



Academic Board Agenda

Executive Officer: Megan Kemmis

Secretariat, Quadrangle, A14

Phone: 9351 3306; Fax: 9351 3572

E-mail: admin@academicboard.usyd.edu.au

Web site: <http://www.usyd.edu.au/ab>

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA for the meeting on Wednesday 27 February 2008

Pages

- ★ 1. **Apologies**
Apologies have been received from:
Professors A Coats, R Jeremy, W Julian (Dr D Cabrera attending in his stead), G Llewellyn (Associate Professor M Thompson is attending in her stead), D Nutbeam, B Robinson, J Trehwella and G Triggs, Associate Professors R Ewing, A Fekete, R Magnusson and S Willcock, Drs M Edmond, C Grupen and A Harvey, and Ms A Freeborn, Ms J Henderson, Ms S Tolerton and Mr G Weary.
- ★ 5. **Report of the Chair** pages 3-9
5.1 **Report on Senate Matters**
5.1.1 **Report of the Senate meeting held on 4 February 2008** page 3
Recommendation
The Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Board on academic matters considered by Senate at its meeting of 4 February 2008.
- 5.2 **Honours and Distinctions** page 3
Recommendation
The Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Board on the honours and distinctions and congratulate the recipients, as set out in the report presented.
- 5.3 **General Report**
5.3.5 **Academic Board Faculty Reviews: Phase 3 Guidelines** pages 3-8
Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the guidelines for the Academic Board Phase 3 Faculty Reviews, as set out in the report presented.
- 5.3.6 **Ethical Entrepreneurialism Working Party: Terms of Reference** pages 3 and 9
Recommendation
That the Academic Board approve the terms of reference for the Ethical Entrepreneurialism Working Party, as set out in the report presented.

- ★ 6. **Report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal** **pages 10-11**
 - 6.1 **Report on Senate Matters**
 - 6.1.1 **Report of the Senate meeting held on 4 February 2008** *pages 10-11*

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal on matters considered by Senate at its meeting held on 4 February 2008.

- 13. **General Business** **page 12**
 - 13.1 **Appointment of members of the Student Proctorial Panel** *page 12*

Recommendation

That the Academic Board appoint members of the Student Proctorial Panel, as set out in the report presented.

AGENDA ITEM 5 Report of the Chair

5.1 Report on Senate Matters

5.1.1 Report on the Senate meeting held on 4 February 2008

Senate, at its meeting on 4 February 2008, on the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 12 December 2007:

- (1) approved the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Constitutions of the Board of Studies in Indigenous Studies, the Faculty of Education and Social Work and the Faculty of Science, with effect from 1 January 2008, as set out in the report presented; and
- (2) noted the report on other items.

Recommendation

The Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Board on academic matters considered by Senate at its meeting of 4 February 2008.

5.2 Honours and Distinctions

I am pleased to report the following honours and distinctions and recommend the Academic Board extend its congratulations to the recipients:

Professor Robert Minasian, School of Electrical and Information Engineering

Elected a Fellow of the Optical Society of America for his contributions to the fundamental understanding of photonic signal processing of microwave signals.

Associate Professor Judy Kay, School of Information Technologies

Awarded the 2008 2008 Computing Research and Education (CORE) Teaching Award.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Board on the honours and distinctions and congratulate the recipients, as set out in the report presented.

5.3 General Report

5.3.5 Academic Board Faculty Reviews: Phase 3 Guidelines

pages x-x

At its meeting of 18 April 2007, the Academic Board noted that the guidelines for Phase 3 of the Academic Board Faculty Reviews had been revised since their original approval by the Board in November 2006. The final version of the Phase 3 Guidelines is enclosed for the approval of the Academic Board.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board approve the guidelines for the Academic Board Phase 3 Faculty Reviews, as set out in the report presented.

5.3.6 Ethical Entrepreneurialism Working Party: Terms of Reference

page x

At its meeting of 10 October 2007, the Academic Board received a report from the Chair of the Academic Board and the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor entitled "the Academic User's Guide to Ethical Entrepreneurialism". It was noted at this meeting that a Working Party would be established to develop a consolidated policy statement on this issue. The draft terms of reference for this Working Party are enclosed for the approval of the Academic Board.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board approve the terms of reference for the Ethical Entrepreneurialism Working Party, as set out in the report presented.



The University of Sydney

Guidelines for Phase 3 Academic Board Faculty Reviews

Approved by Academic Board on:
Date of effect:

1. Purpose

The Academic Board reviews are intended to encourage, in our faculties, an academic culture that values scholarship, free inquiry and intellectual rigour and honesty, supporting, in turn, the development and maintenance of high standards of teaching, scholarship and research. The process of the reviews in Phase 3 is intended to encourage and assist faculties to reflect on the key elements and processes in their academic environments, and form views on the strength of their culture and ways in which it can, if needed, be improved.

2. Principles

- Excellence in teaching, learning, and research is a core value that is essential to the University's mission, goals and activities. The University's quality assurance processes are intrinsic to the work of all staff undertaking or supporting teaching, learning and research.
- The University evaluates its achievements against appropriate national and international benchmarks. Its quality assurance methods are evidence-based. Outcomes and feedback from stakeholders (including students, staff, employers and the community) provide the basis for analyses and conclusions on which improvements are planned.
- The Academic Board reviews provide both insight into the capacity of faculties to sustainably achieve the academic outcomes necessary for the University to achieve its strategic goals and a forum to identify and migrate best practice among faculties.
- The Academic Board reviews are based on the core values and concepts of the Baldrige National Quality Program, elucidated in http://www.quality.nist.gov/Education_Criteria.htm

3. Coverage

Each Faculty will normally undergo an Academic Board Review every five years, although a shorter cycle is discretionary. As the Academic Board has responsibility to "to oversee and monitor the development of all academic activities of the University", in this document, the term "Faculty" is understood to include all Faculties, colleges, boards of studies and similar organisational units.

The Academic Board's five-yearly Review process complements each faculty's internal quality assurance processes, and to the extent possible, will be aligned with accreditation in the professional faculties.

The Chair of the Academic Board has responsibility for scheduling the Reviews. While a timetable is agreed at the beginning of the cycle, it is typically 2-3 years in extent and changes in the schedule to accommodate needs of faculties that may arise in that period can be made by the Chair of the Academic Board.

4. The Review Process

1. **Overall.** The review process is supported by the Director, Quality Assurance, who works with the Dean and faculty staff to develop the self-evaluation report. The review visit and subsequent reporting is supported by staff provided by the PVC Learning and Teaching.
2. **Initiation of the Review.** Following, broadly, the agreed timetable, the Chair of the Academic Board nominates a date for the review visit, typically after consultation with the Dean. At least three months prior to the review visit, the Chair of the Academic Board and the Director, Quality Assurance meet with the Dean and, normally, with senior faculty staff who will be involved in the review, to
 - a. Agree on the level of review (Faculty, school(s);
 - b. Provide the faculty with the Overview and Detailed Guidelines for Preparing the SER;
 - c. Introduce and explain the process of preparing the SER
 - d. Agree on dates for the Quality Assurance Team to begin intensive work with the faculty and for the SER to be completed.
 - e. In addition, the Chair of the Academic Board engages a review panel of four members (including the Chair) plus two reserves and an observer. The Dean is advised of the composition of the team, to allow any conflicts of interest or other considerations to be accommodated.
3. **Review Visit preparation.** The Academic Board provides the Faculty with a draft schedule and list of interviewee groups. The Faculty is responsible for selecting and inviting interviewees and for arranging the meeting location, refreshments (morning and afternoon tea and lunch for the Review Panel).
4. **Submission of the Self-Evaluation Report (SER).** The faculty submits 15 hard copies and one electronic copy of the SER four weeks in advance of the review date. Hard copy is required, but where extensive supporting documents are cross-referenced in the report, an electronic copy of the complete report, including attachments, with hyperlinked cross-references may be an additional useful form for the Review panel. The SER is considered to be Commercial-In-Confidence and is treated as such by the Review Panel.
5. **Review Panel Preliminary Meeting.** The Review Panel will meet immediately after submission of the SER to begin the process of critical analysis of the SER. Initially, each panel member reads the SER independently to form an individual view of it.
6. **Review Panel Consensus Meeting.** The Review Plan meets approximately one week in advance of the faculty/school visit to identify a common list of issues and appropriate questions for the Review Visit.
7. **Review meeting.** The Review Panel visits the faculty and meets with the Dean, senior staff, other staff and students (including undergraduate, postgraduate research and postgraduate coursework students). The duration of the meeting is dependent on size of the faculty, but is usually a day or a day and a half (this may be extended if multiple schools are being reviewed). The visit will conclude with the Chair providing an oral summary of the main findings of the Review Panel to the Dean.
8. **Report of Review Meeting.** The Review Report is prepared by the Review Panel Secretary in consultation with the Review Panel Chair. The Review Report includes Commendations, Recommendations for Improvement, and Affirmations of the faculty's planned improvements. Where appropriate, examples of best practice relevant to other areas of the University will also be identified.

The Report is forwarded to the Dean generally within four to six weeks of the visit to alert the Review Panel Secretary of any factual errors. In consultation with the Chair, the Review Panel Secretary corrects errors of fact in the Report.

9. **Report forwarded to the Learning and Teaching Committee and the Research and Research Training Committee.** The Review Panel Secretary forwards the Report to the Committees for presentation by the Faculty.
10. **Report forwarded to the Academic Board.** The Learning and Teaching Committee and the Research and Research Training Committee forward the Report of the Review to the Academic Board. The Report now becomes a public document and is made available through the University's Quality website.
11. **Faculty submits Progress Report.** Within six weeks of receiving the final Review Report, the faculty submits a response to the Recommendations contained in the Review Report, indicating how the Faculty will build the Recommendations into Faculty planning processes. Twelve months following the final review report the faculty submits a report outlining progress in pursuing the recommendations. This progress report is presented to the Academic Board through the same process as in 9 and 10 above.

5. **Definitions, Roles and Responsibilities**

Faculties/Schools are the educational and organisational groupings responsible for award courses, and the object of the review process.

Review Report will usually contain the following information:

- Introductory section containing list of Review Team, names of senior faculty interviewed and numbers of students and staff who participated in the interview process
- List of Affirmations, Commendations and Recommendations
- Summary of the key points identified in the SER and the associated Affirmations, Commendations and Recommendations.

Review Panels comprise:

- Chair: Chair of the Academic Board or nominee;
- Three members of academic staff of the University, typically comprising one with significant research and research training experience and another with significant learning and teaching experience.

If requested by the Dean, Review Panels may contain an external member, either from a relevant professional body, an employing body or an academic expert in the discipline.

Review Panels may be accompanied by an observer. Observers have no role in the interview process. Their function is to:

- Observe the interview process and report its effectiveness to the Chair
- Make suggestions for process improvement.

N.B. all panel members must be from outside the Faculty undergoing review. Panel members will disclose any potential conflict of interest.

In addition to visiting the faculty on the day(s) of the visit, members of the Review Panel are required to:

- read all review documentation
- attend pre-visit meetings at which the procedure for the visit will be discussed, issues noted and the questions compiled
- sign off a draft report of the review

Review Panel Chair will:

- chair the pre-visit meetings
- approve the resulting list of questions

- chair the visit meeting, monitor time and ensure all appropriate questions have been asked
- provide an oral report, at the end of the interviews, to the Dean on the main findings
- review and edit the draft report
- signoff the report

Review Panel Secretary will:

- compile and organise an appropriate list of questions
- take minutes of the proceedings of the interviews
- write a draft report of findings of the review, including draft Affirmations, Commendations and Recommendations
- liaise with Review Panel Chair and members of the Review Panel to achieve signoff for the report
- liaise with Dean of faculty to eliminate factual errors from the report
- send the final report to the Learning and Teaching Committee and Research and Research Training Committee of Academic Board

6. Authority

(1) Development

These Guidelines replace the separate Guidelines for Phases I and II of the Academic Board Reviews.

(2) Management responsibility

The Chair of the Academic Board has management responsibility for the Guidelines.

(3) Implementation and monitoring

The Chair of the Academic Board has responsibility for implementing and monitoring the Guidelines.

(4) Review

The Chair of the Academic Board will initiate a review of these Guidelines as part of the five-yearly Academic Board faculty review process.

(5) Communication

The Chair of the Academic Board has responsibility for communicating the Guidelines and authorising updates.

(6) Contact

For information contact:

Linda Schofield,
Director, Quality Assurance
Ph: 9351 7840
Email: l.schofield@usyd.edu.au

7. Related information

(1) *Related University legislation, resolutions, policies and procedures include:*

Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement Policy at http://www.usyd.edu.au/quality/about/docs/quality_assurance_improvement_policy.pdf

(2) University policies superseded or replaced by this policy:

(a) Guidelines for Academic Board Faculty Reviews, March 2004 at http://fmweb01.ucc.usyd.edu.au/FMPro?-db=POL_Main.fp5&-lay=www&-format=/pol/pol_summary.html&-RecID=33966&-find

Ethical Entrepreneurialism Working Party

Preamble

Modern University life inevitably involves us in a wide range of interactions with government and its agencies, non-government organisations and the private sector. These interactions provide great mutual benefit and enable us to fulfil our role as a public University by contributing to social and economic development, and acting as source of ideas and innovation. These interactions can also threaten our integrity and independence, as well as challenge our academic values both for individuals and to the institution as a whole.

To address these challenges, the Provost and the Chair of Academic Board have proposed a joint working party to examine the range of relevant current Academic Board and University policies with a view to developing a consolidated statement and guidance addressing “ethical entrepreneurialism” within the University community.

Terms of reference

The Working Party will report on:

1. The spectrum of external interactions in which the University, its officers and academics might be involved, in which ethical considerations and academic values need to be explicitly recognised;
2. The adequacy of current policies within the University that address or influence the issues identified by the Working Party, with recommendations to appropriate University agencies on revision or extension of existing policies;
3. A concise statement, consistent with the core values of the University, that defines the ethical basis of University interactions with external stakeholders and its community and the academic values which inform those interactions;
4. A concise “users’ guide” providing practical guidance on ethical practice to members of the University engaging with external stakeholders and the University community.

Membership

- a. Professor Don Nutbeam
- b. Professor Bruce Sutton (Chair)
- c. Professor Margaret Clunies-Ross
- d. Professor Les Copeland
- e. Professor Hugh Durrant-Whyte
- f. Professor Ben Freedman
- g. Professor Simon Chapman
- h. Professor Merlin Crossley
- i. Mr Jack Clegg
- j. Mr Richard Fisher

Timeline

The Working Party will produce a draft report with recommendations for consideration by the University community by June 2008.

AGENDA ITEM 6

Report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal

6.1 Report on Senate Matters

6.1.1 Report on the Senate meeting held on 4 February 2008

Senate, at its meeting held on 4 February 2008:

- (1) elected Mr Alan Cameron AM as Deputy Chancellor for a two year term of office from 4 February 2008 at the February meeting of Senate in 2010, and thanked Emeritus Professor Ann Sefton for her service as Deputy Chancellor for four years
- (2) adopted the Rules, set out in the report presented, in respect of the Sydney Peace Foundation, to take effect on 1 March 2008.
- (3) approved the incorporation of the Warren Centre for Advanced Engineering as a company limited by guarantee in accordance with the Constitution set out in the report presented; and resolved that the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to execute the Deed poll set out in the report presented.
- (4) adopted the policy set out in the report presented covering the terms under which the University would provide legal assistance to members of staff summonsed to appear before the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC).
- (5) nominated Dr Margaret Edmond, Acting Director, Student Administration and Services, to replace Mr Rod Tindall on the Law Extension Committee for the remainder of the current term to 30 November 2008, and thanked Mr Tindall for his many years of service to the Law Extension Committee.
- (6) resolved to admit Ms Meg Pickup, retired member of the Academic Staff, to the degree of Master of Science *ad eundem gradum*; and Mr Frank Taeker, retired member of the General Staff, to the degree of Bachelor of Science *ad eundem gradum*.
- (7) noted the International report.
- (8) noted the Community report.
- (9) noted that the following have accepted Senate's invitation to receive an honorary award in 2008:
 - Mr David Anstice - Honorary Fellow
 - The Hon Justice Margaret Beazley AO - Honorary LLD
 - Mr Christopher Lloyd Bowen - Honorary Fellow
 - Father Arthur Bridge AM - Honorary DMus
 - Dr Barry R Catchlove - Honorary Fellow
 - Mr W Peter Coleman - Honorary DLitt
 - The Hon Gareth Evans AO QC - Honorary LLD
 - Mr Paul Fensom - Honorary Fellow
 - Professor John Hopcroft - Honorary DEng
 - Mr Wayne R Lonergan - Honorary DScEcon
 - Emeritus Professor Edward McWhinney QC - Honorary Fellow
 - Mr Robert E Purves - Honorary Fellow
 - Dr Gene Sherman - Honorary DLitt
 - Ms Jane Spring - Honorary Fellow
 - Mr Jeremy Steele - Honorary Fellow
 - Dr Bruce Stillman AO - Honorary DSc
 - Mr Kenneth Turner - Honorary DLitt
 - Mr Ken Unsworth AM - Honorary DVisArts
- (10) noted that the Senate Retreat would be held on Sunday 24 February 2008; and that the next Senate meeting would be held at 5.00pm on Monday 17 March 2008.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal on matters considered by Senate at its meeting held on 4 February 2008.

AGENDA ITEM 13 General Business

13.1 Appointment of members of the Student Proctorial Panel

Clause 64 of the University of Sydney By-law 1999 provides for the establishment of a Student Proctorial Panel. Membership of the Panel includes 9 members of the academic staff (of whom at least 4 are to be professors and at least 4 are not to be professors) appointed by and from the members of the Academic Board, and 9 student members of the Academic Board appointed by and from the student members of the Academic Board.

The following academic staff members have been submitted by the Provost for appointment to the Panel:

Professor Elizabeth Cowley	Faculty of Economics & Business
Associate Professor Merrilyn Walton	Faculty of Medicine
Dr Greg Castillo	Faculty of Architecture, Design & Planning
Associate Professor Nick O'Dywer	Faculty of Health Sciences
Dr Inakwu Odeh	Faculty of Agriculture, Food & Natural Resources
Professor Brian Paltridge	Faculty of Education & Social Work
Associate Professor Roger Magnusson	Faculty of Law
Professor Jo-anne Brien	Faculty of Pharmacy
Dr Vanessa Barr	Faculty of Veterinary Science

The student membership of the Panel has been filled by student members of the Academic Board, with any remaining vacancies filled by re-appointing student members of the Panel previously appointed in 2007. The following student members are submitted for appointment:

Mr J Barrow	Undergraduate Student, Faculty of Education and Social Work
Mr A McLeod	Undergraduate Student, Faculty of Law
Mr D Tremblath	Postgraduate Research Student, Faculty of Health Sciences
Mr R Walpola	Undergraduate Student, Faculty of Pharmacy
Ms R Santos	Undergraduate Student, Faculty of Arts
Ms L-M Syron	Postgraduate Research Student, Board of Studies in Indigenous Studies
Ms S Tolerton	Undergraduate Student, Faculty of Medicine
Mr L Robertson	Undergraduate Student, Faculty of Health Sciences
Mr V Sood	Undergraduate Student, Faculty of Law

Recommendation

That the Academic Board appoint members of the Student Proctorial Panel, as set out in the report presented.