



Australian
National
University

Student Discipline Framework Review

Phase 2 Consultation Report

February 2026

Student Engagement & Education Management Division

Contents

Background	3
Methodology.....	3
Definitions.....	5
Feedback Received for Phase 2.....	6
Strengths and Weaknesses of the Consultation Methodology.....	9
Next Steps.....	10
Attachment 1 - Poster Example.....	11
Attachment 2 - Survey Example.....	12

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 (SDF). A routine process, the review is aimed at continuous improvement ensuring the University's policies remain effective, fair, and follow best practice principles.

ANU established the Student Disciplinary Framework Review (SDFR) Project Board (the Project Board) to oversee the current review from January - November 2025. The review aimed to incorporate:

- 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 scope considered 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 was delivered in three phases:

Phase 1 – Resource base development (Complete): 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 (Complete): This involved 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 (Complete): The final report will be referred to the relevant approval authorities and University teams responsible for implementation.

Phase 1 of the review included consultation with University stakeholders about issues and opportunities. Feedback was gathered through a survey, small group and 1:1 face-to-face sessions. The Phase 1 consultation report is available on the [University's website](#).

Phase 2 consultation asked for feedback about the Draft Recommendations Report, via a survey. Feedback was open 4 November to 14 December 2025.

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 (via survey or email). Face-to-face sessions were available on request.
- Three in-person and one online information sessions were advertised. Low registrations resulted in only the online session going ahead.
- 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 staff raised the consultation opportunity in various committees, meetings and other word-of-mouth opportunities across the consultation timeframe.
- The project email SDFR@anu.edu.au was used as a central point of contact.
- Posters were distributed to libraries, residences, student centres and within Kambri.

Consultation Methods and Reach for Phase 2:

The purpose of Phase 2 Consultation was to socialise and seek feedback on the University's proposed Draft Recommendations.

The Draft Recommendations Report was developed based on Phase 1 feedback. Phase 2 consultation was designed to build on this work by providing a further opportunity for the ANU community and key stakeholders to review the draft recommendations, refine and strengthen them, and contribute to their development. The process ensured the University had captured feedback correctly and tested the clarity and nuance of the draft recommendations, ensuring that stakeholder feedback was fully considered and addressed prior to finalisation.

The survey contained 13 questions, including a combination of fixed and open text questions. The Phase 2 survey was intentionally more quantitative than the Phase 1 survey, asking stakeholders to compare their confidence in the pre- and forecast post-recommendation implementation states. Optional open text fields were provided for qualitative responses (**see attachment 2 – survey example**). The survey was open from 4 November to 14 December 2025.

Feedback during Phase 2 was received through the following channels:

- An online survey made available to ANU staff and students. Eight participants completed the survey.
- Two direct written submissions via email.
- An online information session held via Zoom on 9 December 2025, with 11 attendees
- One 1:1 session provided upon stakeholder request.

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 (acronym):** 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 for Phase 2

Phase 2 consultation feedback has been collated into eight key themes. The majority of feedback received from survey participants centred around the reporting, treatment and response to SASH incidents and focussed on improvements to increase transparency, reduce trauma to Complainants, and ensure communication and outcomes meet expectations across the University community.

Feedback indicated strong support for the direction of the Draft Recommendation Report. Feedback identified that the framework was comprehensive, trauma-informed in intent, and well-structured, with clear implementation pathways. A number of areas for improvement were identified, such as improving scope for survivor agency, evidentiary practices, and appeal rights.

1. Awareness, language, and framing of the framework

- Some of the Phase 1 feedback included in the Draft Recommendation Report contains reference to Senior Residents or 'SRs'. However, in early 2025 Senior Residents were replaced with Residential Mentors (RMs) and Community Support Officers (CSOs). Since the change the CSO model offers residences a 24/7 person whom they can report issues to. The training requirement has also been increased for these roles. The Residential Experience Division has advised that the response to the change indicates students are more inclined to make complaints or reports to CSOs than they did under the previous model. As a result, the monitoring, evaluation and fine-tuning of the new model will be undertaken outside of the SDFR, and it should be noted that the feedback on the old model has limited relevance to the recommendations in the report moving forward.
- Some feedback noted that the Draft Recommendation Report promotes plain-English communication but often struggles to implement plain-language approaches itself, which reduces the accessibility for some students. The University acknowledges that due to the nature of many terms in the report having legal meanings, and the legislative framework driving the work, that the report is limited in its simplicity. The final report attempts to simplify where possible.

2. Survivor agency, rights, and control

- Consistent with feedback received from Phase 1, participants were concerned that the Framework positions Complainants primarily as sources of information rather than active participants with agency. While participants welcomed efforts to 'listen to' and 'inform' Complainants, they felt this did not go far enough. Strong support was expressed for the development of a clear Complainant rights charter, including explicit rights to understand how information will be used, to respond to adverse material, to withdraw, and to appeal outcomes. In response, **Recommendations 1.7, 3.5, and 3.6** were strengthened, to greater emphasise the importance of agency, ensuring Complainants are aware of their rights and how their information will be used, and that Complainant views and preferred outcomes are actively considered where possible. It remains a core function of the SDF that the University has an obligation to reduce and manage instances of gender-based violence, create an equitable environment free of discrimination and fraudulent activity, and manage community risk and this may at times conflict with a Complainant's preferred outcome.
- Participant's identified challenges in the requirement for Complainant documentation needing to be provided to Respondents in full (without redactions), even where they contain sensitive or personal information. Feedback indicated that this presents a significant barrier for Complainants to proceed with formal reports and results in feeling of a loss of control. This tension is acknowledged, as procedural fairness requires that a Respondent be provided material relating to, so they can respond, any complaint made against them. The University seeks to address this tension in two ways:

- First, in embedding an investigative approach within the Discipline Rule, the investigator will review the evidence from both parties and prepare a report for the decision-maker based on the balance of probabilities. The intention being that this approach will result in the report itself becoming the complaint information for the Respondent to review. As the Discipline Rule is subject to legal challenge, the University is awaiting external legal advice as part of the drafting process that this position is defensible.
- Secondly, **Recommendation 1.3** has been strengthened, explicitly identifying that formal rules of evidence do not apply in the decision-making process. This aims to provide both Complainants and Respondents more agency as to the documents (or part of documents) they want to disclose to decision makers throughout formal processes whilst also protecting procedural fairness obligations owed to the parties. It is noted that, when considering a document as a whole, the decision maker may determine the weight it deserves, noting that partial or redacted documents may reduce the weight that can be given.

3. Evidence, disclosure, and procedural fairness

- There was substantial concern about how “credible evidence” is defined and applied, particularly in SASH matters. Feedback cautioned against adopting court-like evidentiary standards that disadvantage victim-survivors, noting that testimony, contemporaneous accounts, and professional reports are often the primary forms of evidence available. In recognition that credible evidence can come from a range of sources, and consistent with the comments above regarding redacted documents, **Recommendation 1.3** has been strengthened to make it clear that the formal rules of evidence do not apply, making it clear that a range of evidence can be provided to decision makers in formal proceedings.

4. Appeals and imbalance of rights

- Consistent with feedback from Phase 1, the appeals process attracted significant criticism. Feedback noted that appeal rights for Respondents are narrow but still exist, while Complainants are largely excluded from the appeal stage altogether. Participants called for Complainant to be afforded appeal rights, broader merits-based review, clearer appeal criteria, and reduced legalism. While the University recognises that greater agency throughout the process for Complainants is consistent with the trauma-informed and people-centred intention of the framework, there is a legal need for the internal University process to achieve a conclusion within a reasonable timeframe, for all parties.
- By allowing additional appeal periods for one party, procedural fairness requires the other party also be able to respond, creating a cycle whereby at some point a final outcome must be identified. It is also important to recognise the purpose of the University's SDF and acknowledge that for some Complainants, external processes may deliver outcomes more aligned to their expectations.
 - **Recommendation 3.1** remains for the University to explore how to best serve Complainants in this space, subject to legal advice.
 - **Recommendation 2.4** has been updated to recommend publication of the already proposed ‘Outcome Guidelines’ to support the alignment between parties’ expectations and decision outcomes.

It is hoped that this approach will provide both Complainants and Respondents greater transparency and confidence in the decision-making process and ultimately increase understanding of the processes and University’s remit.

5. Restorative justice and alternative pathways

- Consistent with feedback received in Phase 1, participants reiterated strong interest in conciliation and restorative approaches, particularly where these enhance survivor choice and control. Participants also emphasised that restorative or conciliatory pathways must not be presented - explicitly or implicitly - as the 'preferred' outcome. The intention of **Recommendation 1.7** was always to expand the types of resolution pathway, not require one over another. Moreover, for restorative justice to be possible, both parties must genuinely desire involvement. The wording of this recommendation has been extended so that it is clear that no pre-determination or Complainant coercion underpin the use of restorative practices. The success of these alternative pathways depends on the willingness of both parties to agree to participate, and importantly, formal complaint processes should remain available if resolution is not achieved through alternative pathways.

6. Transparency, data, and oversight

- Consistent with Phase 1, Phase 2 feedback recognised the tension between the utility of aggregating disclosure data to protect the University community; and the importance of preserving the confidentiality of a disclosers and their agency in how their data will be used. Feedback called for greater clarity in how disclosure data is used, and as a result the wording at **Recommendation 3.6** has been strengthened. This recommendation aims to ensure that Complainants are fully informed prior to making decisions, aware of the difference between a disclosure and a formal report, aware of 'decision points', and aware that some disclosures/formal reports may require the University to undertake reporting or investigations.

7. Support integration and practical impacts

- Participants were concerned that the disconnect between disciplinary processes and academic support mechanisms places a significant and unnecessary burden on students. In particular, requiring medical documentation for academic adjustments - even when a student is already engaged with the ANU Safety and Wellbeing team. This creates duplication and is a source of additional stress for Complainants. Strong support was expressed to integrate support planning directly into the disciplinary framework, consistent with guidance for the National Higher Education Code to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence, so that documentation from the Safety and Wellbeing team can be accepted across both Student Conduct and Academic contexts. Recognising the qualifications and expertise of the Safety and Wellbeing team, a new recommendation was insert as **Recommendation 3.8** to improve clarity around the documentation requirements in place within internal ANU processes related to a disclosure or complaint.
- Participants were concerned that the creation of a digital hub, as recommended by **Recommendation 4.4**, will be complex. The University is currently undertaking appropriate scoping and planning further stakeholder engagement.

8. Equity, inclusion and unintended consequences

- Some participants felt that there were concerns gender-based violence would be treated differently where it occurs in LGBTQIA+ context, and that uncertainty around perceptions was a deterrent to making a disclosure. The University recognises that gender-based violence can occur in any context and **Recommendation 3.6 and 4.2** will emphasise that support is available to any person who experiences gender-based violence irrespective of the context, their gender, or how they identify.
- Some concerns were raised around unintended consequences and active misuse of the process by malicious disclosures, particularly in regard to interim measures which could become punitive, prior to disclosures being investigated. Whilst the intention of interim measures is to be protective, the University recognises the risk of malicious disclosures and the impact of interim decisions on an individual is recognised. Particularly given interim decisions must usually be made quickly, with limited information and without an opportunity for a Respondent to give a response. As a result, **Recommendation 2.4** has been strengthened to include interim decisions.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Consultation Methodology

The Phase 2 Consultation process was more targeted in nature and sought direct feedback from key stakeholders on the Draft Recommendations Report. Overall, feedback received was positive and demonstrated a strong level of support for the proposed recommendations, while some recommendations needed wording adjustments to make the intention clearer.

Strengths of the Consultation Methodology

Stakeholders engaged thoughtfully with the material and feedback was considered, it being clear some participants were following the SDFR review closely and engaging as often as possible. Most participants had a strong understanding of the SDF and the National Code to prevent and respond to Gender-Based Violence, and their operation. Many had direct experience as Complainants, Respondents, decision-makers or support persons. While the overall number of submissions was modest, the feedback represented a broad cross-section of the targeted stakeholder groups. The quality of responses therefore indicates that perspectives from a range of lived and professional lenses were received.

Weaknesses of the Consultation Methodology

Notwithstanding these strengths, overall stakeholder engagement during Phase 2 was limited:

- 8 people completed the survey
- 2 emails were received
- 11 people attended the information session
- 1 face-to-face session was provided

There was also crossover between these groups, meaning fewer than 20 staff and students provided feedback as part of Phase 2. This is not a statistically significant percentage/

The relatively low number of responses can be attributable to several factors;


1. As identified during Phase 1, the subject matter is treated on a 'need to know' basis by most people, it being not a priority or relevant to people until they need it.
2. Given the stage of the review, feedback was sought on specific draft recommendations, requiring participants to engage in detail with complex material and to actively consider potential weaknesses or challenges. From a consultation perspective, this represents a relatively high burden on participants and may have acted as a barrier to broader participation. As such, Phase 2 engagement was always expected to diminish.
3. Consultation took place outside of the teaching semester, during a period when many students and staff were busy with results and conferral periods, on leave or otherwise less engaged with University communications. While not ideal, these timing constraints were influenced by the compressed timeframes available for this phase of work.
4. There is also a strong likelihood that the University community is experiencing engagement fatigue from both the Renew ANU process, the high number of changes at the institution, and other projects requesting attention and input.
5. Given Phase 1 was anonymous the Review missed the opportunity to collect the details of those who had already engaged via survey, keep them informed, and invite them to review the draft Recommendations. Whilst the same communications channels were targeted, and the stakeholder log of known Phase 1 participants was notified, this is an easy area for improvement on future projects by creating (and linking both within the survey and on the webpage) a way to provide contact details to be kept in the loop on specific initiatives like this project.

Next Steps

Implementation

- The final Recommendations Report will be released concurrently with this Consultation Report.
- Overseeing implementation of the recommendations remains a responsibility of the Registrar. However, since the release of the Draft Recommendations Report, a project team has been established under the Registrar to implement the changes needed to ensure the University is compliant with the National Code to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence. The Registrar is chairing the Steering Group overseeing the National Code to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence implementation project. As such, to avoid duplication and create efficiency, implementation of the SDFR recommendations have been incorporated into the National Code project. Significant ongoing collaboration with the team delivering the Nixon Review is also embedded in the project delivery structure.



Attachment 1 - Poster Example

 Australian National University

Final call for feedback on the Student Discipline Framework draft recommendations

Tell us if we've missed anything and help make sure the Framework reflects what matters most to students-protecting wellbeing, upholding community standards and ensuring everyone feels safe, respected and supported at ANU.

TELL US WHAT YOU THINK



© 2023 Australian National University | 1300 261 000

Attachment 2 - Survey Example

Estimated Time
10-15 minutes

Confidentiality

All responses are anonymous, and feedback will be aggregated for review. Some specific text responses may be used within future reporting as examples of feedback received.

This survey will be open until 27 November 2025.

- Are you (select all that apply):
 - ANU Student
 - ANU Staff
 - Other
 - Have been involved in a conduct/discipline process
 - Engaged in student advocacy and support related to conduct/discipline processes
 - Affiliate Staff
- Did you give feedback during Phase 1 Consultation (either through the survey, a 1:1 or group discussion, email, [etc](#)) between May and August 2025?
 - Yes – Continue to Question 3
 - No – Skip to Question 5 and continue

3. Do you feel:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Did not read it
The Phase 1 Consultation Report captures your feedback accurately?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Draft Recommendations Report outlines recommendations and/or actions that respond to your feedback?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. If you feel an element of your Phase 1 feedback is missing or has not been addressed in the Draft Recommendations Report, please let us know.

Open text answers are optional.

5. How familiar were you with the Student Discipline Framework (SDF) before you read the Draft Recommendations Report?

Even if the SDF term is new to you, let us know if you feel familiar with ways the University [sets behaviour](#) and conduct standards, and manages disclosures, reports and complaints related to conduct between students. This can include the code of conduct, University values, rules, policies, [processes](#) but most importantly includes where to access support and advice about incidents that occur between students.

Choose the option you feel is most relevant to [you](#), the examples provided are a guide only.

- Very familiar. For example - I have read one or more conduct policy or [rule](#), or have been involved in a discipline process or supported someone through one.
- Somewhat familiar. For example - I know the University sets and manages conduct and [behaviour](#) expectations and complaints between students but have no idea how.
- Heard of it. For example - Know the term SDF or Discipline Rule, but not sure what it covers or includes.
- Not familiar at all. For example - I had no idea the University set and managed conduct and [behaviour](#) expectations and complaints between students.
- I found out about it during the Phase 1 Consultation between May and August 2025.

6. How **confident** are you that the **current** Student Discipline Framework if you feel you don't know enough about the SDF, use the 'Neutral/Don't Know' option

	Very Confident	Somewhat Confident	Neutral/ Don't Know	Not Confident	Not at all Confident
Is fit for purpose for serious misconduct , such as sexual assault and harassment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Is fit for purpose for other misconduct , such as academic integrity and fraud	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provides a solid foundation to manage conduct that falls outside of the University community's expectations and standards	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Formal reports such as discipline cases and appeals are managed within appropriate timeframes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disclosures and reports are managed sensitively and with appropriate treatment of the privacy of those involved	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Decisions are made by qualified, independent, unbiased decision-makers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The range of outcomes available to decision-makers are appropriate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Processes are procedurally fair	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. How **confident** are you that the **Draft Recommendations Report** outlines recommendations and actions that will improve:

	Very Confident	Somewhat Confident	Neutral/ Don't Know	Not Confident	Not at all Confident
Response and handling of serious misconduct , such as sexual assault and harassment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Response and handling of other misconduct , such as academic integrity and fraud	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Will clarify and improve management of conduct that falls outside of the University community's expectations and standards	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Management of formal reports such as discipline cases and appeals are within appropriate timeframes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Management of disclosures and reports sensitively and with appropriate treatment of the privacy of those involved	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Decisions will be made by qualified, independent, unbiased decision-makers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The range of outcomes available to decision-makers will be appropriate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Processes will be procedurally fair	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Overall, the Draft Recommendation Report reflects the University community's feedback	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Overall, the Draft Recommendation Report captures and connects to all relevant concurrent work being undertaken by the University and other stakeholders regarding student safety, conduct and behaviour	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Overall, the Draft Recommendation Report, if implemented, will result in an improved framework that balances the needs of the parties involved	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. What do you think are the strongest aspects of the draft recommendations and/or the report overall?

Open text answers are optional.

9. Are there any gaps or oversights?

For example - elements you feel are missing, unclear, or need improvement either specifically in the recommendations or the report more generally?

Open text answers are optional.

10. Do you have concerns about how any recommendation or action might be implemented?

If so, how can your concern be addressed? Open text answers are optional.

11. Do you have feedback on any specific recommendation or action?

Open text answers are optional.

12. Which of the recommendations do you feel are most important to prioritise in the early stages of implementation?

Please rank your highest priority at the top, down to lowest. You do not need to take into account timeframes outside of the University's control (such as Rule changes which must go through a legislative drafting process that takes 12-24 months), although these timeframes will affect the University's ability to set timeframes.

- 1. This list will name each recommendation
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.

13. What name best reflects the purpose and values of the University's student conduct and

behavioural expectation setting policies and processes to you?

Please rank your preference at the top, with your least preferred last.

Keep the current name: *Student Discipline Framework*

Student Community Standards

Student Conduct

Student Shared Standards

Student Community Safety and Respect

Values-Based Student Conduct

Student Conduct and Dispute Resolution

Student Behaviour

Student Ethics

Student Rights and Responsibilities