



AUTHORSHIP AND PUBLICATION POLICY

1. Purpose

- 1.1 This Policy establishes the requirements of Lincoln Institute of Higher Education (LIHE) for authorship, the publication and communication of research outputs, and the resolution of disputes relating to authorship.
- 1.2 The Policy gives effect to the responsibility of LIHE, under the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2018) and Authorship: A Guide Supporting the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2019), to develop and maintain policies that provide guidance on:
 - criteria for author eligibility;
 - the responsibilities of authors;
 - the use and applicability of discipline-specific authorship guidelines; and
 - the management and resolution of authorship disputes.
- 1.3 The Policy also sets out how LIHE encourages, supports and requires the presentation and communication of research outputs by its higher degree by research (HDR) candidates, including the avenues available to candidates for publication and dissemination.

2. Scope and application

- 2.1 This Policy applies to all research and scholarly outputs produced in whole or in part by:
 - academic and professional staff of LIHE, including sessional, adjunct, visiting and honorary appointees;
 - candidates enrolled in the Master of Information Technology (Research) and any other HDR course offered by LIHE;
 - supervisors, mentors and examiners engaged by LIHE; and
 - contractors, consultants and collaborators who undertake research using LIHE resources, facilities, data or affiliation.
- 2.2 This Policy applies to all forms of research output, whether published or unpublished, and irrespective of medium. This includes journal articles, conference papers and posters, book chapters, monographs, technical reports, datasets, software and source code, models, algorithms, patents and other registrable rights, creative and multimedia works, preprints, and theses.
- 2.3 This Policy does not determine the ownership of intellectual property. Ownership and management of intellectual property, including intellectual property created by candidates in the course of their candidature, are governed by the Intellectual Property Policy and Procedures and the Candidate Intellectual Property Deed. Authorship and ownership are separate matters, and a person may hold one without the other.
- 2.4 Where a research output is subject to the requirements of an external funder, partner organisation, publisher or professional body, and those requirements are more stringent than this Policy, the more stringent requirement prevails. Where an external requirement is inconsistent



with the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2018), the matter must be referred to the Dean (Research) before the output is submitted for publication.

- 2.5 Nothing in this Policy limits the operation of the Research Integrity and Misconduct Policy and Procedure. Conduct that engages this Policy may also constitute a breach of the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2018) and be dealt with as a research integrity matter under clause 10.9 of this Policy.

3. Definitions

Term	Meaning
Author	A person who has made a substantial intellectual contribution to a research output, meeting the criteria in clause 5 of this Policy, and who has agreed to be listed as an author.
Authorship dispute	A disagreement between two or more persons concerning who is entitled to be named as an author of a research output, the order in which authors are named, the accuracy of a contribution statement, or the decision to publish, submit or withdraw an output.
Candidate	A student enrolled in a higher degree by research course offered by LIHE.
Contributor	A person who has assisted in the production of a research output but whose contribution does not meet the criteria for authorship in clause 5.
Corresponding author	The author nominated to manage correspondence with the publisher and, after publication, with readers; and who is accountable for ensuring the requirements of clause 6.6 are met.
CRedit	The Contributor Roles Taxonomy, a standard vocabulary of fourteen contributor roles used to describe each contributor's specific contribution to a research output.
Gift, guest or honorary authorship	The naming as an author of a person who has not made a contribution meeting the criteria in clause 5, including on the basis of seniority, position, funding, friendship or reputation.
Ghost authorship	The omission from the author list of a person who has made a contribution meeting the criteria in clause 5, including where that omission is at the direction of a third party.
Predatory publisher	A publisher or conference organiser that solicits submissions and levies charges while failing to provide the editorial, peer review and archiving services ordinarily expected of a scholarly publisher.
Research output	Any product of research intended for communication to others, in any medium, as described in clause 2.2.
Working day	A day other than a Saturday, Sunday or public holiday in New South Wales, on which LIHE is open for business. Periods stated in working days do not run during a published LIHE non-teaching shutdown period.



4. Principles

- 4.1 Authorship is a statement of intellectual contribution and of accountability. It confers both credit and responsibility.
- 4.2 Authorship must be determined by contribution, and must not be influenced by a person's seniority, employment status, enrolment status, gender, cultural background, disability, or the existence of a supervisory, assessment or reporting relationship.
- 4.3 Authorship must be discussed and recorded at the earliest practicable stage of a research project and revisited whenever contributions change. Disputes are most often prevented by early written agreement.
- 4.4 Gift, guest, honorary and ghost authorship are prohibited. A supervisor is not entitled to authorship of a candidate's output by virtue of the supervisory relationship alone.
- 4.5 Candidates must be free to raise a concern about authorship without fear of disadvantage to their candidature, supervision, assessment, progression or employment.
- 4.6 Research outputs must be published or communicated in venues that apply recognised standards of editorial oversight and peer review.
- 4.7 LIHE encourages the dissemination of its research to scholarly, professional and public audiences, and supports open access to research outputs wherever it is lawful and practicable to do so.

5. Criteria for authorship

5.1 Eligibility

- 5.1.1 To be named as an author of a research output, a person must satisfy both of the following conditions.

Condition A — Substantial intellectual contribution. The person has made a substantial intellectual or scholarly contribution to at least one of the following:

- conception or design of the research, including the formulation of the research question, hypothesis, architecture or experimental design;
- acquisition of research data, software, code, materials or other research inputs, where that acquisition required intellectual judgement rather than routine execution;
- analysis or interpretation of research data or results, including the design and evaluation of models, algorithms or systems; or
- drafting significant parts of the output, or critically revising it so as to contribute to the interpretation.

Condition B — Agreement and accountability. The person has:

- agreed in writing to be listed as an author;
- reviewed and approved the final version submitted for publication or dissemination; and
- accepted responsibility for the integrity of their own contribution, and for the overall integrity of the output to the extent of their capacity to assess it.



- 5.1.2 All persons who meet both conditions must be offered authorship. A person who meets both conditions may decline authorship, and that decision must be recorded in writing.

5.2 Contributions that do not, of themselves, warrant authorship

- 5.2.1 The following contributions do not, without a contribution meeting Condition A, entitle a person to authorship:
- the provision of funding, equipment, laboratory space, computing resources or datasets;
 - general supervision of the research group, or the holding of a departmental, faculty or institutional office;
 - routine technical assistance, data entry, transcription, coding to specification, or routine laboratory or field work;
 - routine proof-reading, copy-editing, translation or formatting;
 - the recruitment of participants or the collection of data under direction, without intellectual input into design or interpretation; and
 - participation as a research subject.
- 5.2.2 Contributions of this kind must be recognised in an acknowledgement in accordance with clause 7.
- 5.2.3 Generative artificial intelligence tools and other software cannot satisfy Condition B and must not be named as an author. Where such a tool has been used in the conception, execution, analysis, drafting or presentation of a research output, its use must be disclosed in the methods or acknowledgements section in accordance with the requirements of the publisher and the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy. The named authors remain fully accountable for all content so produced.

5.3 Discipline-specific guidelines

- 5.3.1 LIHE adopts the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2018) and the accompanying Authorship guide (2019) as its primary authority on authorship.
- 5.3.2 For research in information and communications technology, which is the field of education of the Master of Information Technology (Research), the following discipline conventions are recognised and may be applied provided they are not inconsistent with clause 5.1:
- the authorship and publication policies of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) and the Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), including their requirements concerning simultaneous submission, prior publication and self-plagiarism;
 - the convention in some sub-disciplines of computing that authors are listed alphabetically rather than by magnitude of contribution, provided that the convention is stated in the output and recorded in the Authorship and Contribution Agreement; and
 - the recognition, in computing and engineering venues, of software artefacts, datasets and reproducibility packages as citable research outputs in their own right.



- 5.3.3 For research with a health, clinical or biomedical dimension, the recommendations of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) apply in addition to this Policy.
- 5.3.4 Where a discipline convention and this Policy cannot be reconciled, the matter must be referred to the Dean (Research) for determination before submission.

6. Responsibilities of authors

- 6.1 Each author is responsible for ensuring that the output is an accurate, complete and honest account of the research, and that data, code and materials underpinning the output are retained and available in accordance with the Data and Records Integrity Policy and Procedures.
- 6.2 Each author must disclose to the corresponding author, and where required to the publisher, any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest, and any source of funding or in-kind support.
- 6.3 Each author must ensure that all necessary approvals have been obtained before the research described in the output was undertaken, including approval from the LIHE Research Ethics Committee for research involving human participants, animals, or identifiable data, and that the approval reference is stated in the output.
- 6.4 Each author must ensure that the output complies with the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy, including in relation to plagiarism, self-plagiarism, redundant publication, data fabrication and data falsification.
- 6.5 Each author must ensure that confidentiality obligations, third-party intellectual property rights, and obligations to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities or other research partners are observed.
- 6.6 The corresponding author is additionally responsible for:
- Obtaining and retaining the written agreement of every author to the final version, the author order and the contribution statement;
 - Providing every author with a copy of the submitted and accepted versions;
 - Managing communication with the publisher, including responses to peer review, proofs, and any post-publication correction, expression of concern or retraction; and
 - Notifying the Research Office of the acceptance and publication of the output for the purposes of clause 9.
- 6.7 An author who becomes aware of a significant error in a published output must notify the corresponding author and the Dean (Research) promptly. LIHE will support authors to issue a correction or retraction where required, and a good-faith correction of the scholarly record is not, of itself, research misconduct.



7. Author order, acknowledgement and affiliation

7.1 Order of authors

- 7.1.1 The order in which authors are listed must be agreed by all authors and recorded in the Authorship and Contribution Agreement at Appendix A.
- 7.1.2 In the absence of a stated discipline convention to the contrary, authors are listed in descending order of contribution, with the person who made the greatest contribution listed first.
- 7.1.3 Where a research output is derived substantially from a candidate's thesis or from work undertaken by the candidate for the purposes of their candidature, the candidate is ordinarily the first author. A departure from this position must be justified by reference to contribution, agreed in writing by the candidate, and reported to the Dean (Research).
- 7.1.4 Author order must be reviewed and, if necessary, re-agreed whenever contributions materially change, and in any event before submission.

7.2 Contribution statements

- 7.2.1 LIHE adopts the CRediT (Contributor Roles Taxonomy) as its standard for describing contributions. A CRediT statement must be prepared for every multi-author output and included in the output where the publisher permits.

7.3 Acknowledgements

- 7.3.1 Persons who contributed to the research but who do not meet the criteria for authorship must be acknowledged, with a brief description of the nature of the contribution.
- 7.3.2 The written consent of a person must be obtained before that person is named in an acknowledgement.

7.4 Affiliation

- 7.4.1 Staff and candidates must state their LIHE affiliation on all research outputs produced during their employment or candidature, in the form: "Lincoln Institute of Higher Education, Sydney, Australia".
- 7.4.2 Affiliation must not be stated in a manner that misrepresents the standing or type of the provider. In accordance with section 108 of the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011 (Cth), LIHE must not describe itself as a university.
- 7.4.3 Authors are required to register for and maintain an ORCID iD and to associate it with their LIHE affiliation.

8. Publication and communication of research outputs

8.1 Expectations of candidates

- 8.1.1 The assessable output of the Master of Information Technology (Research) is the thesis examined in MITR106. Publication is not a requirement for completion of the course, and no candidate will be disadvantaged in examination or progression by a decision not to publish.



8.1.2 LIHE nonetheless strongly encourages candidates to disseminate their work, and expects every candidate to communicate their research at least once to an audience beyond their supervisory team during candidature. This expectation is satisfied by, and is assessed through, the following elements of the course:

Point in candidature	Communication requirement
MITR103 (Trimester 3)	Presentation of the research proposal at Confirmation of Candidature before a panel that includes a member independent of the supervisory team.
MITR104 / MITR105 (milestone subjects)	Presentation of progress at the LIHE Research Seminar Series, which is open to all staff and candidates.
MITR106 (thesis)	A public research seminar on the completed work, which is a hurdle requirement of the subject.
On completion	Deposit of the examined thesis in the LIHE Research Repository, subject to any approved embargo under clause 8.5.

8.2 How LIHE supports candidates to publish

8.2.1 LIHE provides the following support for the publication and dissemination of candidate research:

- **Curriculum.** MITR102 and MITR103 include instruction in scholarly writing, literature synthesis, venue selection, responding to peer review, and research communication for non-specialist audiences.
- **Supervision.** The Principal Supervisor is required to discuss publication opportunities with the candidate at least once each trimester, and to record the outcome of that discussion in the candidate's progress report.
- **Library and information services.** The Library provides guidance on venue selection and quality, including the use of Scopus, Web of Science, the CORE conference ranking and Scimago journal quartiles, and on identifying and avoiding predatory publishers.
- **Research Seminar Series and Colloquium.** LIHE convenes a Research Seminar Series during each trimester and an annual Postgraduate Research Colloquium at which candidates present their work to staff, peers and invited external academics.
- **Financial support.** Candidates may apply to the Research Office for support towards conference registration and travel, and towards article processing charges for open access publication, in accordance with the annual research budget approved by the Academic Board. Applications are assessed by the Dean (Research) against published criteria.
- **Repository and open access.** The LIHE Research Repository provides a permanent, openly accessible record of theses and of accepted manuscripts, where permitted by the publisher.
- **Editorial and integrity support.** The Research Office provides pre-submission review of manuscripts on request, including similarity checking and a check of compliance with this Policy.



8.3 Quality of publication venues

- 8.3.1 Staff and candidates must not submit research outputs to predatory publishers or to conferences that do not conduct genuine peer review.
- 8.3.2 Before submission, the author must satisfy themselves that the venue is indexed in a recognised database, or is otherwise demonstrably reputable, and that the peer review process is described transparently. Where an author is uncertain, advice must be sought from the Library or the Dean (Research).
- 8.3.3 LIHE will not reimburse charges levied by a venue that does not meet the requirements of this clause.
- 8.3.4 Simultaneous submission of the same output to more than one venue is prohibited. Deposit of a preprint is permitted where the intended venue allows it, and the preprint must be updated with the citation to the version of record once published.

8.4 Approval to publish

- 8.4.1 Approval by LIHE is not required to publish, except where the output:
 - Contains confidential information belonging to a third party or a research partner;
 - May be the subject of an application for a patent or other registrable right;
 - Arises from research subject to a funding agreement or contract that imposes a publication condition; or
 - Makes a statement on behalf of LIHE, as distinct from the authors.
- 8.4.2 In those cases the author must obtain the written approval of the Dean (Research) before submission. The Dean (Research) must decide within ten (10) working days of receiving a complete request, and must give reasons where approval is refused or conditions are imposed.

8.5 Theses, embargo and restriction of access

- 8.5.1 The examined thesis is deposited in the LIHE Research Repository and made openly accessible.
- 8.5.2 A candidate may apply to the Dean (Research), with the support of the Principal Supervisor, for an embargo of up to twelve (12) months where open access would prejudice a pending publication, an application for intellectual property protection, a contractual confidentiality obligation, or the safety or privacy of a person. An embargo of longer than twelve (12) months requires the approval of the Research Committee.
- 8.5.3 An embargo delays public access to the thesis; it does not affect examination, the award of the qualification, or the retention of the thesis by LIHE.



9. Recording of research outputs

- 9.1 All research outputs authored by staff and candidates must be recorded in the LIHE Research Outputs Register, maintained by the Research Office within the Research Management System.
- 9.2 The corresponding author must notify the Research Office within twenty (20) working days of acceptance of an output, providing the full citation, the digital object identifier where available, the CRediT statement, and the accepted manuscript for deposit.
- 9.3 The Research Office reports on research outputs to the Research Committee each trimester, and to the Academic Board annually.
- 9.4 Authorship and Contribution Agreements, contribution statements, and records of authorship disputes are retained for a minimum of seven (7) years from the date of the last action, in accordance with the Data and Records Integrity Policy and Procedures. Where a research output relates to clinical or community research, or where an allegation of a breach has been made, records are retained for such longer period as the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2018) or applicable legislation requires.

10. Resolution of authorship disputes

This clause gives effect to Standard 4.2.1g of the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021, which requires research training to be guided by a policy framework designed to achieve the resolution of disputes.

10.1 Principles governing the resolution of disputes

- Disputes are resolved at the earliest stage and at the lowest level possible.
- Each party is entitled to be heard, to see the material relied on in reaching a decision, and to be given written reasons for the decision.
- Each party may be accompanied by a support person at any meeting held under this clause. A support person may be a fellow candidate, a staff member, a student representative or an advocate, but may not be a practising lawyer acting in a professional capacity.
- No person may decide a matter in which they have a conflict of interest, or in which they are a party. Where a conflict arises, the Dean (Research) appoints an alternate decision-maker of at least equivalent seniority; where the conflict concerns the Dean (Research), the Chair of the Academic Board appoints the alternate.
- The candidature, supervision, assessment, progression or employment of a person must not be adversely affected because that person has raised, or participated in, a dispute in good faith. Any such detriment is itself a matter for the Research Integrity and Misconduct Policy and Procedure.
- Matters are dealt with confidentially, and information is disclosed only to those who need it to resolve the dispute or to meet a legal obligation.
- Where an output has been submitted for publication, the corresponding author must notify the publisher that authorship is in dispute, and must not proceed to publication until the dispute is resolved or the Dean (Research) directs otherwise.



10.2 Stage 1 — Local resolution by the Principal Supervisor

- 10.2.1 A person who considers that a dispute has arisen concerning authorship should first raise the matter directly with the other parties.
- 10.2.2 Where the matter is not resolved directly, or where direct discussion is not appropriate, the person raises the matter with the Principal Supervisor, in writing or orally.
- 10.2.3 The Principal Supervisor must convene the parties, seek to resolve the matter by agreement, and record the outcome in writing using the Authorship and Contribution Agreement at Appendix A. The Principal Supervisor must complete this stage within ten (10) working days of the matter being raised.
- 10.2.4 Where the Principal Supervisor is a party to the dispute, or has a conflict of interest, the matter is raised instead with the Associate Supervisor, or is referred directly to Stage 2.
- 10.2.5 The Principal Supervisor must notify the Dean (Research) of the outcome of Stage 1 for recording under clause 10.8, whether or not the matter was resolved.

10.3 Stage 2 — Formal determination by the Dean

- 10.3.1 A party who is dissatisfied with the outcome of Stage 1, or whose matter was not resolved within the Stage 1 period, may lodge a written complaint with the Dean (Research) within twenty (20) working days of the Stage 1 outcome.
- 10.3.2 The complaint must identify the output, the parties, the contribution claimed, and the outcome sought, and must attach any relevant evidence including drafts, correspondence, version histories, code repositories and laboratory or project records.
- 10.3.3 The Dean (Research) must acknowledge the complaint within five (5) working days, give each party a reasonable opportunity to respond in writing and to be heard, and make a determination within fifteen (15) working days of acknowledgement.
- 10.3.4 The Dean (Research) may determine the composition of the author list and the author order, direct that a contribution statement be amended, direct that an acknowledgement be made, direct that submission be deferred, or refer the matter to Stage 3 or to clause 10.9.
- 10.3.5 The determination must be given to each party in writing, with reasons, and must state the right of review under clause 10.4.

10.4 Stage 3 — Review by the Research Committee

- 10.4.1 A party who is dissatisfied with the determination of the Dean (Research) may apply in writing to the Chair of the Research Committee for review within ten (10) working days of receiving the determination.
- 10.4.2 The Chair convenes an Authorship Review Panel of three (3) members, comprising:
 - 10.4.3 A member of the Research Committee, who chairs the Panel;
 - 10.4.4 One senior academic with higher degree by research supervision experience who has had no prior involvement in the matter; and
 - 10.4.5 One member external to LIHE with research expertise in a cognate discipline.



10.4.6 Where the dispute involves a candidate, the Panel must include a person nominated to represent the interests of candidates, who may attend and be heard but who does not vote.

10.4.7 The Panel conducts a full review on the merits, may seek further information, and must give each party the opportunity to be heard. The Panel must determine the matter within twenty (20) working days of the application being received.

10.4.8 The determination of the Panel is the final internal decision of LIHE. It is provided to each party in writing with reasons, and is reported to the Research Committee and to the Academic Board.

10.5 Summary of stages and timeframes

Stage	Decision-maker	How initiated	Time to initiate	Time to decide
Stage 1	Principal Supervisor (or Associate Supervisor where conflicted)	Raised orally or in writing by any party	As soon as the dispute arises	10 working days
Stage 2	Dean (Research)	Written complaint	20 working days from Stage 1 outcome	5 working days to acknowledge; 15 working days to determine
Stage 3	Authorship Review Panel of the Research Committee	Written application for review	10 working days from Stage 2 determination	20 working days
External	National Student Ombudsman; TEQSA; Australian Research Integrity Committee (where applicable)	Direct application by the person	As specified by the external body	As determined by the external body

10.5.1 A time period under this clause may be extended by the decision-maker where the complexity of the matter or the availability of the parties reasonably requires it. Any extension must be notified to the parties in writing, with reasons, before the original period expires, and must specify the new date.

10.6 External avenues

10.6.1 Nothing in this Policy limits the right of a person to seek review or assistance externally. A candidate who has exhausted the internal process, or whose matter has not been dealt with within the stated timeframes, may complain to the National Student Ombudsman. Concerns may also be raised with the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency, and, where the research is funded by the National Health and Medical Research Council or the Australian Research Council, with the Australian Research Integrity Committee.

10.6.2 LIHE provides the contact details of these bodies in the Student Information – MIT (Research) Handbook and on its website, and does not require a person to exhaust the internal process before seeking external advice.



10.7 Recording and reporting

- 10.7.1 The Dean maintains a confidential Authorship Disputes Register recording the date each dispute was raised, the stage at which it was resolved, the timeframes met, the outcome, and any systemic issue identified.
- 10.7.2 A de-identified summary is reported to the Research Committee each trimester and to the Academic Board annually, together with any recommendation for amendment of this Policy or for additional training.

10.8 Relationship to research misconduct

- 10.8.1 Where, at any stage, the decision-maker forms the view that the conduct in question may constitute a breach of the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2018) — including gift, guest or ghost authorship, misrepresentation of contribution, or the deliberate exclusion of an eligible author — the decision-maker must refer the matter to the Dean (Research) as Research Integrity Officer for assessment under the Research Integrity and Misconduct Policy and Procedure.
- 10.8.2 A referral under clause 10.9.1 suspends the process under this clause until the research integrity assessment is concluded. The parties must be notified in writing of the referral and of the suspension.

11. Roles and responsibilities

Role	Responsibility under this Policy
Academic Board	Approves this Policy; receives annual reporting on research outputs and authorship disputes; assures itself that the Policy is operating effectively.
Research Committee	Recommends this Policy to the Academic Board; convenes the Authorship Review Panel under clause 10.5; monitors trends in disputes; approves embargoes beyond twelve months.
Dean (Research)	Owns this Policy; determines disputes at Stage 2; acts as Research Integrity Officer; approves publication where required under clause 8.4; maintains the Authorship Disputes Register; approves conference, travel and open access support.
Research Office	Maintains the Research Outputs Register and the Research Repository; provides pre-submission review; delivers authorship training within induction.
Principal Supervisor	Initiates the Authorship and Contribution Agreement at the start of each collaboration; discusses publication with the candidate each trimester; resolves disputes at Stage 1; ensures the candidate is not disadvantaged for raising a concern.
Associate Supervisor	Supports the candidate in authorship and publication matters; acts at Stage 1 where the Principal Supervisor is conflicted.



Role	Responsibility under this Policy
Candidates and staff	Comply with this Policy; complete the required training; agree authorship in writing and update it as contributions change; disclose conflicts of interest and the use of generative artificial intelligence tools.
Library	Advises on venue quality and indexing; supports open access deposit; maintains guidance on identifying predatory publishers.

12. Training and induction

12.1 Instruction in this Policy forms a compulsory component of the induction to research undertaken by every candidate and every supervisor, in accordance with the Code of Conduct for Graduate Research and the research training policy framework.

12.2 Candidates complete the research integrity training module, which includes authorship, publication ethics and the avoidance of predatory publishing, in Trimester 1 within MITR101 and before commencing any research involving data collection.

12.3 Supervisors complete authorship and publication ethics training as a condition of accreditation under the Supervisor Accreditation Policy, and refresh that training at least every three (3) years.

Version History			
Version number:	Approved by:	Approval Date:	Revision Notes:
1.0	Academic Board	28/07/2026	NA

*Policy review date is 3 years from date of approval