ACADEMIC SENATE

Confirmed minutes of meeting 17/05 of the Academic Senate of Western Sydney University, held on Friday 20 October 2017 at 9:30am in the Boardroom, Ground Floor, Building AD, Werrington North campus.

Present:

Associate Professor Paul Wormell (Chair)	Professor Gregory Kolt
Professor Simon Barrie	Associate Professor Alana Lentin
Professor Kevin Dunn	Associate Professor Jane Mears
Associate Professor Paola Escudero	Dr Terri Mylett
Mr Buch Ezidiegwu	Associate Professor Julie Old
Professor Steven Freeland	Ms Julie Onyango
Mr Michael Gonzalez	Associate Professor Surendra Shrestha
Associate Professor Deborah Hatcher	Professor Simeon Simoff
Professor Annemarie Hennessy	Associate Professor Terry Sloan
Dr Kate Huppatz	Professor Sheree Smith
Professor Peter Hutchings	Professor Deborah Sweeney
Professor Paul James	Associate Professor Linda Taylor
Associate Professor Slade Jensen	Dr Katina Zammit

In attendance:

Professor Sharon Bell	Ms Angela MacDonald (minutes)
Ms Gillian Brown	Mr Peter Tow
Ms Deirdre Lee	Mr Rory Warren
Mr Ian Londish	

Apologies:

Professor James Arvanitakis	Professor Denise Kirkpatrick
Professor Kevin Bell	Professor Scott Holmes
Associate Professor Matthias Boer	Dr Olivia Mirza
Mr Jack Braithwaite	Dr Christopher Peterson
Ms Robyn Causley	Associate Professor Alpana Roy
Mr Andrew Dawkins	Dr Elfriede Sangkuhl
Dr Kathleen Dixon	Professor Michele Simons
Professor Barney Glover (VC)	Associate Professor Zhong Tao

Absent:

Mr Michael Burgess	Professor Lisa Jackson-Pulver
Mr Phil Craig	Professor Carol Reid

1. PROCEDURAL MATTERS

☆1.1 INTRODUCTION, WELCOME, AND APOLOGIES

Welcome
The Chair of Academic Senate, Associate Professor Paul Wormell, welcomed all members to the fifth meeting of Academic Senate for 2017.

The Chair acknowledged the Traditional Owners, paying his respects to their Elders, past, present and future, and extending a warm welcome to all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people attending the meeting.

The Chair welcomed Angela MacDonald, Senior Governance Officer, who is supporting Academic Senate.

Associate Professor Paola Escudero was welcomed to her first meeting of Senate. Dr Christopher Peterson was congratulated on his promotion to Associate Professor, and Robyn Causley was congratulated on her appointment as Director, Student Administration – a key role for the University.

Apologies
Apologies were noted and accepted.

☆1.2   DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were reported.

☆1.3   STARRING OF ITEMS

Apart from procedural items, items already starred on the agenda were:

- 3.1   Report from the Chair
- 3.2   Report from the Vice-Chancellor
- 3.3   Consultation on the Strategic Plan and Academic Structure
- 3.5.2   School of Computing, Engineering and Mathematics Review
- 3.7   Research Impact and Engagement
- 3.8   Red Tape Task Force
- 3.10.5 Progression and Unsatisfactory Academic Progress Policy
- 4.7   Report and Proposed Retirement of the Academic Governance Working Party

It was agreed to star the following additional items:

- 3.4.1   Educational Compliance Update
- 3.10.3 Student Carer Responsibilities
- 3.10.6 OES Policy Amendments
- 3.10.7 Withdrawal from Units of Study Without Academic Penalty
- 3.12.1 New University Donor Funded Scholarships

It was resolved (AS17:05/01):

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

Item 3.3 was reordered to occur at 11:00am to reflect Professor Sharon Bell's availability.

☆1.5   OTHER BUSINESS

No other business was noted.

☆1.6   MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The unconfirmed minutes of the Academic Senate meeting held on 18 August 2017 had been circulated. It was agreed to correct the spelling of Dr Katina Zammit's name in the list of members present.

It was resolved (AS17:05/02):

> *To confirm the minutes of the Senate meeting held on 18 August 2017, as amended, as an accurate record.*

☆1.7 ACTION SHEET FROM LAST MEETING

To assist members with monitoring the work of the Academic Senate, an action sheet from the meeting held on 18 August had been circulated. No comments or updates were noted.

2. BUSINESS ARISING

Items of business arising not covered elsewhere in the agenda are included in this section for noting.

2.1 Minute 3.11.2 Articulation Policy

On 18 August 2017, without comment

It was resolved (AS17:05/03):

> *That Academic Senate approves the revised Articulation Pathway Policy, Articulation Pathway Procedures and Articulation Approval Authorities and Delegations document from date of publication.*

Arrangements are being made to publish the revised version of the Policy, Procedures and Delegations document on the Policy DDS System.

3. GENERAL BUSINESS

☆3.1 REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

A written report from the Chair covering activities undertaken on behalf of the Senate since 18 August had been circulated, including the Chair's report to the 11 October 2017 meeting of the Board of Trustees.

The Chair confirmed that his term of office ends in January 2018, and he will endeavour to share as much corporate knowledge as possible, including end-of-project reports such as the closure report on the Academic Program Review (APR) from 2005, and the Callista Implementation Report which had been passed on to the Student Management System (SMS) Project team. The Chair also advised he was about to submit the final report of the Assessment Review to the Vice Chancellor; unfortunately it was not ready for this meeting of Senate as some final feedback was yet to be incorporated.

The Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) has released a *Good Practice Note: Addressing contract cheating to safeguard academic integrity*. The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning Transformations), Professor Simon Barrie, has asked his

Office to review this document to identify areas for further action at this University. The Note is recommended to schools as a source of good practice:

http://www.teqsa.gov.au/news-publications/good-practice-note-addressing-contract-cheating-safeguard-academic-integrity

The Chair noted his recent opportunity to contribute some questions for inclusion in a set of communication videos about the Shared Services program and its implications for students and academic staff. Once finalised the videos will be uploaded to the University website.

☆3.2 REPORT FROM THE VICE-CHANCELLOR

The Vice Chancellor had provided his apology for this meeting, and Professor Simon Barrie agreed to introduce the Vice-Chancellor's report and receive any questions.

Professor Barrie requested that two items be considered alongside the report. First, events in the national Senate have overtaken the earlier narrative around the higher-education budget, and there had been a very strong rejection of the Government's reform package. Second, he wanted to acknowledge the work of the University in engaging with the Innovative Research Universities (IRU) Network. The network will provide great opportunities for academic benchmarking, engaging with a network of universities with well-established assessment standards and benchmarking processes. In addition, there will be great opportunities to engage in research partnerships.

Professor Barrie responded to several questions and comments relating to the Vice-Chancellor's Online Education Services (OES) Update, and the level of student consultation around the move to a new building in the Bankstown CBD. In relation to the OES Update, a member raised concerns about the increased number of teaching sessions, especially for the School of Business which already has a very complex teaching calendar. This has adverse effects on operational efficiencies, although the VC's report that operational efficiencies are being given consideration was welcomed. It also affects the timeframes for approval and quality assurance of students' results and the pressures placed on academic and professional staff at these times.

Concerns were also expressed that there had been inadequate consultation with students about the decision to move some courses to Bankstown, and that consultation should take place before major decisions are made rather than after. Professor Barrie and some other members confirmed that extensive consultation had taken place, and outlined the forums and email communications that had been undertaken. However, it was suggested that additional information may need to be inserted into the list of FAQs, particularly around student concerns of what will be available on the new campus.

The Chair thanked Professor Barrie for his report and comments.

☆3.3 CONSULTATION ON THE STRATEGIC PLAN AND ACADEMIC STRUCTURE

The Chair introduced the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Strategy and Planning), Professor Sharon Bell, to present a draft white paper on the Strategic Plan and Academic Structure, as circulated. Professor Bell noted that the draft white paper had been to the Board of Trustees before coming to Academic Senate, owing to the meeting schedules. However, the Board had only been asked to note the report for information, not to approve it.

Professor Bell opened the discussion by confirming that a final draft academic structure was not yet available, as consultation had revealed a situation that was more complex

than expected. The draft white paper outlined a proposal for a staged process, with a set of critical issues being addressed in the first stage, leading to a second stage that will lay the groundwork for designing a clustering of schools into appropriate groupings. It is unlikely that a firm proposal will be ready by the end of the year, as proposals for new structures will involve further consultation and a working party, and many University staff who need to be involved in the process are not available during this time. Future structures will need to be flexible and adaptive to future growth, and be able to respond to our changing geographical population. It is hoped the new structure should exist for at least ten years.

Professor Bell highlighted the importance of examining school structures and substructures, noting that by international standards for highly ranked universities this University had a comparatively small number of relatively large schools, and an unusual lack of identifiable academic groupings and substructures within those schools. It is difficult to understand titles and roles within the University, and difficult for people outside the University to navigate its structure.

Members provided a series of comments and questions, seeking advice about what a good school substructure might look like, and how the professoriate might better be involved in decision making. Professor Bell noted that the University is in a unique position that has evolved over time, including the relative disengagement of the professoriate. A minimal model for substructures had been outlined in an earlier review, resembling other models in the sector, but it never came to pass, possibly due to financial constraints.

With the impact of the Shared Services program, every opportunity must be taken to reassure colleagues that the current review has a focus on strengthening decision making within the academic community. It is likely that there will be improvements to roles such as Directors of Academic Programs (DAPs) and Academic Course Advisors (ACAs). Existing roles may well be extended and supported, and additional roles may come into play. Gender equity is a consideration, as the majority of DAP and ACA roles are historically taken up by women, and there is evidence that these staff are not publishing as much as their male counterparts. Professor Bell commented that tracking within organisations has shown that women typically have taken on roles that are not going to generate the most individual benefits. It was suggested these roles should be redesigned so that they are more sustainable, and remove any negative consequences. These staff are contributing enormously and have shown a willingness to take on huge workloads. Workload processes should be used to expose points of pressure and as a tool for reflection, rather than a tool that dictates who we are and how staff contributions are valued. Personal development of staff should be acknowledged throughout the redesign process. It should include peer mentoring, mentoring for research, and consider the amount of administrative support that is required.

In response to a member's question about the proposed "working party with leadership and academic representation to work on the design phase of an academic superstructure." Professor Bell advised that this should be made up of colleagues from different roles within the academic community. Membership and input should be from people experiencing the consequences of decision making, not just staff at a senior level. It is expected that the working party will conduct intense work prior to the end of year in order for strategies to evolve for early 2018.

The Chair concluded by encouraging Senate members, including student members, to provide further input to the consultation. The Chair thanked Professor Bell for an engaged and transparent process.

☆3.4 HIGHER EDUCATION STANDARDS AND REGULATION

[Securing Success: 6.16 Aspire to the highest standards of university governance and accountability]

3.4.1 Educational Compliance Update

The revised *Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015* commenced from 1 January 2017 as a legislative instrument, and re-registration of the University to ensure it meets these standards is due in May 2018.

Submission of documentation for the renewal of registration is due at least 180 days prior to this date (1 December 2017), and is expected to be submitted in November. The circulated paper provides Academic Senate with an update of the progress on implementation of the HESF 2015 Compliance Action Plan, and the University's renewal of registration with TEQSA.

A concern was raised that the report on the performance of transition and support programs (action 3) would rely entirely on student feedback. In response, advice was provided that other data were available; for example, from Transition Programs.

The Chair responded to a query about the Review of University Appeal Mechanisms (action 7). He confirmed that APAG had reviewed a proposed set of appeal procedures, inclusive of an appeal application being consistent with the *Student Misconduct Rule*. When the set of procedures are approved, Senate will be asked to update the appeal provisions in other academic policies, where appropriate. Concerns were also raised that procedures historically had been written to aid in administrative process rather than be judicially fair. The Chair advised this report had been developed with input from the Complaints Resolution Unit, and was well grounded in student, staff and NSW Ombudsman perspectives, with a strong emphasis on providing procedural fairness for students.

Members requested some further information on the following HESF (2015) Compliance Action Items:

- Action 8: The suggested wording on the equivalence of professional experience that will inform the Recruitment and Selection policy was requested for viewing in relation to professional accreditation.

- Action 12: There was interest in the Office of Quality and Performance (OQP) repository for copies of third party agreements, and whether this was open for viewing upon request.

- Action 17: A request for the web links for the following reports:
  - b) statement of financial standing, and
  - c) indicative student enrolments by course.

It was noted that the University's annual report is publicly available on the Western Sydney University website, as required by TEQSA:

https://www.westernsydney.edu.au/about_uws/leadership/governance

3.4.2 Complaints Resolution Unit Report

The Complaints Resolution Unit (CRU) receives complaints from students, staff and members of the public. CRU also manages complaints with the Information and Privacy Commission of New South Wales, NSW Ombudsman, Anti-Discrimination Board of NSW and the Australian Human Rights Commission.

Complaints are managed using case management software, and data are collected on high level categories including administration, assessment, teaching, behaviour, misconduct, privacy and facilities. Complaint outcomes are often circumstance-specific; however, they can also highlight the need for procedural or policy change, as set out in the Report, which had been circulated to Senate members.

The report gathers data on complaints received between January and June 2017, with specific reference to the University's performance against the Higher Education Standards Framework Domain 2 – that "students have access to mechanisms to resolve grievances effectively, at reasonable cost and with appropriate protection from breach of confidentiality or reprisal".

The report was noted without discussion.

3.5 SENATE WORK PLAN AND SECURING SUCCESS
[Securing Success: 6.5 Promote inclusive and participatory decision-making; 6.7 Foster a strong culture and track record of successful renewal and innovation, achieved through the determination, creativity and hard work of all staff; 6.16 Aspire to the highest standards of university governance and accountability]

3.5.1 Senate Work Plan

The latest Senate Work Plan had been appended. The Work Plan will be further updated to reflect the revised Strategic Risk Register approved by the Board of Trustees on 11 October 2017.

☆ 3.5.2 School of Computing, Engineering and Mathematics Review

The School of Computing, Engineering and Mathematics was reviewed in 2017 as part of the University's cycle of School Reviews. The terms of reference for the school review were to evaluate and provide commendations and recommendations on the strategic goals and objectives of *Securing Success: 2015-2020* and the Higher Education Standards Framework 2015. The Panel Report and Action Plan had been attached. The Chair extended thanks to Professor Kevin Dunn (Chair) and Professor Simon Barrie.

Professor Simeon Simoff spoke to the Review, noting that the information and data collected were integral to the professional accreditation of courses. Professor Simoff commented that these reviews also serve as a great opportunity for the Dean to take an overview of the school and better plan for shaping the future. Although it was an increase in workload it was a very worthwhile process.

The Chair noted that the affirmations could inform other streams of work across the University; for example, the commendation about work integrated learning; the affirmation around the use of external advisory committees; and the recommendation around recognising the students involved in student projects. These items speak to the Curriculum Renewal Project, and the Review outcomes should be treated as a further opportunity for the school to engage with the Project, highlighting the importance of benchmarking and socialising proposed changes and benefits amongst staff.

Senate members suggested that the timeframes for Deans and Deputy Deans to implement the changes by the close of 2017 might be unrealistic, and it was suggested that perhaps a longer timeframe would be more realistic in terms of workload.

The Chair thanked Professor Simoff for the report, which other schools will find useful, and acknowledged the professional staff within the School for the large amount of work involved in its preparation.

It was resolved (AS17:05/04):

> *That Senate notes the academic aspects of the 2017 Review of the School of Computing, Engineering and Mathematics.*

3.6 TRANSFORMING WESTERN SYDNEY UNIVERSITY

Transforming Western Sydney University (*TWSU*) is a suite of strategic initiatives organised into five thematic areas, to enact the *Securing Success* strategies. A comprehensive report, including the 21st Century Curriculum Renewal Project, was presented to the August meeting of Academic Senate. A further update will be provided at the next Senate meeting on 8 December 2017.

☆3.7 RESEARCH

3.7.1 Research Impact and Engagement

A paper entitled *2018 Engagement and Impact Assessment: Selection of Impact Case Studies and Next Steps* had been circulated.

The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation), Professor Deborah Sweeney, spoke to the paper and provided a brief overview of the processes to be put in place for the first assessment of engagement and impact by the ARC, which is scheduled for 2018. The Government has not yet released its guidelines, but action has been taken now as it was understood from the trial that extensive work would be required. It is believed the period in which the research needs to have been conducted is likely to be from 1 January 2002 to 31 December 2016, and the impact needs to have occurred between 1 January 2011 and 31 December 2016 – accordingly, we are now in quite a crucial period. Twenty-two cases have been identified for submission: twenty are related to the Fields of Research; one in the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander (Indigenous) field; and one in a multi-disciplinary area. Five panels will provide guidance next year as we prepare the cases for submission. Professor Sweeney extended her thanks to those involved in preparing the report.

In response to a member's question, Professor Sweeney advised that each case study will be considered by an ARC panel. Quantitative and qualitative analysis of impact data will occur. Based on our learning from the earlier pilot study, the range of evidence could range from end-user testimonials to numerical data. Discussion points at the Research Committee included how we work with our Early Career Researchers; embedding impact and metrics from the beginning of a research project; and how we work with our end users. A pipeline of additional case studies has been identified.

The Chair commented that research breakthroughs can take a very long time to produce work of real value and impact, with University staff working consistently over many years. He extended thanks to Professor Sweeney on her report.

☆3.8 RED TAPE TASK FORCE

The Red Tape Task Force (RTTF) was established to review a range of administrative tasks required in support of teaching and research programs. This initiative of the Board of Trustees aimed to identify opportunities to free up academic time currently spent on administration, while improving efficiencies and processes.

The Chair introduced Peter Tow (Director, Project Management Office). Peter provided an update on the work conducted by the Task Force, outlining a number of projects that have been completed this year, particularly the Student Progression Appeal database (SPA) and the Xref database that has been trialled by the Office of Human Resources and closely connected to some processes within the Shared Services project. Feedback has been positive for both of these process improvements. Work by the RTTF has slowed in the last six months, recognising the significant process changes associated with Shared Services; however, the expectation is that once Shared Services concludes next year there will be considerable scope for RTTF activity, emphasising the need for continuous process improvement and efficiency. There will also be a review of the RTTF, for implementation in 2018.

The Chair noted that we should consider what shape the RTTF might take in the future by engaging the University community in this discussion. Feedback was received from an RTTF member who believed the 'grass roots' representation on the Task Force had dropped off and more senior administrative positions had been coming to the meetings in their place. For true effectiveness, and to identify aspects that really matter to the end users, there had to be more end users present, in addition to capturing the student voice.

In reference to point (h) *Career Development Planning and Review (CDPR) process and Compass*, members expressed an interest in seeing the library which is being developed of 'objectives/goals/outcomes that align with the outcome expectations for each academic level'. This will be particularly valuable for new staff who may find the Compass process challenging.

A revised timeline was requested on the Smart E-Forms project.

The Chair extended thanks to Peter Tow and Rory Warren for the report.

3.9 THE SELF-REVIEW OF ACADEMIC SENATE

At the 18 August 2017 Senate meeting, members noted without comment an updated progress report on the set of action items arising from Senate's Self-Assessment Survey completed in late 2015.

3.10 ACADEMIC POLICY REVIEW

3.10.1 Academic Policy Advisory Group (APAG)
An update on the academic policies prioritised for consideration and progress to date by the Academic Policy Advisory Group (APAG) is listed below. APAG met on 18 October 2017.

Policy	Status
Advanced Standing Policy	As part of the *Advanced Standing Policy* Implementation Plan, data will be collected to inform a further review of the Policy in 2018. A further minor amendment to the Policy was agreed at the 16 August APAG meeting and is on this agenda for consideration at item 3.10.2.
Course Design Policy	The Terms of Reference and membership for the Working Party have been agreed, noting that this work will be heavily influenced by the 21st Century Curriculum Project, with guidance from the Project Implementation Advisory Group. Amendments to the *Postgraduate Coursework Policy* regarding Graduate Certificates have been developed by the Office of Quality and Performance and proposed revisions are on this agenda for consideration at item 3.10.4.
Disruption to Studies Policy (renamed from Special Consideration Policy)	The new *Disruption to Studies Policy* and associated guidelines were approved at the 21 October 2016 meeting of Academic Senate and an implementation plan is under development noting the influence of the E-Form Project on progressing this new policy.
Lecture Recording Policy Review	A draft revised *Educational Video Policy* was discussed at the 24 May APAG meeting. Development is continuing via the Learning and Teaching Technologies Advisory Group (LaTTe).
Progression and Unsatisfactory Academic Progress	A revised *Progression Policy* was agreed at the 16 February meeting of APAG and endorsed at the 7 March meeting of Education Committee. The new policy is on this agenda at item 3.10.5 for consideration.

Members are invited to submit expressions of interest in contributing to the review of particular academic policies (please submit these to Gillian.Brown@westernsydney.edu.au).

For information

3.10.2 Advanced Standing Policy

A paper outlining the proposed policy updates for Academic Senate had been circulated. It is proposed that the Policy be amended to align the appeal clauses with other policies.

Without discussion

> **It was resolved (AS17:05/05):**
>
> > *That Academic Senate approves the minor amendments to the Advanced Standing Policy from the date of publication.*

☆3.10.3 Student Carer Responsibilities

A briefing paper had been provided with statistics on young people, aged 25 or under, living in NSW who are carers. This is seen as an important opportunity for Western Sydney University to support students with caring responsibilities.

Senate feedback included warm endorsement of the approach that was proposed, noting that young carers are part of a wider range of people who hold these roles. This initiative

should be seen as springboard for looking at the role of carers more widely; for example, recruitment and admissions processes should recognise the significant educational disadvantages that people with carer's responsibilities have. This is also a pressing issue for many HDR students who would like to devote more time to their studies.

The Chair noted he would bring the paper to the attention to Professor James Arvanitakis in his capacity of Dean, Graduate Studies.

> **It was resolved (AS17:05/06):**
>
>> *That Academic Senate approves the inclusion of Students with Caring Responsibilities in the proposed Guidelines and Procedures.*

3.10.4 Postgraduate Coursework Policy

A paper outlining the proposed policy updates for Academic Senate had been circulated, proposing that the Policy be amended to be consistent with the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF).

Without discussion

> **It was resolved (AS17:05/07):**
>
>> *That Academic Senate approves the minor amendments to the Postgraduate Coursework Policy from the date of publication.*

☆3.10.5 Progression and Unsatisfactory Academic Progress Policy

A paper outlining the proposed policy updates for Academic Senate had been circulated. The substantially revised and renamed *Progression Policy* would introduce a more interventionist and student-centred approach.

Following recent discussions at Senate Assessment Committee and APAG, Professor Simon Barrie reported that these committees recommend that the paper be withdrawn, so that more work can be done to ensure that adequate resources are in place to support the implementation of the revised Policy. However, this item was left on the agenda to alert members of Senate to the approach that the proposed Policy takes in supporting students and their progression. This item will carry over to the December Senate agenda.

> **Withdrawn**

☆3.10.6 OES Policy Amendments

A paper outlining the proposed policy updates to two policies for consideration by Academic Senate had been circulated with proposed amendments to the *Student Fees Policy* and *Enrolment Policy* relevant to Online Education Services (OES) students.

Concerns were raised about the interpretation of the following text in the covering paper for this item, and it was agreed to insert additional wording for clarification, as follows:

- "provide for (OES) Online students to be charged 40% **of the** Student Services Amenities Fee (SSAF) from 1 January 2018. No **SSAF** fees will be charged during the pilot;"

Following discussion, it was agreed to insert the words "in accordance with the relevant legislation" to replace the deleted text "related to sporting and recreational activities, employment and career advice, health and welfare, study skills programs, orientation, child care, financial advice, overseas student services and food services".

In response to concerns that the proposed changes would establish different policies for different types of students, it was noted that there would be a single policy but with reasonable differences in implementation for different cohorts, which could subsequently be identified for the purpose of SSAF reporting. In response to concerns that the proposal had not been considered by School Academic Committees, it was noted that some cohorts already have a SSAF exemption under the Policy and we did not wish to disadvantage the OES cohort – hence this proposed refinement to an existing policy. However, based on feedback received, the OES Steering Committee will ensure that adequate consultation is provided with the schools when further changes to policies are proposed. A member raised concerns that the frequently used term 'online' can be ambiguous, and this needs some attention, while another member welcomed the concept of identifying disengaged students and being able to act upon this in managing their enrolments.

Following discussion

It was resolved (AS17:05/08):

That Academic Senate approves the amendments to the Student Fees Policy and Enrolment Policy from the date of approval.

☆3.10.7 Withdrawal from Units of Study Without Academic Penalty

Following extensive discussion, and with advice from a dedicated task group, Senate Education Committee had recommended that students be allowed to withdraw from units without academic penalty (but with a financial penalty) up until an agreed period within the teaching session, while acknowledging some concerns regarding the provision of any exceptions within a standard university-wide approach.

A Senate member highlighted some concerns that students with significant financial and economic constraints, particularly students in the Bachelor of Education (Primary) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander) Education, might find it difficult to make use of the proposed changes. It was recommended that the implementation should draw on Student Support Services to ensure there is appropriate advice to, and care for, students. Concerns were also raised about the workability of the 2018 timeframes and deadlines. These are governed by the Commonwealth Higher Education Support Act (HESA), and the implementation and communications to students will be integral to the success of the proposed changes.

Additional comments from members included a suggestion that there should be a default process whereby a student could apply for withdrawal from units both without academic and financial penalty, and a concern that some students may use the new policy to withdraw from a unit then repeat it for a better mark and grade-point average. It was recognised that this was a risk, and that a business process needed to be developed, making it clear what students are applying to withdraw from. However, recognising that the proposed changes would be reviewed after one year,

It was resolved (AS17:05/09):

That Academic Senate approves the proposal that students be allowed to withdraw without academic penalty (but with a financial penalty) up until an agreed period within teaching sessions, and the associated amendments to academic policies.

3.11   AWARDS OF THE UNIVERSITY MEDAL AND POSTHUMOUS AWARDS

The following students were awarded University Medals at the September 2017 Graduation ceremonies, as approved by the Chair of Academic Senate, on behalf of the Senate.

- Carolina Janet ARRICOBENE (SID 17431053) Bachelor of Laws, Honours Class 1.
- Lauren Elizabeth BARNETT (15743392) Bachelor of Science (Honours), Honours Class 1.
- Lachlan Stanley MILNER (17716879) Bachelor of Engineering (Civil), Honours Class 1.
- Harpreet Singh MOMI (17876461) Bachelor of Engineering (Electrical), Honours Class 1.
- Sarah SHAHZADI (17035402) Bachelor of Engineering (Electrical), Honours Class 1.
- Declan WILLIAMS (17882301) Bachelor of Engineering (Advanced) (Mechanical), Honours Class 1.
- Todd HOPKINSON (17826714) Bachelor of Engineering (Mechanical), Honours Class 1.
- Brady Jack TURNER (17797405) Bachelor of Engineering (Mechanical), Honours Class 1.

Without discussion

It was resolved (AS17:05/10):

That Academic Senate note the award of the University Medals, approved by the Chair of Academic Senate, on behalf of the Senate.

3.12   APPROVAL OF SCHOLARSHIPS

☆3.12.1 New University Donor Funded Scholarships

Academic Senate was requested to consider the following proposals for new University Donor Funded Scholarships, prepared by the Office of Advancement and Alumni:

- **Goodman Property Group Scholarship**
  This undergraduate scholarship is intended for students who are currently enrolled in the second year of the Bachelor of Business (Property). Applicants must have an understanding and commitment to a career in property, and are expected to maintain satisfactory academic progress; pass all subject attempts, maintain a credit average and a GPA 5.0 or greater.

- **H&R Block Accounting Scholarship**
  This undergraduate scholarship is intended for students who are currently enrolled in the second year of the Bachelor of Business (Accounting) or the Bachelor of Accounting. Applicants are expected to maintain satisfactory

academic progress; pass all subject attempts, maintain a credit average and a GPA 5.0 or greater.

- **Smart Modern Construction Scholarship**
  This undergraduate scholarship is intended for students who are currently enrolled in the third or fourth year of the Bachelor of Construction Management, and have completed at least 160 credit points. Applicants are expected to maintain satisfactory academic progress; pass all subject attempts, maintain a credit average and a GPA 5.0 or greater.

- **Ingredion Scholarship for Occupational Health and Safety**
  This undergraduate scholarship is intended for students who are currently enrolled in the second year of the Bachelor of Natural Science (Environment and Health). Applicants are expected to maintain satisfactory academic progress; pass all subject attempts, maintain a Pass average and a GPA 4.0 or greater.

- **CharterNet R&D Scholarship**
  This is an amendment to the scholarship that was previously approved by Senate Executive Committee on 8-14 September as per item 4.1.

After a discussion between Senate members it was agreed to seek advice from the Office of Advancement and Alumni about its standard approach to implementing the following criterion for two scholarships, recognising that it could affect the recipients' academic workloads: "Applicants must be willing to undertake paid work experience as negotiated with the donor."

- Goodman Property Group Scholarship
- Ingredion Scholarship for Occupational Health and Safety.

It was resolved (AS17:05/11):

> *That Academic Senate approves the following proposed Scholarships:*
> - *H&R Block Accounting Scholarship*
> - *Smart Modern Construction Scholarship*
> - *CharterNet R&D Scholarship*

3.12.2 New University Funded Scholarships

Academic Senate was requested to consider the following variation proposal for University Funded Scholarships, prepared by Western Sydney International:

Vice-Chancellor's and Foundation Exchange Scholarships

Launched a number of years ago, 20 Vice-Chancellor's Scholarships and 30 Foundation Scholarships (grouped together as the International Exchange Scholarships) have been offered each academic year, with the aim of incentivising and supporting Australian domestic students to participate in the semester and year-long Go Global Exchange Program as part of their Western Sydney University degree. This proposal is for the reduction in the GPA requirement for eligibility for these Scholarships from 5.0 to 3.5.

Without discussion

It was resolved (AS17:05/12):

> *That Academic Senate approves the academic criteria variation proposal to the Vice-Chancellor's and Foundation Exchange Scholarships.*

4. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM SENATE COMMITTEES

Items 4.1 – 4.7 provide an overview of the matters dealt with by Senate standing committees.

4.1 SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Senate Executive Committee held a joint electronic meeting with APCAC conducted from 8 to 14 September 2017. The report of this meeting had been circulated.

Without discussion

It was resolved (AS17:05/13):

That Academic Senate notes the report of the electronic joint meeting held from 8 to 14 September 2017 of the Academic Planning and Courses Approvals Committee and Senate Executive Committee.

4.2 RESEARCH COMMITTEE

The Research Committee met on 10 August 2017. The minutes of this meeting had been circulated.

Without discussion

It was resolved (AS17:05/14):

That Academic Senate notes the minutes of the Research Committee held on 10 August 2017.

4.3 RESEARCH STUDIES COMMITTEE

The Research Studies Committee met on 11 July, 10 August and 21 September 2017. The minutes of these meetings had been circulated.

Without discussion

It was resolved (AS17:05/15):

That Academic Senate notes the minutes of the Research Studies Committee held on 11 July, 10 August and 21 September 2017.

4.4 EDUCATION COMMITTEE

The Education Committee met on 5 September. The minutes of this meeting had been circulated and relevant recommendations are covered in earlier items on this Senate agenda.

Without discussion

It was resolved (AS17:05/16):

That Academic Senate notes the minutes of the Education Committee held on 5 September 2017.

4.5   ACADEMIC PLANNING AND COURSES APPROVALS COMMITTEE

The Academic Planning and Courses Approvals Committee (APCAC) conducted an electronic meeting from 17-23 August 2017 and met face to face on 5 September and 4 October 2017. The reports of these meetings had been circulated. The report of the joint electronic meeting with Senate Executive Committee conducted from 8 to 14 September 2017 is provided at item 4.1.

Without discussion

> **It was resolved (AS17:05/17):**
>
>> *That Academic Senate notes the report of the electronic meetings conducted from 17 to 23 August 2017 and the meetings held on 5 September and 4 October 2017 of the Academic Planning and Courses Approvals Committee and approves the recommendations contained therein.*

4.6   ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

The Assessment Committee met on 17 October 2017. The minutes of this meeting will be provided to the December meeting of Academic Senate.

☆4.7   REPORT AND PROPOSED RETIREMENT OF ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE WORKING PARTY

The notes of the last Academic Governance Working Party meeting had been circulated. Senate concluded that the Working Party has discharged its functions, the Terms of Reference have been achieved, and the Working Party will be retired, thanking all members past and present for their contributions. It was suggested that, in view of possible changes to the University's academic structure and School-level governance processes, in future the Senate may choose to create a new working party with Terms of Reference aligned to any changes to academic structures.

4.8   THE COLLEGE ACADEMIC COMMITTEE

The College Academic Committee met face to face on 31 August 2017. An electronic meeting was also conducted commencing 28 September 2017. The minutes of these meetings had been circulated.

The minutes were noted without discussion.

4.9   BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Board of Trustees met on 11 October 2017. The next meeting of the Board of Trustees is scheduled for 6 December 2017. Summaries of Board of Trustees meetings, and minutes of Board of Trustees meetings, are available on the University website at:

https://www.westernsydney.edu.au/about_uws/leadership/board_of_trustees/board_meetings/board_of_trustees_meetings_2017

5. FOR INFORMATION

The meeting concluded at 12:30pm.

6. NEXT MEETING

The next Academic Senate meeting is arranged for _Friday 8 December 2017_ in the Boardroom, Werrington North Campus.

The Academic Senate meeting dates for 2018 are as follows:
- 23 February
- 13 April
- 22 June
- 17 August
- 19 October
- 7 December

Meetings commence at 9:30am and conclude by 12:30pm.