

ACADEMIC SENATE

Circulated: 1 September 2011

Confirmed minutes of meeting 11/04 of the Academic Senate of the University of Western Sydney held on Friday 19 August 2011 at 9:30am in the Boardroom, Building AD, at Werrington North.

Present:

Associate Professor Paul Wormell (Chair)	Dr Trevor Bailey
Professor John Bartlett	Professor Stuart Campbell
Professor Andrew Cheetham	Dr Carmel Coady
Associate Professor Hart Cohen	Dr Bronwyn Cole
Ms Liz Curach	Dr Sara Denize
Professor Gabriel Donleavy	Mr Ned Doyle
Professor Kevin Dunn	Associate Professor Craig Ellis
Associate Professor Andrew Francis	Dr Betty Gill
Professor Rhonda Griffiths	Associate Professor Mary Hawkins
Dr Adelma Hills	Professor John Ingleson
Dr Stephen Janes	Professor John Lodewijks
Mr Terry Mason	Ms Shaneen McGlinchey
Dr Loshini Naidoo	Dr Meg Smith
Dr John Stanton	Professor Deborah Sweeney
Dr Michael Tyler	Professor Margaret Heather Vickers

In Attendance:

Mr Martin Derby (Secretary)	Mr James Fitzgibbon
Ms Deirdre Lee	

Apologies:

Professor Suzan Burton	Professor Annemarie Hennessy
Ms Robyn Moroney	Professor Jan Reid
Professor Clive Smallman	Professor Gary Smith

Absent:

Associate Professor Berice Anning	Professor Branko Celler
Mr Robert Coluccio	Mr Elie Hammam
Professor Wayne McKenna	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.”

The Chair welcomed to their first Senate meeting:

- Associate Professor Hart Cohen, who had been appointed acting Head of the School of Communication Arts until 25 November 2011;
- Professor Gabriel Donleavy, Deputy Chair of Academic Senate;
- Ms Shaneen McGlinchey, who was Acting Registrar;
- Mr Terry Mason, elected member of Senate from the Badanami Centre for Indigenous Education; and
- Associate Professor John Stanton who had been appointed acting Head of the School of Marketing.

This was the last meeting for Professor Stuart Campbell, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching), who was retiring in September. On behalf of the Senate, the Chair acknowledged his energetic, scholarly and wise leadership, highlighting his role as Senate Education Committee Chair, Chair of the former Courses Approvals and Articulations Committee, and involvement in, and leadership of, initiatives in assessment policy, first-year transition and retention, academic literacy, mathematical skilling, and Badanami and Indigenous education. He noted that Professor Campbell had been a strong advocate for Senate and collegial decision-making within the University, and wished him well in the next phase of his scholarly career.

This was the last meeting for Professor John Ingleson, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International and Development), who was retiring in September. On behalf of the Senate, the Chair acknowledged the immense breadth and depth of experience he had brought to UWS, and his knowledge and understanding of the university sector here and elsewhere in the world. His contributions had included leading the development of the University's research profile, building partnerships with overseas universities, and working for social inclusion in Greater Western Sydney, through his effective advocacy for UWS College. Professor Ingleson had chaired the Academic Planning and Courses Approval Committee (APCAC), promoting strategic discussion, and made many clear, cogent and valuable contributions to debates at Senate. The Chair wished Professor Ingleson well in retirement.

Though he was not present, this was the last meeting for Professor Branko Celler, Executive Dean, Health and Science, who was standing down from the role from 1 September 2011 to take on an advisory and project development role on a part-time basis. The Chair wished Professor Celler well in this new role, acknowledging his contributions to the University's research activity, his capacity to promote a broad range of disciplines, including health, medicine, engineering, IT, plant and environmental science, and the importance to the University of the comprehensive review of science courses that he had brought about.

Apologies as listed were noted.

1.2 DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

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

1.3 STARRING OF ITEMS

It was agreed to star item 3.9 Changes to the *Doctor in Cultural Research Policy* as well as the items already starred, as follows:

- 3.2 UWS Leadership and Management Changes
- 3.3 Quality Management – AUQA Cycle 2 Audit
- 3.4 Academic Senate Work Plan 2010-2011
- 3.5 *Articulation Pathways Policy*
- 3.6 *Assessment Policy – Criteria and Standards-based Assessment – Attendance Provisions*
- 3.7 *Structure and Nomenclature of Bachelor Awards Policy*
- 3.8 *Academic Records Issuance Policy*

It was resolved (AS11:04/01):

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

There were no changes to the order of business.

1.5 OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

1.6 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Without discussion ...

It was resolved (AS11:04/02):

to confirm the minutes of the Senate meeting held on 24 June 2011 as an accurate record.

2 BUSINESS ARISING

2 BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

2.1 MINUTE 3.6 - RESEARCH HIGHER DEGREE SCHOLARSHIP POLICY - AUSTRALIAN CITIZENS AND PERMANENT RESIDENTS

Without discussion, it was noted that arrangements were being made for the revised *Research Higher Degree Scholarship Policy - Australian Citizens and Permanent Residents* to be published on the Policy DDS.

3 GENERAL BUSINESS

3.1 CHAIR'S REPORT

The written report from the Chair, covering recent activities undertaken on behalf of the Senate since 24 June 2011, was noted without discussion.

The Chair reported on his attendance at the recent 2011 Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) Awards and Citations Ceremony at which a number of UWS colleagues had received awards. On behalf of the Senate he congratulated

the UWS award recipients including Senate members Dr Carmel Coady, Dr Bronwyn Cole, and Dr Loshini Naidoo.

3.2 UWS LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT CHANGES

Senate had before it:

- recommended changes, prepared by the Chair, to the *Academic Governance Policy* and *Academic Senate Standing Committees Policy* to recognise the appointment of the new Pro Vice-Chancellors;
- a matrix prepared by the Associate Director, Academic Secretariat, intended to prioritise the academic policy changes required to implement the leadership and management changes; and
- clauses from the *Academic Senate Standing Committees Policy* covering School Academic Committees (SACs).

The Chair updated Senate members on progress with the implementation of changes arising from the approval of structural changes by the Board of Trustees.

He reported that he had been invited by the Vice-Chancellor to lead a working party to carry out the work itemised in the 20 July 2010 Board of Trustees report, as follows:

“Academic Governance

- Implement new academic governance committees within schools and at a UWS-wide level, to revise and refine academic policies as required;
- Propose the distribution of academic delegations; and
- Work with schools to develop a plan to transition to the new arrangements for the 2012 academic year.”

However, the advice of Senate members and Senate committee members would be critical for the discharge of these tasks.

The Chair gave a presentation about the context for this work, suggesting that the functions of the Academic Senate and its accountability to the Board of Trustees would not change, but that its membership and the committee structure under the Senate would need to reflect new organisational arrangements. Retaining collegiality and wide representation in academic decision making, and reconciling this with ensuring appropriate expertise, would necessitate committees that would be larger than the committees responsible for corporate governance and management.

Hitherto, college committees had performed a range of important functions, as follows:

- Approval of units and unit variations
- Recommendation of new courses and course variations to APCAC
- Approval of graduation for coursework awards
- Approval of student grades for publication
- Approval of levels of Honours
- Recommend University Medals, for approval by Academic Senate
- Consideration of changes to academic policies
- Referrals and requests from Senate and Standing Committees
- Monitoring and improvement of academic quality matters

... and these functions would need to continue to be performed under a revised governance structure.

Provisional feedback from the AUQA audit had implications for the design of the governance structure, with the following issues needing to be addressed:

- Delegation of authority must be accompanied by stronger central monitoring, and “closing the loop” on quality improvements.
- School Academic Committees (SACs) are a good idea, with some areas of very good practice, but greater consistency is needed across the University.
- Response to student feedback is a high priority.

In discussions about academic governance, a number of suggestions had been made and there were several possible models that might be adopted. The current “Academic Standards and Integrity” committees would be re-designated as “Appeals and Integrity” committees to better reflect what they did. It had been suggested that the Senate’s Research Committee and Research Studies Committee might be combined into one committee, the former Courses Approvals Committee be revived, and more extensive use be made of expert advisory committees.

College Research and Higher Degree Committees might be replaced by School Research Committees. It was noted that a number of schools already had research committees, involved in academic governance activities and quality assurance in relation to research training, research development plans and strategies, and higher degrees research student candidature, as well as in resource management matters that would not fall under the auspices of the Senate. Currently, these committees were not recognised in the *Academic Senate Standing Committees Policy*. It was agreed that Heads of School be asked to provide details about their research committees – membership and terms of reference – to the Chair, for consideration. It would be important to ensure that the research institutes, which had their own students, were represented within the new academic governance arrangements.

It was noted that schools and colleges played an important role in managing honours students, and had honours coordinator positions. In the College of Health and Science, school honours coordinators met as a group, and reported to the Education, Assessment and Progression Committee. With honours oversight at the nexus of teaching and research – all honours courses were at undergraduate level, but many were intended to prepare students for research higher degree study – it was possible that an expert advisory committee would be appropriate to provide advice on honours policy and quality. It was noted that honours courses were discipline, rather than school based. For example, in the School of Humanities and Languages, there were honours coordinators for both languages and humanities.

The considerable work to implement the new structures was underway, and the newly appointed School Deans were beginning to meet as a group. Consideration of academic governance changes was only part of the work towards implementing the new arrangements, which would be predicated on the determination of school positions and sub-structures. In relation to school structures, and the matrix prepared by the Associate Director, Academic Secretariat, prioritising the academic policy changes, heads of programs had a significant role, yet had not been referred to in the “UWS Leadership and Management Changes” discussion paper. It was agreed that Heads of Programs had important roles and delegations in a number of the academic policies (for example, advanced standing, and course rule waivers) and had formed an effective network. These staff would be expected to have a crucial role to play at

the beginning of 2012, when offers went out, and at the 19 January 2012 Course Decision Day event. It was agreed that Senate should emphasise to those charged with implementing the new structures the importance of the continuance of the Head of Program role, and...

It was resolved (AS11:04/03):

To acknowledge the leadership role played by Heads of Programs in supporting academic standards and quality and their important contributions to the overall student experience.

The Chair said that one of the policies that would need substantial revision was the *Misconduct: Student Academic Misconduct Policy*, and he reported that the University's Legal Counsel had commenced a review of the misconduct policies, premised in part on the difficulties in distinguishing, for some incidents of serious misconduct, whether they were "academic" matters, or "non-academic" matters, or both. The review might lead to a misconduct rule being proposed, covering both types of misconduct.

In discussion, it was noted that Heads of Programs were not involved to the same extent in the operation of the current *Misconduct: Student Academic Misconduct Policy*, as they had been in the previous iteration, and this might be the source of inconsistencies in disciplinary penalties. It was suggested that the recently developed matrix of disciplinary penalties was assisting, but was not a complete solution to ensuring consistency.

In relation to the timeline for changes to policies, and governance arrangements, the Chair reported that there were Board of Trustees meetings on 21 September and 7 December 2011, and Academic Senate meetings on 28 October and 9 December. For logistical reasons it may not be possible to hold elections until early 2012, so some transitional arrangements might be necessary.

The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Development and International) said that it would be important to look at the size and number of the academic governance committees, because of the travelling times and the consequent significant costs of meetings in a multi-campus university. It was noted that technology-assisted meetings might help to overcome some of the difficulties.

As an interim measure, the Chair had prepared recommended changes to the *Academic Governance Policy* and *Academic Senate Standing Committees Policy* to recognise the appointment of the new Pro Vice-Chancellors. These were minimalist changes, and...

It was resolved (AS11:04/04):

To endorse the revised Academic Governance Policy, and recommend it for approval by the Board of Trustees.

To approve the revised Academic Senate Standing Committees Policy with effect from the date of publication of the Policy.

3.3 QUALITY MANAGEMENT - AUQA CYCLE 2

The Chair of Academic Senate and the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) reported that AUQA had sent the University a confidential draft report of the University's AUQA audit. The report's contents could not yet be made public.

3.4 ACADEMIC SENATE WORK PLAN 2010-2011

The following matter was raised in discussion of the Academic Senate Work Plan at the 29 April 2011 meeting.

“In discussion, it was suggested that in relation to transition and support for first year students, there was a mis-match between the University's teaching calendar, and that of UWSCollege. If new University students were identified at an early stage as needing remedial support, it would be desirable if they could be offered a place to begin a UWSCollege course, before re-entering the University. However, UWSCollege terms commenced before the University term started, and students leaving UWS would face a delay before they could begin study at UWSCollege.

It was noted that an approach permitting students to withdraw from UWS and begin studying with UWSCollege posed a range of issues, including whether students would need to enter diploma courses, or foundation studies, what the likely numbers might be, and what would be the effect on capacity at the Westmead and Nirimba campuses.

UWS and UWSCollege had significant differences in structure and methodology, with the University's undergraduate courses based on a two-term 26 week academic year, and UWSCollege having a three-term 39 week academic year.

It was agreed that the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) would discuss the possible approaches to the issue with schools, and report back to the Senate.”

The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Development and International) reported that this was under discussion within UWSCollege, but that difficulties associated with course timetabling made it difficult to progress the approach discussed at the April Senate meeting.

3.5 ARTICULATION PATHWAYS POLICY

Senate had before it a proposal from the Education Committee for revisions to the *Articulation Pathways Policy*.

The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) reported that the proposed changes reflected the need to manage risk, and to ensure appropriate accountability in relation to articulation pathways, as follows:

- The current policy specifies that agreements with overseas providers are to be in the form of MOUs. Agreements with local VET or Private Providers are prepared in the form of a standard agreement template. University Legal Counsel has advised that such documents should be drafted as agreements because they contain legally binding obligations.

- Provision for 'reverse' articulation arrangements, so that the Policy states that the University is committed to assisting its own graduates and enrolled students who wish to enrol in a course of another education provider.
- Amendments to the clauses covering final approval of articulation pathways agreements, to specify agreements must be approved and signed by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic and Research) and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International and Development).
- Provisions covering the termination of articulation pathways agreements.
- Changes to the processes for applications from Private VET colleges seeking a partnership for articulation pathways with UWS.

The proposed Policy had been made available for comment via the Policy DDS.

In discussion, it was noted that the relationship between the VET sector and universities was complex, and that students might be co-enrolled with a VET provider, as well as the University.

It was resolved (AS11:04/05):

to approve the proposed amendments to the Articulation Pathways Policy, effective from the date of publication of the revised Policy.

3.6 ASSESSMENT POLICY – CRITERIA AND STANDARDS-BASED ASSESSMENT - ATTENDANCE PROVISIONS

Senate had before it a proposal from the Education Committee for revisions to the *Assessment Policy – Criteria and Standards-based Assessment*.

The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) reported that the changes, which had been referred to college and school committees, and posted on the Policy DDS for comments, covered the conditions under which student attendance could be assessed. There had been extensive consultation, with considerable care given to formulating the revised clauses.

The Teaching Development Unit would be providing leadership and guidance to staff about the interpretation of the clauses covering attendance in the *Assessment Policy – Criteria and Standards-based Assessment*.

It was resolved (AS11:04/06):

to approve the proposed amendments to the Assessment Policy – Criteria and Standards-based Assessment, effective from the date of publication of the revised Policy.

The Chair observed that the development and approval of these clauses reflected a good collegial process within academic units, and in the Education Committee.

3.7 STRUCTURE AND NOMENCLATURE OF BACHELOR AWARDS POLICY – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Senate had before it a proposal from the Education Committee for revisions to the *Structure and Nomenclature of Bachelor Awards Policy*.

The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) reported that the proposed changes were seen as an interim measure, pending a full review of the Policy. The changes provided that the title of majors, if they were approved as part of the Type B course, would appear on testamurs.

In discussion, it was agreed that when the Policy was re-written, it would be desirable if the clauses covering the limits on the number of credit points at level 1, level 2 and level 3 could be clarified, because there was some confusion with the current wording.

It was resolved (AS11:04/07):

to approve the proposed amendments to the Structure and Nomenclature of Bachelor Awards Policy, effective from the date of publication of the revised Policy.

3.8 ACADEMIC RECORDS ISSUANCE POLICY

Senate had before it a proposal from the Education Committee for a new *Academic Records Issuance Policy*.

The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) reported that the proposed policy had been developed by the Registrar's Office, and the need for it identified in the course of the AHEGS project.

The proposed Policy was consistent with the issuance policy that was part of the revised Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF), and the requirements for Australian Higher Education Graduation Statements (AHEGS).

It was resolved (AS11:04/08):

to endorse the Academic Records Issuance Policy, and recommend it to the Vice-Chancellor for approval.

3.9 CHANGES TO THE DOCTOR OF CULTURAL RESEARCH POLICY

Senate had before it proposed revisions to the *Doctor in Cultural Research Policy*, recommended by the Research Studies Committee.

The Doctor in Cultural Research program had been reviewed by the Centre for Cultural Research as part of a quality review given that the program had been operating for a number of years and that there had been concerns that the requirements of the degree were excessively onerous and, possibly, unattainable.

It was suggested that even with the revisions, the examination requirements remained onerous, and with the emphasis on word counts, students might write too much. The reference in clause (30) a. to:

“Up to three projects, each generating a report of approximately 10,000 words, for a total word count of approximately 30,000 words.”

... should be amended to stipulate a word count of between 20,000 – 30,000 words, and the reference in clause (30) b. to “...prepared for peer review...” should instead say “submitted for peer review”.

Further, there needed to be a clarification as to whether the projects referred to in clause (12) a. and the articles or academic outputs referred to in clause (12) b. could cover the same content, or whether different topics were expected.

It was agreed to refer the proposed revisions to the *Doctor in Cultural Research Policy* back to the Research Studies Committee, for further consideration. Once the appropriate changes had been made, it was agreed that the Senate Executive Committee would approve the Policy on behalf of the Senate.

3.10 APPROVAL OF SCHOLARSHIPS AND PRIZES

Without discussion...

It was resolved (AS11:04/09):

to approve the Joan Reid Scholarship for Refugee Women.

3.11 SUSTAINABILITY IN THE CURRICULUM

Without discussion...

It was resolved (AS11:04/10):

to endorse the strategy as set out in the paper "Bringing sustainability to life at UWS".

4 REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM SENATE COMMITTEES

4.1 SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Without discussion...

It was resolved (AS11:04/11):

to note the minutes of the 15 July face-to-face, and 29 July – 31 August 2011 electronic, Senate Executive Committee meetings.

4.2 RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Without discussion...

It was resolved (AS11:04/12):

to note the minutes of the 7 June 2011 Research Committee meeting.

4.3 RESEARCH STUDIES COMMITTEE

Without discussion...

It was resolved (AS11:04/13):

to note the minutes of the Research Studies Committee meetings held on 5 July and 2 August 2011.

4.4 EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Without discussion...

It was resolved (AS11:04/14):

to note the report of the Education Committee meeting held on 25 July 2011.

4.5 ACADEMIC PLANNING AND COURSES APPROVALS COMMITTEE

No report - the Academic Planning and Courses Approvals Committee (APCAC) met on 6 July 2011. The recommended course changes and articulation arrangements were approved by the Senate Executive Committee at its meetings on 15 July 2011, and 31 July – 3 August 2011 – see item 4.1.

4.6 BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Board of Trustees most recent meeting was held on 20 July 2011.

The next meeting was scheduled for 21 September 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 was arranged for Friday 28 October 2011

Senate meeting dates for the remainder of 2011 are as follows:

- Friday 28 October 2011
- Friday 9 December 2011 (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