



Australian
National
University

Student Discipline Framework Review

Phase 1 Consultation Report

September 2025

Division of Student and Academic Services

Contents

Background	3
Methodology.....	3
Definitions.....	5
Feedback Received	6
Strengths and Weaknesses of the Consultation Methodology.....	10
Next Steps.....	10
Attachment 1 - Poster Example.....	12
Attachment 2 - Survey Example.....	13

Background

The Australian National University (the University/ANU) is committed to promoting safety and wellbeing in our community. As part of this commitment, the University is undertaking a review of its Student Disciplinary Framework. A routine process, the review is aimed at continuous improvement ensuring the University's policies remain effective, fair, and follow best practice principles.

ANU has established the Student Disciplinary Framework Review (SDFR) Project Board (the Project Board) to oversee the current review which will be informed by:

- institutional learnings since the 2021 [Discipline Rule](#) review;
- broad consultation with the University community; and
- incoming regulatory changes relating to harmful behaviours on university campuses, including the 'National Higher Education Code to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence', the establishment of the National Student Ombudsman, and the outcomes from the forthcoming National Student Safety Survey.

The review considers the Discipline Rule 2021 ('the Rule'), the Appeals Rule 2023, the ANU (Residential Colleges Affiliation) Statute 2021, the Sexual Misconduct Policy, the Student Code of Conduct, and the process and practice at ANU. The project is being delivered in three phases:

Phase 1 – Resource base development: Benchmarking and development of a resource base from which the review drew findings and recommendations. This involved broad consultation with University stakeholders, collating feedback and consolidating the resources necessary for phase 2.

Phase 2 – Preliminary recommendations & consultation: This will involve drafting recommendations for changes to the Student Disciplinary Framework and conducting further consultation via release of a Draft Recommendations report.

Phase 3 – Final recommendations report: The final report will be referred to the relevant approval authorities and University teams responsible for implementation.

Phase 1 of the review includes consultation with University stakeholders. Feedback was gathered through a survey, small group and 1:1 face-to-face sessions. This report summarises Phase 1 consultation feedback, strengths and weaknesses, and identifies improvements for Phase 2 consultation.

Phase 2 consultation will provide a Draft Recommendations report being open to ANU community and key stakeholder feedback, planned for November/December 2025. This will ensure the ANU has heard and collated feedback accurately, and provide an opportunity for the ANU to outline proposed actions to respond to feedback. Stakeholders can then be part of refining and fine-tuning the ANU's proposed response to the review.

Methodology

Stakeholder Identification

- Stakeholders likely to have interest in the review were identified through the project planning phase. This list of 63 individuals and groups included student groups, staff, current discipline process decision-makers, external experts and affiliates such as student clubs, associations and residential halls.

Stakeholder Communication

- All identified stakeholders received direct emails inviting them to take part in the consultation period (either via survey or face-to-face options).
- The general staff and student community were notified of the consultation opportunity via 11 notices in the On Campus email newsletter, and the use of posters and screens across campus (**Attachment 1 – poster example**).

- Project Board members and project staff also raised the consultation opportunity in various committees, meetings and other word-of-mouth opportunities across the consultation timeframe.
- A project email SDFR@anu.edu.au was established as a central point of contact.

Consultation Methods

- The survey contained 10 questions, the first three questions were demographic questions and the remaining questions open-text format (**see attachment 2 – survey example**). The survey was open from DATE to 18 August 2025. Questions 9 and 10 around ANU Values were added at the Project Board's request on DATE to gather more information about how ANU's approach relates to that of other universities who have strongly linked Values to discipline framework processes through Charters and Codes of Conduct.
- Face-to-face sessions were organised during the same period with key stakeholders being approached for input, as well as an open call via communication channels for people to register for 1:1 sessions. These sessions were led by the Interim Registrar, Dean of Students, Manager, Projects DSAAS or Senior Manager, Student Conduct and Integrity, as appropriate, requested and available.

Consultation Reach

- A total of 23 face-to-face sessions were held with the following stakeholder groups and individuals:
 - ANUSA Executive, Department Heads & staff
 - Colleges and Affiliates including Bruce and Wright Hall SRMs, Burgmann and Johns College SRMs and staff, Burton & Garran Hall, Fenner Hall, Ursula and Wamburun Hall SRMs, Toad Hall, Graduate House, Yukeembruk, and ANU Sport
 - The ANU Interhall Council
 - ANU's Student Conduct and Appeals Team, Legal, Governance and Risk Team, Student Safety & Wellbeing Team and Dean of Students team
 - Current Rule Decision-Makers
 - ANU representatives of the Australasian Union of Jewish Students
 - ANU Law Reform and Social Justice Program – Protest Rights and Legal Observer Initiative
 - External legal and subject matter experts with knowledge of ANU processes and policies
- The survey recorded 266 attempts, however only 63 respondents contributed past the first three demographic questions. Of those 63, 45 identified as students, 17 as staff and 1 preferred not to say.

Interim Consultation Report

- In June 2025, midway through Phase 1 consultation, an Interim Consultation Report was presented to the Project Board, capturing some key learnings that could be actioned before the Draft Recommendations report was released. Five interim recommendations were endorsed. These are:
 - 1. Ensuring the Framework is covered in O-Week sessions and communication to students in first year campaign
 - 2. Reporting on the number of cases, timeframes, and outcomes to be developed and available openly
 - 3. Embedding guided workflow in Canvas to show options for a student who seeks to understand the process
 - 4. Developing poster or postcards that clarify the framework and process

- 5. Ensuring that the reporting process provides an opportunity for victim survivors or reporters to identify their preferred outcome
- Interim recommendations will also be reflected in the Draft Recommendations Report.

Definitions

In this document the following terms are used as defined:

- **Appeal:** A request made to reconsider or review a disciplinary decision due to concerns about fairness, process, or new evidence.
- **Complainant:** The person who makes a disclosure, a formal complaint or report about alleged misconduct or a breach of the rules. The Discipline Rule defines the term Complainant explicitly. In this report the term is used to refer to any person bringing an incident that could become a disciplinary matter to the University's attention. ANU acknowledges that in relation to SASH cases, the term Victim Survivor is more trauma-informed.
- **Confidentiality/Privacy:** The protection of personal information and privacy in the handling of matters.
- **Disclosure:** Informally sharing information about an incident of harm or misconduct, which may not initiate formal disciplinary action.
- **Jurisdiction:** The scope of authority the University has to apply its disciplinary framework, including over students, staff, and affiliated entities such as residential colleges.
- **Outcome Guidelines:** A set of guiding principles or criteria used to determine appropriate disciplinary outcomes.
- **Outcome:** The final decision or result of a disciplinary process, including any sanctions, remedies, or resolutions applied.
- **Policy:** A broader statement of principles or guidelines set by the university to direct decision-making and behaviour, which applies rules and establishes procedures.
- **Practice:** A customary or habitual way of doing something within an institution that may not be formally documented but is widely accepted and followed, ideally closely linked to the operationalisation of written documents. Workplace practices can evolve more flexibly over time in response to feedback and often reflect the culture or values of the organisation.
- **Procedural Fairness:** A legal and ethical standard requiring that disciplinary processes are conducted fairly, transparently, and without bias. It includes the right to be heard, the right to notice, impartial decision-making, and decisions based on evidence.
- **Procedure:** A procedure is a detailed, step-by-step set of instructions that outlines how a specific policy or rule is to be implemented or followed. It ensures consistency and clarity in actions taken by staff, students, or other stakeholders.
- **Resolution Pathway/s:** Different methods for resolving disciplinary matters, which may include formal investigation, informal resolution, restorative justice, mediation, or agreement-based outcomes.
- **Respondent:** The person against whom a complaint or allegation of misconduct is made.
- **Restorative Justice:** An alternative to formal (often punitive) disciplinary measures focused on repairing harm, fostering accountability, and healing for all parties involved. Usually involves support persons and/or facilitators.
- **Rule:** A legislative document that governs the formal process, timeframes and expectations of the ANU and any other party to which the rule is being applied.
- **SASH:** Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment
- **Sexual Misconduct:** Sexual misconduct includes all forms of sexual assault, sexual harassment, and other unwelcome sexual behaviour that breaches ANU's community values, rules, policies, and codes of conduct.

- **Student Disciplinary Framework:** The set of rules, policies, and procedures the university uses to address breaches of conduct by students.
- **Trauma-Informed:** Behaviour, practices and processes that recognise the impact of trauma and prioritises safety, choice, and empowerment to avoid re-traumatisation.

Feedback Received

Feedback from all consultation activities has been collated into eight key themes. A majority of feedback received centred around the reporting, treatment and response to Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment (SASH) incidents, and improvements to this process to increase transparency, reduce trauma to complainants, and ensure communication and outcomes meet expectations across the university community.

1. Awareness and Understanding of the Framework

- Most students, and many staff, only become aware of the framework when personally involved in disciplinary matters, meaning the general community has low baseline knowledge.
- People often enter discipline processes in states of distress or heightened emotions with low base-line knowledge and understanding of roles, remit, responsibilities and supports available.
- Academic integrity processes and outcomes are more widely understood than the wider conduct framework, and the ANU's role and remit in more complex matters often results in outcomes mismatching expectations.
- Confusion exists around the differences between reporting, disclosure, and appeals processes. Importantly, making a report and a disclosure are two different activities and the ANU cannot act on a disclosure, although identity-protected recording of disclosures if appropriate can later support a report. When paired with high-stress situations, this distinction can lead to the timeframe expectations of complainants not being met.
- Staff and students are not always aware of the level of support or pathways available centrally with ANU when responding to complaints, reports or disclosures. This can also result in delayed timeframes and lack of process and documentation that can later affect outcomes for the complainant.
- Language in policies is seen as legalistic and inaccessible, especially notable but not limited to international and English as a Second Language (ESL) students.
- Communication occurs primarily via peer networks and trusted staff and while this entry point is important, it often leads to inconsistent and fragmented support, processes and outcomes. Lack of consistent, shared and shareable resources exacerbates this.

2. Transparency and Trust in the Process

- The process is often described as opaque, lengthy, and bureaucratic by those outside the central ANU teams. For those within, dedication is very high and they are frustrated by reports not coming to them in a timely manner, and expectations being set incorrectly.
- While confidentiality is recognised and valued as necessary, it sometimes limits transparent communication, leaving community members unclear about what outcomes occurred and why decisions were taken.
- Students and complainants report:
 - Lack of timely updates and limited understanding of their rights and options as failing their expectations and needs.
 - Fear of repercussions, confidentiality breaches, and institutional mistrust prevent reporting.
- The appeals process especially can be retraumatising for complainants and lacks procedural clarity.

- The discretion vested in senior decision-makers, including the Vice-Chancellor (i.e. 'call-in powers'), is perceived as lacking appropriate oversight or accountability.
- There is strong community desire for anonymised, aggregate data on complaints, investigations, outcomes, and sanctions to understand how the framework operates in practice.
- Transparency about policy changes, procedural reviews, and lessons learned is limited, reducing confidence in continuous improvement.
- More clarity is needed for students to approach and navigate complaints involving staff, including what process is involved, how they are protected from retaliation and processes treated without institutional bias. Possible outcomes for staff and mechanisms to achieve them should be identified in documentation.

3. Survivor Agency and Support

- There is an urgent need for trauma-informed, culturally sensitive supports and clearer rights for complainants, including appeals and response opportunities.
- Current approaches perceived to favour respondents, with complainants having limited control over their information and case progression.
 - Complainants often experience a loss of control once they engage with the process, especially as their detailed reports and supporting evidence are shared fully with respondents without reciprocal rights to view responses.
 - Complainants frequently report not being given opportunities to respond to or appeal against respondents' statements, leading to perceptions of unfairness and imbalance.
 - Complainants require clear explanations about how their information will be used, what will be disclosed to respondents, and the likely stages and outcomes of the process.
 - Transparency regarding complainant rights, such as the ability to appeal or withdraw from the process needs to be communicated upfront.
- There is strong appetite for restorative justice and other alternative dispute resolution pathways to complement formal disciplinary processes, allowing survivors greater choice.
- Survivors need easily accessible supports, including dedicated case managers external to administrative structures to guide them through the process safely.

4. Staff and Peer Training and Support

- Staff and student leaders report inconsistent training; many frontline staff feel unprepared and unsupported.
- Effective peer support is critical, but peer leaders require clear guidance, accessible resources, and adequate training to fulfill support roles confidently.
- Staff turnover hampers continuity and consistent delivery of support and education.
- Non-academic staff especially often feel unprepared to manage or refer behavioural concerns appropriately.
- Embedded and ongoing training on trauma, cultural competency, referral points, privacy management, documentation and procedural fairness is needed.
- Frequent exposure to difficult cases underscores the need for wellbeing support, supervision, and debriefing opportunities for staff (and students, in respect to appeals panels) involved.

5. Process Navigation and Accessibility

- The complexity and volume of information create barriers; navigating multiple rules, forms, and policies is challenging.

- A centralised digital resource hub is needed to house conduct-related resources, contacts, FAQs, and forms. Ideally embedded in a student environment such as Canvas and accessible through the ANUOK app.
- Simple flowcharts, decision trees, interactive guides that outline the overall map of options and decision-points, and explain what to expect at each stage (disclosure/report, investigation, decision, hearing, outcome, appeal, etc) are needed.
- Real-time support options (crisis lines, live chat are requested) for students at critical moments are needed for significant incidences.

6. Communication and Engagement

- The ‘student discipline framework’ as a term was newly created for this review. An overarching term to describe the interrelationships between the multiple, overlapping rules, policies and processes is needed, however the terminology around SDF may not be the best approach to engaging and connecting with students.
- Multiple communication modes are necessary: digital, print (linking to digital), face-to-face, and peer-led outreach.
- Messaging needs regular refreshing and cyclic, recurrent scheduling to avoid information fatigue. Bite-sized and contextualised information relevant to specific situations and stages of the process is also needed.
- Cultural, linguistic, and cohort-specific tailoring is essential to reach all students effectively.
- Core ANU values and their link to conduct, expected behaviours within the ANU community and therefore links to discipline processes should be clearly articulated and constantly visible across ANU campus and digital spaces.
- Off campus and part-time students are underserved compared to those actively engaged with and/or living on campus.
- ANU branding is very corporate and externally-focussed, students and staff-adjacent to students report issues with disengagement around print material (posters/flyers especially) when in University branding. Hard to distinguish messages, call attention, and stand out to the student cohort.
- The ANU needs to establish a revised approach to identifying a respondent’s connections within the university community. These connections need to be taken into account when communicating across campus and with university affiliated partners about outcomes. Especially where outcomes limit activity, suspend or permanently remove a respondent from the community. This approach must balance privacy concerns, but currently presents a risk that partners may not be notified of a complaint or outcome, unless the complaint originated with the affiliate. Given the complex, embedded and diverse connections students have on campus this has already resulted in affiliates learning about the implications of more minor outcomes too late to manage them appropriately, and poses a risk of much greater harm if not rectified in future.

7. Specific Barriers for Vulnerable Cohorts

- International, ESL, Indigenous, disabled, and off-campus students face distinctive challenges in accessing clear, supportive information and services.
 - Language barriers impede comprehension of complex, legalistic policy language and procedural information.
 - Fear of visa implications, immigration status consequences, and misunderstandings about legislative geography create additional stress and reluctance to report or engage.
 - Experiences of systemic racism, discrimination, and cultural isolation complicate trusting and navigating the formal disciplinary system.
 - There is a pronounced need for culturally safe practices and recognition of intersectional impacts.

- Barriers include inaccessible information formats, lack of tailored support, and assumptions that standard procedures suffice without accommodation.
- Sensory, cognitive, or neurodiverse learners require adaptive communication methods and flexible process timelines.
- Stigma, community size, and confidentiality fears are amplified in smaller or culturally tight-knit groups.
- For survivors of sexual misconduct and other interpersonal harm there is heightened stigma, trauma, and sensitivity that creates significant emotional and psychological barriers to disclosure and engagement.
 - Concerns about confidentiality and retaliatory acts within residential or academic communities are acute.

8. Policy and Procedural Recommendations

- Clarify definitions, powers, and boundaries (especially re: protest, free speech, criminal vs university jurisdiction).
 - Clarify the scope of university authority versus external legal/criminal processes, ensuring students understand when university discipline applies and the limitations thereof.
 - Provide explicit guidance on how academic freedom, freedom of speech, and protest rights intersect with conduct expectations.
 - Establish consequences for procedural breaches or misconduct by decision-makers to foster trust and procedural fairness.
- Standardise sanctions and integrate transparent outcome guidelines to improve fairness and predictability.
- Introduce centralised triage or case management points to better identify repeated or linked concerns and manage risk.
- Appeals hearings are often seen as complicated, lengthy, and legalistic, which can be intimidating and difficult for students to navigate.
 - Clearer communication about the scope, limitations, and consequences at the appeals stage would reduce confusion and mistrust.
 - Clearly define appeal criteria and introduce a formal “final review” stage to ensure cases are ready for fair and defensible outcomes.
- Students want more transparent, timely updates about appeal proceedings and outcomes.
 - Address delays and scope of appeals so that all parties have access to the same level of representation.
- Restructure the appeals process to reduce duplication, re-traumatisation of complainants, and adversarial features while maintaining rigorous standards.
 - Broaden complainant rights in appeals, including access to respond and right of appeal to improve balance and perceptions of fairness.
 - Ensure appeals panel members are sorted into groupings based on decision-making expertise, relevant professional experience and training so that serious and/or traumatising matters are handled by those with the background and supports to navigate any possible vicarious trauma.
 - Inclusion of experienced external professionals (e.g., retired magistrates, career prosecutors) is recommended to improve consistency, fairness, and quality of decisions.
 - Reduce opportunities for direct confrontation or cross-examination between complainants and respondents in appeals.
 - Embed trauma-informed best practices and support mechanisms throughout the appeal process.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Consultation Methodology

The consultation process for the review was comprehensive, engaging a wide range of stakeholders including students, staff, residential leaders, advocacy groups, legal experts, and affiliated community organisations. This broad engagement provided valuable, multifaceted insights into the lived experiences and perceptions of the current framework.

However, the consultation also revealed some methodological challenges:

Requirement for strong pre-existing subject matter knowledge and information overload:

- The technical specificity of the disciplinary framework and related policies demanded considerable subject knowledge. This proved a barrier to meaningful engagement for many students and some staff who lacked familiarity with legal and procedural language. The survey design did not allow for generalised feedback for those without this deeper knowledge. As a result, the process did not establish any evidence for baseline knowledge or performance of the framework within the broad student experience.
- The complexity and volume of materials, coupled with the legalistic jargon in policy documents, posed a risk of information fatigue or disengagement among participants, especially for those without a prior disciplinary experience.
- Phase 2 consultation will provide an opportunity for the ANU to confirm we heard, understood and represented stakeholder feedback correctly; present and refine ANU responses to the feedback; and, position a refined understanding of what and how the framework operates, and how it is proposed to change, that will hopefully facilitate the general student community to engage more confidently.

Introduction of new terminology around ‘framework’:

- This was the first time the university explicitly framed conduct processes as the “Student Disciplinary Framework,” a terminology new to most stakeholders. The unfamiliarity contributed to confusion and limited initial understanding of the scope, processes, and implications of the review. Clarification about the broad and therefore sometimes necessarily vague, scope was needed in face-to-face consultations. To a degree, phase 1 consultation was a further part of clarifying the review scope.
- A process to identify and seek community buy-in for how the overall conduct processes are grouped and described as part of their refinement and improvement is possible in phase 2 consultation before the recommendations report is finalised.

Possible under-engagement of indigenous and vulnerable groups:

- Despite targeted outreach efforts, there is a potential that indigenous students and other vulnerable cohorts were under-represented in the consultation, as we do not have clear demographic data from the survey. This may limit the completeness of perspectives on systemic issues unique to these groups and calls for ongoing, culturally safe engagement strategies to ensure their voices are fully integrated into reform processes.
- Phase 3 consultation will seek to connect with these groups and provide a better contextual base for feedback about how process and policy can better meet the various differences in need.

Next Steps

Phase 1 consultation has been a critical resource in identifying issues and generating options for improvement, as well as further defining the scope of the review in regards to meeting need and expectations. However, it represents one component within a broader evidence and resource base that will influence the recommendation drafting process.

Other important inputs into the review include:

- Information from past internal and external reviews, including judicial and administrative decisions relevant to student discipline.
- Committee deliberations and expert advisory feedback consolidating operational insights and sector best practices.
- Known operational barriers identified through legal proceedings, case management data and staff experience, including workload pressures, administrative friction, and systemic inequities.
- Considerations arising from new legislation and regulatory requirements that will impact university disciplinary processes and standards.

Together with phase 2 consultation feedback, these inputs will inform a robust, evidence-based foundation for forthcoming recommendations.

Drafting of the recommendation report

- A Draft Recommendations Report is being prepared. This draft document will integrate the consultation findings with the other sources outlined above to propose actionable reforms aimed at enhancing fairness, accessibility, transparency, and support across the Student Discipline Framework.

Phase 2 Consultation

- Targeted to open in November 2025, the Draft Recommendations Report will be shared with the ANU community and key stakeholders. This phase will:
 - Enable the ANU to demonstrate how feedback has been incorporated.
 - Provide stakeholders the opportunity to refine and improve recommendations, fostering collaborative design and ownership of suggested reforms.
 - Allow targeted dialogue with specific groups to ensure that nuanced and community-specific concerns are fully addressed before finalising recommendations.
- This iterative consultation approach aims to ensure solutions are appropriately tailored, sustainable, and widely supported, reinforcing ANU's commitment to a safe and inclusive academic community.

Final recommendation report (Phase 3)

- Approximately four weeks after phase 2 consultation closes the ANU will finalise and release the final SDFR Recommendations Report.
- The report will require ANU leadership endorsement via appropriate University governance structures such as committees and Council.
- Implementation of the recommendations will be assigned to relevant teams on timeframes deemed achievable, that have also been prioritised for impact. I.e. Rule changes require legislative engagement, where operations and policy are managed locally by ANU where resourcing is available.
- Communication around the report can then be targeted to appropriate channels around 2026 student presence on campus, as will ongoing improvements from interim and final recommendations to translating and communicating current and future processes.

Attachment 1 - Poster Example

Australian National University

Help Shape a Safer ANU

We're reviewing our discipline processes and want to hear from you!

We understand our student discipline processes are a key part of creating a safe, respectful, and inclusive community. We want to hear how we can do better. You can have your say online through this QR code or by contacting SDFR@anu.edu.au.

Scan QR code for more information.



Feedback will be open until 18 August 2025.

TEQSA Provider ID: PRV12002 (Australian University) | CRICOS Provider: #00120C

Attachment 2 - Survey Example



Survey

Student Discipline Framework Review

RETURN VIA EMAIL: SDFR@anu.edu.au by end of July 2025

The University is committed to promoting a safe, respectful, and inclusive community. One of the ways we address harmful behaviour is through our student disciplinary framework, which is primarily guided by the:

- [Discipline Rule 2021](#)
- [Appeals Rule 2023](#)
- [Sexual Misconduct Policy](#)
- [Student Code of Conduct](#)

The University recognises that strong institutional policy provides the best footing to meaningfully address harmful behaviours in our community. Developing strong policy starts with genuine community consultation. The Disciplinary Framework Review Board is committed to seeking and addressing community feedback within any recommendations made as a product of their review. This form provides an opportunity for students and staff across the University to share their perspectives on the existing framework.

We understand that reflecting on these topics may be challenging. If you are a student completing this form and it causes distress or discomfort, support is available:

- [Student Safety and Wellbeing](#)
- [The Dean of Students](#)
- [ANU counselling](#)

For staff:

- [Staff Advisors](#)
- [Employee EAP arrangements](#)

Privacy notice

- Your responses will remain anonymous and data will not be linked to any individual. By completing the survey, you are consenting for authorised staff to collect information for the purpose for which it was collected.
- The ANU is committed to protecting personal information provided by you in accordance with the *Privacy Act 1988 (Cth)* and the information will be protected against unauthorised access and use. All information collected by the University is governed by the [ANU Privacy Policy](#). For further information about how the University deals with personal information, please refer to the [ANU Privacy Policy](#) or contact the ANU Privacy Officer at privacy@anu.edu.au
- You may access or request correction of any personal information you have provided to ANU by contacting privacy@anu.edu.au



Australian National University

1) What is your connection to the Australian National University/Student Discipline Framework process?

2) Have you been involved in student support, representation or advocacy? If so, how?

3) Do you think that students/staff have sufficient knowledge of the disciplinary framework?

4) Are there any improvements to the information we provide about the framework that you would like to see implemented?

5) What do you think is the most effective method for us to communicate about the framework to ensure students understand our processes, its limitations, and the alternatives available to them?

6) What do you consider to be the strengths of the current process?

7) What do you believe are the biggest barriers to people engaging with the process?

8) Are there other areas of concern with the process, policy, or any other aspect of the framework you would like to address?

9) Do you believe people know what the ANU's core values are and how they relate to Student Conduct? (Can you name any of the values or where to find information about them?)

10) Other comments related to your understanding, opinion or experience with the Student Discipline Framework that should be considered as part of the review: