



The University of Sydney

Academic Board

Board Secretary: Miss E R Ring

Main Quadrangle, A14

Phone: 9351 3305; Fax: 9351 3572

E-mail: ring@extro.ucc.su.oz.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 pm on **Wednesday, 12 March 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 he 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

Sue Chapman

Registrar and Deputy Principal (Administrative Support Services)

4 March 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	6
B11. Report of the Faculty of Medicine	6
C1. Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee	6
C2. Report of the Graduate Studies Committee	9
C3. Report of the Teaching and Learning Committee	14
C4. Report of the Research Committee	14
C5. Report of the Library and Information Technology Committee	18
C6. Report of the Academic Staffing Committee	20
C7. Appointment of members of the Core Committee for Tenure	22
C8. Appointment of members of the Central Promotions Committees	23
D1. Reports of the Academic Groups on Chairs	24
D2. Report of the Tenure Committee	24

A G E N D A

A1. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Academic Board held on Wednesday 12 February 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 11 March 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 Wednesday 12 February 1997 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

A2. Business arising out of the minutes

At the Board's last meeting, there was discussion about making provision for membership of faculties by the Pro-Vice-Chancellors (Colleges) and about whether this should be initiated by the individual faculties or by the Board or Senate. The Board agreed to ask the Registrar to produce a report on this issue for consideration by Senate at its next meeting. (See Minute Item 3/97, Part II, Item 2.)

Senate, at its meeting on 3 March 1997, considered the matter, and a report to the Board will be included in the report on Senate matters that will be tabled at the meeting.

For this reason, the Chair has starred item B11. Report of the Faculty of Medicine.

that the Board note the report.

A4. Report of the Chair

Part I

1. Report on Senate Matters

To be tabled at the meeting.

that the Board note the report.

P

2. New nomenclature relating to academic programs and the academic year

The development of the new SIS is proceeding well and involves a considerable resource commitment by the University. The administrative matters raised in the Memorandum on Nomenclature (sent to Deans on 16 January 1997 and distributed with the February Board papers) has now been followed by a second memorandum to all heads of departments describing how the development of unit of study descriptors is expected to proceed. A copy of this second memorandum is attached. *(see pages 25-26)*

There will be intensive work involving SIS project team members, Publications Unit staff, administrative and academic staff developing processes and materials assisting departments and faculties with this. This work will also develop ways by which handbooks may be more easily modified to accommodate the changes, and is expected to develop a 'handbook template' which may be available for preparation of all 1998 handbooks.

The academic aspects underlying the above developments are threefold:

- (i) a move towards semester-based units of study (now complete in the three generalist faculties and also in a number of others);
- (ii) the adoption of a unit of study as the building block for all courses of study, with a single, unique credit point value (normally 3 or more points) assigned to it, irrespective of the course of study to which it contributes; and

- (iii) a recommendation that all undergraduate courses of study be constructed so that the normal credit point value per semester of full-time study be 24, and that any variations be upwards from this and be justified in terms of a faculty's presentation of curriculum for the course of study concerned.

I remind members of the Board that credit points are not rigidly related to load or to HECS charges, etcetera. These are currently computed in terms of annual full-time load for each student. (Such computations would be simplified if they were computed on a course of study basis, but they are not.) They are designed to relate primarily to completion requirements for courses of study and to enable all students to have similar information given them on each unit of study, irrespective of degree.

I **recommend** that the Academic Board:

- formally endorse items (ii) and (iii) above for undergraduate courses of study at degree level; and
- endorse the adoption of (i) for postgraduate units of study in coursework postgraduate programs, without the proviso on the normal minimum credit point value for postgraduate units.

that the Board adopt the Chair's recommendations.

3. **Extension of delegation of authority to the Chair**

The Academic Staffing Committee expects to review honorary/academic/clinical title procedures in the near future. In order to expedite approval processes pending this review of the whole set of procedures, I **seek approval** from Academic Board for an extension of delegations previously granted, allowing the Chair, to approve on behalf of the Board (formerly, on behalf of its Standing Committee), properly authorised recommendations to it for the approval of short-term visiting professor appointments and for the approval of committees appointed to consider academic/clinical/ other honorary titles, until the above review has brought forward for approval new procedures for these, modelled according to the new appointments procedures for academic staff already adopted.

I also advise the Board that, apart from the regular reporting of short-term visiting professorial appointments, all other honorary and other titles, once approved, will be reported to the Board as part of the regular six-monthly schedule now in place for academic appointments.

that the Board note the report and extend the delegation of authority to the Chair in respect of approving recommendations for short-term visiting professor appointments and committees to consider academic/clinical/ other honorary titles.

4. **West Review of Higher Education**

The Review guidelines for submissions are available on the committee's web site: <http://www.deetya.gov.au/divisions/hed/hereview/>

As agreed at the previous meeting, I have requested the deans of several professional faculties to provide a nominee to the proposed working party. I intend to consult the Vice-Chancellor soon regarding his plan to prepare a University submission.

that the Board note the report.

P 5. **Meeting commencement time and afternoon tea**

At the last meeting, I sought advice from members of the Board regarding the starting time of the meeting (do we continue to meet at 2 pm or defer until 2.15 ?) and the timing of afternoon tea (around 3 pm?).

One member said that it would be preferable for those located at campuses other than the Camperdown one if meetings did commence at 2.15.

It was agreed to discuss this at the next meeting.

To focus the discussion, I propose that future meetings commence at 2.15 pm, and that there be a 15-minute adjournment at 3 pm for afternoon tea.

.....

6. Election of Chair and Deputy Chairs of the Academic Board

Senate, at its meeting on 3 March 1997, resolved to amend the Academic Governance Rules relating to the election of the Chair and Deputy Chairs of the Board, as follows:

Amendment of rules relating to the Academic Board

Rule 8.1 of the Academic Board rules currently provides:

“The Chair holds office for two years, commencing on January 1 following election.”

Rule 9.1 of the rules relating to the Academic Board provides:

“Deputy Chairs hold office for two years commencing on January 1 following election.”

Clause 4(4) of chapter 8 of the *University of Sydney (Academic Governance) By-law 1996* provides that there must be an election for a new Chair and Deputy Chairs by 1 June 1997. Elections for the office of Chair will be held by the end of March 1997, and the election for Deputy Chairs will be held by the end of May 1997.

It is proposed that the Chair and Deputy Chairs assume office from 1 June 1997. Accordingly, it will be necessary to amend the existing rules, which currently provide for them to assume office from 1 January 1998.

Accordingly, it is proposed that the Academic Board Rules be amended as follows:

- Rule 8.1 is amended to read:-
“The Chair holds office as follows:-
(a) the first elected Chair holds office from 1 June 1997 until 31 December 1998; and
(b) subsequent elected Chairs hold office from 1 January in the year following election.”
- Rule 9.1 to amended to read:
“Deputy Chairs hold office as follows:-
(a) the first elected Deputy Chairs hold office from 1 June 1997 until 31 December 1998; and
(b) subsequent elected Deputy Chairs hold office from 1 January in the year following election.”

I understand that the Registrar will shortly commence the process of election by the Academic Forum of the Chair-elect of the Board, with that being completed by the end of March. The Chair-elect will then have opportunity to provide advice to the Forum with regard to Deputy Chairs, prior to their election by the Forum before the end of May. There will be a one month transition period during May when the Chair-elect will work with me, and the Chair-elect and Deputy Chairs will then assume office on 1 June. (This time-frame is consistent with the normal time-frame for such elections, allowing a two-month period between election of the new Chair and assumption of office.)

that the Board note the report.

7. Fees and charges for students

Members are reminded that after the meeting of the October 1996 Academic Board a report on equity issues and fee-paying courses was sent to all deans and faculty secretaries. This report included a request that faculties report on their experiences with regard to fees and postgraduate coursework enrolments to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Professor Richard Johnstone, by 30 April next. This matter has assumed greater importance now that the University will need to develop further its policies on fees and equity at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels.

I remind deans of this request and ask that the reports be forwarded to Professor Johnstone by the date requested. Professor Johnstone will advise on appropriate future action after consideration of the faculty reports.

that the Board note the report.

8. Rescission of Resolutions of the Academic Board

I have received advice recommending the rescission of certain Resolutions of the Academic Board made pursuant to Chapter 10 of the By-laws that have been identified as redundant either because the policies concerned no longer apply or because they are expressed in other Resolutions of the Senate. Several such Resolutions have been referred to Board Committees for advice; I ask the Board to agree to the rescission of the following Resolutions.

TRANSFER OF STUDENTS

Students who enrol in one degree course and pass the courses prescribed for another degree course have not the right to transfer to that other degree course, but may be admitted by the faculty, college or board of studies concerned on merit to the extent that facilities are available.

ADMISSION AFTER EXCLUSION

Applications for admission to a faculty or degree from persons who have been excluded from a degree or courses at this University or another tertiary institution shall be considered by the Academic Board, acting on the advice of the faculties and boards of studies.

that the Board resolve to rescind its resolutions relating to Transfer of Students and Admission after Exclusion, as recommended.

9. Committee of Chairs

I set out below for members' information some of the major issues discussed by the Committee of Chairs of Academic Boards/Senates of Universities in NSW and the ACT during 1996.

(a) **Scaling of HSC English courses**

The Committee agreed that it would not change the scaling method in relation to English for the 1996 HSC. It also agreed, and notified the Board of Studies and schools, that it would continue to use the present scaling method for the 1997 HSC. Professor Cooney asked the Board for comprehensive data on the way in which the comparison process in English was actually carried out in the 1996 HSC.

(b) **McGaw Green paper**

A special meeting was held on 7 May to consider the Committee's submission to the McGaw Green paper. Copies of the submission were sent to all members and to the New South Wales Board of Studies. The major points in the Committee's submission agreed closely with those in this Board's submission to the HSC Review.

(c) **Intellectual Property**

Copies of intellectual property documents of nine of the member universities were distributed for information, some these being in draft/interim stage.

(d) **ACTA Report on the Relative Performance of Commencing Undergraduate Students**

While the Australian Credit Transfer Agency no longer exists, the Committee noted that this report is available from the AVCC Store on (06) 285.8200 (ISBN 7266 0324 4).

(e) **Nomination of University staff to HSC Examination Committees**

The Committee noted a report from the Board of Studies that the method adopted to fill positions on Examination Committees had been very successful, with only some shortfalls, particularly in the languages.

(f) **Fee-paying Undergraduate Enrolments**

At the November meeting, the Committee noted that most institutions' planning had not yet fully addressed the issues of publicising, receiving and enrolling local students into fee-paying undergraduate courses, but that most had agreed that they would not use just the UAC in terms of the fee-paying side of the enrolment process.

(g) The Academic Year

The Committee discussed the changing nature of the academic year, especially with regard to semesterisation and the introduction of additional teaching periods, such as summer sessions.

that the Board note the report.

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

Under delegated authority from the former Board and its Standing Committee, I have considered the recommendations of the Academic Groups in respect of academic appointments and the appointment of selection committees that have been processed under the "old" appointments procedures and have approved/noted them as appropriate. A report on the appointment of Visiting Professors that I have approved is attached.

(see page 27)

that the Board note the report.

11. Work in progress

Set out below is a progress report on a number of issues currently being addressed:

(a) Working Party on the Academic Year

For information of members of the Board, I am attaching a copy of the present draft of the restructuring proposal which has been sent out to deans and faculties for comment. The Working Party will reconvene once comments have been received. One faculty has already asked if a "winter session" would be timetabled in June/July.

(see pages 28-29)

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

I reported to the February Board meeting that the Working Party had met once and agreed that information be sought on 'good practice' here and in some other universities, for consideration at its next meeting (to be held early in 1997). It was felt that better and clearer guidelines were needed to assist both students and staff in dealing with queries regarding academic decisions at departmental and faculty levels. Those with recent involvement in appeals noted that such appeals often related to procedures relevant to class work, assessment or supervision of clinical or practical experience rather than to formal examinations. Common causes of concern were the failure of academic units to adhere to published procedures, and/or to keep proper records.

It was also agreed that the appeals procedure should be reviewed so that there was a common approach for both undergraduate and postgraduate coursework situations. This will also be developed at the next meeting.

The Working Party is awaiting advice from the Registrar on procedures used in selected other universities.

(c) Progress on re-drafting of "green papers" considered by the Board/Forum in 1996

Further work is taking place on the following "green papers", but they are not yet at the stage for re-circulation to the University community.

I have seen a tentative new draft of (i), but no further drafts of (ii) or (iii).

- (i) Code of Conduct:
- (ii) Outside Earnings:
- (iii) Intellectual property

that the Board note the report.

12. 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 Part II

To be presented at the meeting.

P B11. Report of the Faculty of Medicine

The Faculty met on 21 February 1997.

Amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate: Constitution of the Faculty of Medicine

The Faculty **recommends** that the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the constitution of the Faculty of Medicine (pp 383-4, *Calendar 1996, Vol I* and as amended by the Senate at its meeting on 2 September 1996) be further amended from 3 March 1997

- by inserting the following new section 1 (h):
 1. (h) the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Health Sciences);
- and
- by renumbering existing sections 1. (h) - 1. (q) as 1. (i) - 1. (r).

The reason for this amendment is to allow for membership of the Faculty by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Health Sciences).

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

C1. Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee

The inaugural meeting of the Committee was held on 18 February 1997 when there were present: Professor Jocalyn Lawler (Chair), Associate Professor Hilary Astor, Professor Geoff Barton, Associate Professor Lloyd Dawe, Professor Brian Farrow, Dr Ross Gilbert, Professor Jill Gordon, Associate Professor Jan Horsfall, Dr Gary Lee, Dr Edith Lees, Associate Professor Tony Masters, Associate Professor Ewan Mylecharane, Associate Professor Richard Waterhouse and Mr Ross Wilson. Ms E Bergmann was in attendance.

1. Membership

The membership of the Undergraduate Studies Committee is as follows:

The Chair or a Deputy Chair of the Academic Board, who shall act as chair of that Committee:

Professor Jocalyn Lawler

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning):

Professor Richard Johnstone

A nominee of each Faculty offering undergraduate programs, nominated by the Dean:

Faculty of Agriculture:	Dr Edith Lees
Faculty of Architecture:	Associate Professor Mary Lou Maher
Faculty of Arts:	Associate Professor Richard Waterhouse
Faculty of Dentistry:	Associate Professor Ewan Mylecharane

Faculty of Economics:	Dr Greg Patmore
Faculty of Education:	Associate Professor Lloyd Dawe
Faculty of Engineering:	Associate Professor Geoff Barton
Faculty of Health Sciences:	Dr Gary Lee
Faculty of Law:	Associate Professor Hilary Astor
Faculty of Medicine:	Associate Professor Jill Gordon
Faculty of Nursing:	Associate Professor Jan Horsfall
Orange Agricultural College:	Mr Ross Wilson
Faculty of Science:	Associate Professor Christopher Gillies
Sydney College of the Arts:	Ms Su Baker
Sydney Conservatorium of Music:	Dr Ross Gilbert
Faculty of Veterinary Science:	Professor Brian Farrow

Two undergraduate students:

- (i) one of whom is to be nominated by and from the undergraduate student members of the Academic Forum:
to be advised
- (ii) the other of whom is to be a nominee of the Students' Representative Council:
Ms Katrina Curry

2. **Amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate**

Faculty of Medicine - Graduate Medical Program: Restriction upon Re-enrolment

The recommendation from the Faculty of Medicine to amend the Resolutions of the Senate relating to Restriction upon Re-enrolment to reflect the introduction of the Graduate Medical Program had been considered by the Graduate Studies Committee. The Academic Board at its meeting on 12 February 1997 resolved to recommend the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to Restriction upon Re-enrolment in the Faculty of Medicine, as recommended, subject to endorsement by the Undergraduate Studies Committee.

The Committee endorsed the Faculty of Medicine's recommendation.

3. **Librarian's statement in proposals for new or amended undergraduate award programs**

The Academic Board, at its meeting held on 12 February 1997, resolved that, subject to support from the Undergraduate Studies Committee, the report of the Graduate Studies Committee be adopted and faculties advised that the University Library should be allowed sufficient time to make assessments of proposals for new and amended award programs and courses and that proposals without the Librarian's statement would not normally be considered.

The Committee endorsed the Board's resolution.

4. **Prioritisation of tasks**

The Committee agreed to the following priority list of tasks:

- (i) credit point values and nomenclature
- (ii) approval mechanisms for new courses and major changes to existing courses
- (iii) admissions
- (iv) evaluation of the Committee's performance

5. **Credit point values**

The Chair of the Board spoke to the paper "New nomenclature relating to academic programs and the academic year" which had been considered by the February Academic Board, and it was agreed that a copy would be circulated to members.

The Chair undertook to obtain clarification on this matter and to report back.

6. **Review of approval mechanisms for new courses and major changes to existing courses**

The Committee noted the current Undergraduate Award/Course Approval Guidelines and Proformas approved by the Academic Board in September 1995. It was agreed that the streamlining of the Guidelines was an urgent priority. The Committee noted a suggested revised draft timetable and the reasons for bringing forward the closing date for initial

proposals for approval in principle of new degrees and major changes to existing courses or degrees.

The Committee agreed to set up a working party to consider processes and procedures for undergraduate course approvals, including the draft timetable, to comprise:

Professor Jocalyn Lawler (Chair)

Professor Brian Farrow

Dr Ross Gilbert

Dr Gary Lee

Associate Professor Tony Masters (co-opted member)

7. Admissions Policies and Procedures

The Committee agreed to set up a working party on admissions policies and procedures, to comprise:

Associate Professor Ewan Mylecharane (Chair)

Associate Professor Lloyd Dawe

Ms Alison Purcell (Chair of the Health Science Admissions Committee) (co-opted member)

8. Means by which the Undergraduate Studies Committee will assess its performance in 1997 - performance indicators, processes

The Committee noted that the Policy Advisory Committee had reported to the November 1996 meeting of the new Academic Board that the new Board Committees should assess their operational efficiency. It was agreed that this was a priority and that a working party on assessment of performance would be considered at the next meeting.

9. Proposed University Preparation Course: Introduction to Science

Noting oral advice of the Faculty's support, the Committee approved the proposal from the Coordinator of the University Preparation Courses, Centre for Continuing Education, for the University Preparation Course - Introduction to Science - to be offered in 1997, subject to written support from the Faculty.

10. Joint Working Party of the Undergraduate Studies Committee and the Teaching and Learning Committee, and possibly the Graduate Studies Committee

It was agreed that the Chair would represent the Committee on this Working Party in the short term.

11. Member of the Undergraduate Studies Committee to sit on the Teaching and Learning Committee

It was agreed that Associate Professor Lloyd Dawe would be the Undergraduate Studies Committee's representative on the Teaching and Learning Committee.

12. Policy on Student Evaluations of Courses

The Committee supported the draft Policy on Student Evaluations of Courses, noting that section 6 of the policy needed to clarify that Faculty Teaching Reports should be forwarded to the Academic Board's Teaching and Learning Committee.

13. Liberal Studies/Liberal Arts course

Professor Mack advised that he would meet with the Deans of Arts/Economics/Science about the proposal to introduce a Liberal Studies/Liberal Arts course in mid-1998, for full availability in 1999. If the UAC Handbook entry could be finalised before the end of February, he would consult with the Committee about the wording.

14. Annual Reports of Faculty Teaching Committees

The Committee noted a memorandum from Professor Johnstone to Deans concerning Annual Reports of Faculty Teaching Committees.

15. Quality of Performance in Teaching

The Committee noted a memorandum from Professor Sefton to members of the Teaching and Learning Committee concerning Quality of Performance in Teaching.

that, Items 1 to 15, the Board note the report.

C2. Report of the Graduate Studies Committee

The Committee met on 10 February 1997 when there were present: the Chair (Professor J R Lawrence) presiding, Dr L C Campbell, Ms C Davidson, Associate Professor M Gatens, Drs M King, and M J Mahony, Professor Y-W Mai, Associate Professor A F Masters, Mr K Oliver, Associate Professor R Pratt, Dr R Ross, Associate Professor C D Shorey, and Professor D M Walker. Professors G Berry and G E Sherington were present by invitation. Miss E R Ring was in attendance.

1. Terms of reference of the new Graduate Studies Committee

The Committee has held ongoing discussions about its terms of reference and constitution as a committee of the new Academic Board and has agreed to recommend and report to the Board in the following terms:

Amendment of the Academic Governance Rules relating to the Academic Board: Membership of the Graduate Studies Committee

The Committee **recommends** that the Academic Governance Rules relating to the Academic Board be amended to provide that the Chair of the Research Committee be added as a member *ex officio* of the new Graduate Studies Committee.

The Committee recognises the overlapping of some of its work with that of the Research Committee and of the importance of there being a communication channel between the two committees. It believes that membership of the Graduate Studies Committee by the Chair of the Research Committee will address these issues.

Establishment of Sub-Committees of the new Graduate Studies Committee

The Committee reports that it has established the following sub-committees:

(1) **PhD Award Sub-Committee**

The PhD Award Sub-Committee of the former Committee for Graduate Studies has been re-established as a sub-committee of the new Graduate Studies Committee.

While no changes have been made to the Sub-Committee's terms of reference, the Committee has endorsed a recommendation from the Sub-Committee for changes to be made to the PhD examination process. These proposed changes are set out below in Item 2.

(2) **Postgraduate Awards Selection Sub-Committee**

The Graduate Studies Committee, through one of its terms of reference (*viz* to advise the Academic Board on the criteria for determining selection for postgraduate awards and to determine the successful applicants), has within its purview the former Postgraduate Awards Selection Committee.

The role of postgraduate awards is:

- to attract postgraduate students of the highest calibre to the University
- to provide financial support for postgraduate students while they are carrying out their study and research.

The Committee has established the Postgraduate Awards Selection Sub-Committee with the role of the selection of candidates to whom offers of awards will be made. The basis of awards will be academic excellence as demonstrated by previous academic and research performance as well as research potential. The processes for the assessment of candidates should be open and uniform across the University. The processes for the assessment of candidates should be equitable across like awards and will be determined by the Postgraduate Awards Selection Sub-Committee taking into account the specific requirements of the awarders.

The Postgraduate Awards Selection Sub-Committee shall provide a report on its deliberations and make recommendations to the Committee for Graduate Studies. The Committee has authorised its Chair to consider and act on its behalf in respect of the Sub-Committee's recommendations.

The membership of the Sub-Committee shall be as follows, and the Committee can co-opt working members:

Members: (a) Chair, Committee for Graduate Studies (*ex officio*)
 (b) Chair (or the chair's nominee) of the Board or Committee of Postgraduate Studies in each Faculty
 Chair: to be appointed by the Graduate Studies Committee
 Support: The Sub-Committee is serviced by the Research and Scholarships Office.

that the Board note the report and recommend the amendment of the Academic Governance Rules relating to the Academic Board, as recommended.

2. **Amendment of the Resolutions of the Academic Board: PhD examination process**

The Committee considered a report to the PhD Award Sub-Committee, prepared by its Chair, Professor Berry, in which he recommended changes to the PhD examination process. The Sub-Committee endorsed the report and its recommendations, subject to one of the recommendations being amended.

The amended report and recommendations are set out below. The report was endorsed by the Graduate Studies Committee, which recommends its adoption by the Board:

Recommendations for changes to the PhD examination process

In a report dated 8 February 1996 which was presented to the PhD Award Sub-Committee (PhDASC) on 26 February and to the Committee for Graduate Studies on 18 April information was given on a comparison between the result and the opinions of the three examiners based on a survey of 217 cases coming before the PhD Award Sub-Committee between March and December 1995.

The main results may be summarised as follows:

- a) There were 73 candidates where all three examiners recommended award either without further examination or after correction of typographical corrections and in all these cases the chair approved award of the degree either without further examination or after correction of typographical corrections.
- b) 108 candidates were awarded the degree subject to emendations where no examiner required more than this. The award was approved by the chair for 103 (95%) of these.
- c) The other 36 cases were more complicated and required detailed consideration. They included four cases where an examiner had recommended emendations but the Faculty did not consider that these were necessary, 29 where at least one examiner recommended revise and resubmit, and four cases where an examiner had recommended failure. The final result was approved by the chair in 16 cases and the other 20 were considered by the full committee.

As a result of these results the committee accepted the Recommendation that *When all examiners have recommended either that the degree be awarded without qualification or subject to the correction of typographical errors the Faculty shall forward only one copy of the reports to the Sub-Committee.*

This recommendation has been in effect since then although it should be noted that there are still cases where a Faculty unnecessarily prepares and forwards 10 copies of the reports.

I recommend that it is now timely to consider other changes to the examination process based on the above information, on the changes to the Academic Board with a streamlining of its operations and a focus on academic policy¹.

¹ See the Vice-Chancellor's paper, *II A Case for Academic and Administrative Reorganisation*, November 1996, page 2.

The changes that might be made are a simplification of the award procedure whereby the degree might be awarded at Faculty level and reported to the PhD Award Sub-Committee. The advantages of this are as follows:-

- 1 A reduction in time to notification of the award to the candidate of about two weeks.
- 2 A reduction in the administrative workload of the secretariat supporting PhDASC, and in administration and photocopying at Faculty level.
- 3 A reduction in the transport of files by the University's postal service.

If this is to be done then the first obvious category is a) above which constitutes about one third of the total.

Recommendation 1

When all examiners have recommended either that the degree be awarded without further examination or subject to the correction of typographical errors the Faculty may award the degree either without further examination or subject to the correction of typographical errors.

In making this recommendation the PhDASC emphasises that cases in this category are already on a fast track in that a departmental recommendation is not required [see 3.01(a) of Academic Board Resolutions²]. It will be Faculty's responsibility to process these quickly by the exercise of delegation to the chair of the Faculty's postgraduate committee (see Recommendation 4 below). The PhDASC notes that there are still some cases in this category where time is wasted referring to the department for a recommendation.

The second category is b) above, which constitutes about half of the total.

Recommendation 2

When one or more examiners have recommended that the degree be awarded subject to minor emendations and the remaining examiners have recommended award without further examination or subject to the correction of typographical errors the Faculty may award the degree subject to all the emendations required by the examiners being carried out.

In other cases, such as where the head of department's or Faculty's recommendation is that not all the emendations required by the examiners should be carried out, or where an examiner has specified other conditions, or one or more examiners recommend revise and resubmit or failure, authority to award the degree not be delegated to Faculty.

Recommendation 3

Except for cases covered by Recommendations 1 and 2, award of the degree may only be approved by the PhD Award Sub-Committee (or its Chair by delegation under 4.28 of the Resolutions of the Academic Board)

If Recommendations 1 and/or 2 are approved then a further Recommendation is necessary.

Recommendation 4

Where delegation for award of the degree is at Faculty level then the authority for the award shall be the responsibility of the Faculty's postgraduate committee³ and there should be delegation to the Chair of that body in a similar form to that given to the chair of the PhD Award Sub-Committee under 4.28 of the Academic Board's Resolutions.

I consider it essential that the PhDASC maintain a view of the total picture as this is essential for the development of policy in the PhD examination area and for the protection of uniformity across the University.

Recommendation 5

Where the degree is awarded by Faculty delegation then each Faculty shall report to the PhDASC at the end of March, June, September and December of each year the details of such awards for the previous three months showing for each the name of the candidate, the department, the category of award recommended by each examiner, the final result, the

² the Resolutions of the Academic Board relating to the examination process for the PhD are set out on pp 40-44 of the *Postgraduate Studies Handbook 1995* and on pp 111-118 of the *Calendar 1996 Vol I*.

³ the Faculty committee responsible for postgraduate research degrees, whatever the Faculty name for that committee

date of submission of the thesis and the date on which the candidate was informed of the result.

I note also that under the arrangements of reorganising the University into three Colleges a reconsideration of the "possible devolution of the PhD to Colleges" is mentioned for possible discussion⁴. It is too early to make any detailed comments on this. It might well be an appropriate step to take when the Colleges are operating but it will be essential to guard against "non-uniform policies and procedures, unclear and confusing presentations ..., duplication of ... resources."⁵ The proposals given above are not inconsistent with the reorganisation of the University into three Colleges.

Amendment of the Resolutions of the Academic Board Degree of Doctor of Philosophy - the Examination Process

Attached are draft amendments to the Resolutions of the Academic Board relating to the examination process for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (pp 111-118, *Calendar 1996, Vol I*) to reflect the above recommendations. (see pages 30-38)

In September 1996 the Board endorsed a resolution of the Committee for Graduate Studies that provided that faculties be asked to write to examiners after six weeks (that is, two weeks before their reports were due), reminding them politely of the due date if their report had not already been received. This resolution has also been incorporated into the draft amendments.

that the Board note the report and amend its resolutions relating to the examination process for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, as recommended.

3. Proceedings of the Committee

(1) Administration of graduate candidatures

(a) PhD Award Sub-Committee

On the reports of the meetings of the PhD Award Sub-Committee held on 18 December 1996 and 29 January 1997, the Committee noted that:

Meeting held on 18 December 1996

Doctor of Philosophy

- the award of the degree had been approved, without further qualification, to four candidates;
- the award of the degree had been approved, subject to correction of typographical errors, to 11 candidates;
- the award of the degree had been approved, subject to emendations, to 18 candidates;
- one candidature had been referred back to the Faculty of Law;
- the degree had not been awarded to one candidate in the Faculty of Arts who had been permitted to revise and re-submit;
- an assessor had been appointed for a thesis in the Faculty of Arts; and
- examiners had been appointed for eight candidates (including a replacement examiner for one thesis).

Doctor of Juridical Studies

- examiners had been appointed for three candidates.

Meeting held on 29 January 1997

Doctor of Philosophy

- the award of the degree had been approved, without further qualification, to one candidate;
- the award of the degree had been approved, subject to correction of typographical errors, to four candidates;

⁴ See the Vice-Chancellor's paper, *II A Case for Academic and Administrative Reorganisation*, November 1996, page 6.

⁵ See the Vice-Chancellor's paper, *II A Case for Academic and Administrative Reorganisation*, November 1996, page 5.

- the award of the degree had been approved, subject to emendations, to 11 candidates;
- the degree had not been awarded to one candidate in the Faculty of Architecture who had been permitted to revise and re-submit;
- examiners had been appointed for four candidates (including a replacement examiner for one thesis).

(b) Higher doctorates

Admission to candidature and appointment of examiners

The Committee confirmed the action of the Chair in approving a recommendation from the Board of Studies in Music for the appointment of examiners for a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Music.

(2) Report of the Working Party on a Generic Doctoral Program

The Committee noted a report from a Working Party it had appointed to consider the feasibility of introducing a generic doctoral program (initially called a Doctor of Studies) which would embody a considerable coursework component. The Committee noted the conclusions of the Working Party, viz, that, although there was some academic merit in the proposal, there was insufficient evidence of demand for the proposed program.

(3) Appeals by postgraduate students

The Committee noted a report by the Chair on two postgraduate student appeals.

(4) Faculty reports on postgraduate teaching and reviews of postgraduate coursework

The Committee noted that Professor Sherington would request the 1996 annual reports on postgraduate teaching and on reviews of postgraduate coursework from faculties shortly.

(5) Meeting of Departmental Postgraduate Co-ordinators

The Committee agreed that it would be desirable to hold a meeting of all departmental postgraduate co-ordinators, and agreed to discuss this at its next meeting.

(6) Seminars for Supervisors of Postgraduate Students

The Committee noted that a program of seminars for supervisors of postgraduate students would be advertised shortly and agreed that members draw the advertisements to the attention of new and inexperienced supervisors in their faculties.

(7) Work in progress

(a) Levels of award and grading systems used for Master's degrees

The Committee noted that the Working Party would be reconvened shortly and would report to the Committee's March meeting.

(b) UMI Dissertation Service

The Committee considered a report from Professor Berry and correspondence from the Acting University Librarian about the desirability/feasibility of joining the UMI Dissertation Service. It agreed to ask Professor Berry to discuss the merits of the proposal with the Acting Librarian and to report back to the Committee.

(c) Structure of the initial year of the PhD

The Committee noted that a report from the Working Party would be forwarded in the near future.

that the Board note the report.

C3. Report of the Teaching and Learning Committee

The Committee met on 7 February 1997 when there were present: Professor A Sefton (Chair), the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Information Technology) Professor R Hewitt, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) Professor R Johnstone, the Chair, Graduate Studies Committee, Professor J Lawrence, the Director, Centre for Teaching and Learning, Associate Professor J Lublin, the Chair, Library and Information Technology Committee, Professor R McPhedran, the President of the SRC, Ms K Curry, and the President of SUPRA, Mr K Oliver. Ms N Downey was in attendance.

1. Committee to Consider Awards for Excellence in Teaching

It was noted that this Committee had been established as a Sub-Committee of the Teaching and Learning Committee. The Committee reports that, since that Committee also undertakes CAUT ranking, it has been renamed the 'Teaching Awards Committee'.

2. Priority Areas for 1997

The Committee discussed a range of areas of priority in teaching and learning on which it might focus in 1997.

These priority areas would be considered further by the Committee at its next meeting in order to make some decisions as to which the Committee would go ahead with and to establish a schedule for 1997.

3. Language Issues

It was agreed that Professor Angus Martin, along with one or two other staff with expertise in language issues, be invited to form a Language Reference Group with a watching brief in this area. That Reference Group could advise this Committee on significant language matters as they arise. The Group would be invited to pursue issues of significance to the Teaching and Learning Committee and a representative of the Group would be coopted to the Committee for relevant discussions.

4. Policy Review

The Committee agreed that it would undertake a general review of teaching and learning policies. Academic Board policies which fall within the terms of reference of the Committee would be identified prior to the next meeting, and a review schedule established.

5. Appointments/Promotions Documents: Teaching

A revised draft of a document prepared in 1996 by the Undergraduate Studies Committee on Appointments/Promotions documents relating to teaching had been circulated by the Chair. The Academic Staffing Committee was currently considering this matter and had asked the Teaching and Learning Committee to review the 1996 document. Members' comments on the draft were invited and the document will subsequently be forwarded to the Staffing Committee.

that , items 1 to 5, the Board note the report.

C4. Report of the Research Committee

The Committee met on 13 February 1997 when there were present: Professor D Cockayne, Deputy Chair Academic Board (Presiding Member), Professor I D Hume, Professor G J Gill, Professor R I Tanner, Associate Professor S R Garton, Professor D B Melrose, Associate Professor D Cook, Dr J Lingard and Mr K Oliver. In attendance: Dr C Baxter, Mr P Cook, Dr A Reynolds and Ms M Robb.

1. Introduction

The Presiding member introduced Dr A Reynolds who has agreed to chair the Research Forum in 1997. In Professor Clunies Ross' absence, Dr Reynolds will also represent Professor Clunies Ross on the Research Committee. Ms M Robb who has recently taken up the position of Director, Research Development, was also introduced to the Committee.

2. Paper Referred from The University of Sydney Library and Information Technology Committee

Dr Neil Radford's paper entitled "Key Issues in Australian Electronic Publishing" presented to the University Library and Information Technology Committee on 28 November 1996 was referred to the Research Committee on 7 February for consideration and advice. As the document is a summation of four separate position papers, the Committee agreed that once copies of the original position papers were available, a small sub-committee comprising Dr Baxter, Dr Reynolds (convenor) and Professor Tanner would review them and prepare a report for the Research Committee so that it might advise the Library and Information Technology Committee.

3. Presentation by Research Fellows of their Paper Entitled "Research Fellows at The University of Sydney"

Drs B Messerle, Alan Walmsley and Judy Furby attended the meeting to present a paper prepared by research fellows addressing a range of issues relating to the conditions of their appointments with The University of Sydney. The principal issues covered by the paper related to academic equivalence for Research Fellows with academic staff, financial support for research fellows (including access to a start-up grant from the centre and access to other University funds under the same terms as equivalent academic staff), and the provision of departmental administrative support equivalent to that of academic staff. The Fellows also noted that the Academic Board at its meetings on 15 March and 16 August 1993 had addressed these issues in part, and had supported the view being put again now by the Fellows. They also pointed out a memorandum from the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) to Heads of Department dated 11 October 1991, setting out the conditions which should be afforded to Research Fellows, and to The University of Sydney Personnel Policy: Position Classification Standards for Research Only Positions, both of which they said supported the position they were putting forward. The Fellows expressed concern that while it appeared there was existing University policy that addressed in large part their concerns, this was not widely known or understood.

Professor Tanner agreed to look at the proposal that each new (ie commencing) ARC and NHMRC Research Fellow might receive a start up grant and agreed to advise the Committee of the result of his deliberation. It was agreed however that consideration should be given to what guidelines might apply to the use of these funds noting that some Departments might feel they have a need to tap into these funds to provide the necessary research infrastructure for a Research Fellow.

It was agreed that the Research and Scholarships Office should consider establishing on its Homepage a site where the conditions relating to Research Fellows could be found. It was further agreed that eligibility of postdoctoral fellows to apply for Overseas Conference Travel Grants and University Research Grants should be re-examined as there would be an internal inconsistency if this were not done and if Research Fellows are accepted as having academic status.

While there was unanimous support from the Research Committee for the position being put by the Research Fellows, it was agreed that a sub-committee comprising Professors Hume, Garton and Cockayne would work with the Research Fellows to prepare a consolidated document clearly setting out the absolute minimum assistance that the University should provide to externally funded Research Fellows. This document, once agreed by the Research Committee, will then be referred to the Academic Board.

It was noted that while there are a variety of other research only staff, also called 'research fellows,' at the University, the issues raised by the Research Fellows' paper were initially focussed upon all categories of NHMRC and ARC Research Fellows.

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

Professor Tanner noted that Ms Robb had joined the University and said he considered her appointment a very positive feature of The University of Sydney's research effort.

He indicated that results of the latest round of Collaborative Research Centres (CRC) had been good for the University. Despite the fact that a large number of existing CRC's around

Australia were up for renewal we had been awarded one completely new CRC in Sustainable Rice Production. We were also a new partner in a renewed CRC in Mining Technology and Equipment. The existing CRC in Photonics had received a minor increase in funding, and the former CRC in Aerospace Structures had been renewed in the form of a CRC in Advanced Composite Structures.

Professor Tanner noted that offers had been made to fifteen Postdoctoral Fellows under the U2000 initiative. After applications had been received, they were ranked by Faculties which each put forward five ranked applicants for consideration by a central committee.

One successful applicant has declined the offer in order to take up another University of Sydney Fellowship and the top candidate in the reserve list had been offered the fellowship. It was suggested that the process of advertisement for Fellows should in future start in August so that offers could be out by November.

Professor Tanner indicated that Overseas Postgraduate Research Scholarship (with stipend) offers (funded from the U2000 initiative) had had a higher acceptance rate so far this year, that the proposal to provide a maintenance allowance of \$600 to each PhD student (with appropriate limits on period of candidacy) from U2000 funds would be implemented once PhD enrolments had been finalised in early April, and that \$500,000 in U2000 funding had been provided to the new Humanities and Social Sciences Research Centre to establish a secondment program for staff to the Centre.

Professor Tanner advised that plans to appoint a Postgraduate Dean had been put on hold, as it might be considered preferable to wait until a full time position could be established.

He told the Committee that Associate Professor S Garton had agreed to chair the Humanities ARC Small Grants Committee in 1997, Dr A Wiess the Biosafety Committee and Dr I Ramzan the Animal Care and Ethics Committee. Dr J Watson will continue as chair of the Human Ethics Committee in 1997. Professor Cockayne agreed to write to Associate Professor H Beh, former Chair of the Biosafety Committee and Associate Professor R Einstein, former Chair of the Animal Care and Ethics Committee to thank them for their efforts during their terms of office. He also agreed to write to Dr J Watson, asking when guidelines for the operation of the Human Ethics Committee would be available, so that operating guidelines for the Committee could be clearly spelt out.

Professor Tanner advised that he had agreed to defer further disbursements from the E S Wood Bequest, previously used for publication assistance until the quantum of the bequest was built up. He said he would consider any request for publication assistance on its merits and if appropriate find another source of funds to make a contribution towards publication costs, most probably from infrastructure funds.

He reminded the Committee that staff should be beginning to think now about applications to be made for Research Infrastructure (Equipment and Facilities) Grants from DEETYA.

Professor Tanner noted that the draft Intellectual Property Policy was still being re-examined, and Mr Oliver advised that SUPRA was still seeking legal advice in relation to students' rights in relation to the policy. Professor Tanner noted that he felt it was entirely appropriate to await this advice, and that it was likely that a redrafted policy may not be available for another month or two.

5. Report from the Director, Business Liaison Office.

Dr Baxter reported that the first issue of the Business Liaison Office's (BLO) newsletter had been distributed in December and had received an extremely favourable response from industry. The BLO is now working on a second edition as well as a new edition of the BLO user's manual.

She noted that ARC (Collaborative) Grant and APA (Industry) Scholarship applications will close on 9 May and that the BLO will be holding a number of seminars (with associated small group sessions) in the next few weeks to assist potential applicants.

Dr Baxter reported that the BLO was being approached by a relatively large number of people wanting to form companies to provide for the utilisation of University research with one such company being endorsed by Senate at its February meeting.

6. Report of the Director, Research and Scholarships Office

The final report of the working party chaired by Mr Cook which had been considering matters relating to the financial management of research income and associated information reporting was presented to the Vice-Chancellor in December. The two principal outcomes are firstly that as of January 1997 all accounts for research funds are now opened by the Research Office ensuring both a quicker and more efficient process, and secondly, that due to this and other recommendations of the report, as of 1998 the University should be better positioned to ensure greater accuracy in reporting to DEETYA in relation to all categories of research income.

Mr Cook reported that the evaluation of research information management systems for implementation within the Research Office and across the University was underway. Site visits to three CASMAC Unipower installations and two Research Master sites has been completed, and a user testing protocol developed. The user testing of the Research Master software was underway but had been interrupted due to the heavy workload in the Research Office at the moment due to ARC and NHMRC application deadlines. It would recommence in March, as would user testing of the CASMAC Unipower module if data transfer problems associated with this module could be overcome by then. A report of the evaluation was currently being drafted and it is anticipated that a recommendation might be able to be made by the Steering Committee in April.

He explained that there had been numerous problems dealing with ARC in recent months as many staff were new and/or unfamiliar with past procedures. At the same time new application procedures were being put in place and rules relating to these were being established on the run with at times conflicting advice. It is understood a number of these issues have been taken up by the AVCC with ARC. The Research Office is endeavouring to shield academic staff from this situation and trying to ensure that as far as possible consistent advice is provided to them.

The re-submission of the 1996 Publications Report (1995 publications) and the submission of the 1997 Finance and Publications Report (1996 data) to DEETYA are underway. All Heads of Departments (also Deans and Chairs of Faculty Research Committees) were given preliminary advice in December and final guidelines on 6 January. The closing date for the re-submission of the of the 1996 Publication Report is 7 March and for the submission of the 1997 Finance and Publications Report, 9 April. The Research Office is daily fielding numerous inquiries in relation to the much revised DEETYA 'publication' guidelines and in most cases is able to give a definitive response. Where it can't the queries are being referred to DEETYA with varying success in getting clarification of DEETYA criteria. There is concern that some Heads of Department might not be giving both these exercises the necessary urgent attention they require.

As approved by the Academic Board in October 1996, beginning in the next few weeks the Scholarships Office will commence devolving responsibility for a number of faculty, school and department-based awards. A package of information in relation to each devolved award has been prepared, including a comprehensive set of guidelines relating to revised procedures for the establishment, modification and administration of awards within the University and this is to be sent to Faculties with a covering note from the Chairman of the Academic Board, indicating that this procedure follows Academic Board policy.

A scholarship/awards information database is under construction and it is hoped this will be in place in March. This should then enable a more client-focussed service to be provided to staff and students in relation to awards administered by the Scholarships Office.

In response to a question, Mr Cook noted that NHMRC and ARC had indicated they would not be supplementing grants to take account of salary increases in Universities as a result of enterprise bargaining. This, along with the decision in late 1996 by the Industrial and Arbitration Commission to award separation payments for some staff at the end of their contracts, was placing great pressure on grant holders trying to keep within grant budgets. Professor Tanner agreed that he should write to all Deans and Heads of Department about this situation and noting that if the conditions of a research grant did not permit the increased costs being met from the grant, that the Department would have to find the funds.

7. Report of the Director, Research Development

Ms Robb indicated that while she had been with the University for only six weeks, she had been overwhelmed by the number of people and departmental groups wanting to see her. She said she was impressed by the excellent standard of applications she had seen and the standard of research fellows who were seeking her advice. Asked what she saw as her role, she indicated she wanted to provide individual and group support to researchers in an effort to make their research work. She indicated that she felt she had a role to play in advising Heads of Department and Deans, assisting in infrastructural issues, creating networks and helping people with research strategies. She indicated she might concentrate on the major funding schemes.

8. Review of The University of Sydney Research Grants Scheme

Professor Gill agreed to draft a position paper on issues relating to a review of The University of Sydney Research Grants Scheme. Members were invited to provide their input directly to Professor Gill.

9. Order of Australia to Professor John Booker

The Committee expressed its heartfelt congratulations to Professor Booker for his award of an AO in the Australia Day Honours List. The Chair agreed to write to Professor Booker to convey the Committee's congratulations.

that , items 1 to 9, the Board note the report.

C5. Report of the Library and Information Technology Committee

The Committee met on Monday 17 February 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), the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Information Technology) Professor R Hewitt, Dr S Carlile, Associate Professor E Cornell, Professor M Harris, Associate Professor N Newbiggin, the President of SRC (Ms K Curry), Professor J Rosenberg and Ms C Sexton. Pro-Vice-Chancellor R Johnstone, Ms B Olde and Dr C O'Brien were in attendance.

1. Internet Charging and access

An amended report by Mr R Cartlidge on "Internet charging and access at the University of Sydney" was tabled.

It was noted that the joint letter in the papers to the Heads of Departments and Deans from Professors Hewitt (Chair, ITC) and McPhedran (Chair LITC) had slight amendments when sent on 15 February 1997. These changes reflected the advantages in the decision that from 1 July 1997 internet traffic for AARNET will be carried with Optus rather than Telstra. Local traffic will be paid for by a flat rate charge but international traffic will be directly billed to the University and probably to the Department concerned. ITC will continue to pay for net charges during 1997 but as from 1998 there will be no allocation made and consequently, departments should use 1997 to maximise the efficiency of their net usage.

The decision as to devolving costs to the departments is still under review but it is proposed to enforce use of caching either through the I S cache server or an approved departmental cache and encourage mirroring facilities. The aim was to encourage efficient use of the net, minimise University costs, and to take advantage of the substantial opportunities for cooperative action among universities. The issue of the effect on students of such developments was raised as well as the issue relating to open access laboratories.

The committee resolved that the paper be referred to the IT Reference Group to consider the policy implications.

2. Electronic Publishing

Discussion took place on the information provided by Mr T Robinson (Assistant Archivist) on the implications the documents AS 4390 Records Management and "Corporate Memory in the Electronic Age - Common Position Statement: Success through Record Keeping in the Electronic Environment" compiled by David Roberts of the Archives Authority of NSW.

The document had been previously referred to the University's Administrative Systems Steering Committee (ASSC) to be used as a basis for opening a dialogue on the record keeping implications.

The status of the attached recommendations was considered. Members were advised that recommendation (4) "that AS 4390 Records Management be adopted as the basis for all records management in the University including for electronic records" had been adopted in principle by ASSC but that the applicability of the protocol for the institution and the appropriate ways of implementation required further analysis. It was proposed that all new systems conform to the AS 4390 Records Management. The need to develop a policy on electronic archiving as well as including Freedom of Information issues in the package was emphasised.

The Committee resolved that Professors Johnstone and M Harris would report on UWIS action and consider how best to progress the recommendations.

3. **Functioning of LITC and its Reference Groups**

(a) **Chair of IT Reference Group**

With the departure of the Chair of the IT Reference Group, Professor Rosenberg, in June 1997, the issue of who should be appointed chair was raised.

It was **agreed** that Professor McPhedran would try to arrange for a suitable person to take over these duties.

(b) **Paper on ITC and its Sub-Committees/Nature of Library User Groups**

It was noted that while the responsibility for implementation of the recommendations in the Report of the ITPC had been assigned in draft form, some were outside the scope of ITC, namely faculties and the Academic Board.

The Committee resolved:

- (a) that the Chairs of the Reference Groups consider the recommendations contained in the paper and bring forward as items for LITC action.
- (b) that in the light of the Review of the Academic Board that Faculties' attention be drawn to the new Academic Board Committee structure, in particular the LITC, as a possible framework for Faculty Committee structures.

Professor Mack to write to Deans requesting information as to their present committee structures relating to LITC matters and a contact person. The Deans' attention will be drawn to the new Committee structure of the Academic.

(c) **Membership of the Reference Groups**

In follow up action from the last meeting, Deans had been requested to suggest possible members of the two groups. Several faculties had responded to the invitation. It was agreed that these representatives should be academic staff.

Professor McPhedran would email Deans requesting further nominations

4. **Priority topics for action in 1997**

The following topics were raised:

- Open access Laboratories:
i.e. issues relating to software, generic attributes identification of sites, and incentives required to encourage departments to modify teaching.
- Student access to IT, namely policy on network changes, generic skills for graduates.
- policies to be established regarding the provision of IT infrastructure for academics
- library implications for IT matters
- copyright matters relating to the net.
- planning and construction of combined Science Library and its relationship to the Capital Management Plan
- establishment of an Academic Board Budget Review of University Budget proposals to be considered

- future growth patterns relating to space for libraries.
- the multi purpose use of a “smart card” to be considered
- privacy and confidentiality issues in I T matters

Mr P Helm will be asked to provide a report on the “smart card”.

5. **Open Access Laboratories**

It was **agreed** that a working party on the policy on student access to dedicated student laboratories be developed in co operation with the ITC working party on Education and Training.

The names proposed were three from LITC: Professor Ross McPhedran, Professor John Rosenberg and a student representative with three from the ITC working party.

6. **Farewell to Pro Vice Chancellor Professor R Hewitt**

The Chair thanked Professor Hewitt on behalf of the Committee and the Chair of the Academic Board for his contribution to the work of LITC and for his efforts in developing the work of the ITPC and providing the driving force for the achievements in the area of information technology within the entire University community.

that , items 1 to 6, the Board note the report.

C6. Report of the Academic Staffing Committee

The Committee met on 19 February 1997. There were present: Professor R Pesman (Chair), Professor D Anderson, Professor S Armitage, Associate Professor R Arnold, Professor L Burgess, Associate Professor D Davey, Ms S Jamieson and Dr P Whiting; Ms J Deitch and Mr J Ucroft were in attendance.

1. **General Business**

The Chair wished to express her gratitude for the work of Associate Professor Hilary Astor, Professor Lawrence Cram and Professor Don Napper, who have recently resigned from the Committee.

that the Board note the report.

2. **Projects for 1997**

The Committee discussed proposed projects for 1997:

- The Policy Document - Support and Progression of Academic Staff
- Review of adjunct / visiting / honorary/ clinical appointment procedures
- Review of criteria for conferring of title of ‘Emeritus Professor’
- Review of range of appointment options.

These policies will be considered over the course of the year and progress reported to the Academic Board.

that the Board note the report.

3. **Matters referred to Committee - Promotion appeals**

The Committee **recommends** that the Board approve the following guidelines for the composition and reporting of FPACs.

11. a) Report of the FPAC

The role of the FPAC is to act as an assessor rather than as a supporter of faculty applications. A full report of the recommendations of the FPAC to the Promotions Committee is to be written by the Chair and signed by all members of the FPAC Core Committee. It should address the issues identified in the guidelines and include:

- 1) a report on the FPAC procedures followed;
- 2) a table listing the recommendations for and against promotion, the voting of the FPAC for each applicant (number for and against) and the ranking of every recommended candidate;

- 3) a table of the ranking by the core committee;
- 4) a commentary on each applicant (a separate page for each applicant) which addresses both the strengths and weaknesses of the application in relation to the criteria for promotion and which takes into account the referees' reports and information obtained in the interview;
- 5) comments on the standing of referees;
- 6) comments on the status of publications, and on the expectations regarding publications in the particular field of the applicant;
- 7) a declaration, signed by the Core Committee members that the procedures of the FPAC were in accordance with the procedures and guidelines for FPACs and with University policies on the conduct of meetings in relation to equity and equal opportunity. Any variation from these procedures and policies in respect to any applicant should be reported.

The amount of detail in the report should be sufficient for applicants to understand why they were or were not recommended for promotion. All members of the FPAC must be given the opportunity to read and comment on the report prior to its submission to the Promotions Committee. Each unsuccessful applicant receives a copy of the FPAC report which relates to their application.

b) Review of FPAC Reports

The Chair of the Central Promotions Committee will examine the reports of the FPAC as soon as they are received and raise any concerns about irregularities in procedures with the Chair of the relevant FPAC. The Chair of the Central Promotions Committee may ask for further reporting and if deemed necessary the reconvening of the FPAC and the submission of a new report. The Chair of the Central Promotions Committee will report on this process to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Staffing), where relevant, and to the full membership of the Central Promotions Committee.

The Committee **recommends** that the Board approve the following paragraph to be inserted into the document entitled, "Applicant information for Promotion to Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Associate Professor or Reader", which forms part of the document, "Academic Promotions 1997: Associate Professor/Reader/Senior Lecturer/Lecturer". The paragraph would be inserted as an additional dotpoint on page 2 under the heading, "Applicants should also:".

- ensure that they have deposited two copies of three pieces of published research with the Faculty;

The Committee **recommends** that the Board approve the following information to be inserted into the document entitled, "Promotion Committee Procedures and Guidelines", which forms part of the document, "Academic Promotions 1997: Associate Professor/Reader/Senior Lecturer/Lecturer".

The following sentence would be inserted on page 11, replacing the last sentence in the first paragraph under the heading, "Faculty Promotion Assessment Committees".

Although Faculties may set up committees of different sizes and composition, it is considered that they should have a minimum of six members, at least four of whom must be members of the Faculty and two of another Faculty.

The word "general" would be inserted on page 11, in the first sentence in the third paragraph under the heading, "Faculty Promotion Assessment Committees", as follows.

... have expertise in the applicant's general field ...

The following information would be inserted on page 12, replacing the second dotpoint under the heading, "Faculty Promotion Assessment Committees", and the subheading, Documents for Consideration".

- the HoD's report (countersigned by the applicant). This should accurately represent the views of all senior staff in the Department. The Head of Department should not make written comment on any comments the applicant might make on the Head of Department's report.

The Committee **recommends** that the Board approve the following paragraph to be inserted into the document entitled, "Promotion Committee Procedures and Guidelines", which forms part of the document, "Academic Promotions 1997: Associate Professor/Reader/Senior Lecturer/Lecturer". The paragraph would be inserted on page 15 between the second last and last paragraphs.

Where the Central Committee does not endorse the FPAC recommendation, the Chair will make a written report to the Chair of the FPAC outlining the reasons.

that the Board approve the recommendations.

4. Matters referred to Committee - Pro-Vice-Chancellor and FPAC's

It was agreed that discussion on this issue was premature. Any future discussion will be reported to the Academic Board.

that the Board note the report.

5. Matters referred to Committee - Appointment on Nomination

It is **recommended** that advertised externally funded research only positions may also be filled by nomination for the fixed period of the grant and under the same conditions that apply to positions which are not advertised.

that the Board approved the recommendation.

6. Matters referred to Committee - external membership of Level E appointment committees

A recommendation will be forwarded to the next meeting of the Academic Board.

that the Board note the report.

7. Policy Document - Support and Progression of Academic Staff

The Committee had further discussions on the document which addresses the issues of induction, support and development, probation and confirmation of appointment, incremental progression and promotion. The document is in the process of development and progress will be reported to the Academic Board.

that the Board note the report.

C7. Appointment of members of the Core Committee to Consider Tenure for Tenurable Staff

The Board is asked to appoint three members of the Core Committee, at least one of whom is to be a professor and one a non-professorial member of staff. The constitution of this Committee is as follows:

- a Deputy Vice-Chancellor
- the Chair or a Deputy Chair of the Academic Board
- three others, including at least one professor and at least one non-professor, appointed each year by the Board.

The Chair **recommends** the re-appointment of the current Board nominees, so that the 1997 Core Committee for Tenure comprises the following persons:

Professor Derek Anderson (Deputy Vice-Chancellor)
 Professor Ros Pesman (Deputy Chair, Academic Board)
 Professor Gordon MacAuley (Agricultural Economics)

Associate Professor Stuart Reid (Civil Engineering)
 Associate Professor Sybil Jack (History)
 Professor David Cockayne (Deputy Chair, Academic Board) (reserve)

that the Board appoint the Core Committee members, as recommended.

C8. Appointment of members of the Central Promotions Committees

The Chair **recommends** the appointment of the following members of Central Promotions Committees for 1997.

Personal Chair

Professor Gavin Brown (Vice-Chancellor and Chair) (*ex officio*)
 Chair, Academic Board (*ex officio*)
 Professor Derek Anderson (Deputy Vice-Chancellor) (*ex officio*)
 Professor Roger Tanner (Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research))
 Professor Robert King (UNSW) (external member)
 Professor David Hill (Electrical Engineering)
 Professor Jocalyn Lawler (Clinical Nursing)
 Professor Kevin Lee (SACAH)
 Professor Tania Sorrell (Medicine)

Date of Meeting: 17 October, 1997

Associate Professor/Reader

Professor Derek Anderson (Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Chair) (*ex officio*)
 Chair, Academic Board (*ex officio*)
 Deputy Chair, Academic Board
 Professor Robert King (UNSW) (external member)
 Professor David Hill (Electrical Engineering)
 Professor Kevin Lee (SACAH)
 Professor Tania Sorrell (Medicine)
 Associate Professor Martin Painter (Government and Public Administration)
 Associate Professor Edward Fackerell (Mathematics & Statistics)
 Associate Professor Moira Gatens (Philosophy)
 Associate Professor Ros Arnold (Teaching and Curriculum Studies)

Date of Meeting: 14-15 August 1997

Lecturer

Professor Richard Johnstone (Pro-Vice-Chancellor and Chair) (*ex officio*)
 Chair, Academic Board (*ex officio*)
 Deputy Chair Academic Board
 Associate Professor Tony Baker (UTS) (external)
 Professor Brian Haynes (Chemical Engineering)
 Associate Professor Nerida Newbiggin (Italian)
 Associate Professor Flora Gill (Economics)
 Dr Jennifer Lingard (Biomedical Sciences)
 Dr Ove Hoegh-Guldberg (Biological Sciences)
 Dr John Reeve (History)
 Dr Anne Green (Physics)

Date of Meeting: 21 November 1997

A further report on a recommendation in respect of the Senior Lecturer Committee will be tabled at the meeting.

that the Board appoint the Committee members, as recommended.

D1. Reports of the Academic Groups on Chairs

Reports from the Academic Groups on Chairs are attached.

(see pages 39-44)

that the Board note the reports.

D2. Report of the Tenure Committee

The Academic Board is asked to note that the relevant Deputy Vice-Chancellor, acting on the recommendation of the appropriate committee, has approved the granting of tenure to the following tenurable academic staff:

Senior Lecturer:

Dr Martijn C de Sterke PhD 1987 *Rochester*, Ingenieur 1982, BEng 1981 *Delft*

Current Appointment: Tenurable Senior Lecturer in the School of Physics since November 1995.

Dr David L Evans PhD 1987, BSc 1976

Current Appointment: Tenurable Senior Lecturer in the Department of Animal Science since January 1996.

that the Board note the report.

Nomenclature

MEMORANDUM TO: All Heads of Departments

FROM: Professor Michael Koder (Chair, new SIS Steering Committee),
Professor John Mack (Academic Board rep on the SIS Steering Committee),
Mr Thomas Crook (SIS Project Manager)

DATE: 3 March 97

SUBJECT: Re: The 'Nomenclature' memo to Deans sent on 16/1/97

A copy of that memo is enclosed with the present note (hard copy) or included as an attachment with the soft version of this note-both forms are being sent to all academic HODS, (copies to deans and faculty managers), as we are interested in learning if each of you receives both forms. [If you have not received this material in both hard and soft forms, please e-mail to the sis.feedback address given below, advising which one not received- assuming at least one will arrive!]

The principal changes to current practice that will be required for course and unit of study information needed for 1998 publications, apart from the usage of 'course' and 'unit of study', all relate to the new 'unit of study descriptor format', given on p4 of the Nomenclature memorandum. The SIS project manager and the Chair of the Academic Board are consulting with the Publications Unit and ITS to create an online system to ease, and as far as possible, automate, the conversion of existing course descriptions to the new unit of study descriptor.

Intensive work will be done on this during March, in order that a second memo in early April should come to you with precise information on how to enter the necessary information.

We seek your help now by requesting that you begin in your department/school/centre the following activities:

1. If your faculty has not already begun work on developing the 4 letter alpha code(s) you wish to use for the units offered by your department, then please begin to do so, in conjunction with your faculty office. [Departments with offerings in more than one discipline field may use more than one prefix (eg, Mathematics and Statistics may use MATH and STAT) but in general we would hope one such code will suffice.]

Once your department has produced its codes, please provide them to your faculty office for approval. Faculty managers are asked to email sets of departmental/faculty codes to Ms Cath Crittenden (who is on secondment from the Arts Faculty to the SIS Project during March), at:

Cath.Crittenden@faculty.arts.su.edu.au

as soon as possible in March. She will identify any possible sources of ambiguity and advise faculties if these arise. We would like to have these codes finalised by the end of March, so that a complete table can be prepared and circulated for comment prior to their being adopted (i.e., if there are objections raised, we wish these to be raised and debated and resolved prior to closing the list).

2. Commence an assignment of the 4 digit numeric code to your existing units of study, in accordance with the guidelines on p4 of the Nomenclature memo. We suggest that if you already have 3 digit codes, the most consistent way to make the change is to add a 0 after the first digit. For example, MKTG 201 would become MKTG 2001.
3. Agree on the credit point value of the unit (which should be the same as its current unit value unless your course(s) of study do not meet the 'minimum 24 credit point per semester' average requirement, in which case your faculty will need to advise on the revised credit point structure of its degree(s)).
4. Determine names for each unit of study.
5. Examine any current description of the unit of study appearing in faculty handbooks, or preferably, at present for undergraduate units only, check its description given in the web-based collection of such descriptors, prepared by the Publications Unit, and accessible at:

<http://www.usyd.edu.au/homepage/exterel/undergr/database.htm>

Having checked that, decide as to any modification needed for the 'Description' section of the descriptor.

In April, we hope that the process of construction of the unit of study code descriptors will be managed using a website and a web interface. PLEASE INFORM THOMAS CROOK IMMEDIATELY (by email to the sis. feedback address below, or by phone to 17709) IF YOU CANNOT ACCESS THE WEB!!

This interface will be specific to each department, and each HoD will be given a confidential password to use in order to access it and to enter information. It is intended that a descriptor proforma will be provided for each unit of study listed in the relevant 1997 handbooks for both u/g and p/g units, and that this might contain the alpha code, the index number and the current description of that unit as it appears in the website mentioned above.

The next stages in the process of conversion involves the development of a format template for the preparation of faculty handbooks, which it is expected will reduce the amount of future work needed in faculty offices and in the Publications Unit for annual review of handbooks, once the new format is agreed upon and implemented. Intensive work on this will take place in March, in order that a draft proposal may go out for comment in April. The most difficult aspect of this, which must be done in conjunction with the SIS project, will be the development of a 'grammar for course of study rules', intended to provide a common format for the presentation of these in handbooks and for the computerisation of these as part of the software to be used in SIS for checking enrolments against such rules. It should be possible, by late March, to provide deans and faculty managers with advice regarding what is considered feasible to attempt here in 1997 and how the work is intended to be carried out. The careful analysis of existing information is the first step in the above two tasks.

Please send comments to this memo to:

sis.feedback@mail.usyd.edu.au

If you have any specific inquiries on other aspects of the Nomenclature memo please contact:

Thomas J Crook (tomc@vision.econ.su.oz.au),
tel 17709,
fax 17712,
Lecturer, Dept of Marketing
Project Manager, Student Information System
Building G05
University of Sydney, Australia 2006

Professor J Mack
Chair, Academic Board
University of Sydney NSW 2006
Australia

cc All Deans and Faculty Secretaries

Reports from Academic Groups on Academic Appointments

Appointment of Visiting Professors

The Board is asked to note the action of the Chair of the Academic Board in approving the following appointments which have been recommended by the relevant Pro-Vice-Chancellor, on the advice of the relevant Head of School:

1. Sciences Academic Group

Name	Department/School	Period
Professor Vieri Benci	Mathematics & Statistics	1 September 1997 to 31 October 1997
Professor Kee Yuen Lam	Mathematics & Statistics	15 May 1997 to 15 November 1997
Professor Takuo Fukuda	Mathematics & Statistics	1 July 1997 to 31 July 1997
Professor Anthony Hartley	Computer Science	1 April 1997 to 30 June 1997
Dr Juhl R S Hales	Animal Health	13 March 1997 to 31 December 1997
Professor Peter A Tasker	Chemistry	28 July 1997 to 19 September 1997
Professor Brigid R Heywood	Chemistry	2 April 1997 to 21 May 1997

2. Professional Faculties Academic Group

Name	Department/School	Period
Professor Khim-Teck Yeo	Civil Engineering	November 1997 to February 1998
Professor Elisha Tatsa	Civil Engineering	October 1997 to March 1998
Professor Paul Ch'en	Law	1 September to 30 September 1997

3. Arts and Humanities Academic Group

Name	Department/School	Period
Professor Michael Dunkin	Educational Psychology, Measurement and Technology	1 March 1997 - 28 February 1998

A PROPOSAL TO RESTRUCTURE THE ACADEMIC YEAR

Rationale

Several issues have led to a number of distinct aspects of the University's current academic year structure being questioned. These issues include

- a widely-held view that it is becoming increasingly difficult for staff to obtain uninterrupted periods of time of two weeks or longer for work on specific projects
- a perception that the University should determine an academic session in the summer months rather than allow such a session to emerge in an uncoordinated fashion across the faculties
- a developing belief that the end-of-semester examining and assessment period needs to be reviewed in terms of overall assessment policy and the time currently taken to complete these periods of work
- concerns regarding the uneven splitting of each of the two semesters, produced by the present system for determining intra-semester breaks
- a realisation that mid-year intakes may become necessary as well as desirable for both undergraduate and postgraduate coursework programs.

Initial discussions have taken place with Deans of faculties and other members of the University community, and as a result, the following revised structure is proposed for consideration. (Week numbers refer to weeks of the calendar year.)

1. A "summer session" of 7 weeks, commencing in the latter half of Week 1 and terminating at the end of Week 8, be established.
2. Semester 1 teaching commences at the beginning of Week 10 and concludes at the end of Week 23, with a 1-week break in Week 17, and the Easter break restricted to Good Friday and Easter Monday.
3. Semester 1 stuvac, examining and reporting be restricted entirely to Weeks 24-27.
4. Semester 2 teaching commences at the beginning of Week 31 and concludes at the end of Week 44, with a 1-week break in Week 38.
5. Semester 2 stuvac, examining and reporting be restricted entirely to Weeks 45-48.
6. (Note that the 'Nomenclature' memo of 16 January 1997 has indicated changed descriptions for semesters, commencing 1998.)
7. Where end-of-year reporting is necessary and cannot be completed by Week 48, it, and any consequential scholarship meetings, be completed by end of Week 49.
8. Teaching Semesters may be considered as consisting of two "quarters" each, and teaching duties could be organised on a semester-length or quarter-length basis.
9. The use of 'supplementary' exams following each semester's examination period should be confined to one week, as close as possible to the examination period. One week in the summer session is to be assigned for deferred examinations from either semester, but its use should be minimised.
10. Enrolment processing for each semester and for the summer session should be confined to agreed periods, decided upon after consultation between faculties and the administration. The possible benefits in introducing an official mid-year intake, or an intake into the summer session and leading into the March semester, now need consideration at faculty level.
11. There should be a review of the schedule of graduations, with the aims of completing each graduation cycle in a shorter period, set closer to the completion of degree requirements.
12. Given that the University has published its academic calendar through to the year 2000, it is unlikely that anything other than the formal introduction of a summer session, and slight changes to semester dates, will be possible before 2001, although I am seeking information on advance bookings for 1999 and 2000. A copy of the present calendar 1997-2000 is attached.

Note that the use of the summer session may be expected to vary widely across the University. Intensive short courses (either for award or non-award purposes), intensive courses offered to

students as additional studies for award purposes because their regular semester loads preclude additional study at these times, catch-up/review sessions for students needing to complete prescribed academic year requirements (to avoid having to repeat an entire year), preparatory and study skill classes are but some examples of the possibilities.

The present proposals have significant implications for the pattern of student assessment in use across the University. Since the time available for examination and reporting would be condensed at the end of each semester, Faculties may need to make greater use of a variety of modern assessment instruments, including progressive tests administered during course time. Experience with these formats is increasing across the University, and opportunities for interested faculties to familiarise themselves with these methods could be provided in conjunction with experts from the Faculty of Education.

A important and necessary requirement for adoption of a restructure of the kind proposed is the demonstrated capacity of academic and administrative units to handle all aspects of student administration efficiently and effectively for each teaching session. These aspects include all necessary financial and accounting processes as well as reporting and processing of students' results and the data collections necessary for use in measuring performance according to agreed indicators.

John Mack
11/2/97

(Ref: Summer Session Proposal - draft/Feb1997)

Amendment of the Resolutions of the Academic Board Degree of Doctor of Philosophy - the Examination Process

Set out below are draft amendments to the Resolutions of the Academic Board relating to the examination process for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (pp 111-118, *Calendar 1996, Vol I*). Sections to be deleted are struck through, and new text is italicised in bold.

DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY THE EXAMINATION PROCESS

1. Appointment of examiners

Faculty or college board to seek recommendation for examiners

1.01 After the prescribed number of copies of the thesis have been lodged and the supervisor's certificate has been received, the faculty or college board, having considered the certificate, shall seek a recommendation for the appointment of examiners from the head of department concerned, unless the faculty or college board considers that examiners should not be appointed.

Examiners not appointed

1.02 If a faculty or college board, after consideration of the supervisor's certificate, has resolved not to proceed to the appointment of examiners, it shall report the circumstances and the reasons for the decision to the PhD Award Sub-Committee which may note the decision or require the faculty or college board to appoint examiners.

Delays in appointment to be avoided

1.03 (1) The head of department and the faculty or college board shall take all possible steps to ensure that examiners are appointed within four weeks of the submission of the thesis and, where this does not occur, shall report the circumstances to the PhD Award Sub-Committee.

(2) The head of department should normally have taken the steps outlined below in sections 1.04 to 1.11, noting the provisions of section 1.14, before the thesis is submitted.

Head to consult and recommend

1.04 The head of department shall, if reasonably possible, before making his or her recommendation for the appointment of examiners, consult the supervisor and, if it is considered by the supervisor to be necessary, any appointed associate supervisor or co-supervisor.

1.05 The head of department shall recommend the appointment of three examiners of the thesis of whom at least one shall be external to the University, i.e. not being a member of the staff of the University or holding a clinical academic title, and of whom normally one shall be a member of the academic staff of the University, or hold a clinical academic title.

1.06 The head of department may also recommend the appointment of one or more qualified additional persons who may be called on to act in place of one or more of the three first appointed examiners.

Qualifications of examiners

1.07 (1) Examiners recommended should be known to be familiar with the supervision and examination of research theses and should normally still be active in research and/or scholarship.

(2) An examiner appointed to act as an assessor under section 4.03(e) should possess very high standing in the subject in question.

Supervisor as examiner

1.08 Subject to any policy to the contrary adopted by the faculty or college board concerned, a supervisor of a candidate may be appointed as an examiner for that candidate, except that a supervisor shall not normally be so appointed if he or she is also the head of the department or academic unit concerned.

Examiners free from bias

1.09 A head of department, in making a recommendation, shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that the examiners proposed are free from bias either for or against the candidate or the supervisor.

Involvement of candidate

1.10 The head of department or the supervisor or the candidate may initiate a general discussion with the candidate by the supervisor and/or the head of department of a wide range of possible examiners.

1.11 A candidate may advise the head of department or the dean of the faculty, or the chair of the appropriate faculty or college board of postgraduate studies or equivalent, of the names of any persons the candidate does not wish to see appointed as examiners, giving the reasons in writing.

Faculty to appoint examiners

1.12 The faculty or college board, on receipt of a recommendation for the appointment of examiners from a head of department, and having considered through its dean or chair of the board of postgraduate studies any advice from the candidate, may appoint the examiners as recommended or appoint different examiners after consultation with the head of department.

Report to PhD Award Sub-Committee

1.13 The faculty or college board shall, using the prescribed form, report the names and qualifications of the examiners appointed to the PhD Award Sub-Committee which may itself appoint, or may request the faculty or college board to recommend for appointment, one or more additional examiners.

Names not to be disclosed

1.14 Except as may be necessary when an oral examination is required, the names of the examiners appointed shall not be disclosed to the candidate until a determination has been made about the award of the degree.

Invitation to examiners

1.15 After the appointment of examiners by the faculty or college board, the Registrar shall write to each external examiner inviting him or her to act, specifying the conditions applicable to the examination process and enclosing the resolutions for the degree, an information statement and the examiner's report form.

1.16 On receipt of an acceptance of the invitation to act, or on advice from the head of department concerned that the examiner is willing to act under those conditions, the Registrar shall dispatch a copy of the thesis.

1.17 The Registrar shall similarly write to each internal examiner advising him or her of their appointment and the conditions which apply and enclosing the resolutions for the degree and the examiner's report form together with a copy of the thesis.

Delegations of authority

1.18 A head of department may delegate to a specified member of the academic staff his or her responsibilities under this section by countersigning a specific recommendation in respect of a particular candidature or by making, and forwarding to the Registrar, a written statement of delegation of those powers.

2. Consideration by examiners

Examiners to report within two months

2.01 An examiner is required to complete the examination of the thesis and submit a report on the prescribed form within two months of receipt of the thesis.

Examiners to submit independent reports

2.02 The examiner shall be advised by the Registrar of the names of the other examiners who have agreed to act and may consult these co-examiners directly at any stage of the examining process, but shall submit an independent report and shall not have any right of access to other examiners' reports.

2.03 An examiner who is also the supervisor of a candidate may consult with any associate supervisor or co-supervisor of the candidate before making his or her independent report.

Content of report

2.04 The report shall include the recommendation that:

- (a) the candidate be awarded the degree without further examination; or
- (b) the candidate be awarded the degree subject to correcting typographical errors before the degree is conferred (typographical errors include spelling, grammar, punctuation, capitalisation and reference dates); or
- (c) the candidate be awarded the degree subject to conditions listed in the examiner's report being addressed to the satisfaction of the University (which may include a recommendation that if reasonably possible the candidate should be required to take an additional oral or other examination); or
- (d) the candidate be not awarded the degree, but be permitted to resubmit the thesis in a revised form for re-examination following a further period of study, the examiner having formed the opinion that the errors or deficiencies substantially affect the argument or the thesis; or
- (e) the candidate be not awarded the degree.

2.05 The report shall also record whether in the opinion of the examiner—

- (a) the thesis is a substantially original contribution to the knowledge of the subject concerned;
- (b) the thesis affords evidence of originality by the discovery of new facts;
- (c) the thesis affords evidence of originality by the exercising of independent critical ability;
- (d) the thesis is satisfactory as regards literary presentation; and
- (e) a substantial amount of material in the thesis is suitable for publication.

2.06 The examiner shall state the grounds on which his or her recommendation is based, indicating the strengths and weaknesses of the thesis and the particular contributions made by the candidate and may list emendations that it is considered should be made and shall indicate the extent of any consultation with other examiners or associate or co-examiners.

Release of examiners' names

2.07 As part of the report form, the examiner shall be asked to indicate whether he or she is willing to have his or her name and/or his or her report in full or in part released to the candidate, either at the conclusion of the examination, or in the circumstances outlined in sections 4.16 to 4.19.

Receipt of reports to be monitored

2.08 The Registrar shall acknowledge receipt of reports as received and arrange for payment of the examiner's fee to external examiners.

~~**2.09**— The Registrar shall contact any examiner who has not submitted his or her report within ten weeks of despatch of the thesis, requesting advice as to when it will be submitted and reminding the examiner of the conditions of the examination.~~

2.09 *The Registrar shall contact any examiner who has not submitted his or her report within six weeks of despatch of the thesis, reminding the examiner of the due date for the report, and the Registrar shall contact any examiner who has not submitted his or her report within ten weeks of despatch of the thesis, requesting advice as to when it will be submitted and reminding the examiner of the conditions of the examination.*

Replacement examiner if report not received

2.10 The Registrar shall further contact any examiner who has not submitted the report by the end of the fourteenth week after despatch of the thesis, advising that it will be necessary to proceed to the appointment of a replacement examiner if the report is not received within a further two weeks and shall proceed to do so if the report is not received within that time.

2.11 Notwithstanding the fact that replacement examiners may previously have been appointed, the Registrar shall seek advice from the head of department as to who should act as a replacement examiner in the event of an examiner being replaced under the circumstances referred to in section 2.10 and, if necessary, the faculty or college board shall appoint a further qualified examiner on the recommendation of the head of department who shall, if necessary, have carried out the same consultative procedures as applied to the initial appointment of examiners.

2.12 Should the process of appointing a replacement examiner under the circumstances referred to in section 2.10 have proceeded to the point where a copy of the thesis has been dispatched to the replacement examiner, any report subsequently received from the examiner who has been replaced shall not be considered in determining the result of the candidature.

2.13 Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 2.10 to 2.12, the PhD Award Sub-Committee or its Chair may, in such circumstances as it shall determine are exceptional, and on the recommendation of the faculty or college board concerned, allow some specific variation to those requirements.

3. Consideration of examiners' reports: head of department

Examiners' reports **By the faculty**

3.01 When all three examiners' reports have been received,

- (a) if all examiners have recommended either that the degree be awarded without qualification or the degree be awarded subject to correction of typographical errors, the faculty shall forward the reports to the PhD Award Sub-Committee for consideration and to the head of department and supervisor for information **may award the degree either without further examination or subject to the correction of typographical errors (as specified by the examiners) being made in all the copies of the thesis to be retained in the University before the degree is conferred and shall forward the reports to the head of department and supervisor for information;** or
- (b) if any other recommendations have been made, the faculty shall forward the reports to the head of department for a recommendation and to the supervisor.

By the head of department

3.02 Neither head of department nor supervisor shall have a right of access to the examiners' reports before they have all been received, except where the dean of the faculty or chair of the college board considers that special circumstances exist.

Head of department to consult

3.03 The head of department, if there is disagreement among the examiners, shall, before making a recommendation, if reasonably possible, consult the candidate's supervisor and shall consult the candidate's annual progress reports.

3.04 The head of department shall indicate when making his or her recommendation the nature and extent of consultation that has been carried out and shall forward a copy of any written report he or she has received from the supervisor.

Head of department's recommendation

3.05 The head of department, having considered the reports of the examiners and carried out any required consultation, may make one of the following recommendations:

- (a) that the degree be awarded without further conditions; or
- (b) that the degree be awarded subject to the correction of typographical errors being made in all the copies of the thesis to be retained in the University before the degree is conferred; or
- (c) that the degree be awarded subject to emendations being made in all copies of the thesis to be retained in the University; or
- (d) that the candidate be required to take an additional oral or other examination or answer specific questions put by an examiner; or
- (e) that an additional examiner be appointed; or
- (f) that an additional examiner be appointed to examine the thesis and act as an assessor of the reports of the other examiners, and the comments of the supervisor, whether or not already an examiner, subject to endorsement by the PhD Award Sub-Committee which will consider the reports of the examiners and the justification forwarded by the Board of Postgraduate Studies. In cases where the faculty had previously formed the intention to resolve that the degree be not awarded, or the candidate be allowed to revise and resubmit, and the candidate's comments have been received, the faculty's Postgraduate Committee should determine whether the candidate's comments should be forwarded to the assessor.
- (g) that the reports of the examiners, together with comments from the supervisor, whether or not already an examiner, shall be referred to all the examiners for their comment; or
- (h) that the candidate not be awarded the degree, but be allowed to revise and resubmit the thesis within a prescribed maximum period of time; or
- (i) that the degree be not awarded.

Head of department to specify emendations

3.06 A head of department, if recommending under section 3.05(b) or (c) that the degree be awarded subject to typographical corrections or emendations, shall specify the typographical corrections or emendations to be made, noting that the PhD Award Sub-Committee normally requires expects any typographical corrections or emendations or minor errors identified by examiners to be corrected after its consideration of the examiners' reports and head of department's recommendation.

Release of examiners' reports

3.07 The head of department shall, with his or her recommendation, after noting the wishes of the examiners, indicate what portions of the examiners' reports may be released to the candidate, but the reports shall remain confidential until after consideration by the PhD Award Sub-Committee, faculty or college board.

Delegation of authority

3.08 A head of department may delegate to a specified member of the academic staff his or her responsibilities under this section by countersigning a specific recommendation in respect of a particular candidature or by making, and forwarding to the Registrar, a written statement of delegation of those powers.

4. Consideration of eExaminers' reports and head of department's recommendation*Referral of head of department's recommendation and faculty or college board action*

4.01 — The head of department shall forward his or her recommendation to the dean of the faculty or chair of the college board who, if the recommendation is for the award of the degree under section 3.05(a), (b) or (c), shall forward the recommendation together with copies of the reports of the examiners to the PhD Award Sub-Committee and, if any other recommendation has been made, shall refer the recommendation to the faculty or college board.

4.01 (1) The head of department shall forward his or her recommendation to the dean of the faculty or chair of the college board.

(2) If the head of department has recommended that the degree be awarded, under section 3.05(c), subject to emendations as specified by one or more of the examiners, and one or more of the examiners have recommended that the degree be awarded subject to minor

emendations and the remaining examiners have recommended award without further examination or subject to the correction of typographical error, the faculty may award the degree subject to all the corrections and/or emendations required by the examiners being carried out in all the copies of the thesis to be retained in the University before the degree is conferred.

(3) If the head of department has recommended, under section 3.05(c), that the degree be awarded but that not all the emendations required by all the examiners should be carried out, the faculty may not award the degree, and the reports of the examiners, together with the recommendation of the head of department and copies of the reports of the examiners, shall be forwarded to the PhD Award Sub-Committee.

(4) Except as provided under sections 3.01(a) or 4.01(2), the dean of the faculty or chair of the college board shall refer the recommendation of the head of department to the faculty or college board, which shall forward a recommendation to the PhD Award Sub-Committee together with the recommendation of the head of department and copies of the reports of the examiners.

PhD Award Sub-Committee action

4.02 The PhD Award Sub-Committee, after consideration of the examiners' reports and the recommendation of the head of department and where these have been made any recommendation from the faculty or college board:

- (a) may award the degree without further examination; or
- (b) may award the degree subject to the correction of typographical errors being made in all the copies of the thesis to be retained in the University before the degree is conferred; or
- (c) may award the degree subject to emendations specified by the head of department or the Sub-Committee being made in all copies of the thesis to remain available in the University; or
- (d) may refer the candidature to the faculty or college board concerned; and shall refer the candidature to the faculty or college board concerned if a member of the Sub-Committee so requires and the examiners' reports and the recommendation of the head of department have not already been considered by the faculty or college board.

Faculty or college board action

4.03 The faculty or college board, after considering the recommendation of the head of department and the reports of the examiners that have been referred directly to it or by the PhD Award Sub-Committee, may resolve:

- (a) to recommend to the PhD Award Sub-Committee that the degree be awarded without further examination; or
- (b) to recommend to the PhD Award Sub-Committee that the degree be awarded subject to the correction of typographical errors being made in all the copies of the thesis to be retained in the University before the degree is conferred; or
- (c) to recommend to the PhD Award Sub-Committee that the degree be awarded subject to emendations specified by the head of department or the faculty or college board being made in all copies of the thesis to remain available in the University; or
- (d) that the candidate be required to take an additional oral or other examination or answer specific questions put by an examiner, this not being a substitute for requiring the candidate to make emendations to the thesis or to revise and resubmit the thesis; or
- (e) that an additional examiner be appointed; or
- (f) that an additional examiner be appointed to examine the thesis and act as an assessor of the reports of the other examiners, and the comments of the supervisor, whether or not already an examiner, subject to endorsement by the PhD Award Sub-Committee which will consider the reports of the examiners and the justification forwarded by the Board of Postgraduate Studies. In cases where the faculty had previously formed the intention to resolve that the degree be not awarded, or the candidate be allowed to revise and resubmit, and the candidate's comments have been received, the faculty's Postgraduate Committee should determine whether the candidate's comments should be forwarded to the assessor.
- (g) that the reports of the examiners, together with comments from the supervisor, whether or not already an examiner, shall be referred to all the examiners for their comment; or
- (h) that the candidate not be awarded the degree, but be allowed to revise and resubmit the thesis within a prescribed maximum period of time; or
- (i) that the degree be not awarded.

Award without further conditions

4.04 Where the **faculty or college board or PhD Award Sub-Committee** has approved the award of the degree without further conditions, the Registrar shall advise the candidate that the degree has been awarded subject to the lodgement of a permanently bound copy of the thesis printed on acid-free or permanent paper, shall lodge this copy with the University Librarian, and shall advise the examiners, head of department and supervisor.

Award subject to correction of typographical errors

4.04A 4.05 Where the **faculty or college board or PhD Award Sub-Committee** has approved the award of the degree subject to the correction of typographical errors, the Registrar shall advise the candidate that the degree has been awarded subject to the lodgement of a permanently bound copy of the thesis printed on acid free or permanent paper in which the typographical corrections have been made to the satisfaction of the head of department, shall lodge this copy with the University Librarian, and shall advise the examiners, head of department and supervisor.

Award subject to emendations

4.05 — Where a **faculty or college board** resolves under section 4.03(c) to recommend to the PhD Award Sub-Committee that the degree be awarded subject to emendations specified by the head of department or the faculty or college board being made in all copies of the thesis to remain available in the University, it shall report this decision to the PhD Award Sub-Committee.

4.06 — Where the PhD Award Sub-Committee has approved the award of the degree subject to emendations specified by the head of department or the Sub-Committee being made in all copies of the thesis to remain available in the University, the Registrar shall advise the candidate of the decision and of the nature of the emendations required and the latest date by which the emendations shall be made, being, unless otherwise determined by the faculty or college board, within a further three months, and shall provide such detail in relation to the examiners' reports as the head of department recommends.

4.06 *When the award of the degree has been approved by a faculty or college board or by the PhD Award Sub-Committee, subject to specified emendations being made in all copies of the thesis to remain available in the University, the Registrar shall advise the candidate of the decision and of the nature of the emendations required and the latest date by which the emendations shall be made, being, unless otherwise determined by the faculty or college board, within a further three months, and shall provide such detail in relation to the examiners' reports as the head of department recommends.*

Additional oral or other examination

4.07 Where a faculty or college board has resolved under section 4.03(d) that the candidate be required to take an additional oral or other examination, or answer specific questions put by an examiner, unless the faculty or college board has determined otherwise, the faculty or college board shall be responsible for the oversight of these further examining processes and, having sought a further recommendation from the head of department, may then resolve in accordance with section 4.03.

Conduct of oral examination

4.08 Those present at an oral examination may include one or more of the examiners and persons, other than the examiners, nominated by the faculty or college board; shall include the supervisor if he or she wishes; and may include, with the approval of the dean of the faculty or chair of the college board, a member of the University nominated by the candidate.

4.09 A candidate shall be given reasonable notice of any oral examination and of the nature of the examination and the names of the persons who will be present, and may advise the dean of the faculty or chair of the college board of reservations he or she may have about the presence of any particular person, giving reasons in writing.

Additional examiner

4.10 Where a faculty or college board resolves under section 4.03(e) that an additional examiner be appointed, the provisions of sections 1, 2 and 3 shall apply as appropriate and the Registrar shall write to the examiner as provided in section 1.14 or 1.16 and shall advise the previously appointed examiners of the name of the additional examiner.

4.11 A faculty or college board, having received a further recommendation from the head of department together with an additional examiner's report, may then resolve as provided in section 4.03.

Additional examiner as assessor

4.12 Where a faculty or college board resolves under section 4.03(f) that an additional examiner be appointed to examine the thesis and act as an assessor of the reports of the other examiners, the provisions of sections 1, 2 and 3 of these resolutions shall apply as appropriate and the Registrar

shall write to the examiner as provided in section 1.14 or 1.16, inviting the examiner to act as an assessor of the examiners' reports as well as an examiner of the thesis and shall provide copies of the unidentified examiners' reports, and the comments of the supervisor, whether or not already an examiner. In cases where the faculty had previously formed the intention to resolve that the degree be not awarded, or the candidate be allowed to revise and resubmit, and the candidate's comments have been received, the faculty's Postgraduate Committee should determine whether the candidate's comments should be forwarded to the assessor. The Registrar shall also advise the previously appointed examiners of the name of the additional examiner who is also to act as assessor.

4.13 A faculty or college board, having received a further recommendation from the head of department together with an additional examiner-as-assessor's report, may then resolve as provided in section 4.03, except that, where the faculty or college board does not substantially resolve in the terms recommended by the assessor, it shall include a report of the reasons for its decision with any recommendation to the PhD Award Sub-Committee.

Referral of reports to examiners

4.14 Where a faculty or college board resolves under section 4.03(g) that the reports of the examiners, together with comments from the supervisor, whether or not already an examiner, shall be referred to all the examiners for their comment, the Registrar shall seek comments from the supervisor and then send copies of the examiners' reports and the supervisor's comments to each of the examiners, advising them that it is in order for them to confer and seeking a further report from each examiner within a period of four weeks.

4.15 The Registrar shall forward the responses received, following the circulation of reports, to the head of department for such consultation as is required under section 3 and to make a recommendation, and the faculty or college board on receipt of that recommendation may then resolve as provided in section 4.03.

Candidate to be consulted before degree not awarded

4.16 Where a faculty or college board forms the intention, either to resolve under section 4.03(h) that the degree not be awarded but that the candidate be allowed to revise and resubmit the thesis within a prescribed maximum period of time, or to resolve under section 4.03(i) that the degree not be awarded, that resolution shall be deferred to allow a process of consultation with the candidate.

4.17 The Registrar shall advise the candidate in writing of the faculty or college board's intent; shall provide unidentified copies of such of the examiners' reports as the examiners have indicated may be released and shall advise the candidate that he or she may within a period of four weeks give notice of intention to provide comment on the foreshadowed recommendation of the faculty or college board, such comments to be submitted in writing by no later than a total of eight weeks from the date of the Registrar's advice.

4.18 The faculty or college board shall further consider the examiners' reports and the head of department's recommendation, together with any comments provided by the candidate and any further comments provided by the head of department or supervisor and may then resolve as provided in section 4.03.

4.19 The dean of a faculty or chair of a college board may extend either of the time limits set out in section 4.17.

Revise and resubmit

4.20 Where a faculty or college board, following the consultation process referred to in sections 4.16 - 4.19, resolves under section 4.03(h) that the degree not be awarded but the candidate be allowed to revise and resubmit the thesis within a prescribed maximum period of time, this decision shall be reported to the PhD Award Sub-Committee, which may note the decision or refer it back to the faculty or college board for further consideration, and the Registrar shall advise the candidate of the decision, of any provisions relating to appeals, the particular conditions applying and the general requirements in respect of revision and resubmission and shall provide such detail in relation to the examiners' reports as the head of department recommends and shall also advise the examiners, head of department and supervisor of the terms of the decision.

Degree not awarded

4.21 Where a faculty or college board, following the consultation process referred to in sections 4.16-4.19, resolves under section 4.03(j) that the degree not be awarded, this decision shall be reported to the PhD Award Sub-Committee which may note the decision or refer it back to the faculty or college board for further consideration, and the Registrar shall advise the candidate of the decision, of any provisions relating to appeals, shall provide such detail in relation to the examiners' reports as the head of department recommends and shall also advise the examiners, head of department and supervisor of the decision.

Emendations and lodging of corrected thesis

4.22 A candidate, on receipt of advice from the Registrar that the degree has been awarded subject to emendations being made, shall make these emendations in consultation with his or her supervisor or head of department on all the copies of the thesis which are to be available within the University, including the copy printed on permanent or acid-free paper which is to be lodged with the University Librarian; shall comply with the requirements with respect to permanently binding a copy of the thesis; shall request the head of department to certify that the corrections have been made and shall submit the thesis copies to the Registrar by no later than the latest date advised for completing such action.

4.23 The Registrar, on receipt of at least one corrected, permanently bound copy of the thesis and a statement from the head of department that the corrections have been made to his or her satisfaction, shall cause all corrected copies submitted to be stamped to indicate that the thesis is in the form which has been accepted for the degree; shall advise **either** the PhD Award Sub-Committee **or the faculty, as appropriate**, that the corrections have been made and that the **faculty or Sub-Committee** can therefore approve the award of the degree; shall write to the candidate advising that all the requirements for the award of the degree have been met; shall lodge the permanently printed copy with the University Librarian, and shall so advise the examiners, head of department and supervisor.

4.24 If a candidate does not carry out the required emendations within the time limit set, or the head of department after consultation with the supervisor does not consider that the emendations made are satisfactory, the head of the department shall refer the matter to the faculty or college board which may grant additional time or set different conditions or may initiate proceedings under the provisions for the termination of candidature.

Transfer to Master's candidature

4.25 A faculty or college board may permit a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy who, after examination, has not been awarded the degree, to use part or all of the material in the thesis as a thesis to be submitted for a Master's degree, subject to completing all of the necessary administrative requirements.

Participation of supervisor and head of department

4.26 The supervisor and head of department may be present at any discussion by a faculty or college board of a recommendation by the head of department in respect to examiners' reports on the thesis of a candidate.

Delegation of authority

4.27 A head of department may delegate to a specified member of the academic staff his or her responsibilities under this section by countersigning a specific recommendation in respect of a particular candidature or by making, and forwarding to the Registrar, a written statement of delegation of those powers.

4.28 The Sub-Committee may delegate to its Chair, or in the absence of the Chair to the Chair's nominee from the Sub-Committee, its powers to award the degree under section 4.02(a), (b) or (c).

4.29 **Where the PhD Award Sub-Committee has delegated to faculties and colleges the authority to approve the award of the degree under sections 3.01(a) or 4.01(2), the authority for the approval of the award shall be the responsibility of the faculty's or college board's postgraduate committee which may delegate authority to act on its behalf to its Chair, or in the absence of the Chair to the Chair's nominee.**

5. Revision and re-examination*Faculty or college board to prescribe conditions*

5.01 A faculty or college board which has resolved that a candidate not be awarded the degree but be permitted to revise and resubmit the thesis for re-examination, shall prescribe a maximum period of further candidature and may prescribe particular conditions to be met.

Candidate to re-enrol

5.02 A candidate permitted to revise and resubmit shall re-enrol while remaining a candidate for the degree and shall proceed according to the provisions of these resolutions.

Appointment of examiners

5.03 A head of department shall recommend examiners for a revised and resubmitted thesis after the consultation processes provided for in section 1, but the faculty shall normally reappoint the original examiners of the thesis, provided that they are available, unless one or more of those examiners has required modifications of the thesis that the faculty or college board consider to be unnecessary or undesirable or, in the opinion of the faculty or college board, there are academic reasons for not reappointing any or all of the original examiners.

Process of examination

5.04 Subject to section 5.05, all the provisions of sections 1, 2, 3 and 4 relating to the examination process apply to the examination of a revised and resubmitted thesis.

5.05 Except where the Committee for Graduate Studies on the recommendation of the faculty or college board permits otherwise, the recommendation that a candidate be not awarded the degree but be permitted to resubmit the thesis in a revised form for re-examination shall not be available to examiners of a thesis that has itself been submitted for re-examination.

6. Faculty and college board delegations

6.01 Where in these resolutions reference is made to a faculty or a college board or action to be taken by a faculty or a college board, that reference shall also include a faculty or college board of postgraduate studies or equivalent and any dean, chair, associate dean or other officer of the faculty or college board acting with the authority of the faculty or college board.

7. Annual quarterly reports to the PhD Award Sub-Committee

Where the degree is awarded by faculty delegation, the faculty shall report to the PhD Award Sub-Committee at the end of March, June, September and December of each year the details of such awards for the previous three months showing for each the name of the candidate, the department, the title of the thesis, the category of award recommended by each examiner, the final result, the date of submission of the thesis and the date on which the candidate was informed of the result.

Reports on Chairs

(as at 26 February 1997)

1. Sciences Academic Group

(1) Chairs under active consideration

- **Cisco Systems Chair of Internetworking**
 Selection Committee appointed: 13 November 1996
 Applications closed: 16 January 1997
 Nine applications were received and have been forwarded to the Dean.
- **Sybase Chair of Information Systems**
 Selection Committee appointed: 15 January 1997
 Applications close: 17 April 1997

(2) Chairs for which an offer has been made but not yet accepted:

- **Chair of Physics (Theoretical Astrophysics)**
 Selection Committee appointed: 10 July 1996
 Applications closed: 19 September 1996
 Five applications were received with referees' reports called for two short listed applicants. The Committee met on 6 November 1996 to short list for interview. It was agreed that the two short listed applicants be invited for interview. Interviews were conducted on 12 December 1996. Approval was received by the Senate Chair Appointments Committee to circulate the selection committee's recommendation for approval. All members of the Senate Chair Appointments Committee approved an offer of appointment. An offer of appointment was made on 23 January 1997. The successful candidate is yet to indicate acceptance of the offer.
- **Head of Medical Psychology, Westmead Hospital, Professor/Associate Professor, Department of Psychology (Conjoint Appointment)**
 Selection Committee appointed: 16 October 1996
 Applications closed: 31 October 1996
 Seven applications were received with referees' reports called for four short listed applicants. The Committee met on 20 December 1996 to confirm the short list for interview. It was agreed that three applicants be invited for interview. One applicant subsequently withdrew. Interviews were conducted on 24 January 1997. An offer of appointment was made on 5 January 1997. The successful candidate is yet to indicate acceptance of the offer.

2. Professional Faculties Academic Group

(1) Chairs for which an offer has been made but not yet accepted

- **Dunhill Madden Butler Chair of Women and the Law (REF. B24/14)**
 Selection Committee appointed: 4 July 1996
 Applications closed: 16 August 1996
 6 applications were received and referees' reports were called for 3 applicants. The Committee met on 2 December 1996 to interview 3 applicants. An offer of appointment was made on 31 January 1997. The successful candidate is yet to indicate acceptance of the offer.

(2) Chairs accepted

- **Shell Chair of Environmental Engineering (Ref B43/01)**
 The successful candidate, Dr James Petrie, has accepted the offer with effect from January, 1998. Dr Petrie will spend 4 months with the Department in 1997. An extract from the report of the Chair Selection Committee for this applicant is attached. (see page 42)

- **Abbott Tout Chair of Litigation and Dispute Resolution (REF. B24/13)**
The successful candidate, Associate Professor Hilary Astor, has accepted the offer with effect from 7 February 1997. An extract from the report of the Chair Selection Committee for this appointment is attached. (see page 43)

3. Health Sciences Academic Group

The Academic Board is asked to note the following report:

(1) Chairs under active consideration

Chair of Paediatric Epidemiology, Director, Epidemiology Unit, Royal Alexandra Hospital for Children

Selection Committee approved: 17 February 1997

Applications close: 29 May 1997

Chair of Neonatal Medicine, Western Sydney Area Health Service, Royal Alexandra Hospital for Children (Re-advertised)

Selection Committee appointed: 17 June 1996

Applications close: 9 May 1997

Motor Accidents Authority of NSW, Professor of Rehabilitation Medicine or Associate Professor, Director of Medical Services, Royal Rehabilitation Centre, Sydney

Selection Committee approved: 13 December 1996

Applications close: 3 April 1997

Chair of Orthodontics, Faculty of Dentistry

Selection Committee approved: 29 January 1997

Applications close: 8 May 1997

Professor/Associate Professor of Materno-fetal Medicine, Central Sydney Area Health Service

Selection Committee appointed: 25 November 1996

Applications closed: 17 January 1997

One application was received and referees' reports have been called for. The Committee will meet on 11 March 1997 to short-list for interview and again on 23 April 1997 to interview.

Chair of Surgery, Western Sydney Area Health Service, Westmead Hospital

Selection Committee appointed: 21 October 1996

Applications closed: 14 November 1996

Four applications were received and referees' reports have been called for all the applicants. The Committee met on 5 February 1997 and will meet again on 9 April 1997 to interview three applicants.

North Shore Heart Research Foundation Chair of Cardiology, Northern Sydney Area Health Service, North Shore Heart Research Foundation

Selection Committee appointed: 21 October 1996

Applications closed: 14 November 1996

Six applications were received and referee's reports have been called for all the applicants. The Committee met on 14 January 1997 and will meet again on 28 February 1997 to interview five applicants.

Professor/Associate Professor, General Practice, Canberra Clinical School

Selection Committee appointed: 16 September 1996

Applications close: 14 November 1996

Five applications were received and referees' reports have been called for three applicants. The Committee met on 15 January 1997 and again on 18 February 1997 to interview three applicants. A recommendation for the award of the title of Associate Professor has been reported elsewhere in the Academic Group (Health Sciences) report.

Professor/Associate Dean (Western Clinical School), Wentworth Area Health Service, Western Sydney Area Health Service

Selection Committee appointed: 16 September 1996

Applications closed: 28 November 1996

One application and three expressions of interest were received and referees' reports have been called for the applicant. One expression of interest and the applicant have withdrawn. The Committee met on 28 January 1997. Subsequently, a further two expressions of interest have been received. The Committee have invited the three people who have expressed interest to meet with them on 30 April 1997.

Professor/Associate Professor & Senior Staff Specialist, ACT Health/Department of Psychological Medicine

Selection Committee appointed: 20 August 1996 (revised)

Applications closed: 13 June 1996

Six applications were received. Referees' reports were called for all six applicants. The Committee met on 10 October 1996 and 28 November 1996 to interview four applicants. The Committee will meet again shortly.

Professor/Associate Professor of Paediatrics, ACT Health

Selection Committee appointed: 18 March 1996

Applications closed: 9 May 1996

Five applications were received. One applicant withdrew. The committee met on 9 September 1996 and 11 October 1996 to interview one applicant. The Committee recommended that the appointment be offered at level of Associate Professor, which was approved by the Chair on behalf of the Standing Committee of the Board in November. However, the applicant subsequently withdrew his application.

Chair of Oral Biology

Selection Committee appointed: 16 February 1994

Applications closed: 12 April 1995

The Committee met on 26 April 1995 to discuss the applications and, in view of other developments, it was decided to put the position on hold.

(2) Chairs accepted

Director, Professor/Associate Professor of Developmental Disabilities, The Centre for Developmental Disability Studies

The successful candidate, Professor T R Parmenter, has accepted the offer with effect from 1 March 1997. An extract from the report of the Chair Selection Committee for this applicant is attached.

(see page

**Report of the Committee appointed to consider applications for
the Shell Chair of Environmental Engineering (B43/01)**

The committee to consider applications for the above chair was constituted as follows:

Vice-Chancellor, Professor Don McNicol
 Pro Vice-Chancellor, Professor John Glastonbury
 Deputy Chair, Academic Board, Professor Margaret Harris
 Acting Dean of Engineering, Professor John Booker
 Professor Brian Haynes, Chemical Engineering
 Professor Rolf Prince, Chemical Engineering
 Professor Don Napper, Physical Chemistry
 Professor John Carter, Civil and Mining Engineering
 Professor Brian Fletcher, History
 Mr Denys Goggin, Shell Australia
 Dr Stephen Burger, Shell Australia

Following advertisement in Australia and overseas, sixteen applications were received and referred to the Department. An additional candidate was invited by the Core Committee to apply for the position. Statistics of candidates are as follows:

	Australia	Overseas	Total
Male	5	12	17
Female	nil	nil	nil
	5	12	17

The committee concurred in the departmental core committee's recommendation that referees' reports be called for 6 candidates. Following a circulation to the committee, of applications, summaries and referees reports for the 6 candidates, all members of the committee indicated in writing, their concurrence with the core committee's recommendation to interview three candidates. Arrangements were made to interview the candidates on 17 May, 1996. All members of the committee were in attendance for the interviews.

	Australia	Overseas	Total
Male	1	2	3
Female	nil	nil	nil
	1	2	3

The committee unanimously recommended that:

1. appointment to the Shell Chair of Environmental Engineering be offered to Dr James Petrie; and in the event that he decline the offer
2. the committee reconvene to further consider the application of another applicant.

**Report of the Committee appointed to consider applications for the
Abbott Tout Chair of Litigation and Dispute Resolution (B24/13)**

Committee

Vice-Chancellor, Professor Gavin Brown
 Pro Vice-Chancellor, Professor John Glastonbury
 Chair, Academic Board, Professor John Mack
 Dean of Law, Professor David Weisbrot
 Professor Ron McCallum, Law
 Professor Les McCrimmon, Law
 Associate Professor Rosalind Atherton, Law (Head of Department)
 Professor Margaret Harris, English
 Professor Virginia Spate, Fine Arts
 Mr Alan Hunt, Managing Partner, Abbott Tout Solicitors
 Sir Laurence Street (formerly Chief Justice of NSW)

Following advertisement in Australia and overseas, 14 applications were received and referred to the Department. Statistics of candidates are as follows:

	Australia	Overseas	Total
Male	1	8	9
Female	3	2	5
	4	10	14

The committee concurred in the departmental core committee's recommendation that referees' reports be called for three candidates. Following circulation of applications, summaries and referees reports for the candidates, all members of the committee agreed to interview three candidates on 28 November, 1996. With the exception of the Vice-Chancellor, all members of the committee were in attendance for the interviews. Statistics are as follows:

	Australia	Overseas	Total
Male	nil	nil	nil
Female	3	nil	3
	3	3	3

The committee unanimously recommended that: appointment to the Abbott Tout Chair of Litigation and Dispute resolution be offered to Associate Professor Hilary Astor; and that in the event that she decline the offer, the committee reconvene to further consider the application of the other two candidates.

**Report of the Committee appointed to consider applications for the position of
Chair of Developmental Disabilities/Associate Professor - Director, The Centre for Developmental
Disability Studies (Conjoint Appointment)**

The committee appointed to consider applications for the above post was constituted as follows:

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Professor J A Young), Deputy Chair of the Academic Board (Associate Professor R Waterhouse), Acting Dean, Faculty of Medicine (Professor S Leeder), Professor C Tennant (Psychological Medicine), Professor R Oates (Paediatrics and Child Health), Professor S Dunn (Medical Psychology, RNSH), Professor K Goulston (Associate Dean, Northern Clinical School), Professor J Kinnear (Dean, Faculty of Health sciences), Ms G McPhee (Director, Strategic Policy and planning Unit, Ageing and disability Department), Dr R Oakeshott, Ms B Moye (Chair, Disability Council of NSW) (non-voting member)

Following advertisement in Australia and overseas, four applications were received. The statistics are as follows:

	<u>Australia</u>	<u>Overseas</u>	<u>Total</u>
Male	1	-	1
Female	2	1	3
Total	3	1	4

Referees' reports were called for four candidates and two were short listed for interview. Statistics are as follows:

	<u>Australia</u>	<u>Overseas</u>	<u>Total</u>
Male	1	-	1
Female	1	-	1
Total	2	-	2

The committee met on 14 November 1996 and 19 December 1996. At the meeting held on 14 November 1996, all members of the committee were present. At the meeting held on 19 December 1996, all members of the committee were present, except Professor Tennant and Ms McPhee from whom apologies were received.

The committee unanimously recommends that Professor T R Parmenter be appointed to the post of Chair of Developmental Disabilities, Director, The Centre for Developmental Disability Studies. In the event that Professor Parmenter declines to accept the appointment, it is recommended that the position be offered to another applicant at the Associate Professor level.