

ACADEMIC SENATE

Circulated: 2 December 2011

Confirmed minutes of the special meeting 11/06 of the Academic Senate of the University of Western Sydney held on Friday 18 November 2011 at 9:30am in the Boardroom, Building AD, at Werrington North.

Present:

Associate Professor Paul Wormell (Chair)	Dr Trevor Bailey
Professor John Bartlett	Ms Robyn Benjamin
Professor Suzan Burton	Dr Carmel Coady
Associate Professor Hart Cohen	Dr Bronwyn Cole
Dr Sara Denize	Professor Gabriel Donleavy
Mr Ned Doyle	Professor Kevin Dunn
Professor Rhonda Griffiths	Dr Stephen Janes
Professor John Lodewijks	Mr Terry Mason
Ms Shaneen McGlinchey	Ms Robyn Moroney
Dr Loshini Naidoo	Professor Clive Smallman
Dr Meg Smith	Professor Deborah Sweeney
Dr Michael Tyler	Professor Margaret Heather Vickers

In Attendance:

Mr Martin Derby (Secretary)	Mr Marco Cimino
Mr James Fitzgibbon	Ms Helen Fleming
Ms Deirdre Lee	Mr Peter Spolc

Apologies:

Associate Professor Berice Anning	Professor Andrew Cheetham
Ms Liz Curach	Associate Professor Andrew Francis
Dr Betty Gill	Mr Elie Hammam
Associate Professor Mary Hawkins	Professor Annemarie Hennessy
Dr Adelma Hills	Mr Angelo Kourtis
Professor Kerri-Lee Krause	Professor Wayne McKenna
Professor Jan Reid	Professor Gary Smith
Dr John Stanton	

Absent:

Ms Soumaya Alaouie	Mr Robert Coluccio
Dr Swapan Saha	

1 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

1.1 INTRODUCTION, WELCOMES, FAREWELLS AND APOLOGIES

The Chair of Academic Senate Associate Professor Paul Wormell chaired the meeting of the Senate, and opened it by reading an Acknowledgment of the Traditional Owners, as follows:

“As a matter of Indigenous cultural protocol and out of recognition that its campuses occupy their traditional lands, the University of Western Sydney acknowledges the Darug, Gandangarra and Tharawal peoples and thanks them for their support of its work in Greater Western Sydney.”

It was noted that Associate Professor Craig Ellis, Associate Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education) was attending the meeting at the request of Professor Kerri-Lee Krause, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education), and Ms Helen Fleming was present for item 3.4 Student Misconduct – University Rule.

Apologies as listed were noted.

1.2 DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The Chair reported that he had a pecuniary interest in item 3.2 Leadership and Management changes, in relation to any Senate discussions on election arrangements. As the elected Chair of Academic Senate position was remunerated for the half-time role at a higher rate, he potentially was a beneficiary of a decision that would extend his term.

He said that in those circumstances, he would not participate in the discussion on election arrangements and would abstain in any vote.

If appropriate, he would relinquish the Chair for that discussion. He said that although other elected Senate members had an interest in what was decided in relation to election arrangements, this need not preclude them from participating in the debate.

No other members reported any conflict of interest in relation to agenda items.

1.3 STARRING OF ITEMS

No additional items were starred. Items already starred on the agenda were as follows:

- 3.1 Chair’s Report
- 3.2 UWS Leadership and Management Changes
- 3.3 Quality Management – AUQA Cycle 2
- 3.4 Student Misconduct – University Rule

It was resolved (AS11:06/01):

that the documents for all unstarred agenda items be noted and, except where alternative action is noted as appropriate, all recommendations contained in those items be endorsed.

1.4 ORDER OF BUSINESS

It was agreed to take item 3.4 Student Misconduct – University Rule at the start of the meeting.

1.5 OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

1.6 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Without discussion ...

It was resolved (AS11:06/02):

to confirm the minutes of the Senate meeting held on 28 October 2011 as an accurate record.

2 BUSINESS ARISING

2 BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

2.1 MINUTE 3.4 - ADVANCED STANDING POLICY

Without discussion ...

It was resolved (AS11:06/03):

To approve the addition of the heading and clause:

“Advanced Standing towards professionally accredited courses

(xx) Advanced standing for units in professionally accredited courses (eg Law, Nursing) can only be given for equivalent units that would satisfy the requirements for professional accreditation.”

...as an amendment to the Advanced Standing Policy (approved by the Academic Senate on 28 October 2011) effective from the date of publication of the revised Policy.

2.2 MINUTE 3.5 - CHANGES TO THE AWARD COURSES AND UNITS APPROVAL POLICY

Without discussion, it was noted that arrangements were being made for the revised *Award Courses and Units Approval Policy* to be published on the Policy DDS.

2.3 MINUTE 3.6 - CHANGES TO THE DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (POLITICAL AND SOCIAL THOUGHT) POLICY

Without discussion, it was noted that arrangements were being made for the revised *Doctor of Philosophy (Political and Social Thought) Policy* to be published on the Policy DDS.

2.4 MINUTE 3.7 - CHANGES TO THE *DOCTOR OF CULTURAL RESEARCH POLICY*

Without discussion, it was noted that arrangements were being made for the revised *Doctor of Cultural Research Policy* to be published on the Policy DDS.

3 GENERAL BUSINESS

3.1 CHAIR'S REPORT

The Chair provided an oral report, covering recent activities undertaken on behalf of the Senate since 28 October 2011, covering:

- His participation in University academic staff promotion committees.
- Work and meetings (including the Deans Forums) about the University restructure, leading to the Senate now considering the changes to its membership and terms of reference, and the latest draft of the *Academic Senate Standing Committees Policy*.
- Preparation of revised academic policies, including possible transitional policies pending the full implementation of new structures. For example, the existing College Academic Standards and Integrity committees (renamed Student Academic Misconduct Committees but with a very similar membership to the present committees) might need to be retained to operate the *Misconduct: Student Academic Misconduct Policy*. Changes to the *Award Courses and Units Approval Policy* would be predicated on the outcome of continuing discussions about academic delegations.
- Attendance at the National Conference of Chair and Secretaries of Academic Boards and Senates, which had discussed:
 - the roles Academic Boards would perform to assist universities to comply with the complex new regulatory system being developed under the auspices of TEQSA; and
 - the challenges of interpreting and implementing the new Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF). Particular concerns were the nature and volume of learning of Masters degrees; Graduate Diplomas, Graduate Certificates and, possibly, Postgraduate Diplomas; honours in four-year Bachelor awards, and federal funding for postgraduate awards such as the Master of Teaching, and sub-degree awards such as diplomas and associate degrees.

He asked Senate members to alert him to discussions that are taking place between University staff and professional bodies about AQF-related matters (e.g. the MBA, Honours in Engineering).

3.2 UWS LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT CHANGES

Senate had before it a paper from the Chair of Senate "UWS Leadership and Management Changes" containing revised versions of the *Academic Governance Policy*, and the *Academic Senate Standing Committees Policy*, updated to reflect recent and continuing discussions.

The Chair reported that following the Senate discussion, he proposed that the *Academic Governance Policy*, which had been placed on the Policy DDS for comment from the University community, would be referred to the Board of Trustees for approval.

Feedback from the Policy DDS had focused on the representation of the research institutes, and the larger schools, on Senate

In relation to the *Academic Governance Policy and the representation of Research Institutes* the following points were made:

- Despite one Policy DDS comment saying the opposite, it was suggested that Research Institutes were small, and despite their importance, it seemed inappropriate that each of them – and there were likely to be five – should be represented on the Senate. Research Institute representation might be limited to just one or two Senate members, perhaps on a rotational basis.
- It was suggested that as Research Institute staff were members of other Senate committees, at Senate, the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) should represent the Institutes.
- As the Research Institutes were small (the Hawkesbury Institute for the Environment was envisaged as having about 35 staff members), it might be burdensome for them to have as many as one member per Institute on the Senate, and if they did not attend meetings, Senate might find it harder to reach quorum.
- Research Institutes were separate to schools and would in due course, have responsibilities for research higher degree students and programs. It was therefore important that they be represented on Senate.
- It was unfortunate that the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic and Research) could not be present at the meeting, owing to prior commitments, to offer advice about the future development of the Research Institutes.

It was agreed that the *Academic Governance Policy* before Senate be amended to change the membership on Senate from Research Institutes from “the Director of each University Research Institute, or nominee;” to “two Directors, or their nominees, of University Research Institutes, elected by the Directors;”

In relation to the *Academic Governance Policy and the representation of larger schools*, the following points were made:

- It had been suggested that some larger schools should have more Senate members than smaller ones. Some universities had arrangements that provided for this, including the University of Sydney. Having greater representation from larger schools would increase the size of the Senate.
- At this stage, only estimates for the sizes of the new schools were available, and it was not straight forward to arrive at a formula to determine which schools would have additional Senate representation, and which would not. It was likely that four schools — Business; Science and Health; Humanities and Communication Arts;

and Computing, Engineering and Mathematics – would be larger than the other schools.

- A reasonably large Senate was desirable, to ensure that it could function as a forum for academic debate and discourse, but it was not clear that a form of proportional representation was necessary to produce a Senate that could operate effectively in this respect.
- It was not apparent what a big school would be doing that a small school would not, and why, therefore, a bigger school needed more voices to represent it. Better consultation and engagement by the elected representatives with their constituencies ought to be able to ensure that staff views were represented.
- Senate meetings would take longer if the numbers of Senate members was increased.
- Some schools – particularly the new School of Business – encompassed so many academic disciplines and professions that it was unreasonable to expect two elected members to represent the diverse range of interests in the School.
- The clause in the Policy about appointed members of Senate - “The appointed members of the Academic Senate are three members... whom the Vice-Chancellor may appoint, in consultation with the Chair of the Academic Senate, for the purposes of achieving gender balance, consistent with the Women's Representation on Committees Policy and an informed perspective on matters under consideration.” – might be used to ensure that larger schools had additional representation on the Senate. However, it was noted that these appointments were at the discretion of the Vice-Chancellor and neither Senate, nor the Chair of Senate could influence the Vice-Chancellor to use the positions in the manner under discussion.

The Chair asked Senate to vote on its preference for:

- school-elected representation of two staff per school, as in the *Academic Governance Policy* in the paper before Senate; or
- a proposal that in recommending the *Academic Governance Policy* to the Board of Trustees for approval, Senate request that once the size of the new schools is finalised, the schools with the largest academic staff numbers have additional representation, according to a formula based on school academic staff numbers.

Following a vote it was agreed that Senate's preference was for schools with the largest academic staff numbers to have additional representation.

The Chair asked Senate to consider the way that the changes to the membership of the Senate could be implemented, if the revised *Academic Governance Policy* was approved, so as to best ensure continuity. He suggested that it would be advantageous for the new Senate to be constituted early in 2012 once the Board of Trustees had approved the changes to the *Academic Governance Policy* as discussed, and elections should be held to effect this as soon as possible. However, which positions required new elections, and which should continue, required further discussion and consideration.

It was agreed that in relation to the transitional arrangements for establishing the new Academic Senate, elections be called as early as possible to fill the positions on the Senate elected by academic staff in schools and the Badanami Centre for Indigenous Education for two-year terms ending on 31 December 2013. Until these elections were completed in early 2012, the current elected members of Senate should continue in office.

Further, it was agreed that it would not be desirable to arrange new elections for the elected undergraduate and postgraduate student positions on the Senate, as student elections for the Board of Trustees, the Student Campus Councils, and the Senate itself had taken place in 2011.

(At this point Associate Professor Wormell relinquished the Chair in favour of the Academic Registrar because of his conflict of interest (see item 1.2) and neither he, nor the Deputy Chair of Senate, participated in the discussion.)

Similarly, though there were significant changes to the Senate, it was agreed that the positions of Chair and Deputy Chair of Academic Senate had not changed markedly, and accordingly, it would not be desirable or advantageous if new elections were called to fill these offices.

The Chair of Academic Senate, and the Deputy Chair of Academic Senate, and the elected undergraduate and postgraduate student members of the Senate should therefore continue to serve to the end of their current terms on 31 May 2013.

Associate Professor Wormell re-assumed the Chair.

In relation to the *Academic Senate Standing Committees Policy*, the Chair reported that following discussion, he intended to post the Policy on the Policy DDS with comments invited from the University community.

In discussion, the following points were made:

- The proposal for the Research Committee and the Research Studies Committee to have very small numbers of members was inappropriate. It was important that there be school representation on these committees, to ensure effective communication.
- The clause “Convene a Scholarship Ranking Panel to determine the ranking of applicants for Higher Degrees by Research recommended by the School Research and Higher Degrees committees” should be in the terms of reference of the Research Studies Committee, not the Research Committee.
- The proposed Honours Committee appeared deficient in that if honours degrees were seen as providing research training, the Committee needed to include in its membership a senior researcher. School honours coordinators were not necessarily researchers. The Committee would be expected to play an important role in providing advice about the AQF, and the Bologna-style degrees currently under consideration in the sector. It might be necessary for the Honours Committee to have a link to the Research Studies Committee, as well as the Education Committee.

- In relation to the Honours Committee, it was noted that some schools had honours coordinators for different disciplines, rather than one coordinator for the school. For some schools, the Director of Research might also take on the Honours Coordinator role. There was no University-approved job description for an honours coordinator.
- It was suggested that the proposed Curriculum Quality Committees were unwarranted, as schools should be given the delegation to approve units. It appeared that they were replacing the Education, Assessment and Progression Committees, and this appeared to go against the spirit of the leadership and management changes, which were intended to give the schools and their deans greater authority. Instead, School Academic Committees (SACs) should be given greater powers to approve units, with Associate Pro-Vice Chancellors (Education) being members. If SACs did not have these powers they became pointless.
- It was suggested that the Academic Planning and Courses Approvals Committee be advised by the Course Quality Committees in relation to new units only; changes to units would not then need to be referred upwards, but could be approved by SACs.
- Current existing school research committees advised heads of schools on a range of operational matters that pertained to research grants, budgets, and conference attendance. The proposed School Research and Higher Degree Committees, as academic governance committees, should not have jurisdiction over resource and staffing matters. In these circumstances, it appeared that the School Research and Higher Degree Committees needed to be management committees, rather than Senate committees; otherwise some duplication and overlap of committees within schools would occur, as separate committees were established.

It was agreed that a further iteration of the *Academic Senate Standing Committees Policy*, updated to reflect these discussions, would be published on the Policy DDS for comment from the University community. The Policy would then be considered again at the 9 December Senate meeting.

With the inclusion of the changes to the *Academic Governance Policy* in relation to the representation of research institutes and larger schools on Senate, as agreed...

It was resolved (AS11:06/04):

To recommend to the Board of Trustees that it approve the revised Academic Governance Policy, providing for changes to the terms of reference and membership of Academic Senate effective from 1 January 2012.

If so approved, the Board of Trustees also approve:

- *the calling of elections as early as is possible to fill the positions on the Academic Senate elected by academic staff in schools and the Badanami Centre for Indigenous Education for two-year terms ending on 31 December 2013;*

- *that until the time these elections are completed, the current elected members of Senate shall continue as members of the Senate;*
- *the continuance in office of the current elected Chair of Academic Senate, the elected Deputy Chair of Academic Senate, and the elected undergraduate and postgraduate student members of the Senate, to the end of their current terms on 31 May 2013.*

3.3 QUALITY MANAGEMENT - AUQA CYCLE 2

The Chair reported that the final AUQA report had been received by the University and would be released next week.

3.4 STUDENT MISCONDUCT – UNIVERSITY RULE

The Chair reported that the item followed on from the lively discussion of student academic misconduct at the previous meeting. Members had talked about the workloads associated with implementing the policy, and the difficulties many students appeared to have with adhering to appropriate academic conventions.

Senate had before it a paper “Student Misconduct @UWS – Background Paper for Discussion” prepared by, Ms Helen Fleming, University Legal Counsel.

Speaking to the paper, Ms Fleming said that she had begun a review of the University’s various student misconduct policies and related codes, with the aim of:

- streamlining processes, so that there were fewer steps, with more straightforward review / appeal mechanisms, and consequent speedier decision making than currently;
- clarifying roles and responsibilities for those who had to investigate and decide allegations of misconduct;
- providing greater flexibility for handling minor instances of misconduct, both academic and general (non-academic); and
- strengthening the University’s position if misconduct determinations were challenged by students and referred to the Ombudsman or external tribunals or courts.

The suggestion was for the current academic misconduct policy and the non-academic misconduct policy – which were both very procedural – to be combined into a single University rule, written in simplified, clearer language. This would in due course be accompanied by guidelines and supported by training.

In discussion, the following points were made:

- The volume of cases of misconduct was a major concern, and managing the workload through appropriate delegations and processes would be critical. The wording in the discussion paper implied that the Head of Unit or their nominee would be involved in considering all allegations, even minor misconduct allegations. It was noted that misconduct processes involved professional staff as well as academic staff and generally was not recognised in workloads. Moreover the processes were costly, necessitating extensive use of express post.
- The rule would need to define the disciplinary penalties that were available at each stage. Downgrading of marks for an assessment task – a penalty that could be given for proven minor misconduct – was potentially a very serious penalty as it might result in the student failing the unit and needing to retake it. A student's acknowledgement that they had done the wrong thing and admitting the allegation was correct was not in itself enough to make an offence a minor one. The student's level of experience might need to be taken into account, where some poor or inappropriate referencing, or over extensive sharing of work with other students, might be treated more leniently if the student was in the early stages of their studies. It would be important to define who determined whether misconduct was minor or substantial. Where misconduct was deemed minor, students needed to participate in a remediation process and be instructed about appropriate academic conventions. The process needed to be documented.
- Even proven minor academic misconduct might have very serious consequences for students who sought membership of professional bodies.
- The current version of the *Misconduct: Student Academic Misconduct Policy* had been introduced in December 2009 following a review. The changes had included the discontinuance of recognition of "inadvertent" plagiarism, and the removal thereby of the need to consider student intent when dealing with misconduct cases. It was suggested that it might be premature to change the Policy again, without trying to find out how effective some of the changes had been.
- There seemed to be no recognition that many academic staff now used Turnitin™ to determine whether the assignment content was original. With the production of a Turnitin™ report, followed afterwards by checking it, it was not apparent to say when misconduct had been detected, and this made it difficult to apply the timelines prescribed in the current policy.
- It was apparent that occasionally students had to answer allegations of academic misconduct for very trivial matters, for example omitting one citation, or making a small mistake in an annotated bibliography. This was highly stressful for students, and an inappropriate use of the Policy.

The Academic Registrar welcomed the initiative to simplify processes as likely to be better for students, but observed that whatever policy for managing misconduct was operated, it was important to ensure consistency across academic units, to provide appropriate training, and to keep reliable records.

It was agreed to ask Senate Education Committee's working party on the *Misconduct: Student Academic Misconduct Policy* to give advice and assistance to the University Legal Counsel during this review.

4 REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM SENATE COMMITTEES

4.1 SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

No report - the Senate Executive Committee had not met since the last Senate meeting.

4.2 RESEARCH COMMITTEE

No report – the Research Committee met on 4 October 2011 but the minutes were not yet available.

4.3 RESEARCH STUDIES COMMITTEE

Without discussion ...

It was resolved (AS11:06/05):

To note the minutes of the Research Studies Committee meeting held on 1 November 2011.

4.4 EDUCATION COMMITTEE

No report – the Education Committee met on 7 November 2011 but a report of the meeting was not yet available.

4.5 ACADEMIC PLANNING AND COURSES APPROVALS COMMITTEE

Without discussion ...

It was resolved (AS11:06/06):

To note the report of the Academic Planning and Courses Approvals Committee meeting held electronically between 7 and 9 November 2011, and ratify the recommendations contained therein.

(APCAC11: 08/02)

To approve the major course variation to 1640 Master of Arts Translation and Interpreting Studies, consisting of change to course structure to commence in Autumn 2012. TRIM reference: D11/502892

(APCAC11: 08/03)

To approve the major course variation to 1639 Master of Interpreting and Translation, consisting of change to course structure to commence in Autumn 2012. TRIM reference: D11/502885

(APCAC11: 08/04)

To approve the introduction of the new exit award, 1701 Graduate Diploma in Interpreting Studies (exit award only), to commence in Autumn 2012 at the Bankstown campus. TRIM reference: D11/502914

(APCAC11: 08/05)

To approve the introduction of the new exit award, 1702 Graduate Diploma in Translation Studies (exit award only), to commence in Autumn 2012 at the Bankstown campus. TRIM reference: D11/502928

(APCAC11: 08/06)

To approve the major course variation to 1638 Graduate Diploma in Translation, consisting of change to course structure to commence in Autumn 2012. TRIM reference: D11/502866

(APCAC11: 08/07)

To approve the major course variation to 1637 Graduate Diploma in Interpreting, consisting of change to course structure to commence in Autumn 2012. TRIM reference: D11/502860

(APCAC11: 08/08)

To approve the major course variation to 1602 Graduate Certificate in Interpreting and Translation, consisting of change to course structure to commence in Autumn 2012. TRIM reference: D11/502850

(APCAC11: 08/09)

To approve the major course variation to 1695 Bachelor of Arts Bachelor of Business and Commerce, consisting of renaming the existing 80 credit point major in Psychology, available at Bankstown campus only, as a major in Psychological Studies (M1050) available at Bankstown campus only, to commence in Autumn 2012. TRIM reference: D11/504271

(APCAC11: 08/10)

To approve the major course variation to 1651 Bachelor of Arts (Pathway to Teaching Primary), consisting of renaming the existing 80 credit point major in Psychology, available at Bankstown and Penrith only, as a major in Psychological Studies (M1050), available at Bankstown and Penrith only, listing of Psychological Studies major in list of available majors in the Handbook entry and removal of reference to key program in Psychology which students in 1651 could not complete and variation to the Education Studies Major (recoded as M1051), removing 101117 Learning Through Community Service (20 credit points, Level 3) and adding a new unit 101874 Experiential Learning in Communities (10 credit points, Level 2) to commence in Autumn 2012. TRIM reference: D11/504204

(APCAC11: 08/11)

To approve the major course variation to 1652 Bachelor of Arts (Pathway to Teaching Secondary), consisting of renaming the existing 80 credit point major in Psychology, available at Bankstown and Penrith only, as a major in Psychological Studies (M1050),

available at Bankstown and Penrith only, removal of the existing 40 credit point sub-major in Psychology, adding a 40 credit point Psychological Studies sub-major (SM1069) comprising 3 compulsory units and one elective unit from the pool of units in the Psychological Studies major and variation to the Education Studies Sub-Major (recoded as SM1067), removing 101117 Learning Through Community Service (20 credit points, Level 3) and adding a new unit 101874 Experiential Learning in Communities (10 credit points, Level 2), to commence in Autumn 2012. TRIM reference: D11/504229

(APCAC11: 08/12)

To approve the major course variation to 1604 Bachelor of Arts, consisting of including an identified key program of 200 credit points in Psychology (KT1000) comprising the 80 credit point core for the BA and 120 credit points of specified units in Psychology, Psychology key program to be named on students' transcripts, renaming the existing 80 credit point major in Psychology as a major in Psychological Studies (M1050), removal of existing 40 credit point sub-major in Psychology and adding a 40 credit point Psychological Studies sub-major (SM1069) comprising 3 compulsory units and one elective unit from the pool of units in the Psychological Studies major, to commence in Autumn 2012. TRIM reference: D11/503980

(APCAC11: 08/13)

To approve the major course variation to 1655 Bachelor of Arts (Dean's Scholars), consisting of including an identified key program of 200 credit points in Psychology (KT1000), comprising the 80 credit point core for the BA and 120 credit points of specified units in Psychology, Psychology key program to be named on students' transcripts, renaming the existing 80 credit point major in Psychology as a major in Psychological Studies (M1050), removal of the existing 40 credit point sub-major in Psychology and adding a 40 credit point Psychological Studies sub-major (SM1069) comprising 3 compulsory units and one elective unit from the pool of units in the Psychological Studies major to commence in Autumn 2012. TRIM reference: D11/504239

(APCAC11: 08/14)

To approve the major course variation to 1630 Graduate Diploma of Psychological Studies, consisting of addition of Penrith campus, change to Head of Program, updating curriculum mapping of graduate attributes and updating handbook, prospectus and UAC entries, to commence in Autumn 2012. TRIM reference: D11/468646

(APCAC11: 08/15)

To approve the introduction of the new unit set SM1069 Psychological Studies, to commence in Autumn 2012 at the Bankstown and Penrith campuses. TRIM reference: D11/504406

(APCAC11: 08/16)

To approve the introduction of the new unit set KT1000 Psychology, to commence in Autumn 2012 at the Bankstown and Penrith campuses. TRIM reference: D11/504373

(APCAC11: 08/17)

To approve the introduction of the new unit set M1050 Psychological Studies to commence in Autumn 2012 at the Bankstown and Penrith campuses. TRIM reference: D11/504388

4.6 BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Board of Trustees most recent meeting was held on 21 September 2011.

The next meeting is scheduled for 7 December 2011. Summaries of Board of Trustees meetings, and minutes of Board of Trustees meetings, are available on the web-site at: <http://www.uws.edu.au/boardoftrustees>.

5 FOR INFORMATION

No items.

6 NEXT MEETING

The next Academic Senate meeting is arranged for Friday 9 December 2011. This meeting would consider a revised draft of the *Academic Senate Standing Committees Policy*, for implementation in 2012.

Senate meeting dates for 2012 are as follows:

- Friday 24 February
- Friday 27 April (date to be changed)
- Friday 22 June
- Friday 17 August
- Friday 26 October
- Friday 7 December (provisional meeting - to be held if necessary)

All the meetings start at 9.30 AM, and will be held in the Board Room, Building AD, at Werrington North.