HESC4551

Research Project

Course Outline

Term 3, 2023

School of Health Sciences

Faculty of Medicine & Health

Table of Contents

1. Staff

Position	Name	Email	Consultation times and locations	Contact Details
Course Convenor	**Dr Briana Clifford**	b.clifford@unsw.edu.uau	By appointment	Via teams or Room 202 Wallace Wurth Building East
Lecturer	**Dr Briana Clifford**			
Tutors	**Dr Briana Clifford**			

2. Course information

Units of credit: 6UOC

Pre-requisite(s): MATH1041 and HESC4501

Teaching times and locations:

http://timetable.unsw.edu.au/2023/HESC4551.html

2.1 Course summary

This course will lead on from the prerequisite course, HESC4501 Exercise Physiology Research Seminars, and will give students experience in conducting a literature review on a self-selected topic related to exercise physiology. It is primarily a self-directed project that involves deciding on a research question/topic and addressing this question by a narrative review of the literature. Assessment tasks will provide experience in a range of research activities such as preparation of research proposals, review of the literature, and oral presentations.

2.2 Course aims

- To develop critical thinking in relation to the scientific literature.
- To foster independence in undertaking reviews of scientific literature, and synthesising and analysing scientific and clinical data.
- To provide skills in effective scientific communication.

2.3 Course learning outcomes (CLO)

At the successful completion of this course you (the student) should be able to:

1. Synthesize and analyse data from review of scientific literature.
2. Develop an understanding of current techniques used in biomedical research.
3. Develop skills in critically evaluating research articles and writing a literature review.
4. Be able to organise, present and discuss research data.

2.4 Relationship between course learning outcomes and assessments

Course Learning Outcome (CLO)	Learning outcome Statement	Related Tasks & Assessment
CLO 1	Synthesize and analyse data from review of scientific literature	Research Proposal Oral Presentation Written Report
CLO 2	Develop an understanding of current techniques used in biomedical research	Research Proposal Oral Presentation Written Report
CLO 3	Develop skills in critically evaluating research articles and writing a literature review	Research Proposal Oral Presentation Written Report
CLO 4	Be able to organise, present and discuss research data	Research Proposal Oral Presentation Written Report

3. Strategies and approaches to learning

3.1 Learning and teaching activities

How the course relates to other courses in the Exercise Physiology program.

Together with Research Seminars (HESC4501), this 4th year course builds upon the knowledge accumulated **throughout the whole program**. It uses previously understood fundamental concepts to build the necessary critical thinking towards professional independence.

Although the primary source of information for this course is the scientific literature itself, effective learning can be enhanced through self-directed use of other resources such as textbooks and Web based resources to enhance your research skills. The seminar session is essential to prepare for you for listening to and presenting scientific knowledge in a way that is accessible and understandable. This skill will be invaluable to you when you are on placement, and you will use this skill daily in your working career.

Students will receive guidance on the literature review process from the course convenor via a lecture/ interactive seminar.

Learning activities occur on the following days and times:

Lectures

There will be one Introductory lecture/ discussion session: Week 1, Tuesday (2-hour session) **STUDENTS** are **requested** to attend this session (conducted online via BB Collaborate).

Tutorial Sessions

These 2-hours sessions will be offered online to students in **Week 5**. If you cannot attend the tutorial, please email the convenor in week 4 to arrange a mutually convenient time to meet. These can be done Via Teams or Phone if convenient. These sessions will be short so come prepared.

Seminar Session

These 2-hour sessions will be held in **Week 8,** you are required to attend the **whole of the session** that you are **presenting** in. You, therefore, must ensure that this session does not clash with other commitments.

Class Type	Date	Weeks	Location	Size
Lecture	Tue 3PM-5PM	1	Online BB Collaborate	30
Tutorial	Thu 11AM-1PM	5	Online BB Collaborate	10
	Thu 2PM-4PM	5	Online BB Collaborate	10
	Thu 4PM-6PM	5	Online BB Collaborate	10
Seminar	Wed 9AM-11AM	8	Wallace Wurth LG02	10
	Wed 11AM-1PM	8	Wallace Wurth LG02	10
	Wed 2PM-4PM	8	Wallace Wurth LG02	10

3.2 Expectations of students

Students are expected to attend all scheduled activities for their full duration (1 hour of lecture in weeks 1 and 3 and one two hours seminar session in week 8). Some courses have specific attendance requirements, and an Unsatisfactory Fail (UF) may be recorded as the final grade for the course if students fail to meet the requirements, as specified in the course and assessment information provided on the course Moodle page. As stipulated in the course information on Moodle, course attendance expectations are determined by the requirements of the accrediting body for each health discipline. Where a student is unable to attend, they are advised to inform the course convenor, according to the instructions outlined on your course Moodle page.

Students are reminded that UNSW recommends that a 6 units-of-credit course should involve about 150 hours of study and learning activities. The formal contact sessions for this course add to 4 hours throughout the term. Thus, students are expected to do the bulk (~145 hours) of the study independently. Thus, it is a critical part of this course to be self-disciplined and commit time weekly to ensure the tasks are advanced progressively over the term.

Independent study

Independent studies will be an essential component of the course, as you will be asked to retrieve publications from databases, synthesise and have critical reading on what you will present. You will also need to finalise an individual talk outside of course contact hours. This strategy is to foster your independence as an exercise scientist/physiologist to gather information to inform your practice facilitating an evidence-based approach.

4. Course schedule and structure

Week [Date/Session]	Date	Activity [Learning opportunity]	Details
Week 1	***Tuesday* 12th September**	*Introductory Seminar I*	**Introductory Lecture:** ONLINE Session will introduce the course and Assessment tasks 1, 2 and 3
Week 2	***Wednesday 20th September***	***Topic of Review***	***Decide your review topic, upload to Moodle***
Week 3	***Sunday 1st October***	*Research Proposal*	**Assessment task 1 is to be submitted no later than 11pm Sunday of WEEK 3**.
Week 4	***Please EMAIL to arrange a time in week 5***	***Guidance session***	***Students wishing to get guidance on their review can email* the convenor *before Thursday evening in week 4 to arrange a convenient time* in week 5 if they cannot attend the tutorial.**
Week 5	***Thursday 12th October at 11am, 2pm, or 4pm (see class timetable for your scheduled tutorial time)***	***Tutorial***	***A 2-hour ONLINE meeting for guidance on the review.***
Week 8	***Week* starting Monday 30th October**	*Oral Presentation*	**Assessment task 2 to be submitted no later than 11 PM Sunday of WEEK 7, 29th October** (i.e., the PowerPoint presentation file to be submitted via Moodle). Presentations will be face-to-face during timetabled seminar.
Week 10	***Friday 17th November***	*Written Report*	**Assessment task 3 is to be submitted no later than FRIDAY WEEK 10** (i.e., the final written report is to be submitted via Moodle).

Exam Period: 24 November – 7 December 2023
Supplementary Exam Period: 8 January – 12 January 2024

5. Assessment

5.1 Assessment tasks

Assessment task	Weight	Mark	Due date and time
Assessment 1: *RESEARCH PROPOSAL*	20%	10	11pm 1st October
Assessment 2: *ORAL PRESENTATION*	30%	20	11pm 29th October
Assessment 3: *WRITTEN REPORT*	50%	50	11pm Friday 17th November

Further information

UNSW grading system: https://student.unsw.edu.au/grades

UNSW assessment policy: https://student.unsw.edu.au/assessment

5.2 Assessment criteria and standards

A primarily self-directed project that involves deciding on a research question/topic and addressing this question by a narrative review of the literature.

In some instances, the literature review may be completed under the guidance of an academic.

Your literature review topic should be determined by the Wednesday week 2.

Literature review - Assessment Task 1 – *RESEARCH PROPOSAL*

Learning Outcomes

- To clearly define a research question
- Provide a brief background and rationale for the review.
- Provide an overview of the methods and the hypothesis.
- To synthesize and present data from a critical review of the literature.

The Proposal is to be a concise overview of the research topic, rational and relevance to exercise physiology, any hypotheses and any protocols or procedures being used, with a discussion on potential outcomes.

General Assessment Guidelines:

Word Count – 1000 to 1500-word limit

	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
BACKGROUND **Introduction to the area being reviewed**	Introduction lacking detail	Minimal Detail given. Some relevant background.	Clear account of the scientific background	Concise and clear account of the scientific background	Very concise and clear account of the scientific background
RATIONALE **Aims, why review being done, search strategies, inclusion exclusion criterion**	Poor rationale for the review and poor logic	Attempted to give a logical rational but lacks detail	Good rationale provided and sound logic demonstrated	Clear and logical rationale for the review/research area	Very concise, clear and logical rationale for the review/research area
POSSIBLE CLINCAL SIGNIFICANCE	Poor association between the possible clinical significance and the background and review outline	Minimal association between the possible clinical significance and the background and review outline	Association between the possible clinical significance and the background and review outline	Links between the possible clinical significance and the background and review outline	Very clear links between the possible clinical significance and the background and review outline
Overview of reviews structure/ area being reviewed with reference to literature	Poor overview of structure seems disjointed with no connections to background and previous studies	Poor overview of structure, Minimal discussion, or relation to previous studies	Review structure is sound with reference to previous studies	Review structure is clear and logical with reference to some seminal studies	Review structure is excellent and logical with reference to the seminal scientific studies
STYLE/ **PRESENTATION**	Disjointed flow of ideas. Sentences poorly constructed. Non-professional expression and lacking style. Many grammatical or spelling errors	Poor flow of ideas some poor language. Style is colloquial. some grammatical or spelling errors noted	A good flow of ideas. Sentences well-constructed adequate professional expression and style. A grammar or spelling error	Clear flow of ideas. Sentences well-constructed and professional expression and style used. Delivery clear.	Very clear and logical flow of ideas. Sentences very well constructed and professional expression and style used. Delivery very clear and technical. No errors

Research Proposal Marking Scheme - Review HESC 4551

Student …….. **Date** ……..

Examiner ……

Mark /10 converted to /20

Background *Overview of field:*	**Max. Marks = 4**	**Unsatisfactory (mark = 0)**	**Below average (0.5)**	**Satisfactory (mark = 1.0)**	**Good (mark = 1.5)**	**Excellent (mark = 2.0)**	**Mark**
Clear description of field investigated	2						
Aims adequately explained	2						
Content	**Max. Marks = 4**	**Unsatisfactory (mark = 0)**	**Below average (0.25)**	**Satisfactory (mark = 0.5)**	**Good (mark = 0.75)**	**Excellent (mark = 1.0)**	**Mark**
How is this review adding to the field	1						
Scope of review explained	1						
Methods described briefly (i.e. search criterion, major methods used)	1						
Overview of review structure (refers to current literature)	1						
Presentation *Readability:*	**Max. Marks = 2**	**Unsatisfactory (mark = 0)**	**Below average (0.25)**	**Satisfactory (mark = 0.5)**	**Good (mark = 0.75)**	**Excellent (mark = 1.0)**	**Mark**
Able to be understood by an educated but non-expert reader	1						
Grammar, spelling, and concise sentence structure	1						

Comments: ……

Assessment Task 2 – *ORAL PRESENTATION*

Of the format **6 minutes** presentation, 2 minutes questions/discussion followed by 2 minutes of Feedback/ direction from the markers.

Learning Outcomes

- To be able to organise, present and discuss research topic
- To generate original scientific illustrations

Assessment Criteria

Use this to guide your preparation of the presentation. Note that the marking scheme on next page will be used to grade your presentation. Each category will be marked on a sliding scale from 0 to full marks for that division.

Presentation	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Overview – rationale for review & selection of appropriate scientific journal articles relevant to the project	Selection of articles inappropriate for the assignment (e.g. textbook chapters). No attempt to identify clinical relevance.	Selection of some appropriate articles (original research articles or reviews). Unclear at times, with minimal description of the clinical relevance.	Selection of appropriate articles (original research articles or reviews). Clear and accurate description of the clinical relevance.	Selection of appropriate original research articles. Clear and accurate description of the clinical relevance. Possibly critical thought	Selection of appropriate original research articles. Clear and accurate description of the clinical relevance. Some critical thought.
Body of the Presentation ▪ *Background, If appropriate Hypothesis* ▪ *Aims* ▪ *Methods to be used* ▪ *Discussion*	Incomplete and inaccurate overview of articles. Lacking, or inaccurate, details for all or some of the purpose and methods Some attempt to identify the clinical relevance.	Below average overview of the articles. Minimal detail for purpose and methods of review.	Good overview of the articles. Report purpose and methods of own study.	Good overview of the topic area, articles, Reports purpose and methods of own study. Some attention to the key details.	Very clear description of topic area, research plan and methodology to be used. Very good critical analysis of topic including strengths and limitations of study design
Quality of the presentation ▪ *Presentation style* ▪ *Clarity of slides* ▪ *Allocation of time* ▪ *Ability to correctly interpret & answer questions*	Presentation style poor read most of presentation with little eye contact. Slides not clear. Slides overcrowded. Little use of figures and diagrams. Presentation goes over/significantly under time. Unable to interpret and answer most questions.	Below average presentation style with some eye contact. Read some. Some unclear slides. Some use of figures and diagrams. Over time. Answered some questions with reasonable accuracy	Good presentation style with some eye contact. Mostly clear slides. Uses figures and diagrams. Keeps to time. Answers most questions with reasonable accuracy	Good presentation style with eye contact. Clear slides. Good use of figures and diagrams. Adheres to the prescribed format. Keeps to time. Understands questions and answers them with reasonable accuracy	Clear, fluent and concise presentation with good eye contact. Clear slides without overcrowding. Clear figures and diagrams. Adheres to the prescribed format. Keeps to time & appropriate allocation of time. Accurate answers to questions

Oral Presentation Marking Scheme - Review HESC 4551

Mark /20 converted to /30

Student …….. **Date** ……..

Examiner ……

Background (Context)	**Max. Marks = 4**	**Unsatisfactory (mark = 0)**	**Below average (0.5)**	**Satisfactory (mark = 1.0)**	**Good (mark = 1.5)**	**Excellent (mark = 2.0)**	**Mark**
Review topic justified and relevant to Ex Phys.	2						
Aims/ Scope of Review adequately explained	2						
Content	**Max. Marks = 4**	**Unsatisfactory (mark = 0)**	**Below average (0.5)**	**Satisfactory (mark = 1.0)**	**Good (mark = 1.5)**	**Excellent (mark = 2.0)**	**Mark**
Enough information given to understand topic	2						
Information is focussed and on topic, evidence from current literature is apparent	2						
Slides appearance & Presentation Style	**Max. Marks = 8**	**Unsatisfactory (mark = 0)**	**Below average (0.5)**	**Satisfactory (mark = 1.0)**	**Good (mark = 1.5)**	**Excellent (mark = 2.0)**	**Mark**
Used pictures, diagrams & tables: Effectively explained	2						
Confident voice, audience engagement & timing (not too short/long, not read)	2						
Able to be understood by an educated but non-expert reader	2						
Slides attractive Font size & colour easy to read	2						
Conclusions	**Max. Marks = 4**	**Unsatisfactory (mark = 0)**	**Below average (0.5)**	**Satisfactory (mark = 1.0)**	**Good (mark = 1.5)**	**Excellent (mark = 2.0)**	**Mark**
Summary of strengths & weaknesses	2						
Ability to interpret & answer questions	2						

Comments:

……

Assessment Task 3 – *WRITTEN REVIEW*

Learning Outcomes

- To read, assess, and synthesis the literature of a chosen area.
- To be able to write a literature review.

The review article should follow the following guidelines:
Title – Up to 20 words, Student number and name
Abstract – Up to 300 words (should be updated to include interpretation of literature reviewed)
Key words – Up to five key words defining the topic developed in the review.
Introduction, body of text and conclusion will come to up to 3,000 words.
It is advisable to use appropriate subheadings to section off distinct areas of the literature being reviewed.

Figures and Tables – if appropriate include no more than 3 to 5 figures or tables, including legends
References – Up to 30 references of original research articles (> 15 references). No **review articles** should be cited in the main sections (ok in the introduction/ background section).
The article should be formatted, 1.5 line-spacing, with Margins 2.5 cm. Body text: 12 font. Illustration legend Text 10 font. Total Word Count ~3500 +/- 10%. The file should be a Word document (.doc or .docx format).

General Assessment Guidelines

Report	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Literature Review – Basis of Review, Background, Aim(s) and if appropriate a Hypothesis. Identification of the relevance to Exercise Physiology	Background is unrelated to reviewed subject, does not give enough information for reader to understand field being reviewed. Aim(s) not explained; Ambiguous Hypothesis is presented. No link at all to exercise physiology. No attempt to identify clinical relevance.	Background is somewhat related to reviewed subject, gives minimal information for reader to understand topic. Aims poorly explained, A poor Hypothesis. Poor link to exercise physiology. Poor attempt to identify clinical relevance	Background is supportive of reviewed subject. Gives some information for reader to understand topic. Aims explained simply Hypothesis is presented. Some link to exercise physiology. An attempt to identify clinical relevance provided.	Background sheds light on the gap filled by reviewing the subject. Aims well explained, A plausible Hypothesis is presented. Clear link to exercise physiology identifying. Some evidence of clinical relevance provided.	Background is so clear it demonstrates why subject needs to be reviewed. Aims precise and concise, A scientifically plausible Hypothesis is presented. Excellent link to exercise physiology identifying a strong clinical relevance.
Body of the Report • *Background /Aim(s)* • *Methods* • *Overview of subject matter being reviewed and Conclusions* • *Depth of critical analysis*	Incomplete and inaccurate overview of the literature. Lacking, or inaccurate, details for all or some of the overviewed literature, methods, results and conclusions. No critical analysis of the field. Inappropriate conclusions that are unsupported by the literature presented	Poor overview of the literature. Lacking, or inaccurate, details for some of the purpose, methods, results and conclusions. Some critical analysis. Poor conclusions that are loosely supported by the results	Simple overview of the literature. Aims and methods described. Review reasonably presented some minor detail lacking for purpose, methods, results and conclusions. Attempt at critical analysis. Appropriate conclusions that are supported by literature	Good overview of the literature. Aims and methods described well. Review presented in a concise manner. No detail lacking for purpose, methods, results and conclusions. Good critical analysis of	Comprehensive and concise overview of the literature, reporting the purpose, key measures, key results and the most pertinent conclusions. Aims and methods easily understood and fully well. Review presented in a professional

				literature. Appropriate conclusions that are clearly supported by results and the literature.	manner. Excellent critical analysis of literature. Conclusions and discussion expertly related to findings in the literature.
Quality of the writing and presentation • *Adherence to prescribed format* • *Fluency and style* • *Spelling* • *Grammar* • *Appropriate referencing*	Unprofessional language style used e.g.: background information in results section, conclusions and discussion in results section. A large number of careless spelling and grammatical mistakes. Overuse of the first person. Excessive colloquial tone. Inaccurate referencing. Illogical structure of the report.	Unprofessional language style used at times. A number of careless spelling and grammatical mistakes. Some use of the first person and Colloquial tone used. Inaccurate referencing. Poor structure of the report.	Professional language style used e.g.: no background information in results section, conclusions and discussion in results section. Minimal number of spelling and grammatical mistakes. Good use of 3rd person. Appropriate referencing.	Scientific style used Ideas easy to follow. Fluent logical flow of ideas. All information in the appropriate sections. One or two grammar and spelling mistakes. Good referencing	Clear, fluent and concise scientific writing. No errors in written expression. Adheres to the prescribed format. Accurate referencing.

Literature review Marking Scheme - Review HESC4551

Student …….. **Date** ……..

Examiner ……

Total Mark /50

Background	**Max Marks = 10**	**Unsatisfactory (mark = 0)**	**Below average (0.25)**	**Satisfactory (mark = 1.0)**	**Good (mark = 1.5)**	**Excellent (mark = 2.0)**	**Mark**
Abstract concise & relevant	2						
Clinical relevance of the review adequately explained	2						
Scope of the review adequately explained	2						
Coverage of appropriate research to date in this area	2						
Explanation of gaps in the literature	2						
Content	**Max Marks = 20**	**Unsatisfactory (mark = 0)**	**Below average (1.0)**	**Satisfactory (mark = 2.0)**	**Good (mark = 3.0)**	**Excellent (mark = 4.0)**	**Mark**
Accurate & detailed description of study methods/procedures	4						
Outcomes of review are well presented	4						
Conclusions are valid	4						
Depth of critical analysis of literature	4						
Logical summary of strengths, weaknesses & future directions	4						
Quality of the writing	**Max Marks = 20**	**Unsatisfactory (mark = 0)**	**Below average (1.0)**	**Satisfactory (mark = 2.0)**	**Good (mark = 3.0)**	**Excellent (mark = 4.0)**	**Mark**
Clear, fluent writing	4						
Grammar & spelling	4						
Adherence to prescribed format	4						
Written for educated but non-expert reader	4						
Referencing (accuracy & consistent format)	4						

Comments:

……

……

5.3 Submission of assessment tasks

All assessment tasks are to be submitted via the Moodle page thru the appropriate links

Late Submission

UNSW has standard late submission penalties as outlined in the UNSW Assessment Implementation Procedure, with no permitted variation. All late assignments (unless extension or exemption previously agreed) will be penalised by 5% of the maximum mark per day (including Saturday, Sunday, and public holidays). For example, if an assessment task is worth 30 marks, 1.5 marks will be lost per day (5% of 30) for each day it is late. So, if the grade earnt is 24/30, and the task is two days late, the student receives a grade of 24 – 3 marks = 21 marks.

Late submission is capped at 5 days (120 hours). This means that a student cannot submit an assessment more than 5 days (120 hours) after the due date for that assessment.

Special Consideration

If you experience a short-term event beyond your control (exceptional circumstances) that impacts your performance in a particular assessment task, you can apply for Special Considerations.

You must apply for Special Consideration **before** the start of your exam or the due date for your assessment, except where your circumstances of illness or misadventure stop you from doing so.

If your circumstances stop you from applying before your exam or assessment due date, you must **apply within 3 working days** of the assessment, or the period covered by your supporting documentation.

More information can be found on the Special Consideration website.

5.4. Feedback on assessment

Proposal

Feedback and Marks for the proposal will be given online via the Moodle grades page for the assignment. Comments and suggestions will be given on the submitted document.

Oral Presentation

Feedback for the presentation will be given in class by the tutors' suggestions to assist in finalising of the literature review will also be given. Comments and the mark will be made available via the Moodle grades page.

Literature Review (Written report)

Feedback on the review will be provided via the Moodle grades page for the assignment. This will be released after the marks for this course have been released by the University.

6. Academic integrity, referencing and plagiarism

Referencing is a way of acknowledging the sources of information that you use to research your assignments. You need to provide a reference whenever you draw on someone else's words, ideas or research. Not referencing other people's work can constitute plagiarism.

Please use an appropriate reference style and be consistent with it. Students have used Numbered, Harvard or APA referencing style for this course.

Further information about referencing styles can be located at
https://student.unsw.edu.au/referencing

Academic integrity *is fundamental to success at university. Academic integrity can be defined as a commitment to six fundamental values in academic pursuits**:** honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility and courage.*[1] *At UNSW, this means that your work must be your own, and others' ideas should be appropriately acknowledged. If you do not follow these rules, plagiarism may be detected in your work.*

Further information about academic integrity and ***plagiarism*** *can be located at:*

- *The Current Students site* https://student.unsw.edu.au/plagiarism*, and*
- *The ELISE training site* https://subjectguides.library.unsw.edu.au/elise

The Conduct and Integrity Unit provides further resources to assist you in understanding your conduct obligations as a student: https://student.unsw.edu.au/conduct*.*

The use of AI tools *is not encouraged in this course. Despite academics acknowledging the benefits of AI tools to assist with writing, one of the aims of this course is that students learn how to communicate in science effectively, including writing. The uses of AI tools such as ChatGPT are discouraged, and they will be checked through plagiarism tools such as Turnitin™. If the students happened to use AI tools such as ChatGPT, this will be considered* ***plagiarism,*** *and relevant penalties will apply.*

7. Readings and resources

University library resources

https://www.student.unsw.edu.au/getting-started-your-literature-review

https://www.student.unsw.edu.au/literature-review

Scientific papers

Chaney, MA (2021). So you want to write a narrative review article?
https://www.jcvaonline.com/article/S1053-0770(21)00521-8/fulltext

Ferrari, R (2015). Writing narrative style literature reviews.
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1179/2047480615Z.000000000329

Gasparyan A, et al (2011). Writing a narrative biomedical review: considerations for authors, peer reviews, and editors. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00296-011-1999-3

8. Administrative matters

Student enquiries should be submitted via the student portal https://portal.insight.unsw.edu.au/web-forms/

[1] International Center for Academic Integrity, 'The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity', T. Fishman (ed), Clemson University, 2013.

9. Additional support for students

- The Current Students Gateway: https://student.unsw.edu.au/
- Academic Skills and Support: https://student.unsw.edu.au/academic-skills
- *Student Wellbeing and Health* https://www.student.unsw.edu.au/wellbeing
- UNSW IT Service Centre: https://www.myit.unsw.edu.au/services/students
- *UNSW Student Life Hub:* https://student.unsw.edu.au/hub#main-content
- *Student Support and Development:* https://student.unsw.edu.au/support
- *IT, eLearning and Apps:* https://student.unsw.edu.au/elearning
- *Student Support and Success Advisors:* https://student.unsw.edu.au/advisors
- *Equitable Learning Services (Formerly Disability Support Unit):* https://student.unsw.edu.au/els
- *Transitioning to Online Learning* https://www.covid19studyonline.unsw.edu.au/
- *Guide to Online Study* https://student.unsw.edu.au/online-study