All correspondence should be undertaken using the email facility within LTMS. Changes in the lecture schedule, seminars, workshops and assignment dates will be posted on the Calendar in LTMS.

It is important that students regularly check LTMS for changes in calendar events and for email messages. It is strongly recommended that students use the mail redirection facility to forward LTMS emails to their usual email address.

Course Description
This course is intended to develop the capability and requisite skills of an engineer to build a foundation of knowledge related to a particular industry-related problem. This foundation provides a basis on which to design a solution that is robust and safe, cost effective and appropriate to the end-user.

It is essential that this foundation reflects not only established thinking and practices but equally important, it should account for divergent and newly developing views as well as any limitations or weaknesses that underpin current understanding. The quality of the engineering solution is therefore a function of the quality and timing to complete this investigation; an investigation that forms part of a process known as research.

The course entails the second phase of the Research Project that begun with Mining Research Project I, the focus of which was planning of the Project. With planning completed, the focus of the current course moves to the investigation, analysis and reporting phase. This entails one or more elements of equipment/model/survey design and build; experimentation and data gathering; analysis and modelling of data; conclusion and linking back to project objectives; and, finally presentation of project outcomes.

Assessment
Assessment in the course will take the form of a seminar presentation, a written report on the research project in the form of a thesis dissertation and a summary of the project in the form of a conference paper.

Note: Course completion requires all assessment items be completed; failure to submit on time can result in an Unsatisfactory Failure (UF) in the Course.

Course Completion
Course completion requires submission of all assessment items as detailed in the Course Outline and compliant with the requirements as detailed in the Course Learning Guide.

Assumed Knowledge
This course assumes that a student:
- is currently enrolled in the Mining Engineering single degree program or a Mining Engineering double degree program at UNSW; and
• satisfactorily completed all the courses in Stages 1 to 3 of the Mining Engineering single degree program or equivalent in the Mining Engineering double degree program and are in their final year of the program; and
• has successfully completed MINE4440; and
• submitted to the Course Authority of MINE4440 of a completed copy the Project Plan Agreement (PPA) form by the student that has been signed by the student’s Project Supervisor.
2. COURSE CONTENT

The course provides the opportunity for the student to undertake a research project on a mining, minerals engineering or other topic approved by the Course Convenor. Candidates are required to submit a dissertation or thesis, conference paper and make a presentation. The work may take the form of an engineering analysis, experimental investigation, theoretical study or design project.

3. LEARNING OUTCOMES AND GRADUATE ATTRIBUTES

Learning Outcomes

On completion of the course, the students will be able to:
1. design and assemble appropriate resources necessary to support the research investigation (e.g. test apparatus and equipment, computer models, survey forms, data collection methodology);
2. manage a research project to successful completion – achieve objectives within required timeframe with available resources;
3. collate and analyse results of investigation;
4. formulate relevant conclusions and recommendations against the project objectives;
5. present the research results in the form of a thesis dissertation and seminar presentation;
6. prepare a document to the standards required for a conference hosted by Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy (AusIMM), the professional association for Mining Engineers in Australia.

Graduate Attributes

This course will contribute to the development of the following Graduate Attributes:
1. appropriate technical knowledge
2. having advanced problem solving, analysis and synthesis skills with the ability to tolerate ambiguity
3. ability for engineering design and creativity
4. awareness of opportunities to add value through engineering and the need for continuous improvement
5. being able to work and communicate effectively across discipline boundaries
6. having HSEC consciousness
7. being active life-long learners.
4. **RECOMMENDED TEXTS AND RESOURCES**

**Reference Texts**

- *Report Writing Guide for Mining Engineers*, 2014. P Hagan and P Mort (Mining Education Australia (MEA)) (Available for download from the School website and/or from the UNSW Bookshop)

**Other Resources**

Other material that should be referred to in conjunction with this Course Outline include:

- *Learning Guide: Mining Research Project*
- *Student Resource Book: Mining Research Project*

Selected readings as well as other supporting material (e.g. course outline and lecture notes) will be made available in LTMS.

It is recommended that students review *ELISE*, the on-line study skills tutorial, as well as *ELISE Plus*. Both tutorials will be useful to students when preparing the Annotated Bibliography and Project Progress Report assignments, particularly the latter as it includes a tutorial on EndNote and Refworks. The tutorials can be accessed at <http://info.library.unsw.edu.au/skills/tutorials.html>.
5. LEARNING ACTIVITIES

Learning Activities Summary

The schedule of learning activities and outcomes for the course are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Schedule of topics in course during the semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEA Week</th>
<th>Week beginning</th>
<th>Activity/task/milestone</th>
<th>Assessment item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jul 28</td>
<td>Course Induction: outline of assessment requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aug 4</td>
<td>Finalise experimental design and begin construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aug 11</td>
<td>Finalise construction, commission and calibrate equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aug 18</td>
<td>Undertake first round of experiments and analyse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aug 25</td>
<td>Modify equipment design, materials and/or procedure as required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sep 1</td>
<td>Undertake second round of experiments and analyse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sept 8</td>
<td>Analyse experimental results and begin drafting project report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sept 15</td>
<td>Draft project results, conclusions and presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sept 22</td>
<td>Project Presentation* including objectives, current knowledge and most importantly the results, analysis, conclusions and recommendations.</td>
<td>Project Seminar Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept 29</td>
<td><strong>Mid-Semester Recess</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Oct 6</td>
<td><strong>Non-Teaching Week</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Oct 20</td>
<td>Prepare the draft of the Conference Paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|          | Oct 27         | Final Submission Requirements* Finalise Thesis* incorporating comments in marked copy of Examiner’s Copy from Supervisor. Submit Conference Paper* and CD* | Final Submission Requirements including:  
  - Thesis (2 copies);  
  - Conference Paper; and  
  - Project CD/DVD  
  - Project Final Clearance |

Notes:
- The MEA Week may not always align with the Semester Week.
- Assignment submission requirements, see Section 4.2 in the Course Learning Guide.
- For details of Project Milestones, see Section 5 in the Course Learning Guide.
6. Course Assessment

Assessment of the research project is based on the submissions made at various project milestones over the course of the year. Details on the project milestones and requirements are contained in the *Course Learning Guide* which contains more detailed information related to each item of assessment.

The range of assessment tasks have been designed to ensure a student can demonstrate they have satisfactorily attained the minimum requirements of the course as defined in the *Learning Outcomes* of the course and *Graduate Attributes* of the program. The student is also advised to review the relevant *Assessment Criteria* before completing each of the assessment items.

**Assessment Summary**

The following assessment tasks indicated in Table 2 have been devised to ensure the student can demonstrate that they have satisfactorily attained the minimum requirements of the course as defined in the *Learning Outcomes* of the course and the *Graduate Attributes* of the program. The student is advised to review the respective *Assessment Criteria* prior to commencing each assessment item.

**Table 2. Weighting of the various course assessment tasks.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Assessment item</th>
<th>MEA Week due</th>
<th>Course weighting</th>
<th>Learning outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A01</td>
<td>Student seminar on project and outcomes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A02</td>
<td>Examiner's Copy of Thesis</td>
<td>10^2</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A03</td>
<td>Final Submission Requirements, including Conference Paper, Final version of Thesis, CD and Project Final Clearance form</td>
<td>12^3</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A04</td>
<td>Consultation with Supervisor</td>
<td>1 to 9</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1 - 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
1. As per Table 1 in Section 5.  
2. Examiner’s Copy of Thesis is due by 1pm on Tuesday of Week 10.  
3. Due at commencement of the formal University Examination period. A student must make a prior appointment with the Course Convenor when they are ready to submit.

**Submission requirements**

*All assessment items must be submitted to the Course Convenor NOT to the student’s individual Project Supervisor.*

Before starting and again prior to submission of each assignment task, the student is advised to read the requirements for the particular assignment as detailed in the Assessment Criteria whenever it is made available.

Also prior to submission, the student is recommended to make sure they have have read and understood the following.
- Declaration of Academic Integrity contained on the Assignment Coversheet;
- Assignment Submission requirements detailed in the University Policies section; and
- The School's Policy on Assignment Submission a copy of which can be found on the School's website.

In the case of electronic submission of an assignment, note in particular the requirements in the School Policy that only a single PDF document should be uploaded with the file consistent with a specific file naming convention.

Submission requirements for all assignments are listed in Sections 4 and 7 of the Course Learning Guide.

Assignment attachments

Each assignment submitted for assessment must be attached with:

- an official School Coversheet at the front of the assignment; and
- the requisite Assessment Criteria form at the end of the assignment with the self-assessment completed by the student.

If either or both of these are not attached then the assignment will be deemed non-compliant with the assessment requirements. A non-compliant submission may not be marked and zero marks may be awarded for that assessment item. In any case a minimum 5% of the total marks will be forfeited for that assignment.

Examiner's Copy of Thesis

- In the case of the Examiner’s Copy of the Thesis, the assignment must be bound along the left hand margin by a plastic binding comb and have a clear plastic front cover.
- The assessment item must clearly identify the name of the student’s Project Supervisor.
- An official School Coversheet must be attached to the front of the Examiner’s Copy of Thesis.

Final Submission Requirements (FSR)

- review Sections 4.2.4 and 7 in the Course Learning Guide that outlines the requirements of each element comprising the FSR.
- The official deadline to comply with the FSR is the last day of semester.
- All elements that comprise the FSR must be submitted to the Course Convenor as one job lot. Submissions of individual elements will be not accepted.
- The FSR must be made in person by the student with the Course Convenor, usually the process will take 15 minutes to complete.
- A prior appointment must be made with the Course Convenor or their alternate at the School Reception. No appointment will be accepted on the day. During that time a check will be made to ensure:
  - the hardcopies are in order, for example: the student declaration has been signed in both copies; the special style template for the thesis opening page has been used with no changes/alterations; and, bound in the required manner.
  - all the required data files have been stored on the CD including thesis, presentation, conference paper and the special electronic version of abstract;
Assignments due date and time

If not otherwise stated the default deadline for submission of an assignment is 9:00am on Monday in the nominated week. If the Monday coincides with a Public Holiday then the due date is the next business day in the nominated week.

Penalties will apply for non-conformance with Assessment Deadlines as detailed in the Course Outline.

Early submissions are suggested if the student will otherwise be absent on the due date of submission.

Non-compliant Submissions

Penalties will apply to non-compliant assignment submissions, that is a submission that does not meet any or all of the requirements as detailed in the School's Policy on Assignment Submission and/or the later section on Assignment Submission in this Course Outline.

Some examples of non-compliant assignments and the penalties that will apply are as follows.

- The assignment document does not contain a signed copy of the Student Declaration Statement. Penalty: assignment not marked.
- The assignment document does not contain at the end of the document a completed self-assessment by the student using the provided Assessment Criteria. Penalty: 5 marks.
- The assignment file is not a single PDF document. Penalty: assignment not marked.
- The assignment file name is not fully consistent with the required file naming convention. Penalty 5 marks.
1. **Assessment Process**

**Overview**

Each student must have an assigned *Project Supervisor* who is a member of academic staff in the School. In some instances, the Project Supervisor may deem it appropriate to appoint a Project Co-Supervisor who is either an academic from the School or some other School/Faculty/University or, a person from industry. The Project Supervisor is responsible in conjunction with the Course Convenor for assessment of the student’s performance in the research project.

In general, students should arrange to consult regularly with their Project Supervisor to discuss project progress, options and future direction and, issues that may potentially impact performance and/or project completion.

The onus is on the student to initiate and attend meetings with their Project Supervisor. With regular communication there is less likelihood that surprises may arise which could adversely impact the project.

**Assessment Process**

Depending on the assessment item, grading will be undertaken by the Course Convenor and/or Project Supervisor. In the case of the:

- *Seminar Presentation*; assessment will be made by a panel of academic staff that may include the student’s Project Supervisor;
- *Examiner’s Copy of the Thesis*; assessment will be undertaken by one or more academics in the School. It may also be assessed by an academic at another Mining Education Australia (MEA) institution. The student’s Project Supervisor may be an examiner;
- *Conference Paper*; assessment will be undertaken by the Course Convenor.

Note: Do NOT submit any assessment item directly to your Project Supervisor as a late submission penalty will be applied.
2. **Assessment Criteria**

The following assessment criteria provide both a framework for students when preparing major assignments in the course as well as a guideline for assessors when marking an assignment. The student is advised to review the relevant framework before undertaking their assignment.

The criteria listed for each item of assessment and the descriptions contained therein are not intended to be prescriptive nor is it an exhaustive list. Rather it should be viewed as a framework to guide the student as to the type of information and depth of coverage that is expected to be evident in an assignment; the framework illustrates for example what would distinguish an excellent achievement from a poor achievement.

The student should be cognisant that a range of factors are often being assessed in any one assignment; not just whether the final results are numerically correct. Consideration is given to other relevant elements that contribute to the *Learning Outcomes* of the course as well as the *Graduate Attributes* of the overall degree program.

*The student is cautioned against merely using the assessment criteria as a checklist.* When assessing an assignment, elements in the framework will be examined in terms of quality and creativity. Hence ensuring all elements are merely covered in an assignment is often not sufficient in itself and will not automatically lead to full marks being awarded. Other factors such as how the student went about presenting information, how an argument was structured and/or the elements supporting a particular recommendation or outcome are also important.

Finally the framework can also be used to provide feedback to a student on their performance in an assignment. Periodically the criteria are reviewed and updated, consequently changes may be made from time to time to the framework to improve their effectiveness in achieving both these objectives.

Note: Reference to *RWG* in the assessment criteria refers to the *MEA Report Writing Guide*, and *GTA* to the *AusIMM Guide to Authors*.

**Student Seminar Presentation**

The seminar presentation is intended to be an end-of-project verbal report on the whole of the project; it is not intended to be a progress report. The presentation should provide an overview of the complete project with particular emphasis given to the experimental activities/investigation undertaken, findings and conclusions.

Each presentation will be assessed by a panel of academics, some of whom may not be familiar with the topic area. Hence the student needs to set the context for the project i.e. to provide some background material on the project. Normally the panel would include, whenever possible, the student's Supervisor.

Each seminar will be scheduled for a **maximum of 20 minutes**: It is recommended the student allow for no more than **15 minutes for presentation leaving 5 minutes** for questions. Uploading of the presentation should be done prior to each presentation session; otherwise loading time will reduce the available presentation time. Students must be in attendance throughout the scheduled time for student
presentations. *Students will not be allowed to enter the seminar room whilst a presentation is underway.*

As time will be strictly limited, it is suggested that the student make good use of appropriate visual aids.

The assessment criteria and weighting that will be used in assessing the Seminar Presentation is summarised in the following table.

### Assessment Criteria – Seminar Presentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>nil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction, objectives &amp; background</strong></td>
<td>• provided an excellent and comprehensive overview of the context for the project, the project objective, and likely benefits</td>
<td>• provided a good overview of the context, objectives and benefits of the project with few points that were not clearly discussed</td>
<td>• provided only limited overview of the project resulting in some questions about the project</td>
<td>• provided limited or confusing overview resulting in questions about project</td>
<td>• provided no background to project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research quality and analysis</strong></td>
<td>• demonstrated comprehensive knowledge of past work undertaken in the topic area</td>
<td>• demonstrated sound knowledge of past work on the topic</td>
<td>• demonstrated minimal knowledge of the topic area</td>
<td>• demonstrated limited or no knowledge of the topic area</td>
<td>• approach appeared to be unsoundly based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• research methodology appeared to be based on solid scientific principles that also demonstrated a degree of creative approach to investigation</td>
<td>• research methodology was soundly based</td>
<td>• followed soundly-based but established methodology</td>
<td>• unclear approach or approach not soundly based</td>
<td>• limited or no analysis of results presented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• analysis of results made use of some models/analytical tools that indicated reasonable insight of problem/issues</td>
<td>• analysis of results made use of some models/analytical tools that indicated reasonable insight of problem/issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 14</td>
<td>13 11</td>
<td>10 8</td>
<td>7 4</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions and recommendations</strong></td>
<td>• clear, concise, appropriate, useful and strongly insightful conclusions soundly linked to the observed results</td>
<td>• clear and well developed set of conclusions demonstrating recognition of the significance of the results,</td>
<td>• reasonable articulation of conclusions linked to results</td>
<td>• unclear or questionable set of conclusions not fully supported by the results</td>
<td>• invalid or inappropriate conclusions that had only tenuous justification</td>
<td>• lacked any clear conclusions or lack of any justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 14</td>
<td>13 11</td>
<td>10 8</td>
<td>7 4</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>nil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response to questions</strong></td>
<td>• excellent and valid responses to questions</td>
<td>• appropriate and valid responses to questions</td>
<td>• adequate responses to questions</td>
<td>• barely appropriate and/or valid responses to questions</td>
<td>• inappropriate and invalid responses to questions</td>
<td>• unable to reasonably respond to questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• allowed for min of 5 minutes for question time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Quality of presentation aids and resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• excellent balance in content and information that supplemented rather than overpowered the message of the presenter</td>
<td>• good balance in content</td>
<td>• adequate balance of information in slides</td>
<td>• some slides difficult to read and/or too much content</td>
<td>• most slides were poorly designed</td>
<td>• slides mostly illegible, confusing and/or containing many errors that distracted the audience from the main messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• appropriate number of slides/visual aids</td>
<td>• slides easy to read with appropriate sized graphs, wording etc</td>
<td>• reasonably legible and mostly well designed</td>
<td>• slides dominated the communication process</td>
<td>• message was often confusing</td>
<td>• an inappropriate number of slides/visual aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• slides designed well so required little effort and easy to read/digest with appropriate sized graphs, wording etc</td>
<td>• few minor errors</td>
<td>• some slides contained several minor errors in formatting, wording, sizing etc</td>
<td>• several major errors/mistakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• no errors on slides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Quality of delivery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• excellent standard of verbal presentation by speaker to the audience</td>
<td>• clear presentation of main messages</td>
<td>• reasonable quality of presentation</td>
<td>• generally unsatisfactory presentation</td>
<td>• poorly presented with little or poor structure</td>
<td>• inaudible presentation and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• speaker was mindful of audience in delivery</td>
<td>• largely confident delivery with reasonable level of engagement</td>
<td>• some recognition of need of audience in delivery</td>
<td>• speaker spoke to screen and/or notes, not to audience</td>
<td>• poorly presented leading to alienation/lack of engagement of audience</td>
<td>• speaker was unaware of/ignored audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• delivered with confidence and enthusiasm that lead to real engagement of the audience</td>
<td>• well-planned and structured that aided in understanding by audience</td>
<td>• reasonable delivery</td>
<td>• messages often confused and/or ambiguous leading to lack of engagement of audience</td>
<td>• with little evidence of planning and/or poor structure</td>
<td>• lacking any structure and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• well-structured so that presentation flowed smoothly leaving audience feeling they had been provided with all relevant info on background &amp; issues, method, and outcomes related to project</td>
<td>• some evidence of planning evident that ensured the audience was informed of most of the main messages</td>
<td>• some evidence of delivery</td>
<td>• presentation difficult to follow partly due to poor planning of presentation, erratic structure and/or method of delivery</td>
<td>• poor time management and/or not completed within allotted timeframe</td>
<td>• difficult to understand main messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• completed on time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mark for assessment returned as a whole number.
Examiner’s Copy of Thesis

Considering the diversity of topics and the approaches that can be taken by a student in the project, assessment of each thesis will be partly dependent on the complexity of the major activities involved in the project; the higher the complexity, the greater the potential for a higher mark. As a guide, the following research activities are ranked from relatively low complexity to high complexity.

- state of the art investigation
- laboratory investigation or some quantitative/qualitative assessment
- modelling of results/observed behaviour
- development of some underlying principle

A good Honours thesis would be expected to involve one or more activities of higher complexity.

The thesis should represent a comprehensive report on the research project consistent with the usual requirements of an undergraduate thesis. The Examiner’s Copy of the Thesis should include an updated and/or revised version of the earlier submitted literature review taking account of the comments made by the Supervisor.

Aside from complexity, assessment will also account for the quality of work by a student. As would be expected there should be a reasonable correlation between the quality of the research and the resultant assessment.

Another dimension to assessment of the thesis entails the student’s demonstrated capability in Project Management. This includes consideration of whether the project objectives were clearly defined and achieved, achieving the various project deadlines, degree of ownership and leadership of the project, amount of initiative demonstrated, organisational and scheduling skills, and how any OH&S and environment issues of the research project were managed.

The assessment criteria and weighting that will be used in assessing the Examiner’s Copy is summarised in the following table.
### Assessment Criteria – Examiner’s Copy of Thesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>nil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abstract</strong></td>
<td>● Abstract is well written and accurately yet concisely captures all the essential aspects of the project objective, methodology, outcomes and issues</td>
<td>● Abstract is reasonably well written and captures most of the essential elements of the project</td>
<td>● Abstract is adequately written and captures most elements though missing some information</td>
<td>● Abstract is poorly written and does not clearly convey information concerning project topic, method, issues and/or outcomes</td>
<td>● Abstract is badly written and/or does not summarise the project topic and its outcomes</td>
<td>● Abstract is missing and/or largely incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>● Introduction provides a clear definition of the aims and objectives and, scope of project clearly identifies the relevance and significance of the project to the industry</td>
<td>● Introduction provides a good definition of the aims and objectives and scope of project identifies the relevance and significance to industry</td>
<td>● Introduction satisfactorily outlines the aims and objectives and/or provides a reasonable discussion of relevance and significance to industry</td>
<td>● Incomplete and/or unclear definition of project scope</td>
<td>● Project topic and scope are very unclear and/or confused</td>
<td>● Introduction is missing and/or largely incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background, methodology/ experimental procedures and risk management</strong></td>
<td>● extensive, relevant and logically organised review that critically analysed previous work on the topic and sets the scene for the research to be conducted</td>
<td>● relevant and logically organised review that critically analysed previous work on the topic and set the scene for the research to be conducted</td>
<td>● presented a good description of the research methodology and/or experimental procedure that was used to obtain data</td>
<td>● limited coverage of background material that lacked critical analysis. A lack of understanding of the material in the topic area was evident</td>
<td>● extremely limited coverage of background material. A lack of understanding of the material in the topic area was evident</td>
<td>● critique of previous work is missing and/or largely incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results and analysis</strong></td>
<td>● all relevant results are presented in a manner from which meaningful analyses and interpretations are drawn</td>
<td>● most results are presented in a manner from which meaningful analyses and interpretations are drawn</td>
<td>● many results are presented in a manner from which meaningful analyses and interpretations are drawn</td>
<td>● some results are presented and some analysis and interpretations of these results are given</td>
<td>● poorly presented some results and some results missing little or no analysis or interpretation of results</td>
<td>● no results presented and/or analysed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abstract</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background, methodology/ experimental procedures and risk management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results and analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>nil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Quality of research and innovation in research process** | • approach highlights creativity and innovation, while working to an organised plan  
• actual execution of the work showed the application of knowledge gained from background research through relevant analysis of data to generate new knowledge.  
• clearly demonstrated that Risk Analysis and Management have been used in the project | • approach is systematic and showed some innovation  
• actual execution of the work showed the application of knowledge gained from background research through relevant analysis of data  
• demonstrated that Risk Analysis and Management had been used in the project | • approach is reasonably systematic.  
• actual execution of work showed some understanding via application of prior knowledge and some background research to produce limited analysis of data  
• demonstrates that some Risk Analysis and Management had been used in the project | • approach is not well considered and does not flow logically from the background research presented  
• actual execution of work shows flawed understanding and little application of either background research or prior knowledge  
• limited Risk Analysis and Management had been used in the project | • approach is haphazard and has no logical basis  
• actual execution of the work shows very little understanding and little application of either background research or prior knowledge  
• hardly any Risk Analysis and Management have been used in the project | • little/no evidence of quality of research and innovation |
| **Conclusions and recommendations** | • excellent, clear and concise summary of the outcomes of the research that demonstrates sound comprehension and insight into the significance of the results  
• excellent and appropriate recommendations for continuation and improvement of the research were discussed | • good summary of the outcomes of the research that demonstrates comprehension and some insight into the significance of the results  
• some recommendations for continuation and improvement of the research were discussed | • reasonable summary of the outcomes of the research that demonstrates some comprehension but limited insight into the significance of the results  
• limited recommendations for continuation and improvement of the research were discussed | • summary of the outcomes of the research that demonstrates limited comprehension  
• few, inappropriate and/or irrelevant recommendations | • fails to explain what was achieved with no real comprehension demonstrated  
• no conclusions and/or recommendations |
| **Referencing** | • all in-text citations are correct as per the RWG  
• all sources of information are referenced  
• all listings in the References section are exactly in accord with the AusIMM standards as contained in the RWG  
• there are no missing References | • majority of in-text citations are correct with only a few minor errors  
• majority of sources of information are referenced with few exceptions  
• majority of listings in the References section are correct with only a few minor errors  
• there are a few references missing from the References section | • most in-text citations are correct though there are several errors and/or some information is not referenced  
• most listings in the References section are correct though there are several errors  
• the References section is mostly complete | • limited/poor range of references and/or some are not appropriate to the topic  
• many errors with in-text citations  
• too little use of in-text citations and/or many instances of information not being properly referenced to identify source of information  
• most of the listings in the References section are incorrect  
• the Reference section is incomplete/missing some references | • too few references and/or most are not appropriate to the topic  
• no in-text citation in thesis or incorrect system of referencing is used  
• incorrect system of listing in the References section | • there is no References section  
• no in-text citation in thesis or incorrect system of referencing is used  
• incorrect system of listing in the References section |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>nil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Conference Paper

The assessment criteria and weighting that will be used in assessing the Conference Paper is summarised in the following table.

**Assessment Criteria – Conference Paper**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>nil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Title, Abstract & Introduction** | • Title reflects well the content of the Paper  
• Abstract is informative and summarises the paper in one paragraph  
• Introduction provides the reader with a concise background to the topic that is appropriately referenced | • Title is good reflection of the content of the Paper  
• Abstract is informative and summarises the paper in one paragraph with minor errors.  
• Introduction provides the reader with relevant background to the topic | • Title essentially reflects the content of the Paper  
• Abstract is not informative and summarises the paper in one paragraph with some errors  
• Introduction provides the reader with the background on relevant background to the topic | • Title does not reflect the content of the paper  
• Abstract is not informative with major errors and does not summarise the paper in one paragraph  
• Introduction is inappropriate | • Title does not reflect the content of the Paper or is missing  
• Abstract poorly structured with key information missing  
• Introduction provides the reader with very little background to the topic | • Title, Abstract and Introduction missing |

Note: Mark for assessment returned as a whole number.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>nil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology and/or experimental procedures</strong></td>
<td>• Paper provides the reader with an excellent and clear description of the research methodology and/or any experimental procedure that was used to obtain experimental data</td>
<td>• Paper provides the reader with a reasonable description of the research methodology and/or any experimental procedure that was used to obtain data, which contains minor errors</td>
<td>• Paper provides the reader with a brief description of the research methodology and/or any experimental procedure that was used to obtain data, which contains major errors</td>
<td>• Paper provides the reader with a limited description of the research methodology and/or any experimental procedure that was used to obtain data</td>
<td>• Methodology and/or Experimental Procedures missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results and discussion</strong></td>
<td>• Paper is supported with appropriate and incisive analysis supported by results with detailed discussion that advances the knowledge of the topic</td>
<td>• Paper is supported with results, analysis and discussion that partially advance the knowledge of the topic</td>
<td>• Paper is supported with some results, analysis and discussion</td>
<td>• Paper has only minimal results and discussion but analysis is missing</td>
<td>• Results and discussion missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions</strong></td>
<td>• Concise, appropriate and excellent conclusions, clearly demonstrating the significance of the results</td>
<td>• Good conclusions, but significance of the results not clearly demonstrated</td>
<td>• Reasonable conclusions but significance of the results only partially addressed</td>
<td>• Unreasonable conclusions not fully supported by the results in the paper</td>
<td>• Invalid conclusions</td>
<td>• Conclusions missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Layout and standard of Paper</strong></td>
<td>• Paper adheres to AusIMM’s Guide to Authors, with no or few spelling and grammatical errors. References are correctly used and all headings used in the paper are relevant. Figures and Tables are correctly formatted, legible and relevant to the content of the paper</td>
<td>• Paper adheres to AusIMM’s Guide to Authors, with some spelling and grammatical errors. References are correctly used and all headings used in the paper are relevant. Figures and Tables are correctly formatted, legible and relevant to the content of the paper, but contain minor errors</td>
<td>• Paper partially adheres to AusIMM’s Guide to Authors, with major spelling and grammatical errors to be corrected. Few references are used and many headings used in the paper are not relevant. Figures and Tables contain major errors</td>
<td>• Paper does not adhere to AusIMM’s Guide to Authors, with major spelling and grammatical errors to be corrected. No references are used and many headings used in the paper are not relevant. Figures and Tables contain major errors</td>
<td>• Unable to read paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mark for assessment returned as a whole number.
Consultation with Supervisor

The assessment criteria and weighting that will be used in assessing the quality of the student consultations is summarised in the following table.

Assessment Criteria – Consultation with Supervisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>nil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of consultation</td>
<td>• student maintained regular contact with academic supervisor (at least once a week), and • clearly demonstrated consistent effort and progress, and • discussed options to resolve issues related to project, and • was able to clearly demonstrate significant initiative and competence that contributed to successful completion of project</td>
<td>• student maintained regular contact with academic supervisor (at least once a fortnight), and • demonstrated to a reasonable degree some effort and progress of project, and • discussed some issues related to project, and • demonstrated competence in completing project and was largely self-directed</td>
<td>• student had intermittent contact with academic supervisor (at least once a month), and • indicated sporadic progress, and • some initiative in resolving issues • but had to be largely guided in project by Supervisor</td>
<td>• student had infrequent contact with academic supervisor (e.g. two to four times during semester), and/or • little evidence to suggest otherwise that the project was not high on agenda and not left until final weeks before Seminar, and • little initiative demonstrated nor ownership shown of the project unless directed by Supervisor</td>
<td>• student had very little contact if any with academic supervisor (perhaps only once for the semester), and/or • little evidence to suggest otherwise that large portion of the project was left till the last minute, and • lack of any initiative demonstrated nor ownership shown of the project</td>
<td>• lack of any meaningful consultation by student with academic supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

---
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3. UNIVERSITY POLICIES

Assignment Submissions

All assignments submitted for assessment in this course must be made in accordance with the School Policy on Assignment Submissions, hereafter in this subsection termed the Policy. Details can be found in the School Policies section of the School webpage at <www.engineering.unsw.edu.au/mining-engineering/school-policies>.

Students are required to read the latest version of the Policy and be aware of the various requirements including submission requirements and academic integrity. Failure to adhere to the requirement and/or submit an assignment that is in full accordance with the Policy can result in forfeiture of all marks for that assignment by the student.

An Assignment Coversheet must be attached to each assignment submitted for assessment whether the assignment is submitted in electronic or hardcopy form. The coversheet identifies the student, assignment, course and contains a declaration of academic integrity – see later section on Academic Honesty and Plagiarism. An assignment that does not contain a full and proper completed copy of the official coversheet for the assignment will be deemed non-compliant and not marked and the student will be awarded zero marks for the assignment.

In the case where a hardcopy submission of an assignment has been permitted in the assignment briefing document then the submission requirements for hardcopy submissions as detailed in the Policy must be followed. The student must attach to the front of the assignment a completed and signed copy of the appropriately coloured Assignment Coversheet for the particular Course Convenor which in this case is LIGHT GREEN. A copy of the coloured Coversheet is available from the Course Convenor one week before the assignment due date. The assignment must be stapled in the top left hand corner or bound in an appropriate manner. Alternatively an assignment can be bound along the left hand margin with a plastic binding comb with a clear plastic front cover. Assignments must NOT be submitted in a protective plastic sleeve.

Assignments which submitted electronically may be required to be submitted through Turnitin.

Students are advised to retain a copy of every assignment submitted for assessment for their own record either in hardcopy or electronic form. From time to time assignments may be mislaid and a student can be asked to re-submit.

Late Submission of Assignments

In the normal course of events late submission of an assignment will automatically result in a zero (0) mark being awarded to the student/project team for the assignment.

The onus is on the student to ensure each course assignment is submitted on-time during normal business hours and no later than the required time on the due date as stated in the relevant assignment briefing document.
For further details see Late Submissions in the School Policies section on the School webpage. See also the later section on Adverse Performance – Special Consideration.

In the case of the Examiner’s Copy of the Thesis, penalty marks will be applied by the Course Convenor at the following rates if submitted after the due date:

- fifteen (15) percentile points of the maximum possible mark for the first week overdue or part thereof; and
- an additional five (5) percentile points for each week or part thereof thereafter.

For example if a student submitted the Examiner’s Copy of the Thesis ten days after the due date and the unadjusted assignment mark was 68% then the final adjusted mark for the assignment would be 48% – that is 68% (raw mark) less 15% (1st week penalty less a further 5% (2nd week penalty).

Unsatisfactory and/or Non-completion of Course Assessment

In the case where assessment of the Examiner’s Copy of the Thesis, the Assignment, is found to be less than satisfactory then the student will be required to address the issues highlighted by the Supervisor and re-submit the Assignment for a second reassessment. This may require the student to undertake further data collection, analysis and/or make other changes. Where the Assignment is required to be re-submitted then the maximum mark a student will be awarded for the Assignment if and when determined to be at least Satisfactory, will be 50%. Only one re-submission will be allowed. If the resubmission is unsatisfactory then the student will not be awarded a passing grade in the course and the student will be required to re-enrol in the course.

In the case of non-completion of assessment items, the student will be awarded one of the following grades for the Course.

- If none of the assessment items for the course have been completed and submitted before the last day of the academic semester that is by Friday preceeding StuVac then the student will be awarded an Absent Fail (AF) for the Course in that semester.
- If the Examiner’s Copy of the Thesis has not been submitted prior to commencement of the designated Formal Examination period for the semester enrolled then the maximum mark a student will be awarded for that assessment item is 64%.
- If ALL assessment items have not been submitted by 4 pm on the last day in the Formal Examination period for the semester enrolled then the Course result will be recorded as Not Completed (NC). A grade of NC signifies the student did not complete assessment in that semester. The student will be required to re-enrol in the Course at some future time in order to finalise assessment requirements. While the student has not failed, NC indicates the student did not complete the Course.
- If any assessment item required to be re-submitted has not been submitted by commencement of the following academic session then the final course result for the semester completed will be altered to Not Completed (NC).
- If by commencement of the following academic semester any re-submitted assessment item is determined to be less than Satisfactory then the Course result will be recorded as Unsatisfactory Fail (UF).
Course Results

For details on assessment policy, assessment process and an explanation of course results, see the Assessment Policy section in the School Policies section on the School webpage.

In some instances a student’s final course result may be withheld and not released on the usual date. This is indicated by a course grade result of either:

- **WD** – which usually indicates that the student has not completed one or more items of assessment or there is an issue with one or more assignment; or

- **WC** – which indicates the student has applied for Special Consideration due to illness or misadventure and the course results have not been finalised.

In either event the onus is on the student to contact the Course Convenor as soon as practicable but **no later than five (5) days** after release of the course result. Failure to take this action will normally result in forfeiture of any additional assessment granted to the student. In which case the student may be required to re-submit an assignment or re-sit the final exam. Failure to contact the Course Convenor within the stated period may result in the student failing the course.

If contact has not been made and/or course assessment has not been finalised by commencement of the following academic semester then the grade will be automatically altered to a course grade of **NC** (course not completed) in Week 2. This will require the student to re-enrol in the course at some later time.

Adverse Performance – Special Consideration

In cases of illness or other extenuating circumstances that may have adversely impacted on a student’s performance in a course, it is recommended the student apply to Student Central for Special Consideration.

Students are advised that as a consequence of a late submission, should it be granted, that it may delay finalisation of a student’s course results.

It is incumbent on the student to contact the Course Convenor immediately following lodgement and acceptance of the Special Consideration preferably in person and no later than one week from lodgement. Failure to make contact can result in forfeiture for any consideration and subsequent finalisation of the mark for the assignment and/or course.

Only following acceptance and official notification from the University, will any decision be made by the Course Convenor as to an appropriate response based the circumstances outlined by the student.

For further information, see Special Consideration – Illness and Misadventure within the section on UNSW Policies on the School webpage.

In addition to the established university system dealing with cases of Special Consideration, students may apply directly to the Course Convenor seeking consideration with regard to penalties for late submission of the Examiner’s Copy of the Thesis.

The following process has been established for students to apply for such consideration.
• In general, consideration will only be given where there were unforeseen circumstances related to the project or, where there were other circumstances not related to the project that were beyond the control of the student which affected the student's performance in the Course during the semester.
• All requests for consideration must be made in writing to the Course Convenor.
• The student must clearly state in their request, the reasons for consideration and indicate what progress had been made by the student in the project up to that date.
• Consideration will be based on the information as provided by the student in the request and advice from the student’s Project Supervisor. All relevant supporting documentation should be attached to the request. It is not the responsibility of the Course Convenor to seek any further information though in some instances the Course Convenor may request information from the student.
• In general, a request should be submitted prior to the due date for submission of the assessable item. Only in exceptional circumstances will a request for consideration be accepted after the due date.
• The date of submission relative to the due due date will be taken into account when considering the request.
• The Course Convenor may consult with the student’s Project Supervisor if appropriate concerning the request for consideration.
• The Course Convenor/Co-ordinator may reject the request for consideration or, waive all or part of the deductions of marks that would otherwise apply.

Academic Honesty and Plagiarism

The University has certain expectations in terms of academic behaviour related to study and research. This is expressed in the University Policy on Academic Misconduct. Students should be aware of and understand this Policy. For further information, see Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism in the section on UNSW Policies on the School webpage.

Plagiarism is one form of Academic Misconduct. It is the presentation of the thoughts or work of another as one's own\(^1\). Examples include:

• direct duplication of the thoughts or work of another, including by copying work, or knowingly permitting it to be copied. This includes copying material, ideas or concepts from a book, article, report or other written document (whether published or unpublished), composition, artwork, design, drawing, circuitry, computer program or software, web site, Internet, other electronic resource, or another person's assignment without appropriate acknowledgement;
• paraphrasing another person's work with very minor changes keeping the meaning, form and/or progression of ideas of the original;
• piecing together sections of the work of others into a new whole;
• presenting an assessment item as independent work when it has been produced in whole or part in collusion with other people, for example, another student or a tutor; and,
• claiming credit for a proportion a work contributed to a group assessment item that is greater than that actually contributed\(^2\).

Submitting an assessment item that has already been submitted for academic credit elsewhere may also be considered plagiarism.

---

\(^1\) Based on that proposed to the University of Newcastle by the St James Ethics Centre. Used with kind permission from the University of Newcastle.

\(^2\) Adapted with kind permission from the University of Melbourne.
The inclusion of the thoughts or work of another with attribution appropriate to the academic discipline does not amount to plagiarism.

Students are reminded of their Rights and Responsibilities in respect of plagiarism, as set out in the University Undergraduate and Postgraduate Handbooks, and are encouraged to seek advice from academic staff whenever necessary to ensure they avoid plagiarism in all its forms.

The Learning Centre website is the central University on-line resource for staff and student information on plagiarism and academic honesty. It can be viewed at <www.lc.unsw.edu.au/plagiarism>.

The Learning Centre also provides substantial educational written materials, workshops, and tutorials to aid students, for example, in:

- correct referencing practices;
- paraphrasing, summarising, essay writing, and time management;
- appropriate use of and attribution for, a range of materials including text, images, formulae and concepts.

Individual assistance is available on request from The Learning Centre.

Students are also reminded that careful time management is an important part of study and one of the identified causes of plagiarism is poor time management. Students should allow sufficient time for research, drafting, and the proper referencing of sources in preparing all assessment items.

In line with this university expectation, a student must attach to each assignment a fully completed official coversheet which contains a declaration of academic integrity. The following is an example of an assignment coversheet (note: changes to the assignment may occur from time to time).

[An example extract from an Assignment Coversheet]

**ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS**

Before submitting this assignment, students are advised to review:

- the assessment requirements contained in the briefing document for the assignment;
- the various matters related to assessment in the relevant Course Outline; and
- the Plagiarism and Academic Integrity website at <http://www.lc.unsw.edu.au/plagiarism/pintro.html> to ensure they are familiar with the requirements to provide appropriate acknowledgement of source materials.

If after reviewing this material there is any doubt about assessment requirements then in the first instance the student should consult with the Course Convenor and then if necessary with the Director – Undergraduate Studies.

While students are generally encouraged to work with other students to enhance learning, all assignments submitted for assessment by a student must be their entire own work and they may be required to explain any or all parts of the assignment to the Course Convenor or other authorised persons. **Collusion** is where another person(s) assists in the preparation of an assignment without the consent or knowledge of the Course Convenor.

Plagiarism and Collusion are considered as Academic Misconduct and will be dealt with according to University Policy.

**STUDENT DECLARATION OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

I declare that:
• This assessment item is entirely my own original work, except where I have acknowledged use of source material [such as books, journal articles, other published material, the Internet, and the work of other student(s) or any other person(s)].

• This assessment item has not been submitted for assessment for academic credit in this, or any other course, at UNSW or elsewhere.

I understand that:

• The assessor of this assessment item may, for the purpose of assessing this item, reproduce this assessment item and provide a copy to another member of the University.

• The assessor may communicate a copy of this assessment item to a plagiarism checking service (which may then retain a copy of the assessment item on its database for the purpose of future plagiarism checking).

**Continual Course Improvement**

Periodically the process of course evaluation is undertaken. One aspect of this evaluation is feedback from students gathered by various means including:

- UNSW's Course and Teaching Evaluation and Improvement (CATEI) which is an anonymous, on-line survey system.

Student feedback is taken seriously, and continual improvements are made to the course based in part on such feedback.

Significant changes that are made to a course as a result of such student feedback will be communicated to students by the Course Convenor at commencement of semester when the course is next run.

**Correspondence and Email Messages**

University policy states that official correspondence with a student will be made using the university provided email address and that it expects students will regularly check their official university email account. The School assists in this by providing free access to computing facilities and the internet.

In line with this policy, messages will be sent to students through their LTMS account. Students can retrieve messages from the mailbox in each LTMS course account.

**Administrative Matters**

Students should ensure they are familiar with the various policies related to expectations of students. Links to the Policies can be found on the School web page.

Equity and diversity: those students who have a disability that requires some adjustment in their teaching or learning environment are encouraged to discuss their study needs with the course convener prior to, or at the commencement of, their course, or with the Equity Officer (Disability) in the Equity and Diversity Unit (<www.equity.unsw.edu.au/disabil.htm>).

Issues to be discussed may include access to materials, signers or note-takers, the provision of services and additional exam and assessment arrangements. Early notification is essential to enable any necessary adjustments to be made. Information on designing courses and course outlines that take into account the needs of students with disabilities can be found at <www.secretariat.unsw.edu.au/acboardcom/minutes/coe/disabilityguidelines.pdf>.