

Subject: CMP1406037 - Your concern raised with TEQSA [SEC=OFFICIAL]
Date: Wednesday, December 17, 2025 at 4:28:39 PM Pacific Standard Time
From: TEQSA - Concerns <Concerns@teqsa.gov.au>
To: scott scottgraffius.com <scott@scottgraffius.com>
Attachments: image001.png, image002.png

OFFICIAL

Dear Scott Graffius,

Thank you for your email today in which you detail your concerns around research integrity and plagiarism by staff at the University of Sydney.

TEQSA's role as the national regulator is to ensure that registered higher education providers comply with their obligations under the Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF).

Concerns are a particularly important source of information for TEQSA to identify risks with higher education providers' compliance with their obligations.
The nature of the concerns you have raised is a priority for us.

We are carefully considering the information you provided, in addition to other information we have available, to determine the appropriate action. Where we identify material risks of non-compliance we will engage with the University of Sydney as necessary.

There are a range of [possible outcomes](#) of our assessment of a provider's compliance with their obligations. We generally do not advise individual complainants of specific regulatory action we may take with a provider, due to confidentiality obligations.
Thank you for bringing this matter to our attention. We will only contact you again if we need further information.

Please contact us at concerns@teqsa.gov.au if you have any questions and quote **CMP1406037**.

Kind regards,
Dale Wescombe

TEQSA Concerns

Risk and Compliance Group
Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency
[E:concerns@teqsa.gov.au](mailto:concerns@teqsa.gov.au)

 [@TEQSAGov](#) | www.teqsa.gov.au/

TEQSA

TEQSA acknowledges the Traditional Owners of Country throughout Australia and their continuing connection to land, waters and community. We pay our respects to their Cultures, Country and Elders past, present and emerging
Classification: OFFICIAL
Classified by: enquiries@teqsa.gov.au on: 18/12/2025 6:27:46 AM

From: scott scottgraffius.com <scott@scottgraffius.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 18, 2025 5:37 AM

To: TEQSA - Enquiries <Enquiries@teqsa.gov.au>

Subject: FW: University of Sydney Faculty Commit Egregious Plagiarism and Copyright Infringement – Institutional Whitewash Rejected in Full [Formerly Titled: Notice to European Society of Medicine and Offending Authors: Infringement of Scott M. Graffius' ...]

TEQSA,

An anonymous person remarked that I should have included you on my 9 December 2025 email. So, I am forwarding it to you here. If you have any questions or if you need any additional information about this consequential matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Scott M. Graffius

From: "scott scottgraffius.com" <scott@scottgraffius.com>

Date: Tuesday, December 9, 2025 at 11:36 AM

To: "research.integrity@sydney.edu.au" <research.integrity@sydney.edu.au>

Cc: "info.centre@sydney.edu.au" <info.centre@sydney.edu.au>, "vice.chancellor@sydney.edu.au" <vice.chancellor@sydney.edu.au>, "info.centre@sydney.edu.au" <info.centre@sydney.edu.au>, "legal@sydney.edu.au" <legal@sydney.edu.au>, "rachel.fergus@sydney.edu.au" <rachel.fergus@sydney.edu.au>, "gregory.miskelly@sydney.edu.au" <gregory.miskelly@sydney.edu.au>, "clare.masters@sydney.edu.au" <clare.masters@sydney.edu.au>, "chancellor@sydney.edu.au" <chancellor@sydney.edu.au>, "media.office@sydney.edu.au" <media.office@sydney.edu.au>, "records.online@sydney.edu.au" <records.online@sydney.edu.au>, "internal.audit@sydney.edu.au" <internal.audit@sydney.edu.au>, "aric@arc.gov.au" <aric@arc.gov.au>, "aric@nhmrc.gov.au" <aric@nhmrc.gov.au>, "integrity@nhmrc.gov.au" <integrity@nhmrc.gov.au>, "caudit@caudit.edu.au" <caudit@caudit.edu.au>, "info@copyright.org.au" <info@copyright.org.au>, "team@retractionwatch.com" <team@retractionwatch.com>, "editorialteam@esmed.org" <editorialteam@esmed.org>

Subject: University of Sydney Faculty Commit Egregious Plagiarism and Copyright Infringement – Institutional Whitewash Rejected in Full [Formerly Titled: Notice to European Society of Medicine and Offending Authors: Infringement of Scott M. Graffius' ...]

NOTE: THIS EMAIL AND ADDITIONAL RELATED INFORMATION ARE ALL PROVIDED IN THE ATTACHED PDF. PLEASE READ IT.

Susan Maastricht / The University of Sydney:

Your letter dated 8 December 2025 is an institutional masterclass in how to trivialize, excuse, and whitewash blatant, systematic, word-for-word plagiarism and copyright infringement while pretending to uphold academic integrity. It is cowardly, disingenuous, and an insult to all honest researchers worldwide.

Your "Outcome of Preliminary Assessment" is a calculated—yet miserably failed—exercise in damage-control and reputational laundering for intellectual thieves.

For the benefit of readers who may not yet be familiar with the case, background information follows.

Here's a brief description of my copyrighted 'Phases of Team Development' property.

Informed by the research of Bruce W. Tuckman and Mary Ann C. Jensen, over 100 subsequent studies, and my first-hand professional experience with, and analysis of, team leadership and performance, I created my 'Phases of Team Development' as a unique perspective and visual conveying the five phases of team development—Forming, Storming, Norming, Performing, and Adjourning—inclusive of a graph showing how performance varies by phase, as well as the characteristics and strategies for each phase.

I initially developed my material in 2008, and I periodically (typically, annually) refresh it.

Organizations around the world engage me to deliver compelling talks and workshops. To date, I've presented sessions at 96 conferences and other events across 25 countries, including Armenia, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hong Kong, Hungary, India, Ireland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, and the United States.

My 'Phases of Team Development' intellectual property is central and key to many of those sessions.

With authorization/license from me, my 'Phases of Team Development' copyright property is featured and relied upon by businesses, professional associations, government agencies, and universities around the world. Examples include: Adobe, American Management Association, Amsterdam Public Health Research Institute, Bayer, Boston University, Broadcom, Cisco, Deimos Aerospace, DevOps Institute, Finland Government, Ford Motor Company, FSU College of Medicine, Hasso-Plattner-Institut für Digital Engineering, Hochschule Coburg, IEEE, Johns Hopkins University, Life Sciences Trainers & Educators Network, Manufacturers Alliance, Microsoft, National Science Foundation's LTER Network, Oracle, Singapore Institute of Technology, TBS Switzerland, Tufts University, United States National Park Service, United States Tennis Association, UC San Diego, University of Galway Ireland, University of Waterloo, Virginia Tech, Warsaw University, Yale University, and many others.

I am vigilant in upholding, protecting, and enforcing my intellectual property rights.

Here's a brief description of the infringing paper.

- Title of the infringing paper: Achieving the unachievable: the development of a large-scale interprofessional education workshop for first-year health professional students
- Names and affiliated institutions of the offending authors as listed on the infringing paper:
 - Jacqueline Bloomfield - The University of Sydney Susan Wakil School of Nursing and Midwifery, Faculty of Medicine and Health, Sydney, Australia.
 - Christie van Diggele - Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.
 - Astrid Frotjold - The University of Sydney Susan Wakil School of Nursing

- and Midwifery, Faculty of Medicine and Health, Sydney, Australia.
- Carl Schneider - The University of Sydney School of Pharmacy, Faculty of Medicine and Health, Sydney, Australia.
- Rosa Howard - The University of Sydney School of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine and Health, Sydney, Australia.
- Christopher Roberts - Honorary Professor of Medical Education, The University of Sydney School of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine and Health, Sydney, Australia.
- Stuart Lane - The University of Sydney Medical School, Head of Intensive Care Medicine, Sydney Medical School, Australia; Senior Staff Specialist in Intensive Care Medicine, Nepean Hospital.
- Publication date for the offending paper: 26 March 2024
- Link to the offending paper: <https://esmed.org/MRA/mra/article/view/5118>
- 'How to cite' information exactly as noted by the publisher: BLOOMFIELD, Jacqueline et al. Achieving the unachievable: the development of a large-scale interprofessional education workshop for first-year health professional students. Medical Research Archives, [S.I.], v. 12, n. 3, mar. 2024. ISSN 2375-1924. Available at: <<https://esmed.org/MRA/mra/article/view/5118>>.
- Note: As detailed in this letter, due to the egregious offenses of the authors, the publisher—The European Society of Medicine—executed the rarest of all options: the publisher removed (deleted) the infringing paper.

Back to addressing your fanciful letter dated 8 December 2025.

1. You admit the infringement.

You state that my 2019 copyrighted property should have been cited and acknowledged.

You further concede that the failure to do so constitutes a significant departure from academic practice and a possible breach of your own Research Code.

That is the entire case. Everything else in your letter is noise designed to deflect from the fact that lead author Jacqueline Bloomfield (her name is listed first in the offending paper) and other authors, which includes those also at The University of Sydney, used my copyrighted property verbatim, without permission, without quotation or attribution, deceitfully passing the work off as their own scholarly contribution in a peer-reviewed journal. That is plagiarism. And a violation of my intellectual property rights. Full stop.

2. Your some-authors-didn't-see-the-final-manuscript excuse is contemptible.

The respective publisher, The European Society of Medicine, requires ethical conduct of those submitting works for publication. Its Publication Ethics (<https://esmed.org/ethics-statement/>) states, among other requirements, that authors who use the work or words of others must properly cite or quote them; submitting plagiarized work is unacceptable. It also requires that all co-authors must see and approve the final version and agree to its submission.

You attempt to mitigate collective accountability by claiming that not all authors reviewed the final version before it was submitted. That is irrelevant, self-serving fiction collapses the moment one remembers Clause 12(9) of your own Code, which you yourself quote: "all listed authors are considered collectively accountable for the whole research output."

The offending authors chose to put their names on the paper. They chose to accept authorship credit. They have authorship responsibility. Trying to hide behind we-didn't-all-read-it (even if that was true, though that is not believable) is the academic equivalent of a bank robber saying, "I only drove the getaway car, I never went inside."

3. Your take that the violation is only a "moderate breach" is absurd.

My copyright ownership details are integrated into and appear on my copyrighted "Phases of Team Development" property. Specifically, it reads: "Copyright © 2008-2019 Scott M. Graffius. All rights reserved. For permission requests, contact scott@scottgraffius.com." The offending authors neither requested nor received permission to use my copyrighted property. Yet, in blatant plagiarism and copyright infringement, the offending authors engaged in extensive misuse of my intellectual property, including numerous instances of flagrant word-for-word copying. Further, the offending authors brazenly misused my protected property without attribution to me, thereby willfully misleading others as to the ownership of my work. For the aforementioned reasons, the offending authors' misuse of my intellectual property was absolutely not "fair dealing" nor "fair use" nor "fair practice" nor otherwise allowed. The offending authors clearly plagiarized my protected property and infringed on my copyright. As a legal note, the offending authors acted in violation of law under Australia's *Copyright Act 1968*, as well as the U.S. *Copyright Act of 1976*, which is enforceable in Australia pursuant to the Berne Convention.

The offending authors engaged in extensive misuse of my intellectual property, including numerous instances of blatant word-for-word copying. Their infringement is massive and pervasive. Here are some examples.

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **"Questioning"**
- Offending authors' infringing 2024 paper has: **"Questioning"**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **"Socializing"**
- Offending authors' infringing 2024 paper has: **"Socialising"**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **"Displaying eagerness"**
- Offending authors' infringing 2024 paper has: **"Displaying eagerness"**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **"Focusing on group identity & purpose"**
- Offending authors' infringing 2024 paper has: **"Focusing on group identity and purpose"**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **"Sticking to safe topics"**
- Offending authors' infringing 2024 paper has: **"Sticking to safe topics"**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **"Taking the 'lead'"**
- Offending authors' infringing 2024 paper has: **"Taking the 'lead'"**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **“Providing clear expectations and consistent instructions”**
- Offending authors’ infringing 2024 paper has: **“Providing clear expectations and consistent instructions”**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **“Quick response times”**
- Offending authors’ infringing 2024 paper has: **“Quick response times”**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **“Resistance”**
- Offending authors’ infringing 2024 paper has: **“Resistance”**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **“Lack of participation”**
- Offending authors’ infringing 2024 paper has: **“Lack of participation”**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **“Conflict”**
- Offending authors’ infringing 2024 paper has: **“Conflict”**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **“Competition”**
- Offending authors’ infringing 2024 paper has: **“Competition”**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **“High emotions”**
- Offending authors’ infringing 2024 paper has: **“High emotions”**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **“Starting to move towards group norms”**
- Offending authors’ infringing 2024 paper has: **“Starting to move towards group norms”**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **“Normalizing matters”**
- Offending authors’ infringing 2024 paper has: **“Normalizing matters”**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **“Encouraging leadership”**
- Offending authors’ infringing 2024 paper has: **“Encouraging leadership”**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **“Reconciliation”**
- Offending authors’ infringing 2024 paper has: **“Reconciliation”**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **“Relief, lowered anxiety”**
- Offending authors’ infringing 2024 paper has: **“Relief, lowered anxiety”**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **"Members are engaged & supportive"**
- Offending authors' infringing 2024 paper has: **"Members are engaged and supportive"**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **"Developing cohesion"**
- Offending authors' infringing 2024 paper has: **"Developing cohesion"**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **"Recognizing individual and group efforts"**
- Offending authors' infringing 2024 paper has: **"Recognising individual and group efforts"**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **"Providing learning opportunities and feedback"**
- Offending authors' infringing 2024 paper has: **"Providing learning opportunities and feedback"**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **"Monitoring the 'energy' of the group"**
- Offending authors' infringing 2024 paper has: **"Monitoring the 'energy' of the group"**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **"Demonstrations of interdependence"**
- Offending authors' infringing 2024 paper has: **"Demonstrations of interdependence"**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **"Healthy system"**
- Offending authors' infringing 2024 paper has: **"Healthy system"**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **"Ability to effectively produce as a team"**
- Offending authors' infringing 2024 paper has: **"Ability to effectively produce a team"**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **"Balance of task and process orientation"**
- Offending authors' infringing 2024 paper has: **"Balance of task and process orientation"**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **"Celebrating"**
- Offending authors' infringing 2024 paper has: **"Celebrating"**

- My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **"'Guide from the side' (minimal intervention)"**
- Offending authors' infringing 2024 paper has: **"'Guide from the side' (minimal intervention)"**

● My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **“Encouraging group decision-making and problem-solving”**

● Offending authors’ infringing 2024 paper has: **“Encouraging group decision making and problem solving”**

● My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **“Providing opportunities to share learning across teams”**

● Offending authors’ infringing 2024 paper has: **“Providing opportunities to share learning across teams”**

● My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **“Shift to process orientation”**

● Offending authors’ infringing 2024 paper has: **“Shift to process orientation”**

● My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **“Sadness”**

● Offending authors’ infringing 2024 paper has: **“Sadness”**

● My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **“Recognition of team and individual efforts”**

● Offending authors’ infringing 2024 paper has: **“Recognition of team and individual efforts”**

● My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **“Recognizing change”**

● Offending authors’ infringing 2024 paper has: **“Recognising change”**

● My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **“Providing an opportunity for summative team evaluations”**

● Offending authors’ infringing 2024 paper has: **“Providing an opportunity for summative team evaluations”**

● My 2019 copyrighted property includes this: **“Providing an opportunity for acknowledgments”**

● Offending authors’ infringing 2024 paper has: **“Providing an opportunity for acknowledgements”**

As shown, the offending authors engaged in extensive misuse of my intellectual property, including numerous instances of blatant word-for-word copying. Their infringement is extensive, systematic, and egregious. The preceding listed some examples.

Publishers follow well-established, tiered responses when problems are discovered after publication. These actions are codified in COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics) guidelines. Below is the full spectrum of post-publication actions, arranged from least severe to most severe.

1. Do nothing – when a matter is unproven or trivial.
2. Editorial note/expression of concern – when there is a minor problem.
3. Corrigendum/erratum/addendum – when honest errors exist, and some action is needed.
4. Partial retraction – rare, when a paper has significant incorrect or unreliable information and said information must be removed.
5. Full retraction – still more rare, for when a paper contains plagiarism or other serious violations.
6. Removal (sometimes called deletion) – this is the rarest of all options, that nuclear option, reserved for the most egregious and extreme offenses, such as the ethical issue of plagiarism and the legal issue of copyright infringement.

Due to the egregious offenses of the authors, the publisher—The European Society of Medicine—executed the rarest of all options: the publisher removed (deleted) the infringing paper.

The European Society of Medicine demonstrated exemplary integrity and professionalism on this serious matter.

The facts clearly show that the violators at The University of Sydney executed plagiarism and copyright infringement that was extensive, systematic, and egregious. Your “moderate breach” characterization is comical and wrong. Your attempt to minimize the case is laughable and reveals that the real purpose of your “assessment” is to protect the reputations of The University of Sydney faculty at the expense of the victim.

4. You sadly attempt to spin and minimize the matter as the-paper-was-only-public-for-twelve-months.

So, your metric for the gravity of plagiarism is how long the thieves managed to get away with it before being caught? That is a jaw-dropping admission. By that logic, if the authors had successfully kept the journal online for five years, the breach would have been more serious? The damage is not measured by how long the infringing article was visible; it is measured by the fact that your faculty stole my protected intellectual property, published it under their own names, and derived professional benefit from it.

5. You unbelievably claim no evidence of institutional failures.

The original complaint made no mention of institutional failures. Yet somehow, you couldn’t resist bringing it up yourself—perhaps a Freudian slip revealing what you’d rather keep hidden.

Multiple academics from The University of Sydney plagiarized my copyrighted property and violated my intellectual property rights. Again, the offenders are:

- Jacqueline Bloomfield - The University of Sydney Susan Wakil School of Nursing and Midwifery, Faculty of Medicine and Health, Sydney, Australia.
- Christie van Diggele - Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.
- Astrid Frotjold - The University of Sydney Susan Wakil School of Nursing and Midwifery, Faculty of Medicine and Health, Sydney, Australia.
- Carl Schneider - The University of Sydney School of Pharmacy, Faculty of Medicine and Health, Sydney, Australia.
- Rosa Howard - The University of Sydney School of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine and

Health, Sydney, Australia.

- Christopher Roberts - Honorary Professor of Medical Education, The University of Sydney School of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine and Health, Sydney, Australia.
- Stuart Lane - The University of Sydney Medical School, Head of Intensive Care Medicine, Sydney Medical School, Australia; Senior Staff Specialist in Intensive Care Medicine, Nepean Hospital.

This matter demonstrates a cultural and supervisory failure on a spectacular scale at The University of Sydney. Pretending otherwise is institutional gaslighting.

And then there is the exquisite, almost operatic irony of Jacqueline Bloomfield, the lead author of the plagiarizing and infringing paper, having built part of her academic brand on lecturing the world about plagiarism and academic integrity. This is the same Jacqueline Bloomfield who, in 2021, solemnly warned in a paper[†] she co-wrote that, “Academic dishonesty is increasing in prevalence in universities globally.” Well, she’s clearly contributing to the disgraceful problem! Her paper also notes, “There is concern that nursing students who knowingly plagiarise or cheat may lack the attributes of integrity, honesty and trustworthiness required by the nursing profession, and subsequently carry dishonest behaviour into the workplace.” Just students? What about professors who, as plagiarists and violators of intellectual property rights, demonstrate a total lack of integrity, honesty, and trustworthiness? ([†]Source: Bloomfield, J. G., Crawford, T., & Fisher, M. (2021). Registered nurses understanding of academic honesty and the perceived relationship to professional conduct: Findings from a cross-sectional survey conducted in Southeast Asia. *Nurse Education Today*, 100, 104794. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2021.104794>).

The lead author on the infringing paper has written a sanctimonious sermon on why plagiarism is unethical, dangerous, and intolerable, while blatantly plagiarizing my work and brazenly infringing on my intellectual property rights.

The hypocrisy is breathtaking. The University of Sydney is not merely sheltering plagiarists; it is sheltering a serial public moralizer on plagiarism who cannot even abide by the standards she preaches in her own peer-reviewed articles. It’s world-class violation dressed up in a The University of Sydney gown.

6. Your proposed remedies are an international joke.

- Mandatory training on responsible research practices. My response: The same training these professors are supposed to deliver to students? They don’t need training; they need consequences.
- An “authorship agreement” for future papers. My response: As if the problem were paperwork rather than embodying and manifesting honesty, integrity, and ethics.
- If the infringing paper ever resurfaces, the violators should seek appropriate permission. My response: If the violators think they can launder their theft and damage into something ethical, they are mistaken.

None of these ridiculous and insufficient measures undoes the theft, none repairs the market harm, and none holds a single individual accountable. They are the administrative equivalent of thoughts and prayers.

The University of Sydney faculty committed deliberate, extensive, provable plagiarism and copyright infringement. Your assessment is a transparent attempt to sweep that misconduct under the rug while preserving the careers and reputations of the offenders. Your refusal to proceed to a further, formal investigation is itself a breach of academic duty and an act of institutional bad faith. I reject your findings.

The facts are that my copyright ownership details and permission request information are integrated into and appear on my 'Phases of Team Development' intellectual property. The offending authors—Jacqueline Bloomfield, Christie van Diggele, Astrid Frotjold, Carl Schneider, Rosa Howard, Christopher Roberts, and Stuart Lane—neither requested nor received permission to use my copyrighted property. Yet, in blatant plagiarism and copyright infringement, they engaged in extensive misuse of my protected property. Further, they brazenly misused my copyrighted property without attribution to me, thereby willfully misrepresenting the ownership of my intellectual property as their own work. Their violation was extensive, systematic, and egregious. The violators' actions are a textbook case of disgraceful, immoral, unethical, unprofessional, and illegal behaviour.

The proven violators negatively affected the potential market and value of my 'Phases of Team Development' intellectual property and related work. Intellectual property is a strategic asset that provides significant value. I rigorously maintain, enforce, and protect my intellectual property rights.

What the proven violators from The University of Sydney did was damaging, disgraceful, immoral, unethical, unprofessional, and illegal. Shockingly, you made the grave situation worse.

You had the duty and authority to do what was right. Instead, you chose to defend the proven offenders. By doing so, you've made yourself and The University of Sydney complicit in serious ethical and legal wrongdoing. It's a disgrace.

This serious situation requires transparency and action, not silence. That's why it will be escalated through every available and appropriate legal and regulatory channel and jurisdiction. Your letter will be an Exhibit in demonstrating that the University of Sydney knowingly shelters proven plagiarists and intellectual property violators and has zero intention of enforcing even basic standards of ethics and integrity. I expressly reserve all rights in this case.

Sincerely,

Scott M. Graffius

Attachments/accompanying information (**all included in the attached PDF; please read it**):

- **Report from Scott M. Graffius sent on 1 March 2025.**
- **Response from The University of Sydney received on 14 May 2025.**

Excerpts from the email:

"Thank you for your email below and I apologies for the delay in responding."

"We will be touch regarding an update on the matter as this progresses."

- **Follow-up from Scott M. Graffius sent on 7 December 2025.**

Excerpts from the email:

"David Thodey, Chancellor
Mark Scott, Vice-Chancellor & President
The University of Sydney

I reported this damaging, disgraceful, immoral, unethical, unprofessional, and illegal matter in March.

Two hundred eighty (280) calendar days have elapsed since then.

What has been done?!

I re-attached the PDF I provided with my original communiqué.

I expressly reserve all rights in this disturbing and consequential matter.”

- **Response from The University of Sydney received on 7 December 2025.**