



The University of Sydney

Academic Board

Board Secretary: Miss E R Ring

Main Quadrangle, A14

Phone: 9351 3305; Fax: 9351 3572

E-mail: ring@mail.usyd.edu.au

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

MEMORANDUM TO: Members of the Academic Board

A meeting of the Academic Board will be held at 2.15 pm on **Wednesday, 11 June 1997** in the Professorial Board Room.

The agenda for the meeting is set out below, and the Chair's recommendation for the action to be taken by the Board in respect of each agenda item is set out below each item, preceded by the symbol #. The Chair has also starred those items which she believes need discussion. Members will be invited at the beginning of the meeting to star any other items that they wish to have discussed.

Erica Ring

for

Dr W Adams

Acting Registrar and Deputy Principal (Administrative Support Services)

4 June 1997

The items on this agenda are as follows:

	Page
A1. Minutes	1
A2. Business arising out of the minutes	1
A4. Report of the Chair	1
A5. Statement by the Vice-Chancellor and Principal	2
A8. Report by the Vice-Chancellor and Principal on proctorial matters	3
A12. Report of the Academic Forum	3
B14. Report of the Orange Agricultural College	7
C1. Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee	8
C3. Report of the Teaching and Learning Committee	10
C4. Report of the Research Committee	10
C5. Report of the Library and Information Technology Committee	13
C6. Report of the Academic Staffing Committee	14

A G E N D A

A1. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Academic Board held on 14 May 1997 are enclosed.

Any proposed amendments to the minutes should be submitted in writing to the Registrar (Attention: Miss E R Ring) before the meeting and preferably by 10 June so that they can be included in the supplementary agenda for the meeting.

that the minutes of the meeting of the Academic Board held on 14 May 1997 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

A2. Business arising out of the minutes

A4. Report of the Chair

Part I

1. Report on Senate Matters

To be tabled at the meeting.

that the Board note the report.

2. International Relations Committee

At its last meeting, the Board received a draft of the proposed Terms of Reference for the International Relations Committee. Professor Mack had requested that comments on the draft be referred to him by 23 May.

To allow opportunity for further comment, this item will be deferred until the July meeting of the Board.

that the Board note the report.

3. Procedures and Guidelines for the establishment of awards, prizes and scholarships

At its last meeting, the Board considered a document on "Guidelines for the Establishment and Variation of Awards, Prizes and Scholarships" and agreed to adopt the Guidelines, subject to the request for further advice on the resource implications of its administration.

Advice from the Academic Colleges is still to be received.

that the Board note the report.

4. Amendment of Policy Document on the Appointment of All Categories of Academic Staff: Representative of the Chair of the Board on Chair Selection Committees

At present University policy relating to the constitution of Chair Selection Committees enables Deputy Chairs to be able to represent the Chair of the Board on Chair Selection Committees.

I **recommend** that the Board formalise the practice of the previous Chair of the Board in making provision for members and former members of the Central Promotions Committee for Personal Chairs to be similarly eligible to represent the Chair on Chair Selection Committees.

that the Board adopt the recommendation of the Chair to amend the Policy Document on the Appointment of All Categories of Academic Staff to provide that members and former members of the Central Promotions Committee be eligible to represent the Chair of the

5. Action under delegated authority and reports from the Academic Groups

Under delegated authority, Professor Mack considered the recommendations of the Academic Groups in respect of academic appointments and the appointment of Faculty Promotions Assessment Committees and selection committees that have been processed under the “old” appointments procedures and has approved/noted them as appropriate. A report on the appointment of Visiting Professors and FPACs that he has approved is attached. (see pages 15-18)

that the Board note the report.

6. Work in progress and issues under consideration

(1) Working Party on the Academic Year

Professor Mack has recommended that work on the structure of the Academic Year be deferred pending an evaluation of the 1998 Pilot Summer School.

(2) Working Party to examine the present procedures for student appeals against academic decisions

Mr Bowan sought information on practices in some other universities and, following consideration of this, together with a review of recent appeal cases here, drafted a set of guidelines. Professor Mack modified the draft, which was then circulated for comment, prior to a further meeting of the Working Party. At that meeting some additional changes were suggested and Mr Bowan agreed to prepare revised guidelines by early June. These will be circulated to relevant administrative and faculty staff for comment before a final document is produced for submission to the Board.

(3) McGaw Review of the HSC

Advice is being awaited on Minister Aquilina’s decisions on the recommendations of the McGaw Review.

(4) Status of “green papers” considered by the Board/Forum

Drafts of the Code of Conduct and Intellectual Property policy documents are included in the Vice-Chancellor’ report (Item A5.).

Further work is being undertaken on the draft Outside Earnings policy document and it is expected that it will be presented to the July meeting of the Board.

that the Board note the report.

7. Question Time

I have not received any questions this month.

that the Board note the report.

P Part II

To be presented at the meeting.

A5. Statement by the Vice-Chancellor and Principal

Part I

1. Report on Senate Matters

To be tabled at the meeting.

that the Board note the report.

P 2. **Draft Policy Documents:
Intellectual Property Policy
Code of Conduct**

These attached draft policy documents have been endorsed by the Senior Executive Staff following extensive consultations with staff. The Acting Vice-Chancellor now forwards the documents to the Board for advice prior to submission of the final drafts to Senate.

(see pages 19-28 and 29-33)

.....

P **Part II**

To be presented at the meeting by the Acting Vice-Chancellor, Professor Anderson.

A8. Report by the Vice-Chancellor and Principal on proctorial matters

The Acting Vice-Chancellor and Principal will table a report at the meeting.

that the Board note that a report was tabled.

A12. Report of the Academic Forum

The Academic Forum met on Monday 19 May 1997.

1. **Forum focus: Selection of students into the University**

Discussion was introduced by Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Professor Ken Eltis who has responsibility for policy in this area and by Professor John Mack as Chair of the Academic Board.

Professor Eltis reminded members that, in approving on 7 April the future intake of undergraduate fee-paying students, Senate stressed the importance of: ensuring students are selected on merit; a proportion of the income from fee-payers being put towards services of the University; ensuring that the University as a whole benefited from the move; and using the opportunity to enhance equity and merit programs for all students. While Professor Mack had the responsibility of liaising with deans about how faculties would approach the admission of students, Professor Eltis had the task of exploring operational questions: which faculties might admit fee-paying students and in what departments; the impact on load, space, staffing and administration; and how faculties saw the initiative leading to enhanced possibilities for the University.

At the Senate meeting of 5 May, the Vice-Chancellor had announced the establishment of an operational group to oversee development of policy and to interact with the reference group established by Senate. This Local Fee-Paying Undergraduate Students Project Management Group, chaired by Professor Eltis, had 7 terms of reference as follows:

1. To critically review estimates of likely enrolment levels in 1998 and beyond and formulate advice for the Strategic Planning Advisory Committee
2. To review space and timetabling issues and provide advice to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Planning & Resources)
3. To review advice from faculties on fee levels, formulate principles and provide advice to the Vice-Chancellor
4. To establish effective admission procedures (including relating to advanced standing) and to provide advice to the Undergraduate Studies Committee on admission policies and criteria in the light of advice from the faculties.
5. To develop policy with respect to
 - payment and refund of fees
 - transfer to HECS-liable status
 - transfer to scholarships
 - access and equity

7. To provide advice on the distribution of funds to enhance equity and merit programs and for enhanced student support and social services.

The group was yet to meet.

The reference group which Senate had agreed to establish contained members of both Senate and the Academic Board. This Local Fee-Paying Undergraduate Students Reference Group, also chaired by Professor Eltis, would provide feedback to the Project Management Group on the appropriateness of procedures and policies it develops and advise the Vice-Chancellor and Senate on the appropriateness of procedures and policies recommended.

Advice to Professor Eltis from deans to date indicated that probably ten faculties currently saw themselves as enrolling students on a local undergraduate fee-paying basis. This did not entail all departments in each faculty and no faculty had as yet firmly decided fee levels. Figures for estimates of likely enrolments were uncertain; it would be necessary to look at overall student load and then likely levels of local fee-payers to be admitted. Advice from faculties and a space review throughout the University suggest that the pressure of students in the first year would not cause undue rooming difficulties. Faculty advice on fee levels showed three approaches being proposed: taking the HECS cost and multiplying by three, taking the international fee, or taking the international fee and subtracting the capital component or some other amount. Whatever developed in regard to payment and refund of fees would be consistent with postgraduate coursework fee-paying arrangements. It was still to be determined whether payment would be on a semester or annual basis and whether there would be an application fee. Views on marketing were split between those advocating central control and those recommending precise targeting by individual faculties through professional organisations and contacts.

In his introduction to discussion Professor Mack referred to both the Vice-Chancellor's discussion paper on fees and his and Professor Lawler's memorandum to deans which asked faculties to distinguish between eligibility for an offer and the selection process. Faculties were being asked to determine what academic quality they thought desirable so that a student would have a reasonable guarantee of success. This was important for all faculties because the University had taken the argument that an offer of admission is made on the understanding of expectation of success in the first year. If there were special types of admission, steps should be taken to alert departments so they could provide extra support if necessary. In establishing a reasonable TER cut-off, faculties needed to be prepared to offer support.

In the memorandum to deans, faculties were also being asked to consider taking advantage of the extra flexibility provided by being able to prescribe 'adult criteria' for making offers (e.g. knowledge), additional to a TER.

Replies so far from faculties indicated that some would select on TER alone while others were prepared to utilise upper and lower figures and adult criteria to distinguish some applicants from others. The number of courses with additional criteria for selection was increasing (e.g. Pharmacy will have an extra test on top of the TER for 1998 entry). Faculties may need to look more at students' previous record, other than simply their TER.

Professor Mack said that the other underlying principle illustrated in the white paper was the idea that, because we're unable to have a blurred boundary between HECS and fee-paying admission, straight application of merit criteria means that offers are first made of HECS places and followed by fee-based offers. This was not necessarily the best way, especially in an environment where governments were reducing the amount of student subsidy. If the University can develop its own resources, it makes sense to look at each applicant in terms of their ability to pay a fee.

Most faculties said they wanted to build up scholarship funds. This would require a combined effort from the University and individual faculties as well as a strong appeal to alumni and other donors and sponsors. It was not known yet whether the UAC would be able to handle applications for fee-paying places.

Areas subsequently discussed in the meeting included: the University's contractual obligations and how that would remain the same for all students, difficulties in determining budgets, the need to clarify distribution of the 95% concern for maintaining

2. **Report from the Vice-Chancellor**

In the Vice-Chancellor's absence, Professor Derek Anderson reported the following information.

(1) **Proposal to establish pilot Summer School in 1998**

Following VCAC's endorsement of the plan to implement the summer school, the Academic Board has given its support in principle. The plan will go to Senate for approval in June. The NTEU had expressed concern about this development, and had lodged a notice of dispute with the Industrial Commission, but has since indicated its intentions to withdraw that notice. Further discussions concerning the operational detail of the School will be held with both academic and general staff Joint Consultative Committees.

(2) **Status of University in industrial matters**

There have been two industrial cases recently concerning enterprise bargaining, which involve the identification of universities as 'trading corporations'. The University is implicated in one of these, and the matter will be heard in the Industrial Commission later in the month.

The AVCC has employed a private consultant to advise on the implications of various aspects of competition policy in so far as they may affect the operations of universities, and particularly any proposal to effect course rationalisations between universities.

(3) **Revised policy document on appointment of deans**

The revised policy on appointment of deans was adopted by Senate and came into effect on 5 May. It will be available on the Web next week. The policy will be due for review in 1999.

(4) **Promotion briefing session**

A briefing session on the forthcoming Promotion Committee operations, conducted by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic and Staffing), the Chair-elect of the Academic Board and other senior colleagues, will be held on Thursday 29 May, 12.45 to 2.00 pm in the Bosch Lecture Theatre 3.

(5) **Eureka Prizes**

Nominations are about to be called for the Eureka Prizes and colleagues are encouraged to take an interest in making appropriate nominations. This year there are ten prizes worth \$78 000.

3. **Report from the Chair of the Academic Forum**

The Forum noted the University's final response to the West Review of Higher Education and the Chair added that it was gratifying to see that the improved document in part reflected comments made on the earlier draft by Academic Forum members at the last meeting.

Congratulations were extended to the re-elected Deputy Chairs of the Academic Board as well as to Professor Philip Kuchel and Professor Colin Sullivan on their election as Fellows of the Australian Academy of Science.

The Forum noted a report on the forthcoming Chancellor's Committee's Birthday Celebration and Book Launch.

4. **Question time**

In response to a question concerning the voucher system as discussed in the University's final response to the West review, Professor Mack said that the proposal was there to provide a targeted alternative to the still unclear nature of the currently revived government 'voucher system' suggestions. Another purpose behind it was to support related comments to

and apply an admissions policy on equity and merit principles that covers all types of applicant.

Professor Anderson, in response to questions on the student occupation of the main quadrangle on 9 May, said that the decision to call police was taken on the basis of advice by the Vice-Chancellor after an extensive period of consultation with senior officers, and no charges have or will be laid.

Responding to questions concerning the Vice-Chancellor's absence from two consecutive Academic Forum meetings, Professor Gill explained that the VC was attending a rescheduled AVCC meeting in Brisbane, but currently was available to attend the balance of the Forum meetings for the year. Professor Gill undertook to provide an explanation in the agenda papers should the Vice-Chancellor become unavailable to attend a future meeting.

5. **Tribute to Professor John Mack, Chair of the Academic Board, 1991-7**

Professor Gill paid the following tribute to Professor Mack on the occasion of his last Academic Forum meeting as Chair of the Academic Board.

Today's is the last Academic Forum to be attended by John Mack. John has been the Chair of the Academic Board for six years, and during that time has given the sort of leadership of which the academic community was sorely in need. This was a time of great change and of significant threat to the core academic values which lie at the heart of a great University. The major changes to the administration of the University stemming from the report of the Boston Consulting Group not only caused considerable disruption to the operation of the University, but also threatened to push the sorts of scholarly issues which should be at the heart of the agenda into the shade. John's response to this was two-fold.

First, John was concerned to ensure that the voice of the academic community continued to be heard through effective organisational structures. He was instrumental in the reconfiguring of the Academic Board, and those changes which for the first time gave that body a capacity effectively to be involved in all aspects of the academic agenda. With activist deputy chairs, a refined committee structure, and a direct link between those deputy chairs and the committees, the Board was well-placed to play a defining part in the future course of University affairs. The danger of isolation of the streamlined Board from the University as a whole has, hopefully, been avoided with the development of the Academic Forum. John has been the major force in driving this reorganisation, and I would like personally to acknowledge the enormous part he has played in setting the contours of both Board and Forum. John has clearly been a major institution-builder, and has stamped his influence indelibly on the academic community's deliberative structures.

Second, John has been at the forefront in the articulation of scholarly values and the upholding of scholarly standards. He has not pulled away from the difficult decisions, but has always been intent on ensuring that the sorts of standards about which we all talk are actually realised in the activities of the University. He was not swayed by the managerialist language and impetus associated with the administrative organisational changes, but always sought to concentrate upon their scholarly implications. Such a focus was clearly essential if the University was not to lose its way under the impact of what can only be called an undue focus upon administrative matters by elements within the University's then upper echelons. Scholarly issues have remained at the heart of John's personal agenda.

Throughout this time as Chair of the Board, John always put the University and its interests first, even ahead of his personal health. He was dedicated in serving it, diligent in protecting its interests, and dogged in chiding it if he believed it fell short of its own standards. As a leader he was energetic, always fair, scrupulously honest, and possessed of enormous integrity. It is a measure of his kindness and generosity of spirit perhaps more than his considerable achievements that not only is he held in high esteem by his colleagues, but he is also regarded with significant affection by those who have come into contact with him. It is clear that with his retirement, the Board and Forum are losing one of their most distinguished members. If Gough Whitlam is popularly considered to be a

On behalf of the Forum, and through that the University community more generally, I want to wish you all the best as you leave us. You can be sure in the knowledge that we are poorer for your going.

6. Next Academic Forum meeting

Professor Gill announced that there was no proposal to hold an Academic Forum meeting in June unless there was a good swell of opposition to this. Unless members are informed otherwise, the next meeting will therefore be held on Monday 18 August in accordance with the list of dates previously circulated.

that the Board note the report.

B14. Report of the Orange Agricultural College

Semester and vacation dates: 1998-9

The Principal Dates for 1998 and 1999 were approved by the Standing Committee of the Orange Agricultural College Board on 30 April 1997. These dates have been referred to the Board of Undergraduate Studies and the Standing Committee of the College Board, both of which have student representatives as sitting members. Feedback from the Student body has been provided through these student representatives.

These dates fit in with the requirements of Distance Education students, and students' wishes re study vacation.

The College requests approval of the following variations to the AVCC/University Calendar of Dates:

1. that the March Semester commence one week earlier i.e:
 - 1998 - Monday, 23 February NOT 2 March
 - 1999 - Monday, 22 February NOT 1 March
2. that the April and September study breaks be two weeks long rather than one, i.e:
 - 1998 - scheduled classes for internal students cease at end of day 9 April (prior to Easter Holiday break); study break ends 24 April
 - scheduled classes for internal students cease 21 September; study break ends 2 October
 - 1999 - scheduled classes for internal students cease at end of day 1 April (prior to Easter Holiday break); study break ends 16 April
 - scheduled classes for internal students cease 17 September; study break ends 1 October
3. that the study break prior to examinations be 3 days rather than 5 days i.e:
 - 1998 - study break commences Monday, 15 June; examinations commence Thursday, 18 June
 - study break commences Monday, 16 November; examinations commence Thursday, 19 November
 - 1999 - study break commences Monday, 14 June (Public Holiday); examinations commence Thursday, 17 June
 - study break commences Monday, 15 November; examinations commence Thursday, 18 November
4. that the variation to the University's designated examination periods for Extended Semester Options and posts be accepted to also include:
 - 1998 - 29/30 January - Post Examination Period
 - 25/26 February - Extended Semester Option Examinations
 - 29/30 July - Post, supplementary and ESO Examinations
 - 1999 - 28/29 January - Post and supplementary Examinations
 - 24/25 February - Extended Semester Option Examinations
 - 28/29 July - Post, supplementary and ESO Examinations
5. that the end of semester examination periods only extend for 7 days NOT the two week

- Examinations commence Thursday, 19 November and end Friday, 27 November
- 1999 - Examinations commence Thursday, 17 June and end Friday, 25 June
- Examinations commence Thursday, 18 November and end Friday, 26 November.

that the Board approve the semester and vacation dates for Orange Agricultural College for 1998 and 1999 as requested.

C1. Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee

The Committee met on 20 May 1997.

There were present: Professor Jocelyn Lawler (Chair), Professor Hilary Astor, Ms Su Baker, Associate Professor Geoff Barton, Professor Brian Farrow, Associate Professor Christopher Gillies, Associate Professor Jill Gordon, Associate Professor Jan Horsfall, Professor Richard Johnstone, Dr Gary Lee, Dr Edith Lees, Associate Professor Ewan Mylecharane, Dr Greg Patmore and Associate Professor Richard Waterhouse. Professor Terry Walter and Ms Mary Ferguson were present by invitation. Ms E Bergmann was in attendance.

1. Amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate

(1) Faculties of Arts and Science: Bachelor of Liberal Studies

The Committee **recommends**

- (a) that the Academic Board approve the proposal of the Faculties of Arts and Science for the new award program Bachelor of Liberal Studies, for introduction in 1998; and
- (b) that the Resolutions of the Senate be amended, with effect from 1 January 1998.

While this proposal was presented on the form for initial proposals for approval in principle, the Chair of the Academic Board had recommended that it be treated as a full proposal, for approval, which the Committee supported.

The purpose of the proposal is to produce graduates who have studied a broad range of subjects in Arts and Science. It is comparable with North American models, and at present no such other course exists in New South Wales. It is expected to appeal to both local and international students who wish to integrate studies in the humanities, social sciences and sciences.

Amendments to the Resolutions of the Senate are attached. (see pages 34-36)

that the Board adopt the proposal and recommend the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate, as recommended.

(b) Faculty of Economics: Bachelor of Commerce (Liberal Studies)

The Committee **recommends**

- (i) that the Academic Board approve the proposal of the Faculty of Economics for the new award program Bachelor of Commerce (Liberal Studies), for introduction in 1998; and
- (ii) that the Resolutions of the Senate be amended, with effect from 1 January 1998.

While this proposal was presented on the form for initial proposals for approval in principle, the Chair of the Academic Board had recommended that it be treated as a full proposal, for approval, which the Committee supported.

The purpose of the degree is to produce graduates who have studied a broad range of courses in arts and science as well as commerce and economics, and is strongly supported by the accounting profession.

Amendments to the Resolutions of the Senate are attached. (see pages 36-38)

that the Board adopt the proposal and recommend the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate, as recommended.

2. Admissions matters

Faculty of Science - Proposal to change selection criteria

The Chair of the Board had advised the May Board that, in relation to the Faculty of Science's proposal to change selection criteria, the relative weightings to be assigned to the TER/tertiary results component and the STAT component would be determined shortly and forwarded to the Board.

The Committee **recommends** that the Board note the following selection process for applicants for the degree of Bachelor of Pharmacy, to operate for the 1998 round of offers:

Step 1: Applicants will be ranked according to the STAT result.

Step 2: In the top 80% of this ranking, there will be a re-ranking according to the TER, or according to tertiary rank for those who have completed one year or more of tertiary study.

Step 3: No offers will then be made to applicants with a TER of less than 80, except for those where there is a record of one year or more of tertiary study showing results with a weighted average of credit or higher.

Applicants seeking entry through the Special Admission Procedures: - Broadway Scheme, Mature-age Entry Scheme, Educationally Disadvantaged Admission Scheme and the Cadigal Program must also take the STAT.

The Department wishes to review the operation of the selection process after admissions are complete for the 1998 intake.

that the Board note the report.

3. Admission and selection into fee-paying undergraduate courses in 1998

The Committee noted the Chair's advice that Deans' responses to the memorandum from Professors Mack and Lawler relating to admissions/selection procedures had been received and, as there were issues to be clarified, would be circulated to members for the June Committee meeting.

that the Board note the report.

4. Credit point values and nomenclature

The Chair tabled a draft discussion paper on credit points and invited comments to be forwarded to her, so that a revised paper could be prepared for the June Committee meeting.

that the Board note the report.

5. Admissions

A memorandum recommending a series of amendments to the By-laws and Resolutions governing undergraduate admission and enrolment, incorporating the new nomenclature for courses and units of study, had been tabled at the April meeting. Associate Professor Ewan Mylecharane undertook to prepare a summary of points raised by responses, to be given to Ms N Downey together with the responses.

that the Board note the report.

6. Overseas Qualifications Sub-Committee

The Chair took on notice a request from Associate Professor Mylecharane for the Overseas Qualifications Sub-Committee to be re-established, and for the Committee to recommend Associate Professor Dawe as its convenor, noting that this was not within the terms of reference of the Committee. She undertook to seek advice and report to the June Committee meeting.

C3. Report of the Teaching and Learning Committee

The Committee met on 1 May 1997 when there were present: Professor A Sefton (Chair), Associate Professor L Dawe, Ms S Graham (representing Mr K Oliver), Professor R Johnstone, Professor J Lawrence and Associate Professor J Lublin. In attendance: Ms N Downey.

Annual Reports of Faculty Teaching Committees

The Committee *resolved* that the **attached** format should be used for requests for Annual Reports from Faculty Teaching Committees and that it should form the basis for the current and future consolidated reports on teaching to the Academic Board and the Senate. *(see page 39)*

The Committee agreed by circulation, following the meeting, to present the **attached** consolidated report on 1996 Teaching Activities to the Academic Board and the Senate. The report presents examples under each heading from a selection of faculties only. If any members wish to read the full reports from any faculty, they are invited to contact the Committee Chair. *(see pages 40-44)*

that the Board

- **note the format for the reports; and**
- **note the 1996 Report on Teaching Activities and forwarded it to Senate.**

C4. Report of the Research Committee

A. First report

The Committee met on 8 May 1997 when there were present: Professor D Cockayne, Deputy Chair Academic Board (Presiding Member), Professor G J Gill, Professor R I Tanner, Professor I D Hume, Associate Professor D Cook, Associate Professor S R Garton and Dr J Lingard. In Attendance: Professor L Field, Dr A Reynolds, Ms M Robb and Mr P Cook.

1. Chair

Professor Gill assumed the Chair as Professor Cockayne had an unavoidable commitment at another meeting and was unable to attend till 9.30 am.

2. Taxation Status of Postgraduate Scholarships

Professor Tanner advised that it was his understanding that the possibility of taxing a range of postgraduate scholarships was now not under active consideration by the Federal Government, and that the current tax free status of most postgraduate scholarships was likely to remain for the moment.

3. Partial Supplementation for Increased Salary Cost of Staff Employed on National Competitive Grants

Professor Tanner advised that Deans were progressively advising the Research and Scholarships Office of the total costs in 1997 of the impact of enterprise bargaining salary increases for staff employed on National Competitive Grants. He indicated however that until the enterprise agreement was formalised no decisions could be made in relation to the quantum of partial support that might be able to be offered to grant holders.

4. Review of University Research Grants Scheme (URGS)

Professor Gill spoke to his paper distributed with the agenda which canvassed various issues in relation to the URGS. He expressed the view that the URGS may have exhausted its function, although he was also of the view that some sections of the University may still benefit from it. The success rate for Category A applicants (ie those staff without an established research record) was down to ARC success rates, and there may not be strong arguments to keep this element of the URGS. Declining numbers and quality of applications suggests that the target pool may be all but exhausted, and therefore it is time to rethink

After considerable discussion, Professor Gill, assisted by Dr Lingard, agreed to draft a set of principles for a revised use of the funds, previously allocated under the banner of URGS, in accordance with the discussion at the meeting.

5. **Report from the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research)**

Professor Tanner reported on the New Images Science Policy Workshop sponsored jointly by the British Council, the University, DIST and the Academy of Science. The workshop was well attended and at it, Mr McGauran (Minister for Science) announced five new postdoctoral places to be held in Britain.

Professor Tanner explained that a mechanism for 'painlessly' distributing the \$600 research expenses per PhD student had been agreed on. Each eligible student will receive a cheque upon filling in a request-for-cheque form explaining the uses proposed for the money. The Head of Department will sign the request form if he/she approves.

The draft Intellectual Property Policy was revised after the December 1996 Academic Forum and it was discussed at the Senior Executive Staff meeting in April 1997. Significant changes to the ownership of teaching materials were requested. The December 1997 draft assigned the right to act as owner of copyright to the author except where a written order to produce the material had been made. The revised draft will initially assign the copyright ownership of all teaching materials to the University. Releases will be authorised where it is thought appropriate. Further discussion of, and refinement of this concept may be warranted.

He reported that the Code of Conduct is still to be discussed and that the Outside Earnings Policy is being redrafted.

Professor Tanner said that the deliberations of the committee looking at a revised university funding model have now been sent to the Colleges. He said he had many criticisms of the research portion of this funding model, even in its present (revised) form. Some of them are:

- (i) only about \$17M of the Research Quantum is visible in the funding, out of \$23M.
- (ii) statistical problems in the data and non-congruence in departments which may appear to have similar names. Professor Tanner said he believed that aggregations at the Faculty level would be more meaningful.
- (iii) large, research supine faculties can obtain a large amount of 'research' money for near zero activity. Professor Tanner said he believed that a lower reward is needed to really low, unimproving performance. (It is now six years since the amalgamations).
- (iv) Some unnecessarily strange methods are used to compute the 1,2,3 categories from the postgraduate completions, grants, and publications data. The statistics on publications may also change categories.

Professor Tanner indicated that he believed there was a need for much discussion on this model so that it is consistent with the University's aspirations to be a research leader.

Professor Tanner noted this would be his last Research Committee meeting. He said he believed this has been a very positive, active committee; and despite its 8 am meeting time, it had been a pleasure to be a member of it.

On behalf of the Committee, Professor Cockayne indicated that he and the Committee had had great pleasure in working with Professor Tanner in his role as Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) both inside and outside the Committee. He indicated that it was recognised that he had greatly improved the workings of the office of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research). In particular it was his role in working with the Research Committee that was now used as a model for other committees of the Academic Board.

6. **Report from the Director, Research Development**

Ms Robb reported that she had been focussed on assisting applicants for SPIRIT (old ARC Collaborative Grants and APA (Industry) Scholarships) grants. It was noted that Dr Baxter had indicated that there may be 50 applications from the University this year. Ms

number of all applications in the next rounds for ARC Large, SPIRIT and NHMRC grants so that it can remain competitive with other institutions.

7. Report of the Director, Research and Scholarships Office

Mr Cook reported that he had recently spent two days at the Orange Agricultural College (OAC) speaking with researchers in an attempt to identify how their needs can be better met from both the OAC and the wider University. The lack of infrastructure to support research at the College concerned him, both for its effect on existing researchers and those trying to establish research careers. He indicated he intended speaking to appropriate people at the Camperdown campus who may be able to assist in this regard.

Mr Cook explained that five new staff would be starting in the Research and Scholarships Office over the next two months as a result of interviews already held in the last month and more to follow. Two of these were additional staff and the rest were the filling of existing positions. Once the staff structure settled, he would ensure the university community were informed of the new structure and contacts within the Office, with the intention of further opening up communications to and from the Office.

The internal audit by the University Audit Office of the resubmission of the 1996 Publications Report was underway and it was clear that difficulties at Departmental level still existed. Mr Cook was to meet with the Internal Audit Office about these matters soon. The internal University deadline for the 1997 Research Income Return of 2 May had passed but a number of departments had been very slow to respond and would be actively followed up in the next week.

Mr Cook reported that the shell of a new MS Access-based scholarships information management database recently installed, once populated, should be operational in late June.

8. Proposed New University Budget Model

Professor Cockayne explained that a proposal for a revised University budget model had been sent to Deans and was currently being actively discussed within Colleges. The Research Committee expressed the view, that it would like the opportunity to comment upon the model. Professor Cockayne undertook to determine whether it was appropriate for members of the Committee to be given a copy of the model. Professor Cockayne gave a very brief outline of the philosophy behind the revised model but explained that if possible it would be best if the Committee was able to examine the documents supporting it themselves.

The Research Committee agreed that there should be a special meeting of the Committee members concerned either on Tuesday 13 or Wednesday 14 May so that they could, if necessary, formulate any comments on the proposed budget model.

that , items 1 to 8, the Board note the report.

B. Second report

The Committee met on 14 May 1997 when there were present: Professor D Cockayne, Deputy Chair Academic Board (Presiding Member), Professor G J Gill, Professor R I Tanner, Associate Professor D Cook, Associate Professor S R Garton and Dr J Lingard. In Attendance: Professor L Field, Dr A Reynolds, Dr C Baxter and Mr P Cook.

1. Audit of 1996 DEETYA Publications Return

It was reported that an audit of the resubmitted 1996 DEETYA Publications Return, recently undertaken by the University's Internal Audit and Review Office had revealed a potentially large error rate in data submitted by Heads of Department. Urgent action would need to be taken in an attempt to rectify this problem which it was surmised would also effect the 1997 DEETYA Publications Return.

2. Proposed New University of Sydney Budget Model

Professor Cockayne who is a member of the Working Party which drafted the new funding model, gave an overview of the philosophy behind the new budget model with particular emphasis on explaining rankings given to Departments in terms of cost of, and performance in, teaching and research.

Discussion was around the ranking of departments in terms of their relative costs in undertaking teaching and research, and around research performance rankings which were determined by comparison with the average of the Group of Seven Universities as provided by Melbourne University. Professor Cockayne reported that College Pro-Vice-Chancellors and Deans are meeting with Professor Eltis, and that concerns about these issues were being discussed.

The Committee discussed whether the Department to Department comparisons against the Group of Seven averages might have statistical problems, and it also discussed the possibility of non-congruence between similarly named Departments in other institutions. It was felt that if these comparisons were to be made they might be better made at aggregated Faculty or discipline levels.

Concern was expressed that the 'stepped' formulae being proposed gives undesirable incentives for seeking marginal improvements in performance to make significant gains in funding. It was agreed that a continuous formula would be preferable. The Committee was of the view that any model that rewarded continuing low research performers was not appropriate for a university that prided itself as being a leading research university.

The Committee was also concerned that the definition of FTE staff included in the new model was possibly inappropriate. As an example it was noted that some disciplines/departments would be clearly advantaged by the inclusion of 'research fellows' funded from external sources, and that there appeared to be an inconsistency by their inclusion while type 2 and 3 staff were excluded. The Committee suggested that the only research fellows to be included should be those granted specific conditions of appointment by the Academic Board at its meeting in April 1997. It was felt that if these categories of Research Fellows were included then so should type 2 and 3 staff.

The Committee asked that it be provided with the basic data from Melbourne University that had been used by the working party. Professor Tanner agreed to provide this information to Committee members.

that , items 1 to 2, the Board note the report.

C5. Report of the Library and Information Technology Committee

The Committee met on Monday 26 May 1997 at 2 pm in the Western Tower Room, when there were present: Professor R McPhedran (presiding), the Chair of the Academic Board (Professor J Mack), Dr S Carlile, Associate Professor E Cornell, Professor M Harris, Associate Professor N Newbigin, the Vice-President of SUPRA (Ms L Frolich), Professor J Rosenberg and Ms J Campbell. Dr D Levy, Ms B Olde and Mr T Robinson were in attendance.

1. Report of the IT Reference Group

A Discussion Paper on Internet Charging from the IT Reference Group was tabled by Dr Carlile. It is to be considered at the next meeting. The Reference Group has established smaller working parties to consider in detail matters referred to the Reference Group by the Committee.

2. Report of the Chair

The matter of internet accounts for student members of the Academic Board will be raised with the Director of Information Technology Services. These accounts should be generic in nature to ensure continuity across membership changes.

The question of administrative support of committees and working parties had been raised with the Chair of the Academic Board. Professor Mack reported that following recent changes in senior administrative staff the issue of staffing resources was unresolved but

Professor McPhedran asked for comments and suggestions on the LITC's Home Page, as the Committee now runs its business electronically.

3. Code of Conduct

Dr David Levy, Chair of the University Wide Information System committee (UWIS) reported on matters related to the Code of Conduct for the use of the University's Internet services (Conditions of Use: <http://www.usyd.edu.au/su/is/helpdesk/COU.html>, and Code of Conduct: <http://www.usyd.edu.au/su/is/helpdesk/code-contentprov.html> signed by students using Extro. There is also the Code of Conduct document of the Information Technology Committee: <http://www.usyd.edu.au/su/is/code-contentprov.html>) The Chair of the Committee, Professor McPhedran, expressed the view that the Code of Conduct should be ratified by the Academic Board. The matter is to be considered by a working party of the IT Reference Group, which will report back to the Committee with a recommendation for the Board. Matters to be included in the consideration will include intellectual property rights, with specific reference to the implications of the Copyright Act 1968.

4. Structure and Functions of Information Technology Services

Following a presentation by Ms Barbara Olde, Director of ITS, a discussion took place on matters related to the future of options for hardware and software in the University. Dr Levy reported on some of the work of UWIS and his views on the need for greater ease of communication within the University. In particular, the benefits and challenges of network based computing and a standard desktop were examined.

that , items 1 to 4, the Board note the report.

C6. Report of the Academic Staffing Committee

The Committee met on 21 May 1997. There were present: Professor R Pesman (Chair), Professor S Armitage, Professor L Burgess, Associate Professor D Davey, Professor L Field, Ms S Jamieson and Dr P Whiting; Ms J Deitch and Mr J Upcroft were in attendance.

1. Policy Document on Academic Promotions Appeals

The Committee **recommends** that the Board adopt the attached Policy Document on Academic Promotions Appeals and commend it to the Vice-Chancellor for his approval.

(see pages 45-47)

that the Board adopt the Policy Document on Academic Promotions Appeals and commend it to the Vice-Chancellor for his approval.

2. Draft Policy Document - Promotion of Academic Staff

Discussion continued on the Draft Policy Document - Promotion of Academic Staff. The Committee will discuss this issue further and progress will be reported to the Academic Board.

that the Board note the report.

Action by Professor Mack under delegated authority

College of Health Sciences

1. Appointment of Visiting Professors

Name	Department	Period
Professor A Duggan	Anaesthesia and Pain Management	26 May 1997 to 31 December 1997
Professor P Y D Wong	Physiology	19 May 1997 to 18 May 1998

2. Appointment of Faculty Promotions Assessment Committees

Senior Lectureships

Faculty of Health Sciences

Core

Professor Elaine Cornell - Acting Dean (Chair)
 Associate Professor Glen Davis (Research in Rehab)
 Dr Alastair Davison (Medical Radiation Technology)
 Dr Cherry Russell (Community Health)
 Associate Professor Lindsay Gething (Behavioural & Social Sciences in Nursing)**
 Dr Robyn Overall (Biological Sciences)**

Additional

Applicant 1: Dr Rosemary Cant (Head, Behavioural Sciences)
 Associate Professor Dianna Kenny (Behavioural Sciences)
 Dr Ross Menzies (Behavioural Sciences)

Applicant 2: Dr Jennifer Lingard (Head, Biomedical Sciences)
 Mrs Neryla Jolly (Orthoptics)

Applicant 3: Dr Jennifer Lingard (Head, Biomedical Sciences)
 Mr Don McLean (Medical Radiation Technology)

Applicant 4: Dr Jennifer Lingard (Head, Biomedical Sciences)
 Dr Ron Balnave (Biomedical Sciences)

Applicant 5: Professor Vicki Reed (Head, Communication Disorders)
 Dr Jan Van Doorn (Communication Disorders)

Applicant 6: Associate Professor Martin Thompson (Head, Exercise & Sport Science)
 Associate Professor Heather Jeffery (Obstetrics & Gynaecology)
 Dr Meng Ngu (Gastroenterology)

Applicant 7: Associate Professor Martin Thompson (Head, Exercise & Sport Science)
 Ms Kathy Refshauge (Physiotherapy)
 Dr Richard Smith (Exercise & Sport Science)

Applicant 8: Associate Professor Colleen Mullavey-O'Byrne (Head, Occupational Therapy)
 Dr Maureen Fitzgerald (Occupational Therapy)
 Ms Jane Gamble (Occupational Therapy)

Applicant 9: Associate Professor Jack Crosbie (Acting Head, Physiotherapy)
 Mr Michael Lee (Exercise & Sport Science)
 Dr Raymond Lee (Physiotherapy)

Faculty of Medicine

Core

Associate Professor C D Shorey (Chair) (Anatomy & Histology)
 Dr A Conigrave (Faculty of Science) **
 Professor R Dampney (Physiology)

Additional

- Applicant 1: Professor T Usherwood (Head, General Practice)
 Professor M Kidd (General Practice)
 *Professor D Saltman (General Practice)
 Clinical Professor M Mira (Division of General Practice, CSAHS)
- Applicant 2: Dr A Keech (Acting Head, NH&MRC Clinical Trials Centre)
 Associate Professor A Coates (Medicine)
 Professor P Brooks (Medicine, University of New South Wales)
 Dr D Henry (Clinical Pharmacology, University of Newcastle)
- Applicant 3: Professor J Stone (Acting Head, Anatomy & Histology)
 *Dr J Provis (Anatomy & Histology)
 Associate Professor R Bandler (Anatomy & Histology)
 *Dr T Chan-Ling (Anatomy & Histology)
- Applicant 4: Professor A B Baker (Head, Anaesthesia)
 Professor M Cousins (Anaesthesia)
 Clinical Professor G Stokes (Clinical Pharmacology, RNSH)
 Professor B Robinson (Medicine)
- Applicant 5: Professor G Berry (Acting Head, Public Health & Community Medicine)
 Professor G Mooney (Public Health & Community Medicine)
 Professor D Nutbeam (Public Health & Community Medicine)
 *Dr M Wise (Public Health & Community Medicine)
- Applicant 6: *Dr L Baur (Acting Head, Paediatrics & Child Health)
 *Dr E Elliott (Paediatrics & Child Health)
 Clinical Associate Professor D Isaacs (Immunology & Infectious Diseases, RAHC)
 Clinical Associate Professor C Mellis (Clinical Epidemiology, RAHC)

Faculty of NursingCore

- *Professor R L Russell (Chair) (Dean, Faculty of Nursing)
 *Ms R Hawley (Clinical Nursing)
 *Dr J Godden (Behavioural and Social Sciences in Nursing)
 Associate Professor B Daley (Family and Community Health in Nursing)
 *Professor S Armitage (Community and Mental Health in Nursing)
 Professor P Seale (Pharmacology)**
 *Professor A Sefton (Physiology)**

Additional

- Applicant 1: *Ms J Edwards (Head, Nursing Therapeutics)
 *Ms J Boney (Clinical Nursing)
- Applicant 2: Dr P James (Head, Life Sciences in Nursing)
 *Ms A McAuliffe (Life Sciences in Nursing)

Changes to Faculty Promotions Assessment Committees Membership*Personal Chairs***Faculty of Medicine**Additional

- Applicant 2: Professor M R Bennett (Physiology) to replace Associate Professor B E Kemp (St Vincent's Medical Research Institute, Melbourne)
- Applicant 3: *Professor B Cass (Dean, Faculty of Arts) to replace *Professor A Sefton (Physiology)
- Applicant 5: Professor M R Bennett (Physiology) to replace Professor N Hunt (Pathology)

Associate Professor/Principal Research Fellow

Faculty of Medicine

Core

Professor J May (Surgery) to replace Professor E L Bokey (Surgery)

Senior Lectureships

Faculty of Health Sciences

Additional

Applicant 1: Associate Professor Mary Westbrook (Behavioural Sciences) to replace Dr Ross Menzies (Behavioural Sciences)

Faculty of Nursing

Core

*Ms B Murphy (Family and Community Health in Nursing) to replace Associate Professor B Daley (Family and Community Health in Nursing)

Additional

Applicant 2: Dr John Bullivant (Life Sciences in Nursing) to replace *Ms A McAuliffe (Life Sciences in Nursing)

* Females marked.

** Have served on promotions committee.

College of Humanities and Social Sciences

1. Appointment of Visiting Professors

Name	Department	Period
Professor Elizabeth Jefferys	Modern Greek	July 1997 to September 1997
Professor John Cragg	Economics	September 1997 to October 1997

2. Membership of Faculty Promotions Assessment Committees

Senior Lectureships

Education

Core

Associate Professor Ken Sinclair (Acting Dean) (ex officio)

Dr Robyn Cusworth (Teaching and Curriculum Studies)

Dr John Harvey (Educational Psychology Measurement and Technology)

Dr Christine Inglis (Social and Policy Studies in Education)

Dr Catherine O'Brien (Teaching and Curriculum Studies)

Dr Gerard Sullivan (Department of Behavioural Studies) (Faculty of Health Sciences)

Dr Udo Bergert (Department of Germanic Studies) (Faculty of Arts)

Dr Lee Owens (Teaching and Curriculum Studies) (Reserve)

Dr Ann Fritz (Teaching and Curriculum Studies) (Reserve)

Additional

Applicant 1 Professor Judyth Sachs (Head of Department's nominee) (Teaching and Curriculum Studies)

Dr Kevin Laws (Teaching and Curriculum Studies)

Applicant 2 Professor Judyth Sachs (Head of Department's nominee) (Teaching and Curriculum Studies)

Dr Kevin Laws (Teaching and Curriculum Studies)

Applicant 3 Dr William Adams (Head of Department) (Students Services)

Dr Geoff Williams (Department of English) (Faculty of Arts)

College of Sciences and Technology

1. Appointment of Visiting Professor

Name	Department	Period
Professor Peter Hein	Architectural & Design Science	1 June 1997 to 31 Dec 1997

2. Appointment of Faculty Promotions Assessment Committees

Personal Chairs

Science

Additional

Applicant 4: Professor Donald B Melrose (Physics) (**Internal Reserve**) to replace Professor David R McKenzie (Physics) (**Internal Reserve**)

Applicant 6: Professor John P Carter (Civil Engineering) (**Internal Reserve**) to replace Professor Harry G Poulos (Civil Engineering) (**Internal Reserve**)

Associate Professorships/Readerships

Science

Additional

Applicant 1: Professor Dennis Evans (Chemistry, ANU) to replace Professor Leo Radom (Chemistry, ANU) and Professor David R McKenzie (Physics) (**Internal Reserve**) to replace Emeritus Professor Noel S Hush (Biochemistry) (**Internal Reserve**)

Applicant 5: Professor Peter A Lay (Chemistry) to replace Associate Professor James K Beattie (Chemistry)

Applicant 8: Professor Iain M Mason (Geology & Geophysics) to replace Professor Peter J Davies (Geology & Geophysics). Professor Davies to be added as the **Reserve** member.

Applicant 12: Associate Professor Rosemarie Einstein (Pharmacology) (**Reserve**) to replace Associate Professor Jean Joss (Biology, Macq) (**Reserve**)

Applicant 13: Professor Sterwart Dunn (Psychological Medicine) to replace Professor John Sheppard (Behavioural Sciences, Cumberland) and Professor Ian Curthoys (Psychology) to replace Professor Stewart Dunn (Psychological Medicine) as the **Reserve member**

Applicant 15: Dr Brian J Morris (Physiology) to replace Professor Ian Dawes (Biochemistry, UNSW)

Veterinary Science

Additional

Applicant 1: Associate Professor David R Hodgson (Animal Health) to replace Professor John R Egerton (Animal Health)

Senior Lectureships

Agriculture

Core

Associate Professor Robert L Batterham (Agricultural Economics) to be removed from the **Reserve** list. Associate Professor Frank W Nicholas (Animal Science, Veterinary Science) to replace Associate Professor Wayne L Bryden (Animal Science, Veterinary Science). Associate Professor Wayne L Bryden to be added to the **Reserve** list.

Additional

Applicant 3: Associate Professor Robert L Batterham (Agricultural Economics) to replace Dr Ernest L Houghton (Econometrics)

Veterinary Science

Additional

The University of Sydney Draft Intellectual Property Policy

Introduction

Universities constitute some of Australia's most important places for intellectual property creation. The University of Sydney is committed to the creation and application of knowledge as major core activities. This policy seeks to ensure that the interests of the University, the creators of intellectual property, and the community are fairly treated. It is essential that the intellectual property developed within the University of Sydney is not wasted or appropriated by others without adequate recompense to the parties that brought about its creation.

Discussions about intellectual property often focus on the issue of ownership. The University acknowledges that it is essential that ownership should be clear. This policy provides clarity by addressing the issue of ownership for staff members, students and visitors. However, more significant than ownership is the issue of what is done with the results from intellectual activity and who benefits from their use. This policy provides a clear framework so that every opportunity for applying new intellectual property can be appropriately pursued.

The policy deals with all forms of intellectual property and the rights which apply to them. There are laws relating to ownership which may vary slightly depending on the particular type of intellectual property being considered. However, the general rule is that the employer owns the intellectual property arising from work undertaken as part of an employee's contract of service. Students and visitors to the University are not employees and need special consideration.

The University acknowledges its role in facilitating the free exchange of ideas and preventing any administrative barrier to the publication of new ideas created by staff. The University has developed a policy which does not seek to place any administrative barrier in the way of the free discussion and development of ideas.

In most cases the monetary returns from intellectual property creation will not be large, but they may be so occasionally. The fair sharing of these rewards between the creator and the University is addressed within this policy.

This policy does not cover intellectual property within any agreements which have been signed by an appropriately authorised office of the University, for example, the Business Liaison Office. Issues relating to intellectual property ownership and usage are addressed specifically in those agreements. This policy also excludes those circumstances in which intellectual property is created by staff or students using facilities not owned by the University (for example, in hospitals) where practice in relation to intellectual property may vary according to the relationships between the University and the owner of any such facilities.

The new arrangements will apply to all intellectual property created after the date of implementation of the Policy. However, any staff member, student or research team which is the creator of already existing intellectual property can submit a request to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) for this policy to apply to that intellectual property.

The University may institute disciplinary proceedings against any staff member or student who fails to adhere to this policy.

Note: All terms which appear in **bold print** have the meanings which are presented in the section headed Definitions on pages 9 and 10 of this policy. *(The definitions are on pages 24-25 of this agenda.)*

Staff

General

The University owns all **University product**. The University prohibits any **staff member** from owning or acting as owner of any **University product** unless he or she is given a written authority to do so from the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research). Every **staff member** is required to make any **University product** which he or she creates or develops available to the University if the University wants it for any purpose.

Except for the restriction of copyright presented in the next paragraph, a **staff member** owns all

Copyright

In accordance with existing copyright law, the **University** owns the copyright in all work, either **University product** or **staff initiated product**, which a **staff member** creates or develops within the terms of his or her employment by the **University**. In order to facilitate the development and free exchange of ideas, the **University** authorises every **staff member** to act as owner of the copyright of any **staff initiated product** which he or she creates or develops. In acting as owner of the copyright of any **staff initiated product**, each **staff member** must take care to ensure that any opportunity to **exploit** that **staff initiated product** is not reduced by his or her actions.

Each **staff member** may make a written request to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) for a written assignment to that **staff member** of copyright in a **staff initiated product** of which that **staff member** is the creator.

Maintain the value of the Intellectual Property you create

All **staff members** must act responsibly and with due care to ensure that the opportunities to **exploit** any **intellectual property** which they create or develop are not diminished by public disclosure. This is very important when dealing with **intellectual property** that is, or may be, the subject of a patent application or other form of registration designed to protect it and for confidential information. Any disclosure of information relating to the **intellectual property** (or any part of it) could invalidate an application to protect it. This could include discussing it, presenting it at a conference or publishing it in a journal article. Confidential advice on this is available from the **Business Liaison Office**.

Rules for using Intellectual Property created by any staff member

If a Department, or any other unit within the University publishes, distributes, broadcasts, performs, or in any way transmits **University product** in its original, unmodified form, that Department or unit must try to ensure that the **staff member** who created the **University product** is acknowledged as its creator.

Distributing net revenue from all forms of intellectual property

If, in the course of employment by the **University** a **staff member** creates or develops **intellectual property** either **University product** or **staff initiated product**, then the **staff member**, the **University**, and the Department or Unit in which the research is conducted, are each entitled to a share of the **net revenue**. The **University** and Department or Unit are entitled to share in the **net revenue** even if the **intellectual property** is **exploited** by the **staff member**, or by a person or organisation external to the **University**. The distribution of the **net revenue** is set out in the Table in Appendix A.

The **University** and the Department or Unit are each entitled to receive a share of the **net revenue** for twenty years starting from the date the **intellectual property** is reported to the Head of Department or Unit or the Director of **Business Liaison Office**, or the date on which a first patent is granted, or other registration is completed, to protect the **intellectual property**, whichever happens last.

[The University and the Department or Unit in which a staff member is employed are each entitled to share, in the manner described in Appendix A, in the net revenues which arise from any intellectual property created by a staff member which is not a University product or a staff initiated product but which has used University facilities in its creation.](#)

Sharing the net revenue among creators of intellectual property

If a single **staff member** is the only person who has created and developed a particular piece of **intellectual property**, that **staff member** is entitled to the whole of the **net revenue** paid to the creator – as set out in Appendix A. However, this is not the case if you have agreed in writing with the University (for example usually via the Director of the **Business Liaison Office**, or his or her nominee), to the **net revenue** being distributed in some other way.

If a **staff member** is one of a group of researchers working on a project in which **intellectual property** is created or developed, then that **staff member** and each of the other researchers in the group is entitled to share equally in the **net revenue** paid to the creators – as set out in Appendix A.

The University's right of first refusal

Except for **University products**, which the **University** owns, every **staff member** must give the **University** the right of first refusal for the **exploitation** of any **intellectual property** created or developed within the terms of the **staff member's** employment. This means that all **staff members** must first offer the **University** the opportunity of **exploiting** any **intellectual property** which they create or develop which is capable of generating income or other benefits.

Alternative means of exploitation

A **staff member** may propose that some person or organisation external to the **University** **exploit** some **intellectual property** which he or she has created or developed if the terms of the proposal to do so benefit the **staff member**, the **University** and the relevant Department or Unit. The Director of the Business Liaison Office will assess the details of any proposal which a **staff member** provides for some person or organisation external to the **University** to **exploit** some **intellectual property**. If this proposal is approved by the Director of the Business Liaison Office on behalf of the **University**, he or she will give the **staff member** and the alternative party a written authority for the alternative party to proceed to **exploit** the **intellectual property**.

If the **University** is to **exploit** your **intellectual property**, the **University** may require you to transfer to it any rights you have in that **intellectual property**.

Students

In general, every **student** owns the **intellectual property** which he or she creates or develops.

A **student's ownership** of any **intellectual property** which he or she creates or develops can only be restricted if that student signs an agreement to restrict his or her **ownership** in exchange for a substantial advantage. The student must then give a copy of that agreement to the Head of the Department or Unit in which he or she is enrolled. The Head of Department or Unit must give a copy of the agreement to the **Business Liaison Office**.

A "substantial advantage" can never include an offer of enrolment in a degree or course of study. The **University's** offer to enrol a student can never depend on the student first agreeing to restrict his or her **ownership** of **intellectual property** which may be created or developed during the candidature for the degree. However, the Department or Unit in which a student may want to study may be unable to accommodate a newly commencing **student** undertaking work on a particular research topic without the student agreeing to restrict his or her **ownership** of any **intellectual property** that he or she may create or develop. As soon as anyone receives an offer of enrolment, that person should speak to the Department or Unit Head to find out about any restrictions that may apply to **ownership** of **intellectual property**.

NOTE: Intellectual property that is created or developed by **students** often forms part of an overall work, the parts of which are created or developed, and owned by others. This can restrict a **student's** opportunities to **exploit** the **intellectual property** that he or she creates or develops.

In the absence of any restriction as noted in the preceding paragraph, every **student** may **exploit** the **intellectual property** which he or she creates or develops. When a student **exploits** his or her **intellectual property**, the **student** must give the Head of the Department or Unit in which he or she is enrolled a copy of any agreement made to **exploit** the **intellectual property**, and any documents that relate to that agreement. The Head of Department or Unit will give a copy of these to the **Business Liaison Office**.

Sharing the net revenue

If a **student** is the only person who has created or developed the **intellectual property**, then that **student** is entitled to receive all of the **net revenue** paid to the creator of that property – as set out in Appendix A. However, this is not the case if the **student** has agreed in writing to the **net revenue** being distributed in some other way.

If a **student** is part of a group of researchers working on a project in which **intellectual property** is created or developed, then the **student**, and all the others in the group, are entitled to share equally in the **net revenue** paid to the creators – as set out in Appendix A. However, this is not the

If a student uses University facilities to create or develop intellectual property

If a student uses **University** facilities to create or develop **intellectual property** then the **University**, and the Department or Unit in which the research is conducted or the facilities used, are each entitled to a share of the **net revenue** – as set out in the Table in Appendix A. The **University** and Department or Unit are entitled to share in the **net revenue** even if the **intellectual property** is **exploited** by the student, or a person or organisation external to the **University**.

The **University** and the Department or Unit are each entitled to receive a share of the **net revenue** for twenty years starting from the date the **intellectual property** is reported to the Head of Department or the Director of **Business Liaison Office**, or the date on which a first patent is granted, or other registration is completed, to protect the **intellectual property**, whichever happens last.

The University must let you seek advice

If a **staff member** asks if you, as a **student**, want to **exploit**, or restrict your **ownership** of some **intellectual property**, then the **staff member** (on behalf of the **University**) must give you at least seven days to seek whatever you think is appropriate advice about doing so.

If you are a **student** who intends to participate in a project remember that Senate regulations prohibit the **University** from entering into agreements that:

- prevent a **student's** thesis from being examined, or
- delay a **student's** thesis from being published outside the period prescribed by the Senate.

(For information on this refer to the Senate resolutions relating to the Higher Degree theses: University Calendar 1996, Vol. 1, Statutes and Regulations, p118-119).

Every **student** may obtain information about **intellectual property** from his or her Research Supervisor, Head of Department or Unit, the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association or the **Business Liaison Office**.

The University's rights in intellectual property you create or develop

Subject to any prior written agreement to the contrary, and although every **student** owns the **intellectual property** he or she creates or develops as a **student** of the **University**, the **University** retains the right:

- to copy any **student's** work to use in record keeping, assessing, or in disciplinary proceedings, and
- to retain a **student's** original work for professional accreditation or similar reasons, and
- to share with a **student** who creates or develops **intellectual property**, and the Department or Unit in which the research is conducted, the **net revenue** – as set out in the Table in Appendix A.

These rights are in return for the facilities and staff the **University** makes available to you when you create or develop that **intellectual property**.

Visitors

Agreements a visitor may have to sign

Before a **visitor** attends any **University** facility, or participates in a **University** program, he or she may be required to sign an agreement to keep **intellectual property** and information that relates to it confidential and an agreement to transfer **intellectual property** created or developed by the **visitor**, to the **University**.

The Head of the Department or Unit that houses the research facility or conducts the research program, or the Principal Researcher of the research team can require the **visitor** to sign these agreements.

In the absence of an agreement being signed, the **University** makes no claim on any **intellectual property** that a **visitor** creates or develops in a research project that is conducted using the **University's** facilities.

Agreements that change what this Policy states

A **staff member**, **student** or **visitor** may apply to the Vice-Chancellor to vary this Policy's operation

the application, to all members of the group participating in the project, to the Head of the Department or Unit in which the project is conducted and to the Director of the **Business Liaison Office**.

In considering an application to vary this Policy's operation, the Vice-Chancellor (or his or her nominee) may consider the advice of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research).

Reporting Intellectual Property

Any **staff member** or **student** who creates or develops **intellectual property** that is capable of generating income or other benefits, or, which may need to be patented, or protected in some other way, must report the full details of it to the Head of Department or Unit in which the work is being conducted or to the Director of the **Business Liaison Office** as soon as possible. If reported to the Head of Department or Unit, that person will then advise the Director of the **Business Liaison Office** about that **intellectual property**.

Any **staff member** or **student** who creates or develops **intellectual property** may also choose to inform the Director of the **Business Liaison Office** about that **intellectual property** directly.

Staff members, students and visitors must protect the value of the intellectual property which they create

If **intellectual property** is to be **exploited**, the persons who create it must not do anything that may limit or reduce its value.

This is important for **intellectual property** that is, or may be, the subject of a patent application or other form of registration designed to protect the **intellectual property**. However, it is also significant when considering confidential information which may be part of some **intellectual property**, but which cannot be protected by registration. Any disclosure of information relating to the **intellectual property** (or any part of it) could invalidate an application to protect it. This includes discussing it, presenting it at a conference or publishing it in a journal article.

Use of the University's share of net revenue from intellectual property

Any **net revenue** that the **University** is entitled to is paid into the **Research fund account** and used to support research within the **University**. Part of this money is used to support the Vice-Chancellor's Innovation Development Fund. The Vice-Chancellor, or his or her representative, decides how to distribute the funds from the **Research fund account** after hearing recommendations from a committee.

This committee must be made up of:

- a chairperson, being the Vice-Chancellor or his or her representative, and
- one student representative of the **University**, nominated by the President of the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association, and
- two representatives from each of the [three Academic Colleges](#) of the **University**. Of these, there must not be more than one representative from each faculty.

The University's assessment of intellectual property

Within 90 days of receiving a report on **intellectual property** created or developed by any **staff member** or **student**, the **Business Liaison Office** must give the person who reported the **intellectual property** and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research):

- an assessment of the opportunities, costs, and benefits associated with the **exploitation** of the **intellectual property**, and
- a recommendation made to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) about any action the **University** may take to protect and exploit the **intellectual property**.

This report is subject to the **Business Liaison Office** receiving sufficient information about the details of the **intellectual property** from the person who has reported it. In the event that this information is requested but not received, the report from the **Business Liaison Office** will be delayed.

Within 7 days of receiving the assessment and recommendation described in the preceding paragraph, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) must advise the person who reported the **intellectual property** and the Director of the **Business Liaison Office** about any action the

If the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) advises the person who reported the **intellectual property** that the **University** does *not* intend to protect and exploit that **intellectual property**, then the person who reported it may choose his or her own way of doing so.

Subject to any delay caused by a failure to provide sufficient details to the **Business Liaison Office**, if the assessment and recommendation referred to in the preceding paragraphs is not provided to the person who reported the **intellectual property** by the **Business Liaison Office** within 97 days of receiving a report on some **intellectual property**, that person is authorised to take whatever action he or she may choose to **exploit that intellectual property**.

Disputes

If a dispute arises about how to interpret or apply this Policy, anyone involved in that dispute may call for everyone involved to meet with the Director of the **Business Liaison Office** (or his or her representative) within 14 days of the dispute arising. The purpose of this meeting is to try to resolve the dispute.

If the dispute is not resolved, or if the meeting is not held within 14 days, the matter may be referred to the Vice-Chancellor (or his or her nominee). Only the Director of the **Business Liaison Office** may refer the matter within 14 days of the dispute arising, but anyone involved in the dispute may refer it after 14 days.

The Vice-Chancellor must decide on the matter within 31 days. The Vice-Chancellor's decision is final and everyone involved in the dispute must abide by it.

Those involved in the dispute must not take any action before the dispute is resolved (or before the Vice-Chancellor makes a decision, if the matter is referred to the Vice-Chancellor) to publicise the dispute or take any alternative action to resolve the dispute.

Review Committee

The Intellectual property Committee is a committee established by the **University** on the date this policy becomes effective. The Committee's purpose is to prepare, implement, and monitor recommendations for revising the **University's** Policy on **intellectual property** created or developed by **staff members** and **students** (this Policy).

The Committee must be made up of:

- the Vice-Chancellor, or his or her representative, and
- the Chair of the Academic Board, and
- the Chair of the Research Committee, and
- one academic member of staff from each of the [three Academic Colleges](#) of the **University**, and
- one non-academic member of staff from the **University**, and
- one student of the **University** nominated by the President of the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association.

The Committee must meet at least once a year to receive a report from the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) on the effect of this Policy, and to review the effectiveness of this Policy and, if necessary, recommend changes to it.

Definitions

In this policy, a word in **bold** has the meaning given to it below unless the context makes it clear that the word has some other meaning:

"**Business Liaison Office**" means the administrative unit of the **University** that has that name, or any replacement of it.

"**exploitation**" or "**exploit**" **intellectual property** means any act or process undertaken in dealing with that **intellectual property** for the purpose of gaining a benefit (for example by selling, mortgaging, exchanging, licensing, charging, hiring out or leasing out the **intellectual property**).

"**intellectual property**" means any and all of the following:

- inventions that can be patented under the Patents Act 1952 and Patents Act 1990
- copyright material as defined in the Copyright Act 1968
- circuit layouts (computer chips) as defined in the Circuits Layout Act 1989
- trademarks that can be registered under the Trademarks Act 1955

- any information that is confidentially communicated; created; developed; generated; or compiled.

For the purposes of this Policy, **intellectual property** includes **intellectual property rights**.

"**intellectual property rights**" mean all legally enforceable rights and obligations that attach to any product, process, outcome, work, invention, design, or concept that is the result of intellectual activity in the areas of industry, commerce, science, art or literature.

These rights include being legally entitled to exercise one or more of the following:

- exclusive right to use some **intellectual property**;
- the right to deal with the **intellectual property** (for example, by transferring ownership of it, licensing it, donating it, or using it as security);
- the right to register the **intellectual property**; or,
- the right to exclusively control and direct the development of the **intellectual property**.

Obligations which are part of the definition of **intellectual property rights** include being legally responsible for the **intellectual property** (for example, being legally responsible for paying the costs of registering and maintaining the **intellectual property**, or being legally responsible to others for any damage the **intellectual property** may cause them or their property).

A booklet giving information about different types of **intellectual property** and **intellectual property rights** is available from the **Business Liaison Office**.

"**net revenue**" means any income received from some **intellectual property** less:

- legal and other fees and expenses incurred in establishing and maintaining the legal protection of that **intellectual property**; and,
- costs incurred in creating, developing, commercialising or exploiting that **intellectual property** – starting from the date its existence is notified to the Head of Department or the Director of the Business Liaison Office and ending on the date that income is first earned from its **exploitation**. These costs do not include research grant expenditures.

"**Research fund account**" means the **University** account for all money the **University** is entitled to under this policy, from the **exploitation** of **intellectual property**.

"**staff initiated product**" means any thing created or developed by a **staff member** within the terms of his or her employment which is not a **University product**. Much, but not all of this will be in the form of copyright material, including journal articles, conference papers and books.

"**staff member**" means a person appointed as a member of the **University's** academic or non academic staff at the time he or she creates or develops **intellectual property**.

"**student**" means a person enrolled as a student of the **University**, or in a course or program of study conducted by or on behalf of the **University**, at the time he or she creates or develops **intellectual property**.

"**University**" means [The University of Sydney, Australia](#).

"**University product**" means **both**:

- (a) — all teaching materials; and,
- (b) — any other thing which is created or developed by a **staff member** within the terms of his or her employment which that **staff member** is requested to produce by his or her supervisor or any other authorised employee of the **University**.

"**visitor**" means any person other than a **student** or **staff member** who takes part in any research project or scholarly activity that is conducted by any **staff member** or **student**, or who visits any part of the **University** in which research or scholarship, or any related activity, is conducted.

Appendix A

Distributing net revenue

exploitation by the University

If the **University** (or its nominee) **exploits intellectual property**, the **net revenue** is distributed as set out in this Table:

Net revenue received:	The creator gets this % of that part:	The University gets this % of that part:	The Department gets this % of that part:
that part up to \$5,000	100%	NIL	NIL
that part between \$5,000 and \$20,000	80%	10%	10%
that part between \$20,000 and \$40,000	50%	25%	25%
that part above \$40,000	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%

exploitation by the creator, or an external person or organisation

If someone other than the **University exploits intellectual property**, the creator will receive the same proportion of the **net revenue** as would have been paid to the creator if the **University** had undertaken the exploitation of the **intellectual property**.

Note: If someone other than the **University exploits intellectual property**, the creator's share of **net revenue** may be substantially larger than the creator's share given in the Table in this Appendix. This will be so if the creator has played a major part in the **exploitation** of the property. This type of variation is subject to the approval of the Vice-Chancellor (or his or her nominee) in accordance with the section of this Policy headed "Agreements that change what this Policy states".

<p>UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY CODE OF CONDUCT</p>
--

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This Code has been formulated to promote the highest ethical and moral standards and to foster an understanding of the conduct expected of staff.
- 1.2 The role of the University is to create, preserve, transmit and apply knowledge and understanding through teaching, research, creative works and other forms of scholarship.
- 1.3 In carrying out this role the University reaffirms its commitment to the values of:
University autonomy;
- intellectual freedom and social responsibility;
 - recognition of the importance of ideas and pursuit of critical and open inquiry;
 - tolerance, honesty and respect as the hallmarks of relationships throughout the University community;
 - understanding the needs and expectations of the communities it serves;
 - constantly improving the quality and delivery of its services.
- 1.4 All staff members should be aware of and act within the spirit of the role and values of the University.
- 1.5 All staff members of the University are accountable through the Vice-Chancellor to the University Senate and the New South Wales and Federal Parliaments. Staff members should be aware that breaches of aspects of this code may fall within the scope of improper conduct and could therefore result in disciplinary action being taken. (Acts relevant to this Code of Conduct can be found in Appendix 1)

2 Personal and Professional Behaviour

- 2.1 In performing their duties all staff members must:
- maintain and develop knowledge and understanding of their area of expertise or professional field;
 - exercise their best professional and ethical judgement, making decisions without bias using the factual information available;
 - treat students, members of the public and other staff members with respect, impartiality, courtesy and sensitivity;
 - maintain a co-operative and collaborative approach to working relationships;
 - be able to feel comfortable about raising the often complex professional and ethical issues which may face them in their work;
 - perform their duties diligently and conscientiously;
 - act fairly and reasonably, carrying out work with integrity and objectivity;
 - respect the confidentiality of information entrusted to them in the course of employment;
 - uphold equal opportunity and health and safety policies and practices;
 - ensure efficient and effective use of University resources, making improvements wherever possible and reducing waste;
 - act within the spirit of the University goals, policies and procedures;
 - ensure that their participation in non-University activities does not conflict significantly with their employment with the University.

3 Conflicts of Interest

- 3.1 Staff members must ensure that there is no actual or perceived conflict between their personal interests and their University duties and responsibilities. Conflicts of interest are assessed in terms of the likelihood that staff members possessing a particular interest could be improperly influenced, or might appear to be improperly influenced, in the performance of their duties. Examples where conflicts of interest could arise include:

- being involved in a tender process where you or your immediate family have a vested interest in the outcome.
- 3.2 Staff members must inform the person to whom they normally report (e.g. pro-vice-chancellor, dean, deputy principal, department head, unit manager) if a conflict of interest arises.
 - 3.3 Situations may occur where staff members are working with family members or with persons with whom they develop close personal relationships. University policy states that the existence of close personal relationships with a member of staff should not constitute a bar to the employment, promotion or transfer of any individual. Where such relationships exist between staff members or with prospective staff members there may be situations where there is the potential to create a conflict of interest, such as in supervisory relationships and employment related decisions. In this case the staff member must notify the person to whom they normally report.
 - 3.4 Similarly a personal, sexual or family relationship between a staff member and student has the potential, or could be perceived, to compromise the fundamental duties inherent in teaching and research. Staff members have a responsibility to students to assess their work fairly, objectively and consistently across the candidature for their particular subject/course. It follows that members of staff should not be involved, in teaching, supervision or assessment of students with whom they have a close personal relationship. Where such arrangements are unavoidable the individual must notify the person to whom they normally report.

4 Outside Employment and Private Practice

- 4.1 The University encourages staff in their contribution to society, not only through teaching and research, but also by providing assistance to government, the professions and industry through a range of activities including consulting work, contracting, collaborative research and participation on committees.
- 4.2 To engage in outside employment all staff members must receive approval and are obliged to ensure that any outside employment does not conflict with their normal work.
- 4.3 General staff members should seek approval for outside work from their department head or unit manager. Outside work must be performed outside the officer's normal University working hours, should not adversely affect their University work performance and not involve the use of University resources.
- 4.4 Academic staff members should refer to the University's Outside Earnings Policy for the conditions of outside work.

5 Acceptance of Gifts and Benefits

- 5.1 Staff members must not solicit gifts or benefits, nor accept gifts or benefits either for themselves or for another person, which might in any way, either directly or indirectly, compromise or influence them in their official capacity. For instance, gifts or hospitality offered as an inducement to purchase are not acceptable.
- 5.2 Gifts of a nominal value (less than \$100 as a guide) used for promotional purposes by the donor may be accepted. Individuals must, however, be satisfied that they cannot be compromised by the acceptance. Gifts of a nominal value above this amount may be retained at the discretion of the relevant supervisor.
- 5.3 Gifts of money are not acceptable.

6 Public Comment

- 6.1 The University supports the right of staff members to speak publicly on any issue. However in cases where the issues discussed relate to policy and other decisions of University management, unless they are officially representing the University, it is important that individuals make it clear that they are expressing a private point of view and that the views are not necessarily those of the University.

7 Union membership

- 7.1 University staff have the right to join trade unions and to choose whether to participate in union activities. The value of effective processes for consultation between unions and management is recognised.

8 Use and Security of Official Information

- 8.1 Staff members must take care to maintain the integrity, confidentiality and privacy of official University documentation and information to which they have access, in order to protect the privacy of individuals concerned. In general, staff members must disclose official information only when required to do so by law, when the need arises as part of their normal duties, when they are called upon to give evidence in court, or where the information has been officially approved for release.
- 8.2 Staff must access information, including that on information systems and files, only for the purposes for which authorisation has been given; staff must not allow any other unauthorised person access. All reasonable precautions must be taken, including password and file protection measures, to prevent unauthorised access or misuse.

9 Use of Official Facilities and Equipment

- 9.1 Staff members must use all University resources in an efficient manner. Unless express permission has been granted University resources are not to be used for private purposes.

10 Notification of Corrupt Conduct, Maladministration or Serious and Substantial Waste of Public Money

- 10.1 Staff members who wish to make allegations of corrupt conduct, maladministration or waste of public money may receive protection under the NSW Protected Disclosures Act 1994. Further details can be found at Appendix 2.
- 10.2 Staff who wish to make allegations, can make them to the following officers, who have a responsibility to ensure allegations of corrupt conduct, maladministration or waste of public money are acted upon:
- the Vice-Chancellor;
 - the Deputy Vice-Chancellors;
 - the Assistant Vice-Chancellor;
 - Pro-Vice-Chancellors or Deputy Principals;
 - the Director of Internal Audit and Review.
- 10.3 In addition, allegations can be made to the Independent Commission Against Corruption, the Ombudsman or the NSW Auditor-General.

11 Equity of Access to Employment and Programs

- 11.1 The University seeks to remove any barriers that may impede benefits and conditions of employment and the delivery of University services. Staff members are expected to uphold this principle.

12 Occupational Health & Safety

- 12.1 The University seeks to provide a safe and healthy workplace. Staff must endeavour to ensure that best practice OH&S procedures are adopted in all University activities and that the requirements of the relevant OH&S legislation are complied with.
- 12.2 Staff members must take care not to put themselves or other University community members at risk or reduce their ability to carry out their duties through the misuse of alcohol or drugs.

APPENDIX 1

RELEVANT ACTS

There are a number of legislative Acts which are relevant to staff. While the University has policies, guidelines, awards and agreements which reflect legislation, such Acts take precedence over any internal policies or practices (including this code).

Examples of such legislation are:

- Affirmative Action (Equal Opportunity for Women Act) 1986
- Annual Holidays Act 1944
- Anti-Discrimination Act 1977
- Australian Industrial Relations Act 1988
- Crimes Act 1900
- Disability Discrimination Act 1992
- Essential Services Act
- Employees Liability Act 1991
- Freedom of Information Act 1989
- Independent Commission Against Corruption Act 1988
- Industrial and Commercial Services Act 1989
- Long Service Leave Act 1955
- Occupational Health and Safety Act 1983
- Ombudsman Act 1974
- Privacy Committee Act 1975
- Protected Disclosures Act 1994
- Public Finance and Audit Act 1983
- Racial Discrimination Act 1975
- Sex Discrimination Act 1984
- University of Sydney Act 1989.
- Animal Act 1985

APPENDIX 2

Definition of Corrupt Behaviour

Corrupt conduct is defined in sections 7 to 9 of the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) Act, in the following way:

"Under this Act corrupt conduct occurs when:

- a public official carries out public duties dishonestly or unfairly;
- anyone does something that could result in a public official carrying out public duties dishonestly or unfairly;
- anyone does something that has a detrimental effect on official functions, and which involves any of a wide range of matters, including fraud, bribery, official misconduct or violence;
- a public official misuses information or material obtained in the course of duty."

All employees of the University are "public officials" under the Act.

Implications for the University

Under the Act the Vice-Chancellor has a duty to report to the Commission any matter which could be suspected on reasonable grounds as concerning or likely to concern corrupt conduct.

The Protected Disclosures Act

The NSW Protected Disclosures Act 1994 offers protection for public officials who make disclosures which concern:

- corrupt conduct;
- maladministration (defined for the purposes of the Act as conduct which involves action or inaction of a serious nature that is contrary to law, unreasonable, unjust, oppressive or improperly discriminatory or based wholly or partly on improper motives); or
- serious and substantial waste of public money.

Protection is not available for disclosures which:

- are frivolous or vexatious;
- primarily question the merits of government policy; or
- are made in an attempt to avoid dismissal or disciplinary action.

For further detail staff members should refer to the Protected Disclosures Act of 1994.

Committee for Undergraduate Studies: Amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate

Bachelor of Liberal Studies

Faculty of Arts

Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty of Arts

The Resolutions of the Senate relating to Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty of Arts are amended to the following effect from 1 January 1998:

- by inserting the following new section (c) (page 180, *1996 Calendar, Vol I*):
(c) Bachelor of Liberal Studies
- and
- by re-lettering sections (d) to (i) as (e) to (j) respectively.

Bachelor of Arts

The Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Degree of Bachelor of Arts are amended to the following effect from 1 January 1998:

- by inserting the following new section 30 (page 182, *1996 Calendar, Vol I*):
30. Bachelor of Liberal Studies
A candidate qualifies for the Bachelor of Liberal Studies by completing 192 credit points in the manner prescribed by the joint resolutions of the Faculties of Arts and Science.
- and
- by re-numbering existing sections 30 to 45 inclusive as 31 to 46 inclusive.

Faculty of Science

Degrees and Diplomas in the Faculty of Science

The Resolutions of the Senate relating to Degrees and Diplomas in the Faculty of Science are amended to the following effect from 1 January 1998:

- by inserting the following new section (b) (page 404, *1996 Calendar, Vol I*):
(b) Bachelor of Liberal Studies
- and
- by re-lettering sections (c) to (l) as (d) to (m) respectively.

Bachelor of Science

The Resolutions of the Senate relating to the degree of Bachelor of Science are amended to the following effect from 1 January 1998:

- by deleting existing section 1.(1)(iii) (page 404, *1996 Calendar, Vol I*) and by inserting instead the following new entry:
1.(1)(iii) Junior, Intermediate, Senior and Honours units of study are indicated by unit of study level designations 1000-1999, 2000-2999, 3000-3999 and 4000-4999 respectively; a Junior unit of study is one for which the qualifying units of study, prerequisites or assumed knowledge are non-tertiary qualifications or the corequisites are other Junior units of study; an Intermediate unit of study is one for which the qualifying units of study or prerequisites are Junior or Intermediate units of study or the corequisites are other Intermediate units of study; a Senior unit of study is one for which the qualifying units of study or prerequisites are Intermediate or Senior units of study or the corequisites are other Senior units of study.

Bachelor of Liberal Studies

Bachelor of Liberal Studies

A candidate qualifies for the Bachelor of Liberal Studies by completing 192 credit points in the manner prescribed by the joint resolutions of the Faculties of Arts and Science.

For the information of the Board:

Joint Resolutions of the Faculties of Arts and Science for the Bachelor of Liberal Studies

The following Joint Resolutions of the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Science are to be inserted after the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science:

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF THE FACULTIES OF ARTS AND SCIENCE FOR THE BACHELOR OF LIBERAL STUDIES DEGREE

General requirements for the award of the degree

1. (a) Candidates qualify for the degree of Bachelor of Liberal Studies by completing units of study during 8 semesters.
- (b) To qualify for the degree candidates must complete 192 credit points from the Tables of Units of Study for the degrees of Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science including:
 - (i) At least 120 Intermediate or Senior credit points;
 - (ii) At least one Arts major and one Science major;
 - (iii) At least 28 credit points, including 16 Intermediate or Senior credit points, from units of study in one language subject-area other than English from Part A of the Table of Units of Study for the degree of Bachelor of Arts;
 - (iv) A 6 credit point unit of study in communication and analytical skills or in other academic skills as may be prescribed from time to time;
 - (v) A minimum of 6 credit points from units of study in Mathematics or Statistics.
- (c) The credit point value of a unit of study shall be that designated by the Faculty which offers the unit.

The major

2. (a) Unless otherwise defined, a major shall consist of units of study taken in a single subject-area from Part A of the Table of Units of Study for the degree of Bachelor of Arts or from Table 1 of the Table of Units of Study for the degree of Bachelor of Science.
- (b) The number and level of the credit points constituting an Arts major is as defined in the Resolutions for the Bachelor of Arts.
- (c) A Science major consists of at least 32 credit points from a single Science Discipline Area, including a minimum of 8 credit points from Intermediate units of study and 24 credit points from Senior units of study.
- (d) Candidates shall nominate their choice of majors no later than the beginning of the fifth semester of candidature, but with the permission of the Dean of Arts or Science as appropriate, may change the majors during the candidature.
- (e) The majors successfully completed shall be named on the testamur.

Transfer to candidature for the Bachelor of Arts or the Bachelor of Science

3. (a) Candidates who at the end of at least four semesters of candidature have completed at least 96 credit points in total, and who intend to satisfy the requirements for entry to a Fourth Year Honours unit of study or joint Honours unit of study for the bachelor's degree in Arts or Science, may apply to transfer to candidature for one of these degrees.
- (b) Candidates who at the end of at least six semesters of candidature have completed units of study which correspond to the entry requirements for Fourth Year Honours for the bachelor's degree in Arts or Science may apply to transfer to candidature for one of these degrees.
- (c) Candidates for the degree may, with the permission of the Faculty concerned, transfer to candidature for the degree of Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science.

he or she may apply to take one of these degrees provided that candidature for the Bachelor of Liberal Studies is abandoned.

Other conditions of candidature

4. (a) Unless otherwise specified, the regulations regarding definitions and entry requirements for units of study taken from the Table of Units of Study for the degree of Bachelor of Arts shall be those applying to the degree of Bachelor of Arts, and the regulations regarding definitions and entry requirements for units of study taken from Table 1 of Units of Study for the degree of Bachelor of Science shall be those applying to the degree of Bachelor of Science.
- (b) Unless otherwise specified, the regulations regarding examination rules, variations of entry requirements, grades of degree, satisfactory progress, credit for previous courses, credit for courses taken concurrently at other institutions, restrictions, time limits, suspension and variation of requirements for the degree shall be those applying to the degree of Bachelor of Arts.

Authority of the Deans

5. The Deans of Arts and Science shall jointly exercise authority in any matter concerning the Bachelor of Liberal Studies degree not otherwise dealt with in the Resolutions of Senate or these resolutions.

Units of study from other programs

6. With the permission of the Deans of Arts and Science, candidates may count towards the degree a maximum of 28 credit points from units of study (other than those listed in the Tables of Units of Study for the degrees of Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Arts) offered by the Faculties of Architecture, Economics and Education, the Boards of Study in Music and Social Work, the Sydney College of the Arts and the Conservatorium of Music.

Award of the degree with High Distinction or Distinction

7. (a) A Weighted Average Mark (WAM) will be calculated for each candidate as an overall measure of performance in the degree; the WAM is calculated by summing the products of the marks achieved and the weighted credit point values of the units of study taken in the degree and then dividing by the sum of the weighted credit point values, with all attempts at units of study being included in the calculation, except where units of study are discontinued with permission; the formula used is as follows:

$$WAM = \frac{\sum WcMc}{\sum Wc}$$

where Wc is the weighted credit point value ie. the product of the credit point value and level of weighting of 1 for 1000-1999 units of study or 3 for 2000-2999 units of study and 3000-3999 units of study; and where Mc is the greater of 45 or the mark out of 100 for the unit of study.

- (b) The degree will be awarded with the following grades, as determined by the Deans of Arts and Science on the basis of the WAM:
- (i) High Distinction
 - (ii) Distinction
 - (iii) Pass

Faculty of Economics

Degrees and Diplomas in the Faculty of Economics

The Resolutions of the Senate relating to Degrees and Diplomas in the Faculty of Economics are amended to the following effect from 1 January 1998:

- by inserting the following new section (d) (page 243, 1996 Calendar, Vol I):
 - (d) Bachelor of Commerce (Liberal Studies)
- and
- by re-lettering sections (d) to (l) as (e) to (m) respectively.

Bachelor of Commerce (Liberal Studies)

The following new Resolutions of the Senate relating to the degree of Bachelor of Commerce (Liberal Studies) are adopted from 1 January 1998:

Bachelor of Commerce (Liberal Studies)

1. (1) The units of study which are available for the degree are set out in the table of courses attached to these resolutions and in other tables approved by the Faculty.
(2) In respect of each unit of study the Faculty may designate prerequisite units of study, corequisite units of study and specific entry requirements and such information shall be added to the table of courses for the degree.
2. A candidate may be permitted by the Faculty to count towards the degree a unit of study or units of study other than those listed in the tables referred to in section 1.
3. (1) Each unit of study available for the degree is either a full semester or half semester unit of study and is designated as having a credit point value as described in the tables of courses.
(2) A first year unit of study, where it comprises a half semester of study in the subject, shall have a value of 3 credit points and where it comprises a full semester of study, a value of 6 credit points.
(3) A later year unit of study, where it comprises a half semester of study in the subject, shall have a value of 4 credit points; where it comprises a full semester of study, a value of 8 credit points.
4. A candidate in any one year shall, except with the permission of the Faculty, enrol in the equivalent of no more than nine and no less than four full semester units of study.
5. A candidate may not, except with the permission of the Faculty, enrol in a unit of study unless the entry requirement for that unit of study is satisfied; an entry requirement may include the completion of a unit of study at a specified level.
6. A candidate may not count the same unit of study more than once towards the degree or count two units of study which overlap substantially in content.
7. Where in the tables of courses referred to in section 1 a unit of study is designated a corequisite to another unit of study a candidate may, except with the permission of the Faculty, enrol in the latter unit of study only if he/she is concurrently enrolled in the corequisite unit of study or has already completed that unit of study.
8. Subject to the Senate resolutions concerning satisfactory progress and except with the permission of the Faculty, a candidate for the Pass degree must complete the requirements for the degree within ten calendar years of first enrolment for the degree, and, in the case of the Honours degree, within twelve calendar years of first enrolment.

Pass degree

9. In order to qualify for the award of the degree a candidate shall complete the equivalent of 28 full semester units of study having a total value of not less than 200 credit points, which shall include:
 - (i) not less than 112 credit points from Table A;
 - (ii) a major in each of two subjects listed in Table A, with at least one of these majors being drawn from the following subject areas:
Accounting
Commercial Law
Economics
Econometrics
Finance
Industrial Relations
Management
Marketing
Operations Research;
 - (iii) no more than 96 credit points at first year level;
 - (iv) the compulsory first year level unit of study *Communication and Critical Analysis 1A* or *Communication and Critical Analysis 1B*; and
 - (v) except with Faculty permission, no more than 60 credit points in total from subjects listed in Table B. Of these, 4 semester units of study must be drawn from the Faculty of Arts, two of which must be a language other than English. Also, 2 semester units

A major comprises a sequence of units of study of not less than 44 credit points, which shall include not less than 32 credit points of later year units of study, as specified for each subject in Table A.

Honours degree

10. The degree may be awarded with honours in:
 - Accounting
 - Computer Science
 - Economics
 - Econometrics
 - Economic History
 - Finance
 - Government
 - Industrial Relations
 - Marketing
 - Operations Research.
11. The degree may also be awarded with joint honours in any two of the subjects in which honours are available.
12. There shall be three classes of honours, namely Class I, Class II and Class III and within Class II there shall be two divisions, namely Division 1 and Division 2.
13. If a student graduates with First Class Honours in any honours subject or in any of the forms of joint honours and the Faculty decides that the student's work is of sufficiently high merit, the student shall receive a bronze medal.
14. A candidate may, except with Faculty permission, enrol in a fifth year honours unit of study only on completion of requirements for the Pass degree and on satisfying any other entry requirements for the fifth year honours unit of study.
15. A student who has been awarded the Pass degree may subsequently be admitted to candidature for the Honours degree and may qualify for the award of the Honours degree upon completion of such additional requirements in such time as the Faculty may decide, provided that such a student may only be admitted to candidature for the Honours degree up to three years after the award of the Pass degree.
16. A candidate who is qualified to enrol in two fifth year honours courses may complete the final honours year in the two courses in one year each or complete a joint honours year in the two courses in one year.
17. A fifth year joint honours course shall comprise such parts of each of the related fifth year honours units of study as may be decided by the Faculty.
18. A candidate may not, except with the permission of the Faculty, repeat an honours unit of study which he/she has discontinued or failed once.
19. A candidate who does not complete an Honours degree may be permitted by the Faculty to count towards the Pass degree any honours units of study completed.
20. The Faculty may grant a candidate credit for units of study completed either at other institutions, or in other faculties within the University of Sydney provided that all the following conditions are met:
 - (i) the Faculty assesses the unit of study or units of study to be equivalent to units of study offered by the Faculty;
 - (ii) the units of study are not counted towards another qualification;
 - (iii) in the case of units of study completed at another institution, credit shall not be given for more than the equivalent of 10 full semester units of study, while credit may be granted for any number of credit points for units of study completed at the University of Sydney;
 - (iv) credit shall not be given for units of study completed ten or more years prior to the proposed year of enrolment.

Table A is identical to the existing Table A courses in the Bachelor of Commerce degree.

Table B (See section 10 of the Senate resolutions)

**Teaching and Learning Committee
Faculty Teaching Committee Annual Reports
Format for Future Reports**

1. Good Practice in Teaching and Assessment

- (a) Strategies and Mechanisms in Place to Enhance Teaching and Assessment
- (b) Examples of Good Practice, Scholarship or Innovation in Teaching and Assessment
- (c) Some comment on events which have had an adverse effect

2. Evaluation activities

Including:

- (a) Methods used to canvass the opinions of students and graduates
- (b) Ways in which the faculty has responded to student evaluations and student feedback
- (c) Ways in which the faculty assesses or monitors the effectiveness of those responses
- (d) Methods used to evaluate innovation in teaching

3. Projects Funded to Support Teaching

- (a) At the Faculty level
- (b) At the University level
- (c) From External Sources

4. Benchmarking activities

This should include use of the GCCA Course Evaluation Questionnaire data.

5. Mechanisms Designed to Support Students at Risk

6. Future Plans for Teaching/Assessment Enhancement and Innovation

Faculty Teaching Committee Annual Reports
Report to the Academic Board and the Senate on 1996 Teaching Activities

For the 1996 report on faculty teaching activities, the Teaching and Learning Committee agreed that, rather than providing a summary of the information received from each faculty in turn, it would be more useful to provide specific examples of good teaching, scholarship and assessment practices from each faculty. This report, therefore, draws attention under each heading to examples from a selection of faculties. This is not to say, however, that only those faculties mentioned have demonstrated good practice in the area in question. In the interests of producing a concise report, each faculty is cited only once or twice.

The report is presented under the following headings:

- Good Practice in Teaching and Assessment
- Evaluation Activities
- Projects Funded to Support Teaching
- Benchmarking Activities
- Mechanisms Designed to Support Students at Risk
- Future Plans for Teaching/Assessment Enhancement and Innovation

1. Good Practice in Teaching and Assessment

(a) Examples of Strategies in Place to Enhance Teaching and Assessment

The **Faculty of Law** has undertaken a major revision of its Bachelor of Laws Program. Two of the main components are:

- replacement of large lecture/tutorial system with small group interactive teaching;
- reduction of class sizes to 40 for compulsory subjects, with smaller groups in first year courses.

These changes are intended to increase the effectiveness of the undergraduate law program and facilitate innovation in teaching and assessment methods. The Faculty has in place a range of processes by which it will monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of these changes, including student evaluations, staff/student consultations and communication with the profession on the quality of graduates.

The **Conservatorium of Music** had introduced Special Projects Weeks for concentrated study, rehearsal and performance in areas of learning which might benefit from such focussed effort. This has resulted in improved standards of performance in the orchestra, choir and chorale.

The **Faculty of Economics** has appointed a Teaching Quality Fellow whose role is to:

- work with staff on projects such as course design and teaching methods;
- design teaching and learning materials;
- work with students to discover their experiences of the Faculty;
- disseminate information about the projects and about on-going teaching innovations in the Faculty through the Newsletter 'Teaching Matters' and teaching forums.

The Faculty has also developed the course 'Communication and Critical Analysis', which will be offered for the first time in Semester 2 1997. This course aims to enhance oral and written communication skills and in the process provide a greater understanding of the philosophy underlying academic discourse.

The **Faculty of Arts** has established an Information Technology Unit to assist with technological developments in teaching.

In the **Faculty of Nursing**, a three-stage system for monitoring teaching at the departmental level is now operating. The system provides for the gathering of data in relation to teaching enhancement projects; innovations; achievements of

“at risk” students; communication skills of students; course and teaching evaluation practices and staff development activities. As part of this monitoring system, heads of department report to the Teaching Development Committee. The faculty has published and made available to its academic staff a comprehensive guidebook on assessing students ‘Making the Grade’. The Teaching and Learning Committee is considering the extent to which this publication may have a wider application in the University.

(b) Examples of Good Practice or Scholarship in Teaching and Assessment

In the Faculty of Health Sciences:

School of Orthoptics

Over 50 self-directed learning packages, funded from a Quality Teaching and Learning grant, have been developed. These packages have been used successfully by undergraduate students to supplement delivery of theoretical material, in preparation for practical examinations and as an alternative learning method for a student repeating a subject.

Department of Biomedical Sciences

The harnessing of information technology in teaching continued with further development of both a Virtual Teaching Hospital project and production of computer-aided learning packages, as well as the introduction of network-based student projects

In the **Faculty of Medicine** the planning for the Graduate Medical Program which is to be introduced in 1997 has had a significant impact on teaching and learning in the existing Undergraduate Medical Program. For example, problem-based learning has been introduced in the fourth year, integration has taken place in clinical attachments in the final year and new assessment methods are being trialed and evaluated.

(c) Some events which have had an adverse effect

Many faculties have drawn attention to the adverse effects on teaching of funding limitations. Budget cuts have led in some cases to the further erosion of small-group teaching and in general to additional pressures and workloads on staff. Many faculties, nevertheless, point out that the quality of teaching has not suffered.

Many faculties also point to infrastructure deficiencies. There are increasing demands on technological infrastructure and staff have problems gaining access to this infrastructure and appropriate expertise when they want to develop new teaching materials. In an attempt to address this widely perceived problem, the University has established NeTTL (New Technologies in Teaching and Learning).

The **Faculty of Arts** cites the generally inadequate standard of audio-visual equipment in lecture and seminar rooms, with many reports of missing or malfunctioning equipment being received. The run-down state of many rooms also undermines staff and student morale. The Faculty also refers to the lack of available lecture and seminar rooms of appropriate sizes within reasonable distance of Arts Faculty buildings. Classes are often over-crowded or held in far-flung rooms. It considers that the centralised room booking system is partially responsible for this situation.

It should be noted that these difficulties relating to equipment in teaching rooms are not confined to the Faculty of Arts.

The **Faculty of Economics** has experienced problems with the marked increase in first year students in 1997, resulting in overcrowded lecture and tutorial space, which does have an impact on quality teaching.

2. Evaluation activities

All faculties conduct regular student evaluations of courses and canvass student opinions

- use of wide variety of student evaluation activities/instruments;
- staff meetings to monitor student progress;
- student feedback on course arrangements and delivery at the end of each semester;
- reviews of courses/programs by Heads of Schools where student feedback suggests this is necessary;
- regular meetings of Program Review Committees comprising members of the professional community for all professional programs;
- benchmarking activities

and advises that it responds quickly to issues identified from student feedback.

In the **Sydney College of the Arts**, Year Convenors meet with students year by year in the studio groups and through that process are able to identify specific issues in those areas. During 1996 the College relocated to the new campus and so this monitoring process proved to be very useful. The College recognises that there is an advantage in gaining direct contact with students to gain a perspective across the years to ensure equity and consistency of expectations.

In the **Faculty of Nursing**, where all courses are evaluated using the Centre for Teaching and Learning Questionnaire:

- student feedback is first considered by teaching teams who decide on follow-up strategies;
- course co-ordinators provide report and action to heads of department;
- heads of department are required to provide a written report to the Faculty Teaching Committee indicating the evaluation procedures used and the ways in which the evaluation information was used to enhance teaching and course presentation.

With respect to canvassing the opinions of graduates, in the **Faculty of Health Sciences**, the Department of Behavioural Sciences has been involved in a follow-up of graduates 'University education and workplace requirements' (Adamson et al, 1996). This large scale study benchmarked the evaluations of employers against the judgements of graduates and academics to determine the relevancy of undergraduate courses in meeting the needs of a changing health care environment. Specific recommendations based on the findings of these surveys were made in this report which, if implemented, can be expected to improve the quality of undergraduate education of health science students.

3. **Projects Funded to Support Teaching**

Projects to support teaching in faculties in 1996 were funded from a range of sources, both internal and external. Funds received by the University as a result of the third Quality Round, in particular, funded a wide range of faculty teaching projects.

The **Faculty of Science** funded 12 teaching projects in 1996, for a total of \$216,810. This included a third annual contribution to the activities of UniServe Science with the money going towards the production of newsletters, development of searchable databases of catalogues of software materials, production of catalogues of materials, organisation of workshops and general dissemination of clearing house activities. Some of the other projects targeted the development of materials suited to the new semester courses being introduced, while other projects looked at the ways in which student performance could be enhanced.

4. **Benchmarking activities**

Benchmarking was not widely undertaken in 1996 and faculties are being encouraged to undertake more in 1997 and beyond.

In the **Faculty of Education**, benchmarking meetings were held with the faculties of Education at the Universities of Queensland and Melbourne in 1996 and will be held with Bristol University and the University of Illinois in 1997.

The **Faculty of Architecture** has reported that it has undertaken benchmarking against the 1995 Graduate Careers Council of Australia Course Experience questionnaire (administered to all graduates). The feedback exercises it undertook in 1996 were benchmarked against

5. Mechanisms Designed to Support Students at Risk

Orange Agricultural College has appointed a Learning Quality Fellow who has developed and implemented a student and literacy assessment and improvement strategy. This included the following major components:

- identification of literacy standard profile of new students;
- development and implementation of literacy remediation strategies for those students identified as needing them;
- further development of academic staff skills in assessing and providing feedback on student literacy;
- development and implementation of strategies aimed at incorporating a higher degree of literacy assessment and feedback on most assessment tasks.

In the **Conservatorium of Music** a Learning Effectiveness Project, supported by Quality funds, was completed. The objectives of the project were:

- identification and assessment of the remedial and/or development needs of students in the area of generic or communication skills;
- collaborative design and piloting of teaching approaches which integrate skills;
- development within each course's units of study, with particular emphasis at the level of first year undergraduate and commencing postgraduate students.

The Conservatorium has also developed an *Online Music Skills* program which uses the WWW to provide interactive music skills material for weaker first year students, helping them to perform better in their academic subjects.

The **Faculty of Science** has introduced a Student Progression Assistance Scheme to fund the development of teaching activities aimed at helping identify students at risk and offering appropriate assistance.

6. Future Plans for Teaching/Assessment Enhancement and Innovation

The **Faculty of Arts** reports that it intends to develop increasingly flexible modular units of study to enable departments to share courses and formulate interdisciplinary areas of study.

The **Faculty of Agriculture** has devoted considerable effort to plans to upgrade the Watt 109 Lecture Theatre, which is used extensively for lectures by all sections of the Faculty.

In the **Faculty of Architecture**, there will be:

- more effective integration of teaching between technology based subjects and design studios;
- scheduling of assessment to avoid workload peaks;
- course review discussions to meet both teaching and financial needs in 1998.

The **Faculty of Engineering** advises that its major emphasis will continue to be on preparing for the introduction of a restructured degree program from 1998. It is anticipated that this new degree program will involve considerable changes to the Faculty's teaching plans.

There are three new initiatives:

- the introduction of two new Bachelor of Engineering degrees (BE in Computer Engineering and BE in Electrical Engineering (telecommunications));
- the introduction of two new combined degree programs, Bachelor of Engineering/Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Engineering/Bachelor of Science;
- the reorganisation of the existing combined degree program Bachelor of Engineering/Bachelor of Commerce.

Orange Agricultural College will implement a revised student survey of teaching system and a number of staff development activities.

The **Faculty of Medicine** introduced its innovative Graduate Medical Program in 1997; graduates were selected for entry during 1996 using an entirely new process of selection.

Attached are details of attendances by Faculty at Centre for Teaching and Learning Workshops in 1996.

Centre for Teaching and Learning Workshop Attendance, 1996

The following figures have been taken from:

- a. CTL records of workshop attendance. These are workshops advertised across the university via a CTL brochure, and open to all. These figures do not include academic staff attendance at VC's Forums, International Seminars or the special seminar for Excellence in Teaching. Nor do they include attendance at workshops commissioned by and presented for specific departments and groups. These figures record one actual attendance per staff member; each staff member has been counted once only in order to show the proportion of faculty staff attending workshops rather than total attendances per faculty.
- b. University figures have been taken from *Statistics 1996*, The University of Sydney, pp 66, 67.

Attendance by Faculty

<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Total ac staff</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>As %</u>
Agriculture	48	14	29%
Architecture	51	17	33%
Arts	284	66	23%
Dentistry	41	9	22%
Economics	123	22	18%
Education	149	26	17%
Engineering	120	35	29%
GSB	21	4	19%
Health Sciences	223	137	61%
Law	66	20	30%
Medicine*	263	79	30%
Nursing	122	43	35%
OrangeAC	53	6	11%
Science	389	87	22%
SCA	31	10	32%
Conservatorium	90	6	7%
Veterinary Sciences	61	24	39%
Total	2134	605	28%

*The Faculty of Medicine also undertook staff development within the Faculty targeted to the Graduate Medical Program.



THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

POLICY DOCUMENT ON ACADEMIC PROMOTIONS APPEALS

As appropriate for the local nomenclature and reporting lines, when this document refers to Faculty read also College, Graduate School of Business or Administrative Unit; to Dean read also Director or College Principal.
Abbreviations are used throughout this document as follows:
Faculty Promotion Assessment Committee (FPAC), Central Promotion Committee (CPC)

Overview	This policy document defines the policy and procedures to be followed for an appeal against a promotion decision.
Policy	Appeals in relation to academic promotions will only be considered on the grounds of procedural error.
Procedures	<p>AVENUES FOR APPEAL</p> <p>The promotions guidelines and procedures are laid down in detail in the Academic Promotions documents, available from the Personnel Services Team. It is the responsibility of applicants to make themselves familiar with these procedures. Enquiries about the documents should be addressed to the Personnel Services (Corporate Group) or to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic and Staffing).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each applicant is informed of the composition of the FPAC and the CPC which assesses his or her application. Applicants may address objections, within seven days of receipt of advice, concerning a member or members of the Committee to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic and Staffing). If the objection is considered to be justified, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic and Staffing), after consultation with the Dean, will normally nominate an alternative member of the Committee. Where the objection relates to the Dean and is considered justified, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic and Staffing) will normally appoint an observer from outside the Faculty who will be present at all points in the FPAC process relating to that applicant, including the ranking process. • An applicant or a member of a Committee may complain about a significant departure from the established guidelines or other principles of proper procedure. The matter will be dealt with in the first instance by the Chair of the CPC, and if necessary by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic and Staffing). • Upon completion of the process <p>Within a period of fourteen days from the date of receipt of advice of the outcome of an application, an appeal on the grounds of significant departure from the established guidelines or other principles of proper procedure may be lodged with the Vice-Chancellor.</p> <p>The Vice-Chancellor, in making a ruling on whether a promotion decision has been vitiated by a significant departure from the established guidelines or other principles of proper procedures, will normally refer the appeal for advice from an Appeals Committee.</p>

The Appeals Committee consists of

- one nominee of the Vice-Chancellor
- one nominee of the Chair of the Academic Board
- one nominee of the applicant.

The nominee of the Chair of the Academic Board will act as Chair of the committee. All members of the Appeals Committee will be members of the academic staff of the University of Sydney and will not have served on the FPAC or CPC which considered the application for promotion and will not have acted as a referee for the applicant.

The Committee shall have access to

- the applicant's letter setting out the grounds for appeal
- the application for promotion and the referees' reports
- the report of the FPAC
- the report of the CPC (if appropriate).

The applicant may seek an interview with the Committee.

The Appeals Committee will make a written report to the Vice-Chancellor outlining the reasons for the recommendation for upholding or dismissing the appeal.

If the Vice-Chancellor rules that the appeal is upheld, the merits of the application shall be reconsidered by a Committee consisting of

- the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic and Staffing)
- the Chair of the Academic Board
- one member of the CPC which considered the application
- the chair of the FPAC which considered the application
- one member of the FPAC which considered the application
- a nominee of the applicant, who shall be a member of the academic staff of the University of Sydney.

The Committee will follow the same procedures as the relevant CPC.

The Committee will make a recommendation for or against promotion to the Academic Board for endorsement and to the Vice-Chancellor for approval.

The Vice-Chancellor's decision is final.

BACKGROUND/CONTEXT

Background	The Academic Board at its meeting on 18 February 1991 endorsed provisions for appeal on the grounds of procedural error in relation to academic promotions. The Board made no additional specific provisions for appeal beyond those on the grounds of significant departure from the established guidelines or other principles of proper procedure.
References	<p>Policies, procedures etc which are now superseded by this document and its attachments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appeals Procedure Academic Promotions (AB 18.2.91) <p>Other related policies/references</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of Sydney Academic Promotions documentation, including the Promotion Committee Procedures and Guidelines (under review).
Authority/consultation	This policy has been drafted, following the 18 February 1991 Academic Board endorsement of academic promotions appeal procedures, by the Academic Staffing Committee (Professor R Pesman (Chair), Professor D Anderson, Professor S Armitage, Associate Professor R Arnold, Professor L Burgess, Associate Professor D Davey, Professor L Field, Ms S Jamieson, and Dr P Whiting) in collaboration with the Personnel Policy Unit (Ms J Deitch, Ms G Deakin, Mr J Upcroft) and taking account of comments made by Ms H Beamish.
Ownership	Academic Board
Responsible Officers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic and Staffing) • Chair of Academic Board
Dates	<p>Approval</p> <p><u>By</u> _____ Vice-Chancellor</p> <p><u>Date</u> June 1997</p> <p>Date of effect June 1997</p> <p>Proposed date of review June 1999</p>



The University of Sydney

Academic Board

Meeting held on Wednesday 14 May 1997

Minutes of the meeting of the Academic Board held at 2.15 pm on Wednesday 14 May 1997 in the Professorial Board Room.

There were present: the Chair (Professor J M Mack) presiding, the Deputy Chairs (Professors D J H Cockayne, J R Lawrence and R Pesman), the Vice-Chancellor and Principal (Professor G Brown), Professors C Adam and D Anderson, Associate Professors R Arnold and R Atherton, Ms S Baker, Associate Professor H C Beh, Dr A E Brew, Professors L W Burgess, J P Carter, B Cass and R E Collins, Associate Professors L J Copeland, E Cornell and C J Durrant, Professors K Eltis, L D Field, D R Fraser and G Gill, Associate Professors C B Gillies and J Gordon, Professor M A Harris, Ms C Hyde, Associate Professor P Jones, Professors J F Kinnear and S R Leeder, Associate Professor A F Masters, Dr P McCallum, Mr J McNicoll, Professor R McPhedran, Dr R A Mitchell, Associate Professor N E Newbigin, Drs M Peat and P Phibbs, Professor N Quarry, Dr A Reynolds, Professors B D Roufogalis and S M Salisbury, Associate Professor M Sankey, Professor W Schworm, Associate Professor G M Stone and Mr R Wilson.

Present as observers were: Dr W Adams (Acting Secretary to the Academic Board), Mrs J Campbell and Professors L M Koder, D Napper, D Weisbrot and J A Young.

Present by invitation were: Ms L Frohlich (for Mr K Oliver); and Ms E A Bergmann, Ms J Hackett, Ms L Maral and Mr T Robinson.

In attendance: Miss E R Ring.

P This symbol denotes items which were starred for discussion at the meeting. All other items were dealt with as recommended in the agenda.

44/97 Minutes

*** It was agreed that the minutes of the meeting of the Academic Board held on Wednesday 16 April 1997 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

45/97 Business arising out of the minutes

None.

46/97 Report of the Chair

The following reports had been circulated and tabled:

(see agenda and supplementary agenda item A4.)

Part I

1. Report on Senate Matters April meeting of Senate

P

May meeting of Senate

The Chair said that he had starred sections (1), (2) and (3) of this report in order to draw attention to Senate's decision to let lie on the table the recommendations from the Faculties of Dentistry, Health Sciences and Medicine to make provision for Faculty membership by their Pro-Vice-Chancellor (College).

Professor Young said that he and Professors Napper and Weisbrot had discussed this matter and agreed that they would not press the issue of college pro-vice-chancellors being members of the faculties in their respective colleges; they all retained membership of their original faculties.

The Chair said that Senate was awaiting recommendations from all the faculties in respect of this matter and he had been asked to expedite faculty responses. He would therefore write to the deans and the college pro-vice-chancellors outlining his understanding of Senate's views on the issue. Without prejudice, he believed that there was a preference, at least as far as some Fellows were concerned, that the relationship between the college PVCs and the faculties not be formalised but that faculties advise the Board and Senate that it was their intention to invite their respective college pro-vice-chancellors to attend all meetings of faculty.

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

2. Election of Deputy Chairs of the Academic Board

*** The Board agreed to note the report and to congratulate the Deputy Chairs-elect.

3. Introduction of a summer session

*** The Board agreed to adopt the recommendations of the Chair.

4. Selection into fee-paying undergraduate courses

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

P

5. Guidelines for the establishment and variation of awards, prizes and scholarships

In response to several issues raised by Associate Professor Masters, it was agreed:

- that the references to the "Pro-Vice-Chancellor" needed to be clarified to indicate whether the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (College) or (Research) was appropriate, it having been noted that at the time of drafting the references were most probably to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic Support); and
- that the conditions of award of Sydney University Postgraduate Scholarships should be amended to provide that each award provide a tax free stipend of at least \$10,000 (rather than the specified sum of \$10,000) in order to allow for some flexibility.

Associate Professor Masters also expressed concern about the resource implications of the proposed Guidelines and suggested that while the Board could give broad agreement to the academic principles, if it considered this to be appropriate, there was insufficient information available in respect of the workloads for faculties and departments for the Board to adopt the Guidelines outright. During the ensuing discussion, some members echoed the concerns about the resource implications of the devolution, but others supported the proposal, citing the over-all savings in administration.

The Vice-Chancellor observed that the discussion was touching on the important underlying issue of the extent to which the Board should take resource issues into account when making recommendations on academic matters. It might be dangerous if the line between academic and management issues were drawn too clearly; he believed that the Board should consider underlying policy issues separately but also that it should have the capacity to consider them in the context of resourcing.

The Chair said that the "Procedures" document was the one which dealt with resource-related issues, while the "Guidelines" document dealt with academic principles. The "Procedures" document had been referred to senior managers for comment and would be referred to VCAC together with any comments received, with the outcome reported to the Board.

*** After some discussion, the Board agreed to adopt the Guidelines, subject to the request for further advice on the resource implications of its administration.

6. International Relations Committee

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

7. **West Review of Higher Education**
*** The Board agreed to note the report.
8. **McGaw Review of the HSC**
*** The Board agreed to note the report.
9. **Forum of academic and general staff and students held on 23 April 1997**
*** The Board agreed to note the report.
10. **Annual Report of the Learning Assistance Centre**
*** The Board agreed to note the report.
11. **Membership of the Board**
*** The Board agreed to note the report and to welcome Dr Phibbs to membership of the Board.
12. **Selection Committee for the Deanship of Health Sciences**
*** The Board agreed to note the report.
13. **Membership of the Student Proctorial Panel**
*** The Board agreed to note the report.
14. **Action under delegated authority and reports from the Academic Groups**
*** The Board agreed to note the report.
15. **Work in progress**
*** The Board agreed to note the report.
16. **Question Time**
*** The Board agreed to note the report.
17. **Recognition and thanks**
*** The Board agreed to note the report.
18. **Joint Senate/Academic Board Committee: Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research)**
*** The Board agreed to nominate the persons recommended.

P Part II

At the meeting the Chair reported on the following matters:

1. **Disturbance in the Main Quadrangle**
The Chair said that the disturbances in the Main Quadrangle had impacted on staff and he wished to thank them for their efforts in producing work with relatively few glitches under trying circumstances. He also wished to put on record his appreciation of the first-rate job done by the Security Staff.
2. **Confidential staffing matter**
The Chair reported on a confidential staffing matter which had been referred to him.
*** The Board noted the Chair's report and agreed to support his proposed course of action in respect of the staffing matter.

47/97 Statement by the Vice-Chancellor and Principal

The following reports had been circulated and tabled:

(see agenda and supplementary agenda item A5.)

Part I

1. **Report on Senate Matters**
*** The Board agreed to note the report.
2. **Review of Higher Education Financing and Policy**
*** The Board agreed to note the report.

P

3. Sydney Summer School Proposal

The Chair said that he had starred this item in anticipation of members wishing to discuss it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he understood that the NTEU might be taking the University to the Industrial Commission over the issue of the proposal being referred to the Board for endorsement rather than just for discussion. The Board should feel free to reach its own determination on the proposal rather than be guided by his recommendation.

The Chair drew attention to item 3. in Part I of his Chair's report and to the Board's *de facto* adoption of his recommendations in this item as the item had not been starred.

*** After some discussion the Board agreed unanimously to endorse in principle the proposal to establish a "Sydney Summer School", on a pilot basis for two years, subject to the following provisos (as set out in item 3 of the Chair's report), and to so report to Senate:

- Faculty approval must be given for the selection procedures for admission into those units of study to be offered in the pilot programs, and also for the delivery and examining arrangements by which those units will be conducted, for the Academic Board to accept such summer school units as appropriate for contributing to degree progression requirements in the relevant faculties.
- Each faculty participating in the 1998 summer school in this way must provide to the Board's Graduate/Undergraduate Studies Committee (as relevant), by 1 May 1998, a full report from its Dean on the above aspects of any unit of study offered in the 1998 Pilot Summer School (if this is put into operation), together with any other comments of relevance to the academic oversighting roles of faculties and the Academic Board and, subject to the Board's consideration of these reports in 1998, similar procedures apply in 1999.

P

Part II

At the meeting, the Vice-Chancellor reported on the following:

Federal Budget

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Federal Budget was neutral for the University but that there was an anticipation of a kindly election Budget next year and the University should prepare for that. In response to a reference to the \$1 billion which the Federal Government had allocated to special centenary celebrations, the Vice-Chancellor said that the University could submit a proposal for seed funding for a project that met the centenary guidelines.

*** The Board noted the report.

48/97 Report by the Vice-Chancellor and Principal on proctorial matters

*** The Board noted that the Vice-Chancellor tabled a report.

49/97 Report of the Academic Forum

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item A12.)

1. **Forum focus: The University's response to the West Review of Higher Education**
2. **Report from the Vice-Chancellor**
3. **Report from the Chair of the Academic Board**
4. **Report from the Chair of the Academic Forum**
5. **Question time**

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

50/97 Report of the Faculty of Economics

The following report was tabled:

(see agenda item B6.)

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

51/97 Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C1.)

1. **Full proposal for major changes to existing awards/courses**
Orange Agricultural College:
Bachelor of Business (Agricultural Commerce) (Honours)
Bachelor of Management (Honours)
 *** The Board agreed in principle to approve the introduction of the generic honours program at Orange Agricultural College.
2. **Admissions matters**
Faculty of Science - Proposal to change selection criteria
 *** The Board agreed to recommend that Senate approve the new selection criteria for the degree of Bachelor of Pharmacy.
3. **Credit point values and nomenclature**
 *** The Board agreed to note the report.
4. **Approval mechanisms for new courses and major changes to existing courses**
 *** The Board agreed to note the report.
5. **Admissions**
 *** The Board agreed to note the report.
6. **Evaluation of the Committee's performance**
 *** The Board agreed to note the report.
7. **Terms of Reference**
 *** The Board agreed to note the report.
8. **Admission and selection into fee-paying undergraduate courses in 1998**
 *** The Board agreed to note the report.
9. **Equity and Merit Scholarships**
 *** The Board agreed to note the report.
- P 10. **New courses and major changes to existing awards/courses**
Full proposals for a new academic program
 (1) **Faculty of Economics: Bachelor of Commerce (Liberal Arts)**
 (2) **Faculties of Arts and Science: Bachelor of Liberal Studies**

The Chair said that he had started this item in order to report that a number of years of planning had now culminated in proposals for the Bachelor of Commerce (Liberal Arts) and Bachelor of Liberal Studies having been finalised. The proposals would shortly be considered by the Undergraduate Studies Committee, and it was hoped that entries about the new degree programs would be able to be inserted into the 1998 UAC Guide. He was pleased about this initiative which utilised strengths in various areas of the University and he was appreciative of the hard work by the Deans and many others in achieving this result.

Associate Professor Beh said that she wished, on behalf of the Deans, to thank the Chair for the time and effort that he had contributed towards the initiative, and her comments were endorsed by Professors Cass and Salsbury.

 *** The Board agreed to note the report.

52/97 Report of the Graduate Studies Committee

The following reports had been circulated:

(see agenda item C2.)

A. First report

1. PhD examination process: recommendations to the PhD Award Sub-Committee

*** The Board agreed to note the report and to ask faculties and academic colleges to ensure that there is an appropriate justification in their recommendations to the PhD Award Sub-Committee.

2. Proceedings of the Committee

- (1) Administration of graduate candidatures
- (2) Coursework Sub-Committee
- (3) Seminars for Supervisors of Postgraduate Students
- (4) Workshop for Postgraduate Co-ordinators
- (5) Postgraduate coursework units of study
- (6) Electronic Publication of Theses
- (7) Faculty reports on postgraduate teaching and reviews of postgraduate coursework
- (8) Postgraduate Studies Handbook
- (9) Postgraduate Appeal
- (10) Membership of the Teaching and Learning Committee
- (11) Work in progress

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

B. Second report

Proceedings of the Committee

1. Administration of graduate candidatures
2. Postgraduate Coordinators' Workshop

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

53/97 Report of the Teaching and Learning Committee

The following reports had been circulated:

(see agenda item C3.)

First Report

1. Annual Reports of Faculty Teaching Committees
2. Priority Teaching Areas
 - (1) Distance Education/Flexible Learning
 - (2) Graduate Students' Teaching Loads
3. Policy review
 - (1) Examination and Assessment
 - (2) Statement on the Management of Teaching Activities

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

Second Report

1. Annual Reports of Faculty Teaching Committees

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

2. Priority Teaching Areas

- (1) Generic Attributes of Graduates

*** The Board agreed to adopt the revised statement on the Generic Attributes of Graduates of the University of Sydney, as recommended.

- (2) Teaching and Learning Committee as Broker
 - (a) Image Database
 - (b) Flexible Learning/Distance Education
 - (c) CUTSD Grants

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

54/97 Report of the Research Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C4.)

1. Conditions to be Provided to ARC and NHMRC Research Fellows

*** The Board agreed to note the report, noting that the Chair of the Research Committee and the Chair of the Board had agreed to present the Committee's recommendations to the Board in their entirety and that the Board, at its April meeting, agreed to adopt in principle the recommendations in respect of the conditions to be provided to the categories of research fellow listed and to commend to the Vice-Chancellor for his endorsement those recommendations with resource implications.

2. Taxation Status of Postgraduate Scholarships

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

3. AVCC Guidelines for Responsible Practice in Research and Dealing with Problems of Research Misconduct

*** The Board agreed:

- that Heads of Department should collect both the proforma and the final manuscript submitted for publication, but that they need not keep all revisions; and
- that once the manuscript is published, a copy of the published manuscript should be kept on file in place of the version submitted for publication.

4. Report from the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research)

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

5. Report from the Director, Business Liaison Office.

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

6. Report from the Director, Research Development

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

7. Report of the Director, Research and Scholarships Office

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

8. Eligibility Criteria for ARC Small Grants

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

55/97 Report of the Library and Information Technology Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C5.)

1. Membership of Reference Groups

2. Report from the Chair of the Library Reference Group

3. Report from the Chair of the IT Reference Group

4. Generic Attributes of Graduates of the University of Sydney

5. Provision of IT Accounts for student members of Academic Board, Academic Forum and Committees

6. Provision of IT Accounts for Fellows of Senate

7. Copyright and the WWW

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

56/97 Report of the Academic Staffing Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C6.)

1. Modes of Employment

2. Promotions Appeals

3. Policy Document - Support and Progression of Academic Staff

4. Criteria for Promotion relating to Professional Service

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

57/97 Appreciation of Professor Mack

The Vice-Chancellor referred to this being the last meeting of the Board at which Professor Mack would preside as Chair, and he paid tribute to Professor Mack's contributions to the University in general and to the Board in particular. The Vice-Chancellor's comments were supported with acclamation. Professor Mack thanked the Vice-Chancellor for his comments and the members of the Board for their support.