Australian National University

Student Discipline Framework Review

Recommendations Report

May 2026

Student Engagement and Education Management Division
NCGBV@anu.edu.au

The Australian National University
Canberra ACT 2600 Australia
www.anu.edu.au

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

Contents

Contents 3
Summary 4
Background 5
Guiding Principles 5
Context 6
- Gani Review (2021) 6
- Phase 1 Consultation Feedback (2025) 7
- Phase 2 Consultation Feedback (2026) 7
- Operational Learnings (Ongoing) 8
- National Higher Education Code to Prevent and Respond to Gender Based Violence (the Code) (In effect from 1 January 2026) 8
- Nixon Review (2025) 9
- Australian Human Rights Commission Racism at Australian Universities (2024) 9
- ANU Safety and Wellbeing Committee (ASWC) (Ongoing) 10
- ANU Racism Working Group (2023) 10
- Academic Integrity Working Group (2026) 11
- Higher Education Standards Framework Standard 2.3 (HESF 2021) (Ongoing) 11
- National Student Ombudsman (NSO) (Ongoing) 11

Definitions and Key Acronyms 12
Strengths & Weaknesses 13
Recommendation Action Plan 18

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

Summary

This document presents the final recommendations of the Student Discipline Framework Review (SDFR) conducted by the Australian National University (ANU/the University).

Significant consultation was undertaken in the preparation of this report, as detailed in the Phase 1 and Phase 2 Consultation Reports. Information on the phasing of the review as a project is available in the *Background* section.

Part of a regular history of review, the 2025 review recognises the increasing complexity and varied drivers of change to both stakeholder expectations, regulatory requirements, and student experiences the tertiary sector is facing. Drivers are summarised in the *Context* section.

The nine *Guiding Principles* underpinning the Student Disciplinary Framework (SDF/the framework) and *Definitions* for terms used in this document are set out in the relevant sections. This information will support readers to better understand the discussion of the overarching situation of the current SDF.

The *Strengths and Weaknesses* section is a non-exhaustive overview of the experience students, complainants, victim-survivors, respondents, individuals engaged in student support and advocacy, University and Affiliate staff, and decision-makers have when interacting with the current framework. It identifies key components to maintain or focus on for improvement. This discussion underpins the focus of the eight proposed recommendations:

1. Clarify and simplify the Rules
2. Refine the authority of decision-makers and define outcome options and communications
3. Embed culturally safe, intersectional, trauma-informed and people-centred practices across the framework
4. Enact an annual, ongoing communications strategy that centres conduct, University Values and behavioural expectations into engagement and education activities
5. Improve reporting and data tools
6. Empower all staff to be safe entry points for reporting, by ensuring they are knowledgeable, supported and connected to central subject matter experts
7. Facilitate a connected and seamless safety network across the University community
8. Undertake ongoing monitoring and review

The *Recommendation Action Plan* details the intent of the recommendations through the accompanying 52 proposed actions. It also includes a summary of the impacts, drivers and status of each action. The Action Plan outlines a roadmap for delivery of the recommendations across the targeted 18-month implementation period, providing a point of reference to assess progress and impact.

Background

The Australian National University (ANU/the University) 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/the 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 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
- regulatory changes relating to harmful behaviours on university campuses, including the National Higher Education Code to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence (NCGBV), 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 (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): Involved drafting recommendations for changes to the Student Disciplinary Framework, to be released for further consultation as a draft. This process ensures the University has heard and collated feedback accurately, and provides an opportunity for the University to outline proposed actions to respond to feedback. Stakeholders are invited to be part of refining and fine-tuning the University's proposed response to the review.

Phase 3 – Final recommendations report (this document): The final report will be referred to the relevant approval authorities and University teams responsible for implementation, and monitored by the Registrar and through the NCGBV Implementation Project.

Implementation: Once endorsed, recommendations will be assigned to responsible teams and is expected to take 18 months (approximate). This approach will allow for any necessary operational changes within the University's resourcing environment, and the longer timeframes needed to undertake any legislative Rule changes. Overall implementation progress of the recommendations will be responsibility of the Registrar, through the NCGBV Implementation Project. Collaboration with the Nixon Review team is central to the project delivery plan.

Terms of Reference for the project can be found here (click for link).

Guiding Principles

The nine Principles outlined below were adopted by the Project Board to provide overarching guiding principles that form the ethical and procedural foundation of the Student Disciplinary Framework. In balancing the complex interplay of needs between complainants, victim-survivors, respondents, decision-makers, the University, and others involved in or linked to disciplinary matters, the recommendations aim both to strengthen the Principles and preserve them.

1. **Right to Notice (Prior Warning):** Students must be informed of the allegations against them in clear and understandable terms, including by understanding the policies and/or rule they are found to have violated.
2. **Right to Be Heard (Opportunity to Respond):** Students must have a fair chance to present their side of the story, including the opportunity to provide evidence, call witnesses within a sensible timeframe.
3. **Impartial Decision-Maker:** The decision-maker or panel deciding the disciplinary outcome must be unbiased and free from conflicts of interest.
4. **Evidence-Based Decisions:** Disciplinary actions should be based on credible evidence, not assumptions or hearsay.
5. **Right to Appeal:** Students should have the opportunity to appeal a disciplinary decision if they believe the process was unfair or the outcome was unjust.
6. **Proportionality of Consequences:** Disciplinary measures should be reasonable and proportionate to the offense, including in consideration of factors such as intent and past behaviour.
7. **Confidentiality & Privacy**: Disciplinary proceedings must respect student privacy, sharing information only with parties involved in proceedings.
8. **Consistency & Non-Discrimination:** Rules should be applied consistently to all students without bias based on race, gender, disability, or other protected characteristics.
9. **Support & Guidance:** Students must have access to support where needed (i,e., counsellors, advocates, or legal representation in serious cases — whether through ANUSA or other ACT body support).

Context

The University has reviewed student conduct policies and procedures on a regular as-needs basis throughout its history. The 2025 review recognises the increasing complexity of both regulation and stakeholder expectation changes, and the impact of socio-cultural change which means the ways students engage within the University context are different now than in the past, and will continue to change into the future. This section outlines the sources of key drivers that shaped the recommendations, including consultation feedback, other University and external processes, and regulatory developments. Each element is summarised in regard to purpose and implications for the 2025 SDF review, with links to the source documentation provided where relevant. Within the recommendations section of this document, each recommendation has been linked back to the relevant drivers as identified in this section to demonstrate the connection between the broader institutional, legal, and cultural context necessary to understand the rationale behind the proposed changes.

Gani Review (2021)

The 2021 review of the ANU Discipline Rule identified that while the Rule broadly aligns with sector standards, its complexity, decentralised authority structure, and limited investigative capacity posed challenges to fairness and consistency. Key recommendations included simplifying language, centralising disciplinary decision-making, and enhancing transparency through clearer definitions and procedural guidance. Immediate improvements were actioned without legislative change, such as renaming Vice-Chancellor's Nominees to Delegates, instituting a revised approach for complex cases, and improving training for appeals committees. The review also called for better communication with complainants and stronger support mechanisms for decision-makers handling sensitive matters.

Recommendations requiring rule amendments focused on clarifying who may make findings of misconduct, adopting the term "sexual misconduct" to replace "sexual assault," and explicitly

incorporating principles like proportionality, remorse (where appropriate), and restorative justice as considerations relevant to the consequences of misconduct. Additional proposals included embedding procedural fairness and the civil law standard ("balance of probabilities") into the Rule, drafting future versions in plain English, and consolidating appeals provisions to reduce confusion. These reforms aim to modernise the framework, improve accessibility, and align ANU's disciplinary processes with best practices nationally and internationally, while ensuring the system remains fair, transparent, and trauma-informed.

Phase 1 Consultation Feedback (2025)

The majority of feedback centred on improving the university's response to Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment (SASH) incidents, with strong calls for increased transparency, trauma-informed practices, and survivor agency. Students and staff reported low awareness of the disciplinary framework, often encountering it only during distressing personal experiences. Confusion around reporting, disclosure, and appeals processes was common, exacerbated by inaccessible language and fragmented communication. Complainants expressed frustration with opaque procedures, lack of timely updates, and limited control over their cases, including how their information was shared and their ability to respond or appeal.

Stakeholders advocated for clearer pathways, better support structures, and more accessible resources, including flowcharts, digital hubs, and real-time assistance. There was strong interest in restorative justice options and culturally safe practices, especially for vulnerable cohorts such as international, Indigenous, disabled, and off-campus students. These groups face distinct barriers including language, visa concerns, and systemic discrimination. Feedback also highlighted the need for consistent staff and peer training, improved documentation, and procedural fairness. Suggestions included standardising sanctions, clarifying university jurisdiction, and restructuring appeals to reduce trauma and improve balance. A desire for anonymised data and transparent policy updates reflected a broader call for institutional accountability and trust-building. Five Interim Recommendations were endorsed by the Project Board in July 2025 which have been captured within the recommendations of this report:

- 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

To read the full Phase 1 Consultation Report click here to open link.

Phase 2 Consultation Feedback (2026)

Consistent with areas of tension identified in Consultation Phase 1, a majority of feedback received during Phase 2 Consultation centred around the reporting, treatment and response to 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.

Feedback indicated strong support for the direction of the Draft Recommendation Report. Participants generally felt that recommendations were 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. Some minor changes to the recommendations were made to better respond to Phase 2 feedback.

To read the full Phase 2 Consultation Report click here to open link.

Operational Learnings (Ongoing)

The University monitors the effectiveness of the Student Discipline Framework through ongoing involvement with:

- Complainants, respondents, staff and advocates involved in the discipline process and supporting
- Legal proceedings that test Rules
- Decision-makers and appeals panel members

These operational, rule and policy improvements over recent years have been picked up during this review for action.

National Higher Education Code to Prevent and Respond to Gender Based Violence (the Code) (In effect from 1 January 2026)

The new Code establishes mandatory standards for Australian universities to prevent and respond to gender-based violence through accountable governance, safe environments, trauma-informed processes, and transparent data reporting. It requires institutions to implement whole-of-organisation plans, support services, and disciplinary procedures that prioritise safety, equity, and timely resolution. Direct links to the SDFR are:

- Update all policies, procedures and Rules where relevant to include the broader gender-based violence definition to include physical and non-physical violence, harassment, abuse, threats, coercion, control, and deprivation of liberty or autonomy, based on gender.
- Improve timelines and communication standards - formal reports must be finalised within 45 business days, and appeals within 20 business days. Disclosers must receive:
    - Written notice of outcomes,
    - Reasons for decisions,
    - Information on rights to internal/external complaints.
- Training requirements for decision-makers (including appeals panel members) must be formalised and tracked. The discipline framework must embed trauma-informed principles and the requirement to take on an investigative role. Staff involved in investigations and disciplinary decisions must be trained in:
    - Trauma-informed and person-centred approaches,
    - Procedural fairness,
    - Working with diverse cohorts.
- The discipline framework must be flexible and allow for proportionate responses, not just formal investigations and sanctions. The University must offer multiple pathways for managing disclosures and formal reports, including:
    - Safety measures without investigation,
    - Resolution by agreement,
    - Disciplinary processes.
- The discipline framework must integrate support planning into its processes, ensuring coordination with wellbeing services. Tailored support plans must be developed for both parties, including academic/work adjustments and access to services.
- The discipline framework must enable granular data capture and reporting, which may require new systems or upgrades to existing platforms like Advocate. The University must collect detailed data on:

    - Types of gender-based violence,
    - Outcomes of disciplinary processes,
    - Satisfaction of disclosers/respondents.
- The discipline framework must clarify the University's jurisdiction and enforcement mechanisms over affiliated entities, ensuring consistency in handling gender-based violence as the Code applies to affiliated residential colleges and other third parties.

To learn more about the Code click here.

Nixon Review (2025)

The Nixon Report identifies systemic cultural and structural failures within the ANU College of Science and Medicine (CSM) that have broader implications for university-wide disciplinary processes. Central to the findings is the absence of transparent accountability systems, ineffective complaints management, and tolerance of bullying, harassment, and discrimination. These issues are compounded by poor managerial capability, inequitable recruitment and workload practices, and a lack of trauma-informed, culturally safe support for vulnerable cohorts including international, Indigenous, and Higher Degree by Research (HDR) students. The Nixon Review called for the below, which the SDFR recommendations need to take into account so that CSM practices can be embedded into the wider ANU SDF.

- Embed transparent accountability mechanisms that ensure consequences for misconduct and poor behaviour, especially among senior staff.
- Strengthen complaints handling systems to meet the standards of the forthcoming National Higher Education Code and the National Student Ombudsman, including integrated case management, public reporting, and trauma-informed pathways.
- Ensure procedural fairness and consistency, particularly in supervisory relationships and appeals, with safeguards against conflicts of interest and reprisal.
- Address intersectional vulnerabilities by tailoring support and communication for diverse cohorts, including international students, carers, and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students.
- Align disciplinary processes with institutional values of equity, inclusion, and psychological safety, as articulated in ANU's strategic plans and wellbeing frameworks.

To learn more about the Nixon Review click here.

Australian Human Rights Commission Racism at Australian Universities (2024)

The Respect@Uni Interim Report provides a comprehensive analysis of racism in Australian universities, including systemic, institutional, and interpersonal dimensions. These findings offer critical guidance for the SDFR, particularly in aligning disciplinary processes with principles of equity, safety, and accountability:

- Disciplinary frameworks must address institutional and structural racism, not only individual misconduct.
- There is a disjuncture between policy and practice — many universities have anti-racism policies, but implementation is inconsistent and often ineffective.
- The report calls for culturally safe and trauma-informed approaches to complaints and disciplinary processes.
- First Nations students and staff experience high levels of cultural/colonial load, often being expected to educate others or represent all Indigenous perspectives. Disciplinary processes must avoid reinforcing these burdens and instead promote shared responsibility for cultural safety.

- The disciplinary framework must ensure: Transparent, fair, and timely processes; Culturally competent handling of complaints; Clear consequences for misconduct; Accessible pathways for students and staff to report racism and discrimination
- Disciplinary processes should be designed to recognise and respond to the unique harms experienced by different groups.
- Experiences of racism vary across cohorts (e.g. First Nations, Jewish, Muslim, Arab, Palestinian, African, Asian, international students). The framework must be flexible and responsive to intersectional experiences, avoiding a one-size-fits-all approach.
- Disciplinary processes should be supported by education and training in racial literacy, cultural safety, and anti-racism.
- Disciplinary processes must clearly define boundaries where academic freedom ends and harmful conduct begins. Universities must ensure that freedom of expression does not excuse racism or vilification.
- The report calls for greater transparency in disciplinary outcomes to build trust and demonstrate institutional commitment.
- The framework should include public reporting of outcomes, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms and clear performance indicators for equity and inclusion

For more information about the Interim Report click here.

ANU Safety and Wellbeing Committee (ASWC) (Ongoing)

The ASWC is responsible for monitoring, reviewing, and advising Council on policies related to student safety and wellbeing. This includes disciplinary policies that address sexual assault, harassment, equity, discrimination, and mental health. Any changes proposed in the discipline framework — especially those responding to gender-based violence — fall within the Committee's remit for review and recommendation to Council. Some student SDFR Project Board members were also ASWC members during the SDFR, and the Project Board provided regular updates to the ASWC. Relevant links between the SDF and ASWC ongoing work include:

- The discipline framework must reflect strategic priorities and legal obligations, which the ASWC helps interpret and enforce.
- The revised framework must support improved data capture and reporting mechanisms that meet both internal governance and external compliance requirements.
- The discipline framework is a key tool for shaping institutional culture and must be informed by best practices in these areas.
- The framework must include clear escalation pathways for serious incidents, which the ASWC helps oversee.

ANU Racism Working Group (2023)

The work of the ANU Anti-Racism Taskforce is ongoing as of the time of this report, however in 2023 a Recommendations Report was delivered. Several of its recommendations have direct relevance to the SDFR, particularly in shaping how ANU responds to harmful behaviours, ensures procedural fairness, and promotes inclusive practices. Key links include:

- Provision of multiple pathways for reporting (anonymous, informal, formal), and the need for trained staff to support disclosures.
- Delivery of an online disclosure tool that links to clear pathways.
- The need for supportive, non-punitive options such as resolution options (e.g., restorative justice) alongside disciplinary actions.
- Review of discrimination and racism-related policies to ensure clarity, consistency, and accessibility.

- Robust data capture on racism-related incidents and outcomes, enabling transparency and accountability.
- Training for decision-makers and those involved in disciplinary processes must include anti-racism education, ensuring culturally competent and fair outcomes.
- A university-wide communications strategy to promote broad cultural change, supported by clear messaging and leadership commitment.

To read the 2023 report click here.

Academic Integrity Working Group (2026)

A new working group was established in Q2 2026 with the remit of responding to the significant changes to ways of working in a post-AI world, among other considerations. Currently the Discipline and Appeals Rules are written to cover all misconduct. Regulation and requirements around gender-based violence are strengthening, as Is the need to improve outcomes on campus in response to racism and discrimination. Adjustments to the Discipline and Appeals Rule need to take into account appropriate actions and implications in the academic integrity space, such as having two or more clear streams of response to treat each category of complaint effectively and appropriately.

Higher Education Standards Framework Standard 2.3 (HESF 2021) (Ongoing)

Standard 2.3 (Wellbeing and Safety) sets requirements for higher education providers to actively foster environments that support the wellbeing and safety of all students. It mandates accessible support services tailored to student needs, risk assessment and preventative controls for safety threats, and robust incident management processes. Providers must demonstrate clear, proactive policies for student support, promote safe environments, and ensure mechanisms exist to respond effectively to adverse events or incidents impacting wellbeing and safety.

Standard 2.3 underpins the need for disciplinary systems to not only handle misconduct, but to do so in ways that protect the wellbeing of both complainants and respondents. It outlines that procedures should include trauma-informed and culturally appropriate practices, practical safety supports, and transparent communications, all aligned with the HESF's expectations for a safe, supportive, and responsive university environment.

Click here to learn more about Standard 2.3.

National Student Ombudsman (NSO) (Ongoing)

The National Student Ombudsman (NSO) established by amendment to Part IIF of the Ombudsman Act 1976, in 2004. It provides an independent, trauma-informed complaints mechanism for higher education students to escalate unresolved issues with their providers. For ANU, this introduces a new layer of external oversight that directly impacts the Student Discipline Framework Review (SDFR). The NSO can investigate complaints about ANU's disciplinary actions, recommend improvements, and initiate investigations independently. This means ANU's discipline processes must be transparent, timely, and procedurally fair, with clear pathways for escalation and resolution. The framework must also align with best practice standards in complaint handling, including restorative engagement options, to meet the expectations of the NSO.

Definitions and Key Acronyms

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.
- **Balance of Probabilities**: The civil standard of proof used in university disciplinary processes, meaning that a decision is made based on whether it is more likely than not that the alleged conduct occurred.
- **Collateral:** Written documentation that is procedural, operational and/or used for communications purposes that communicates important messages to the general public and/or key stakeholders or parties to a discipline process.
- **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.
- **CSO:** Community Support Officer
- **Discloser:** Key term in the new Code where it "means a person who has shared information about their experience of Gender-based Violence". At the ANU, the term has been used more commonly to identify a person who shares information about an incident of harm or misconduct, which may or may not lead to a formal complaint or disciplinary process. When used in this way, it distinguishes informal sharing from formal reporting.
- **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, considering factors such as proportionality, remorse, mitigating circumstances, precedent, complainant preferences and restoration.
- **Outcome:** The final decision or result of a disciplinary process, including any sanctions, remedies, or resolutions applied.
- **Person-Centred**: Behaviour, practices and processes that respect and respond to the individual's unique needs, values, and circumstances, ensuring dignity and autonomy.
- **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.

Strengths & Weaknesses

The consultation identified a number of strengths and weaknesses of the existing SDF. **Table 1** reflects the lived experiences of students, complainants, victim-survivors, respondents, individuals engaged in student support and advocacy, University and Affiliate staff, and decision-makers under the rules. It highlights both what is working well and where barriers persist. It aims to provide an overarching view of the current situation and not address detailed strengths and weaknesses exhaustively. It identifies the elements to maintain and the areas to focus on improvement to meet community expectations. The quotes on page 14 are indicative of the range of sentiments received during the Phase 1 consultation.

The knowledge that my perpetrator would be able to keep my report, edit it, share it with mutual friends, etc., ...prevented me from reporting. (Student)

...the perpetrator gets to view all the details and read your statement which is already required to be in depth, but the victim never gets to see the same. This is unfair...(Student)

Most of my peers don't feel safe enough to report SASH to CSOs, and are not properly equipped to support friends who have experienced harm. (Student)

The process needs to clearly identify who is available to provide impartial support to students during their interactions. (Student)

...the deadline for the RRR module needs to be moved up because currently it only needs to be completed half way through the year, by which time many incidents of SASH have already occurred. (Student)

I am worried that if I attempt to mediate between students in conflict then I might become the target of unwarranted complaints by unscrupulous students. (Staff member)

Given how short each semester is, these policy-related investigations can easily derail a student's entire term- even if the final outcome is in their favour. (Student)

The outcomes are considered by decision makers that are impartial and take the time to fully consider matters. (Staff member)

Requiring students with an academic misconduct finding to attend a session with ANU Academic Skills and also ANU Library to learn about academic integrity and best practices and expectations *(is good)*. (Staff member)

...with antisemitism it feels that majority of the time reports are not taken seriously or have just been ignored. (Student)

ANU branding feels designed at times to be as forgettable as possible and that extends to much of the copy written for our university identity. (Student)

...students who have been using their academic freedom and democratic rights to peacefully protest in support of Palestine have been actively targeted with disciplinary action...(Student)

Australian National University

Table 1: Strengths and Weaknesses as identified by stakeholder experiences (Source: Phase 1 Consultation)	
Strength	**Weakness**
The Discipline Rule aligns with sector standards and enables a broad, expert-driven approach to handling student conduct. - External accountability mechanisms, such as the National Student Ombudsman and national codes, are valued and help reinforce trust. - Consistency is a major strength, with triage and strong action in serious cases well managed. - The Discipline Rule itself enables a broad range of outcomes and swift implementation of interim/safety measures, protecting both individuals and the community. - The university is willing to make difficult, high-risk decisions that explore complicated moral issues, that other institutions are less open to addressing. - ANU engages with experienced, credentialed legal professionals who can either support decision-making or be assigned as decision-maker, depending on case complexity.	Students lack sufficient knowledge of policies, processes, and outcomes. - Policy language is inaccessible, especially for international students. - There is a lack of clarity regarding severity and types of consequences for categories of misconduct. - Level of exposure to student conduct information is ad-hoc and differs based on group (residential), college (due to different induction processes), on/off-campus engagement. - The University's approach to communication about community standards and implications conduct that contravenes is poor and fragmented. The overall low-usability of the ANU website and fact that the 'discipline framework' as described in this project has not been brought together and communicated holistically before are key barriers. - There are limited options for informal resolution or restorative justice within the current process. - The framework lacks embedded anti-racism and cultural awareness practices, which can impact fairness and trust.
Affiliated University groups such as ANUSA, Senior Residents (SR) and ANUSport staff are a trusted and accessible support and advocacy services.	Lack of clear, well-communicated differentiation between the roles and responsibilities – and how linked up processes are – between the University and Affiliates causes confusion and mismatched expectations.

- When reporting a complaint, students preference academic and residential hall relationships where they know and trust the academic or SR. *Note: From early 2025 Senior Residents (SRs) have been replaced with Residential Mentors (RMs) and Community Support Officers (CSOs). Feedback received in Phase 1 Consultation did not reflect this change and as such it is not possible to draw direct comparisons between current practice and past practice. The Residential Experience Division is actively monitoring the new structure to ensure it delivers an improved experience. Further details are available in the Consultation Report 2.*	- The Rule's application to affiliated entities (e.g. residential colleges) is not always clear or enforceable. - Community Support Officer (CSO) roles are not working as well as SRs for trust and reporting. The perception is they lack training, can be punitive and are not embedded in the community. - Academics and College staff to whom students disclose are often unaware of the supports available through SCA, DoS and SSWT both for themselves and students. In some cases this results in perceived miscommunication and delays from student perspectives. Inconsistent documentation and process can also harm complainant outcomes during later stages of formal compliant in both university, and external criminal systems.
Internal ANU teams such as the Dean of Students (DoS), Student Safety and Wellbeing (SSWT) and Student Conduct and Appeals (SCA) Teams Staff are accessible and function efficiently for many students. - SSWT can reach students rapidly, ensuring timely support as soon as students seek help. - SCA is experienced, responsive, and collaborative, aiding staff and advocates in supporting students.	Students are rarely aware of the framework, their rights and responsibilities, or the available support services. - Changes to the Higher Education Standards Framework and National Code are changing the roles and responsibilities of the university (this includes requirements around data collection and reporting, a more specific role in identifying and supporting student wellbeing risks and gender-based violence, undertaking investigations and abiding by specific timeframes for response). - There is no centralised incident reporting mechanism for disciplinarily related disclosures or reports. - There is no routine public reporting on the number, type, or outcomes of cases leading to both misinformation that affects trust and lack of information that limits accountability and transparency. - There is no formal requirement, register, deployment or ongoing maintenance of training and support for staff involved in disciplinary matters. This includes communities of practice, supervision (usually external structured professional supports), trauma-informed, mental health first-aid, working with vulnerable people, anti-racism and procedural fairness training, as examples.

For non-SASH, and not overly complex complaints, the process is largely seamless and well-communicated, providing clear information and options. - The process is comprehensive, clearly outlining all steps, and is regarded as fair, impartial, and adaptable. - Comprehensive documentation, consistent updates, and well-defined steps provided by SCA help students understand and navigate the process. - The process is hands-on, diligent, confidential, and secure. - The system balances protection of individual rights with maintaining university integrity, both complainant and respondent can access support from internal and external parties.	The process when applied to SASH matters does not consistently reflect trauma-informed or person-centred approaches, particularly for victim-survivors who more commonly report that: - The process is intimidating and confusing. - They can lose agency after reporting. - The absence of a right to appeal for them is procedurally unfair. - The transfer of students as a "safe-making" measure can be problematic. - They fear starting a process which they are unable to indicate a preferred outcome for, or exit, and ruining someone's life. - There are limited restorative justice options. - They fear repercussions of being identified and/or ostracised from their university community, or facing legal repercussions for reporting, linked to a perceived lack of confidentiality. - Communication is inconsistent and delays are common and frustrating.
Appropriate procedural flexibility to support parties is facilitated - e.g. Zoom engagement in hearings, ability to reschedule when appropriate. - Withdrawal is possible at any point for complainants, something that is clearly communicated from the start and supports complainant agency. - Respondents benefit from being provided time and support to prepare their response. - The University provides an avenue for disclosures in addition to reporting, this provides options for complainants.	The process is difficult to navigate, with unclear language and limited visibility of how to initiate or progress a complaint. - Links/interplay with external processes is not well defined. - There are no mandated timeframes for resolution or appeals, which can lead to delays and uncertainty. - Students are unaware of differences between complaint pathways (reporting vs. disclosure) and effective, concise and clear information on how they are separate but can be linked is not available before making a decision to consider a complaint.

Recommendation Action Plan

Eight proposed recommendations have been identified through the review. Each proposed recommendation is accompanied by several 'actions for consideration' which identify the types of changes the ANU needs to make to deliver each recommendation. Designed to be flexible for operationalisation, the actions set expectations of the identified owner. A summary of the impacts, drivers and status of each action is also provided, with drivers directly linking to the *Context* and *Guiding Principles* section of the document.

Table 2 was further refined following phase 2 consultation feedback to ensure the Action Plan is a functional roadmap for delivery of the recommendations across the targeted 18-month implementation period, and a useful tool to report progress against.

Overall implementation progress of the recommendations will be responsibility of the Registrar, supported by relevant teams and divisions as needed. Between Phase 1 and Phase 2 Feedback, the NCGBV Implementation Project was established, to which the SDFR review recommendations were highly linked. The Registrar was appointed as Chair of the NCGBV Steering Group and as such, the approved project plan included delivery of the SDFR recommendations to reduce duplication.

Table 2: Recommendation Action Plan

Recommendation	Actions	Expected Areas Impacted	Drivers	Indicative Timeline	Owner	Status
1. Clarify and simplify the rules	1.1. Consolidate appeals provisions into the Discipline Rule to reduce duplication and clearly define the purpose of an appeal.	• Discipline Rule • Appeals Rule	• Gani Review • Principle 5 • Operational Learnings	18 months	Registrar	Underway
	1.2. Develop Explanatory Statements in plain English for Rules.	• Collateral	• Gani Review • Principles 1, 4, 6 • Operational Learnings	18 months	Registrar	Accepted
	1.3. Make clear that decisions are made on the balance of probabilities (civil standard of proof, not criminal) and that formal Rules of Evidence do not apply.	• Discipline Rule • Appeals Rule • Policy • Practice	• Phase 1 Consultation • Phase 2 Consultation	18 months	Registrar	Underway

Recommendation	Actions	Expected Areas Impacted	Drivers	Indicative Timeline	Owner	Status
	1.4. Include a definition/requirement for procedural fairness in the Rule.	• Discipline Rule • Appeals Rule	• Gani Review • Principle 4 • National Code	18 months	Registrar	Underway
	1.5. Replace "sexual assault" with "sexual misconduct" to align with sector norms	• Discipline Rule • Appeals Rule • Sexual Misconduct Policy • Sexual misconduct response (Student) Procedure	• National Code, Anti-Racism Taskforce, Operational Learnings	18 months	Registrar	Underway
	1.6. Integrate investigation powers into the Rule	• Discipline Rule • Appeals Rule • New Policy/ Procedure	• Gani Review • Principle 4 • National Code	18 months	Registrar	Underway
	1.7. Introduce multiple resolution pathways (e.g. restorative justice, informal resolution) for Complainants, subject to the agreement of all parties and at the determination of the University (e.g. mediation). Ensure that restorative justice is only used as an option in addition to other outcomes under the Discipline Rule, unless directly	• Discipline Rule • Appeals Rule • New Policy/Procedure • Sexual Misconduct Policy	• National Cod • Phase 1 Consultation • Phase 2 Consultation • Feedback • Anti-Racism Taskforce • NSO • Nixon Review	18 months	Registrar	Underway

Recommendation	Actions	Expected Areas Impacted	Drivers	Indicative Timeline	Owner	Status
	requested by the Complainant. Formal complaint pathways should remain available if resolution is not achieved through informal processes.	• Sexual misconduct response (Student) Procedure • Student Academic • Integrity Policy • Fraud and Corruption Control Policy				
	1.8. Allow for decision-makers to be able to assess and allocate weight to complaints in relation to the level of community harm (i.e. public acts that harm a minority group) – see action 2.4.	• Discipline Rule • Appeals Rule • (Possible new) Outcome Guidelines	• Phase 1 Consultation • AHRC	18 months	Registrar	Accepted
	1.9. Clarify how data reporting requirements (i.e. NCGBV), and the dissemination of information about University processes for reporting, disclosure and support, apply to affiliated entities.	• Discipline Rule • Appeals Rule • Policy	• National Code	18 months	Registrar	Underway
	1.10. Improve links to Student Code of Conduct and University Values within disciplinary documentation.	• Student Code of Conduct • Student Academic	• Principles 8, 9 • Phase 1 Consultation • National Code • Nixon Review	12 months (linked to new University Strategy)	Registrar	Underway

Recommendation	Actions	Expected Areas Impacted	Drivers	Indicative Timeline	Owner	Status
		Integrity Policy • Fraud and Corruption Control Policy				
2. Refine the authority of decision-makers and define outcome options and communicatio n	2.1. Streamline delegations: Replace Vice-Chancellor's Nominee (VCN) with Vice-Chancellor's Delegate (VCD) - remove prescribed authority.	• Discipline Rule	• Phase 1 Consultation • Gani Review • Principles 3, 4, 8 • National Code	18 months	Registrar	Underway
	2.2. Use an impartial panel of decision-makers (at least two) for serious/complex cases such as SASH and exclusions.	• Discipline Rule • Practice	• Nixon Review • Principles 3, 5 • National Code • Phase 1 Consultation	18 months	Registrar	Underway
	2.3. Within the appeals panel register document member's decision-making expertise, relevant professional experience and training. When inviting members to a panel, reference their position in regard to the matter to ensure it is appropriate and where serious and/or traumatising, matters are only handled by those with the appropriate background and supports.	• Practice	• Phase 1 Consultation	6 months	Registrar	Accepted
	2.4. Prepare and publish Outcome Guidelines for interim and final	• Discipline Rule	• Principle 6	6 months	Registrar	Underway

Recommendation	Actions	Expected Areas Impacted	Drivers	Indicative Timeline	Owner	Status
	decisions that explicitly consider proportionality, remorse (where appropriate), mitigating circumstances, restorative efforts, severity of conduct, and impact on parties (where appropriate), linked to a confidential Outcomes Register to improve consistency and proportionality.	• Appeals Rule • Possible new Outcomes Guidelines • Practice	• Phase 1 Consultation • Phase 2 Consultation • National Code			
	2.5. Allow majority decisions in Appeal Panels (not unanimity) and address quorum, role of Chair and how to move forward into a new process if a decision cannot be made.	• Discipline Rule • Appeals Rule	• Phase 1 Consultation • Practice	18 months	Registrar	Underway
	2.6. Expand use of external professionals (retired magistrates, prosecutors) to Appeals and expand eligibility to allow for (and actively seek) members with specialist expertise (refer 2.3).	• Discipline Rule • Appeals Rule • Practice	• Phase 1 Consultation	12 months	Registrar	Accepted
	2.7. Expand decision-maker reporting and Outcome Letters to: - Better explain reasons for outcome, and, where possible within privacy requirements, provide more information or a debrief to complainants about the outcome and reasoning where it - Be clear outcomes are subject to appeal.	• Practice	• National Code • NSO • Phase 1 Consultation • National Code	6 months	Registrar	Underway

Recommendation	Actions	Expected Areas Impacted	Drivers	Indicative Timeline	Owner	Status
	- Include information on right to any further internal/external reviews.					
	2.8. Define the consequences and process for reporting and reviewing allegations of procedural breaches or misconduct by decision-makers.	• Discipline Rule • Appeals Rule • Policy/ Procedure • Practice	• Phase 1 Consultation • Nixon Review	18 months	Registrar	Accepted
	2.9. Assess remit and function of Vice-Chancellor's call-in powers, such as requiring transparency when it is used (links to Action 5.3).	• Discipline Rule • Practice	• Phase 1 Consultation	18 months	Registrar	Accepted
3. Embed culturally safe, intersectional, trauma-informed and people-centred practices across the framework	3.1. Consider complainant rights in appeals (right to respond, right of appeal).	• Discipline Rule • Appeals Rule • Policy/ Procedure	• Phase 1 Consultation • Principle 5 • NSO	18 months	Registrar	Requires further legal advice and exploration
	3.2. Reduce opportunities for direct confrontation between complainants and respondents (i.e. respondent questioning complainant during appeals processes).	• Discipline Rule • Appeals Rule	• Principle 2, 7 • National Code	18 months	Registrar	Underway
	3.3. Ensure timely processes; address delays - align timelines to the National Code (45 business days for	• Discipline Rule	• National Code • Phase 1 Consultation	January 2026	Registrar	Underway

Recommendation	Actions	Expected Areas Impacted	Drivers	Indicative Timeline	Owner	Status
	resolution and 20 business days for appeals).	• Appeals Rule	• Principle 7			
	3.4. Provide transparent, timely and regular updates to all parties about proceeding status and progress.	• Practice	• Phase 1 Consultation • Phase 2 Consultation	6 months	Registrar	Underway
	3.5. Ensure Complainants can identify preferred outcomes at time of making a formal report, and where possible, facilitate ongoing agency around the resolution pathway used.	• Discipline Rule • Appeals Rule	• Phase 1 Consultation • Phase 2 Consultation • Interim Recommendation 5	n/a	Registrar	Complete
	3.6. Provide clear written and verbal information to Complainants about: - The various pathways available and what to expect, ensuring Complainants are positioned to make fully informed decisions - How their information will be used and what will be disclosed to the respondent (and any other parties if relevant), at what stage. The individual process stages (as a process map) and possible outcomes of the process. - What the University's role and responsibilities are (i.e. when matters or outcomes must be actioned due to community risk).	• Practice • Collateral • Possible New Complaint Declaration	• Phase 1 Consultation • Phase 2 Consultation • Principle 5, 7 • Operational Learnings	6 months	Registrar	Underway

Recommendation	Actions	Expected Areas Impacted	Drivers	Indicative Timeline	Owner	Status
	- The type of external processes open to the complainant, and the relationship between University and external processes. - The points at which the complainant has the ability to pause (and for how long) or withdraw the complaint. - Their choice not to consent to information sharing (and the limitations on the process or outcome that may result in), and their ability to withdraw from any process they are uncomfortable with and the impact that may or may not have on the University's responsibility to continue a disciplinary action. - That there may be occasions where the University is required to take action to protect the University Community, even where this is not the Complainants preferred outcome. - The expectation that any information provided to them will be communicated in a manner consistent with principles of equity, inclusion, and psychological safety. Both before and at time of making a Disclosure or formal report, where possible. This may be also form part					

Recommendation	Actions	Expected Areas Impacted	Drivers	Indicative Timeline	Owner	Status
	of a declaration signed at time of formal reporting.					
	3.7. Develop tailored support plans for individual Complainants and Respondents, provided by case managers external to administrative structures.	• Practice	• National Code • Phase 1 Consultation • Principles 8, 9 • HESF 2.3	6 months	Registrar	Complete
	3.8. Expand the acceptable documentation policies for academic adjustments, student conduct and disciplinary matters to expressly include documents prepared by ANU support services, including Student Safety and Wellbeing, reducing administrative burden for Complainants and Respondents engaged in University supports.	• Discipline Rule • Appeals Rule • Policy/ Procedure	• Phase 2 Consultation	6 months	Registrar	Underway
	3.9. Where possible, facilitate an equitable basis for allowed representation between complainants and respondents	• Discipline Rule • Appeals Rule	• Phase 1 Consultation	18 months	Registrar	Accepted
	3.10. Improve clarity around procedural adjustments for parties with disabilities including neurodiversity.	• Policy • Practice	• Phase 1 Consultation • HESF 2.3	18 months	Registrar	Accepted
	3.11. Address confidentiality/retaliation concerns within residential/cultural/academic communities (include in	• Collateral • Practice	• Phase 1 Consultation • HESF 2.3	18 months	Registrar	Accepted

Recommendation	Actions	Expected Areas Impacted	Drivers	Indicative Timeline	Owner	Status
	communications at recommendation 4)					
	3.12. Improve supports available to respondents to ensure fairness (refer Action 3.7).	• Practice	• Phase 1 Consultation • National Code	6 months	Registrar	Underway
4. Enact an annual, ongoing communications strategy that centres conduct, University Values and behavioural expectations into engagement and education activities	4.1. Seek community buy-in for 'Student Discipline Framework' terminology, offer and/or seek alternatives during Phase 2 consultation to ensure terminology used makes most sense to Students.	• Stage 2 Consultation • Practice	• Phase 1 Consultation	January 2026	SDFR Project Board	Complete
	4.2. Develop a shared annual communications strategy between communications, student conduct and wellbeing teams with clear responsibilities and KPIs. The strategy should: - Promote LGBTIQ+ allyship and respectful relationships, identify gender-based violence and anti-racism education, and be flexible to expansion across issues of discrimination and harassment. - Frame conduct policies in positive, aspirational terms, focusing on community safety, standards and expectations. - Clearly link to the Student Code of Conduct and University Values. - Be reviewed and updated as needed annually to adjust	• Practice	• Phase 1 Consultation • National Code • Anti-Racism Taskforce	6 months	Registrar/ Director, Experience, Wellbeing and Inclusion	Underway

Recommendation	Actions	Expected Areas Impacted	Drivers	Indicative Timeline	Owner	Status
	regular messaging and address cyclic scheduling to avoid information fatigue. - Use multiple communication modes: digital, print, face-to-face, peer-led outreach. - Consider tailoring communication for cultural, linguistic, and cohort-specific needs, with the assumption that students at ANU must be proficient plain-English readers to undertake study. - Clearly identify actions and responsibilities across Actions 4.3 – 4.6.					

Recommendation	Actions	Expected Areas Impacted	Drivers	Indicative Timeline	Owner	Status
	4.3. Create simple plain-English static (flowcharts) and interactive guides (decision trees) that outline: - The whole framework (visually) – what is in it and what isn't. - Information detailed at 1.2, 1.3 and 3.6. - The difference between a disclosure and a report, and how they are or aren't linkable. - The roles and responsibilities of students, affiliates, staff, decision-makers, appeals panels, and the University. - Where to refer if complaints relate to staff behaviour. To be disseminated in print (poster/postcard/flip brochure but to Digital Hub (Action 4.4).	• Collateral • Practice	• Phase 1 Consultation • Interim Recommendation 4	6 months (update once Rule changes approved)	Registrar	Underway
	4.4. Establish a 'source of truth' digital hub where framework information is centralised. - Embed guided workflow covering Action 4.3 into Canvas (or similar) to show options for students. - Populate with singular, centralised disclosure and formal reporting tool for all incidents which may become subjects of discipline processes (Action 5.2).	• Practice • Software Solution	• Phase 1 Consultation • Interim Recommendation 3	6 months (update once Rule changes approved)	Registrar	Underway

Recommendation	Actions	Expected Areas Impacted	Drivers	Indicative Timeline	Owner	Status
	- Detailed FAQs covering support and information resources and contacts including: ▪ Which components are university-led and which complainant-led or respondent-led. ▪ Clarify definitions, powers, and boundaries ▪ Provide explicit guidance on how academic freedom, freedom of speech, and protest rights intersect with conduct expectations. ▪ Include clear information about the scope, limitations, and consequences at of appeals. ▪ Clarify the scope of the University's authority versus external legal/criminal processes, ensuring students understand when university discipline applies and the limitations thereof. - Link to ANUOK landing screen.					
	4.5. Explore creation of a less corporate, more engaging internal, or framework specific, branding for materials targeting student cohorts.	• Practice • Collateral	• Phase 1 Consultation	18 months	Marketing	Accepted

Recommendation	Actions	Expected Areas Impacted	Drivers	Indicative Timeline	Owner	Status
	4.6. Ensure the Digital Hub (Action 4.4) and collateral (Action 3.4) is the consistent, standardised and current information made available across the university community (including affiliates, clubs and societies) and is mandated for use/inclusion: - For residence/school/ college inductions for all cohorts. - During O-Week sessions and first-year email and event campaigns. - Through the Rights, relationships & Respect Module. - At other events throughout the year as suits. - In building foyers as part of University branding exercises around University (community) Values. Print collateral should include a version date (so it can be identified and replaced as needed) and an email address where more can be secured.	• Practice • Collateral	• Anti-Racism Taskforce • Phase 1 Consultation • National Code • Interim Recommendation 1	6 months	Registrar	Underway
5. Improve Reporting and Data Tools	5.1. Provide real-time support options (crisis line, live chat with security, escalated if out of hours and reaching threshold).	• Practice	• Phase 1 Consultation • National Code	6 months	Campus Environ-ment	Accepted
	5.2. A singular, centralised formal reporting/Disclosure Tool is required	• Practice • Software Solution	• NSO • Anti-Racism Taskforce	6 months	Registrar	Underway

Recommendation	Actions	Expected Areas Impacted	Drivers	Indicative Timeline	Owner	Status
	to support granular data capture (Wattle/CRM/Advocate). - Ensure disclosure tool supports anonymous, informal, and formal reporting.		• Phase 1 Consultation • National Code • Interim Recommendation			
	5.3. Publish annual reports with aggregated and anonymised case metrics (type, numbers, timeframes, and outcomes).	• Practice	• NSO • Anti-Racism Taskforce • Phase 1 Consultation • National Code • Interim Recommendation 2	6 months	Registrar	Underway but limited by University systems and tools
	5.4. Through centralised triage and case management (Actions 5.2 and 3.7) adopt a practice of reviewing data to identify repeated or linked concerns to better manage risk.	• Practice • Software Solution	• Phase 1 Consultation • National Code	12 months	Registrar	Accepted
	5.5. Linked to Actions 5.4 and 5.6, consider an internal mandatory reporting requirement for all University staff. i.e. college staff or affiliates must refer issues of a certain nature and significance raised with them into the central student conduct team, with privacy considerations applied.	• Training • Practice • Policy	• Phase 1 Consultation • HESF 2.3	12 months	Vice-Chancellor	Requires further legal advice and exploration
	5.6. Linked to Action 5.2 ensure ASWC maintains oversight of disciplinary data and trends around student	• Practice	• ASWC Charter • HESF 2.3	January 2026	Chair, ANU Safety and	Accepted

Recommendation	Actions	Expected Areas Impacted	Drivers	Indicative Timeline	Owner	Status
	risks and share this in a timely way with other areas (i.e. Residential Experience) as appropriate, to ensure local area progress is actioned.		• Phase 2 Consultation		Wellbeing Committee	
6. Empower all staff to be safe entry points for reporting, by ensuring they are knowledgeable, supported and connected to central subject matter experts	6.1. Offer debriefing and counselling to all parties witness to or part of the disclosure/formal reporting/discipline chain during and after complex, significant cases including SASH. This should include staff, decision-makers, panel members, community members.	• Practice	• Phase 1 Consultation • HESF 2.3	January 2026	Registrar	Accepted
	6.2. Establish an induction and training register for all staff, students and external decision-makers involved in student support and discipline cases or appeals, with at least two categories to allow for separation of serious complaints. Issue reminders for refreshers, and delegations/panel status should be lost if not undertaken. Training should be specialised and cover at minimum: - Trauma-informed (intent vs. impact) - Cultural Safety - Institutional Racism - Administrative law training (e.g. procedural fairness, "balance of probabilities", manifest error)	• Practice • Training	• National Code • Principles 8,8, 9 • Anti-Racism Taskforce • Phase 1 Consultation • HESF 2.3	6 months	Registrar	Underway

Recommendation	Actions	Expected Areas Impacted	Drivers	Indicative Timeline	Owner	Status
	- Gender-based violence competency - Restorative justice					
	6.3. Establish ongoing Community of Practices for both general and serious (SASH) cases, and provide Professional Supervision services to all staff, students and external decision-makers involved in student support and discipline cases or appeals of a serious nature.	• Practice	• Phase 1 Consultation	6 months	Director, Experience, Wellbeing & Inclusion	Accepted
	6.4. Require for all University and Affiliate Staff (and people engaged in student/peer support) training that covers (at minimum): - Framework operational overview - Responsibilities as staff - How to receive, treat and escalate a disclosure/report, if necessary. - How to link to central teams to access individual staff and student focussed supports. - Documentation/note taking standards. - Cultural safety - Gender-based violence competency.	• Practice • Training	• National Code • Principles 8,8, 9 • HESF 2.3 • Anti-Racism Taskforce • Phase 1 Consultation	12 months	People & Culture / Vice-Chancellor	Underway
	6.5. Establish a forward plan to professionalise the key student support and conduct roles by	• Practice	• Phase 1 Consultation • Principles 8, 9	18 months	Registrar	Underway

Recommendation	Actions	Expected Areas Impacted	Drivers	Indicative Timeline	Owner	Status
	progressively embedding minimum qualifications and experience requirements into position descriptions including, but not limited to, trauma-informed practice, procedural fairness, cultural competency, investigations and restorative justice. Over time, staff turnover and recruitment will ensure team capabilities remain aligned with the complexity and sensitivity of disciplinary matters.					
7. Facilitate a connected and seamless safety network across the University community	7.1. Establish a revised approach to identifying a respondent's connections within the University community and issuing relevant notifications related to the disciplinary action within privacy requirements: - In some circumstances, relevant affiliates and groups need to receive notifications of interim safety measures put in place (i.e. limiting contact between individuals). - Where outcomes limit activity, suspend or permanently remove a respondent from the University community.	• Practice	• Phase 1 Consultation • Principles 7, 8 • HESF 2.3	18 months	Registrar	Accepted
	7.2. Improve clarity provided in information to students on processes for complaints involving staff, including outcomes and	• Practice	• Phase 1 Consultation • NSO • HESF 2.3	6 months	Registrar	Accepted

Recommendation	Actions	Expected Areas Impacted	Drivers	Indicative Timeline	Owner	Status
	protections from institutional retaliation.					
	7.3. Review staff procedures to ensure policy coherence exists where students report complaints.	• Staff Policies and Procedures	• Phase 1 Consultation • NSO • HESF 2.3	6 months	People & Culture	Accepted
8. Undertake ongoing monitoring and review	8.1. Maintain an implementation oversight body for 18 months to monitor progress, reforms and adjust where needed.	• Practice	• Principles 5, 8 • Operational Learnings	18 months	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)	Underway
	8.2. Formalise the forward review schedule (i.e. 3 or 5 yearly) and identify an external review process (i.e. every 6 or 10 years).	• Practice	• Phase 1 Consultation • Operational Learnings	6 months	Registrar	Accepted