



The University of Sydney

Academic Board

Board Secretary: Miss E R Ring

Main Quadrangle, A14

Phone: 9351 3305; Fax: 9351 3572

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

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

MEMORANDUM TO: Members of the Academic Board

A meeting of the Academic Board will be held at 2.15 pm on **Wednesday, 14 May 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

Bill Adams

Acting Registrar and Deputy Principal (Administrative Support Services)

6 May 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	7
A8. Report by the Vice-Chancellor and Principal on proctorial matters	9
A12. Report of the Academic Forum	10
C1. Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee	13
C2. Report of the Graduate Studies Committee	15
C3. Report of the Teaching and Learning Committee	19
C4. Report of the Research Committee	22
C5. Report of the Library and Information Technology Committee	25
C6. Report of the Academic Staffing Committee	26

A G E N D A

A1. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Academic Board held on Wednesday 16 April 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 13 May 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 16 April 1997 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

A2. Business arising out of the minutes

A4. Report of the Chair

Part I

1. Report on Senate Matters

April meeting of Senate

Senate, at its meeting on 7 April 1997 and adjourned meeting on 22 April 1997, on the report of the Academic Board:

- (1) resolved to recommend the amendment of the By-laws relating to the Student Proctorial Panel, as recommended.
- (2) passed the amendment of the Academic Governance Rules relating to the Academic Board - Membership of the Graduate Studies Committee - as recommended.
- (3) approved the Selection Committee for the Deanship of Medicine, as recommended.
- (4) noted the report of the Chair on the following:
 - (a) Board committees
 - (b) Universal English College
 - (c) New nomenclature relating to award programs and courses and common unit values
 - (d) Academic Year
 - (e) PhD Examining procedures
 - (f) Committee of Chairs
 - (g) Election of Chair of the Academic Board

May meeting of Senate

The report will be tabled at the meeting.

that the Board note the report.

2. Election of Deputy Chairs of the Academic Board

At the deadline for receipt of nominations (4 pm, Wednesday 30 April 1997) five nominations had been received for the five available positions of Deputy Chair of the Academic Board.

Pursuant to section 28.1 of the Academic Governance Rules relating to the Academic Board, the following were declared elected to hold office from 1 June 1997 to 31 December 1998.

Professor David J H Cockayne
 Professor Jocalyn Lawler
 Professor James R Lawrence
 Professor Ross C McPhedran
 Professor Ann E Sefton

3. **Introduction of a summer session**

I advised the Board at its April meeting that I expected to bring a proposal forward to its May meeting regarding formalising a session in the summer. Following further discussion at VCAC and at the recent Academic Forum, I now believe that faculties need to give much greater consideration to the full implications of my proposal for 'restructuring the academic year' than they have done so far, and therefore I am not in any position to propose any alteration to the formal academic year structure at this time.

Members of the Board will note that, in Part I of the Vice-Chancellor's report, there is A PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A SUMMER SCHOOL at university-wide level in 1997/8 and 1998/9, on a pilot basis. I think it therefore necessary that I ask the Board **to endorse a recommendation** from me that, subject to faculty approval being given for the selection procedures for admission into those of its units of study to be offered in these pilot programs, and also for the delivery and examining arrangements by which those units will be conducted, then the Academic Board accept such summer school units as appropriate for contributing to degree progression requirements in the relevant faculties. I further **recommend** that each faculty participating in the 1998 summer school in this way provide to the Board's Graduate/Undergraduate Studies Committee (as relevant), by 1 May 1998, a full report from its Dean on the above aspects of any unit of study offered in the 1998 Pilot Summer School (if this is put into operation), together with any other comments of relevance to the academic oversighting roles of faculties and the Academic Board and that, subject to the Board's consideration of these reports in 1998, similar procedures apply in 1999.

that the Board adopt the recommendations of the Chair.

4. **Selection into fee-paying undergraduate courses**

At the April Board meeting I undertook to provide a copy of the memorandum sent jointly to Deans by Professor Lawler and me in respect of selection into fee-paying undergraduate courses. The text of this memorandum is attached. *(see pages 27-31)*

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

Academic Board last year adopted a recommendation to review these guidelines and to devolve to faculties and departments those awards specific to individual academic units. In consequence, there has been a thorough review of existing policies and procedures relating to these and also to the procedures for administering awards, prizes and scholarships. I have received from the Director of the Research and Scholarships Office revised Guidelines, which are attached, and also revised Administrative Procedures.

(see pages 32-49)

I shall consult with relevant senior management staff regarding the "Procedures" proposal. The Guidelines document will be of use at central, college, faculty and departmental levels and I **recommend** that the Board adopt it and ask that the Research and Scholarships Office distribute it to all relevant units in the University.

that the Board adopt the Guidelines and ask the Research and Scholarships Office to distribute it as recommended.

6. **International Relations Committee**

I attach for information a copy of the present draft of the proposed Terms of Reference for and composition of this Committee. I have consulted with Professor Pesman on this and we request that comments on the draft be sent to me by 23 May. A final draft will be presented to the June Academic Board for recommendation to Senate (as a change to the Academic Governance Rules is required).

Terms of Reference

The Committee has been established to:

1. Advise the Academic Board on policies and issues relating to internationalisation

- (i) development of international benchmarks that will help to assess the quality of performance in all areas of the University;
 - (ii) provision of cost-effective, high-quality educational services overseas;
 - (iii) initiatives that will facilitate the appointment of outstanding staff from overseas;
 - (iv) initiatives and infrastructural support that will assist the University to meet its targets for the admission of international students;
 - (v) provision of English language and other support to international and local NESB (Non-English Speaking Background) students.
2. Advise the Vice-Chancellor and the Academic Board on the academic principles on which the contractual teaching arrangements between the University and other institutions or bodies will be based.
 3. Advise the Vice-Chancellor and the Academic Board on priorities for the development of linkages with international institutions and agencies, both within Australia and overseas.
 4. Advise the Vice-Chancellor and the Academic Board on priorities for the development of international activities involving students or staff and priorities in respect of the implementation of such activities.
 5. Monitor the implementation and effectiveness of all policies relating to international activities with particular reference to how those policies and activities assist the University to meet its internationalisation objectives, and draw any deficiencies to the attention of the Vice-Chancellor and the Academic Board.
 6. Refer matters as appropriate to the other committees of the Academic Board.
 7. Through College Pro-Vice-Chancellors, liaise with Colleges, Faculties, Institutes and Centres and seek advice from them.
 8. Consider and report on any matter referred to it by the Academic Board or the Vice-Chancellor.
 9. Report at least annually to the Academic Board on progress made towards achieving the University's internationalisation objectives.

Membership

- (a) Chair: the Chair/Deputy Chair of the Academic Board
- (b) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International and Development)
- (c) One Dean from each College, nominated by deans in the relevant College
- (d) A member of the Teaching and Learning Committee, nominated by the Chair of that committee
- (e) A member of the Undergraduate Studies Committee, nominated by the Chair of that committee
- (f) A member of the Graduate Studies Committee, nominated by the Chair of that committee
- (g) Deputy Principal External Relations
- (h) Director, International Education Office

Serviced by: International Education Office

that the Board note the report.

7. West Review of Higher Education

On behalf of the Academic Board, I would like to thank members of the Working Party who contributed their ideas to the development of a submission. In particular, I wish to thank Mr Charles Davidson, Associate Professor Philip Jones and Professor Ros Pesman for their considerable help in developing the University's final response (a copy of which is attached as part of the Vice-Chancellor's report).

that the Board note the report.

8. McGaw Review of the HSC

I understand that various bodies have continued to provide advice to the Minister on the merits and feasibility of implementation of the major recommendations in this Review. The Minister is expected to announce his decisions in the near future.

that the Board note the report.

9. Forum of academic and general staff and students held on 23 April 1997

Set out below for members' information is the text of a letter which I received from Stuart Rosewarne, on behalf of the forum organised with the support of the NTEU, HREA (Michael Thomson), CPSU (Andrew Holland or Alice Murphy), the SRC (Katrina Curry) and postgraduate students (Tom Clark, Publications Officer, SUPRA).

A forum of 500 academic and general staff and students met at the University of Sydney today, 23 April 1997, to discuss their concerns with the current state of higher education in Australia and the way in which the University of Sydney has been responding to some of the changes in higher education. Considerable disquiet was expressed with the funding cutbacks and the imposition of higher education charges and fees and the impact this is having on access to education. Concern was also expressed at the effects this is having on the quality of education and the undermining of working conditions and student and staff morale more generally.

The sentiments of the students and staff at the meeting were captured in several resolutions. These were passed unanimously at the forum. We would like to bring these to your attention to signal the concerns of the broader community of the University of Sydney with recent changes to higher education at the University.

"This forum of academic and general staff and students:

1. demands that the University of Sydney affirms its continuing commitment to equity in access to higher education.
2. demands the revitalisation of a publicly owned and funded Higher Education system.
3. endorses the NUS and NTEU National Campaign of 8 May to protest further Higher Education budget cuts.
4. opposes the University of Sydney Senate resolution to set aside places for full fee-paying students.
5. demands job security for all staff and opposes any University of Sydney management moves to retrench staff.
6. demands that staff and students be consulted and that the University of Sydney provide for effective and meaningful representation at all levels of University governance.
7. recognises the desirability of all student organisations, academic and general staff unions working together to stop the attacks on higher education and recommends the convening of a forum of all students and staff on 15 May."

We look forward to your response to these expressions of concern.

that the Board note the report.

10. Annual Report of the Learning Assistance Centre

A copy of the Annual Report of the Learning Assistance Centre is enclosed for members' information. I would like to commend the Centre's range of activities to all Deans.

(see separate enclosure)

that the Board note the report.

11. Membership of the Board

The Faculty of Architecture has advised that Dr Peter Phibbs has replaced Mr Trevor Howells as the elected academic staff member from the Faculty as Mr Howells is unable to act because of teaching commitments.

that the Board note the report and welcome Dr Phibbs to membership of the Board.

12. Selection Committee for the Deanship of Health Sciences

Under delegated authority, and on behalf of the former Standing Committee, after consultation with the Deputy Chairs, I have recommended the following Selection Committee to Senate:

Ex officio

Professor Gavin Brown, Vice-Chancellor (Chair)
Professor Ros Pesman (Chair-elect, Academic Board)

Nominees of the Vice-Chancellor

Professor Bettina Cass (Dean, Faculty of Arts)
Dr Diana Horvath (Chief Executive Officer, Central Sydney Area Health Service)
Professor J A Young (Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Health Sciences)

Nominees of the Faculty

Dr Rosemary Cant (Behavioural Sciences)
Associate Professor Elaine Cornell (Orthoptics)
Dr Jennifer Lingard (Biomedical Sciences)
Dr Ross Menzies (Behavioural Sciences)
Dr Rod Rothwell (Community Medicine)

Reserves

Associate Professor Colleen Mullavey-O'Byrne (Occupational Therapy)
Dr Roger Adams (Physiotherapy)/Dr Cherry Russell (Community Health)/Ms Elfreda Marshall (Physiotherapy)

Nominees of the Academic Board

Associate Professor David Davey (Physiology)
Professor Jocalyn Lawler (Clinical Nursing)

that the Board note the report.

13. Membership of the Student Proctorial Panel

The Presidents of SUPRA and SRC have advised that the following three student members of the Academic Forum have indicated their willingness to serve on the Student Proctorial Panel:

Ms K Beattie
Mr J McNicoll
Mr M Partridge

The Student Proctorial Panel comprises the following people:

Staff

Professor Sue Armitage
Ms Su Baker
Professor Ken Brown
Ms Joyce Edwards
Associate Professor Christopher Gillies
Dr Neville Weber

Student

Ms K Beattie
Ms K Curry
Mr J McNicoll
Mr K Oliver
Mr M Partridge
Mr T-H Tan

that the Board note the report.

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

Under delegated authority, I have considered the recommendations of the Academic Groups in respect of academic appointments and the appointment of Faculty Promotions

appointments procedures and have approved/noted them as appropriate. A report on the appointment of Visiting Professors and FPACs that I have approved is attached.

(see pages 50-53)

that the Board note the report.

15. Work in progress

The following Working Parties are yet to be reconvened:

- (a) Working Party on the Academic Year
- (b) Working Party to examine the present procedures for student appeals against academic decisions

Following recent discussions with Mr Bowan, I expect to call a meeting of the second working party during May at which I will be presenting draft new procedures.

In respect of the re-drafting of the following "green papers" considered by the Board/Forum

- (a) Code of Conduct,
- (b) Outside Earnings, and
- (c) Intellectual property,

I advise the Board that new drafts of all three were considered by SES at its last meeting in April. There was lengthy discussion on the Outside Earnings draft and on the Intellectual Property draft. As a result of this, I hope that "final drafts" will be available soon.

that the Board note the report.

16. Question Time

I have not received any questions this month.

that the Board note the report.

17. Recognition and thanks

In stepping down from my unexpectedly long term (6 years) as Board Chair, I must briefly recognise and thank particular colleagues and even more briefly offer my appreciation to all members of the Academic Board who contributed to its work during this period - many of whom continue to do so and will help to maintain and enhance the policies and procedures underpinning the quality and integrity of our academic work.

The officers of the Board (Deputy Chairs, Committee Chairs, working party conveners) and those representing the Board on a range of University committees (for example, its nominees on selection committees such as those for Vice-Chancellors or Level A staff, or its representatives on Senate or senior management committees such as the Planning Committee or the ITC), through their work, help to preserve what I and all Board members regard as the principal function of the Board. This is, in every relevant way, to provide advice on academic aspects of decision-making throughout the University. Their work, and the issues that arise from it, provides the Board with sensible bases for policy review and development while keeping our academic function prominent within management and governance structures.

My principal goal as Board Chair has been to demonstrate to the University the significance and value of this function. The extent to which this has been achieved is directly attributable to the support given that goal by all who agreed to give time and effort towards its implementation. This is the time for me to recognise and thank each one of you and to urge those willing to continue in this work to do so. To paraphrase a rather neglected slogan, 'The price of Collegiality is a widespread willingness to serve!'

An Academic Board isolated from faculties, or from senior management, is necessarily doomed. On the one hand, the senior officers of the University have made clear the importance they place on having in place an effective working relationship with the Board. The new Board (and Board Committee) structure is based upon this and without it, will not prove successful. It is therefore my earnest desire that the present "independent but supportive" relationship existing between the Board and the Vice-Chancellor's office

channels of communication in place between faculties and the Board. I expect that it is timely now for the Board and the faculties, in consultation with the PVCs (College), to review their respective committee-level linkages in order to ensure that, as far as possible, there is no time wasted in developing and reviewing policies and procedures governing the very important two-way interaction between these bodies.

I have been fortunate in being able to call upon a number of student members of the Board to contribute to many committees and working parties. It is not easy for students to be able to fit into their busy schedules the time needed to absorb detailed background material and then participate in the discussion and development processes leading to recommendations. To these students, I give an especial vote of thanks and wish them well in their future careers.

All of this work depends upon the provision of what is generically called 'infrastructure support' and which in practice means the continual making of ever-more complex and pressing demands on staff who support every academic, management and service unit in the University. In particular, the Registrar and staff in the Academic and Executive Services unit, who support most (but not all) of the Board and its Committees in their work, are crucial in determining the capacity of the Board to address its work effectively and efficiently. To all these staff and to staff in other units supporting its work, I thank you for keeping us moving, despite a number of traumas over the past 6 years. No such thanks are complete without a special reference to Erica Ring, who, as Board Secretary, has maintained a consistent quality in the presentation and recording of Board papers (and has, on a regular basis, managed to ensure that the Board Chair has got it right!) - my sincere thanks, Erica.

I hope that Professor Pesman and her Deputies will continue to enjoy the support of staff and students and that, with Professor Gill as Chair of the Academic Forum, they will address the many jobs yet to be done, and to come, in maintaining the Academic Board in this University.

The motto of my old school, Gosford High, has proven useful to me and I commend it: Specternur Agendo.

that the Board note the report.

P Part II

To be presented at the meeting.

The Chair will report on a confidential staffing matter.

A5. Statement by the Vice-Chancellor and Principal

Part I

1. Report on Senate Matters

April meeting of Senate

Senate, at its meeting held on 7 April 1997 and adjourned meeting on 22 April 1997:

- (1) passed the following motion:
 - that the Senate reluctantly approve in principle the future intake of local undergraduate fee-paying students made possible from 1998 by Federal Government legislation, and undertake systematic consultation and planning to develop appropriate principles and procedures to implement this decision taking particular account of issues of access and equity.
- (2) noted the Vice-Chancellor's report on the University's relationship with the Universal English College.
- (3) noted the Vice-Chancellor's briefing on developments regarding Unipower Australia Pty Ltd.
- (4) noted the Vice-Chancellor's report on the pleasing outcome of the 1997 admissions as at the census date of 31 March 1997, and resolved to congratulate appropriate staff

- (6) resolved, pursuant to section 40 of Chapter 13, to quash determinations made by the Vice-Chancellor against two students.
- (7) noted the Vice-Chancellor's report on the visit of the West Committee and that a final version of the submission would be prepared - incorporating Fellows' suggestions and input from the Academic Board - which the Vice-Chancellor would take responsibility for approving for submission.
- (8) approved the University's participation in Asia-Pacific Capital Markets Limited (ACM).
- (9) disestablished its Standing Committee, and thanked the members for their service to the Committee during 1995 and 1996.
- (10) approved the recommendation that the position of Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences be advertised internally and externally.
- (11) approved the recommendation that the position of Dean of the Faculty of Law be advertised internally and externally.
- (12) approved the recommendation that the position of Dean of the Faculty of Agriculture be advertised internally and externally for a period of three years.
- (13) approved the Vice-Chancellor's recommendation that the position of Dean of the Faculty of Education be advertised internally and externally; and resolved to advise the Faculty that it would consider the proposal concerning the Chair of the Faculty after the Dean has been appointed.
- (14) approved the Annual Report for 1996.
- (15) approved the award of the title of Emeritus Professor to Professor J G McLeod, AO, effective 1 July 1997.
- (16) approved the recommendation that Associate Professor Michael Leigh be admitted to the degree of Master of Economics *ad eundem gradum*.
- (17) thanked Professor Kuchel, Dr Baxter and Professor Austin-Broos for their willingness to be appointed to the Research Training and Careers Committee, the University-Industry Research Collaboration Committee and the Social Sciences and Humanities Discipline Panel of the Australian Research Council respectively, with effect from 18 February 1997 to 31 December 1999.
- (18) noted the additional information on the budget implications of enterprise bargaining.
- (19) noted the report on the Senate Room refurbishment.
- (20) noted the Vice-Chancellor's response to questions raised by Dr Copeman in relation to sections of the Public Outpatients Departments of the Westmead and Nepean Hospitals having been renamed "University Clinic", and that the Vice-Chancellor had asked Professor Leeder, in his capacity as Acting Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, to establish a protocol for such situations.
- (21) resolved to request the Minister to vary the terms of the trust relating to the Dorothy Poate Memorial Lecture, under s25 of the University of Sydney Act 1989.
- (22) noted a report from the Advisory Council of Orange Agricultural College.

May meeting of Senate

The report will be tabled at the meeting.

that the Board note the report.

2. Review of Higher Education Financing and Policy

In response to suggestions from Fellows of Senate and members of the Academic Board, the draft version of the University's submission to the West Committee circulated with the papers for the last meeting was substantially revised. A copy of the final document is enclosed for the information of the Board. (see pages 54-64)

that the Board note the report.

P 3. Sydney Summer School Proposal

It is proposed that the University establish a stand alone "Sydney Summer School", on a

The Summer School would operate over a six week period during the normal summer "vacation" period. Only a unit of study which already has been approved by the Academic Board may be offered in the Summer School, with further certification required from the relevant Head of Department that the unit is one which is appropriate for teaching and assessment in a concentrated period, and the staffing and other teaching arrangements are suitable in the circumstances.

Student participation in the Summer School will be entirely voluntary. All units in the Summer School will be offered on a full fee basis (including local students who are otherwise HECS-liable). The Governing Board of the Summer School will approve the fee structure for the Summer School, including tuition fees and other charges (eg lab fees). A number of fee-waiver scholarships will be provided, in order to meet the University's strong commitment to access and equity.

The Summer School will enable our own students to: (a) make up lost units/credit points where they have failed, or have made slower than expected progress; (b) accelerate their progress through a degree program; (c) manage their studies and workload more effectively, by (eg) taking a somewhat lighter load during the normal academic year and then picking up units in the summer; and experience a period of study in another discipline (or disciplines), which may not otherwise be permissible or practical as part of their award courses. First preference in enrolment should be given to University of Sydney students; however, suitably qualified students from other universities (in Australia and overseas) also should be eligible to attend the Summer School.

Similarly, academic staff participation will be entirely on a voluntary basis - in no case will a member of academic staff be directed to teach in the Summer School by his or her Head of Department, nor shall teaching in the Summer School be considered part of an academic's "normal" teaching load. Such extra teaching will be compensated separately, in accordance with general principles regulating outside earnings for academic consulting.

The pilot Summer School is intended to support the broad educational aims of the University as a whole, and not to focus on a particular Faculty or College. The Governing Board of the Summer School should consist of: the Vice-Chancellor or his nominee; the Deans of participating Faculties; the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Planning and Resources) or his nominee; one or more of the Pro-Vice-Chancellors (College); the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic Support); and the Chair of Academic Board or her nominee. The day-to-day administration of the Summer School will be the responsibility of a Director, appointed for this purpose, who will report to the Board.

The proposal to establish a Summer School was initiated by the Dean of Economics, Professor Stephen Salsbury, the Dean of Arts, Professor Bettina Cass, and the Acting Dean of Science, Professor Helen Beh. Coordination and development of the proposal through to its current form was undertaken by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Humanities and Social Sciences), Professor David Weisbrot, in consultation with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), Professor Derek Anderson, and I now support it. The proposal has also received the endorsement (*nem con*) of the Vice-Chancellor's Advisory Committee.

Accordingly I **recommend** that the Academic Board add its endorsement to that of VCAC.

that the Board note the report and endorse the proposal as recommended.

P Part II

To be presented at the meeting.

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

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

that the Board note that a report was tabled.

A12. Report of the Academic Forum

The Academic Forum met on Monday 21 April 1997.

1. Forum focus: The University's response to the West Review of Higher Education

Chair of the Academic Board, Professor John Mack and SUPRA President, Mr Kyle Oliver introduced discussion by speaking to the paper which had been circulated.

Professor Mack reported on the progress of the Academic Board working party which had been redrafting the University's submission over the past week. The submission would be recast to have a stronger University focus, shortened and simplified, and the conclusion would be rewritten more positively. Some of the major points that would be emphasised more carefully included the following.

The University believed in increasing diversity in the higher education sector, such as by encouraging students to study specialist fields only available here at honours level. The University interfaced well in other sectors, such as the school sector. Appropriate levels of funding were essential to maintain the higher education services that this University would like to continue to deliver. Technological developments affected what was taught across the board and it was important to maintain a relevant infrastructure. As high quality adaptable staff were essential to keep pace with rapid change, the financial cost of attracting such staff must be recognised. It would also be argued that quality assurance was not done effectively through a tightly controlled review system.

In speaking to the paper Mr Oliver expressed dissatisfaction at what he perceived as a lack of any clear image as to what the University should aspire to be. He thought the document smacked of agreeing up to a point with what the government wanted the University to do. It should, rather, make larger claims on what a university would want to be, both for the sake of integrity and because the government was not going to penalise the University for doing so.

He was critical of the reference to students as 'clients' and wondered by what criteria were such clients to 'police' educational institutions when they had come to the University to get an education. He stated that there was no such thing as 'mass higher education'; higher education had not been expanded to more people over the past few years. If the University wanted to accommodate community aspirations there should be more community funding. However, the fact that a community aspired to something was not necessarily a good reason for a university to think that that aspiration should be met.

In the ensuing discussion solid support was given to the view that strong statements should be made about the University's identity and purpose. We should assert the necessity of what we do, stress the social benefits of higher education and emphasise the University's role in producing highly skilled, well educated people. Several Forum members felt that the submission currently complied too much with what the government wanted and that it should, rather, challenge the government's pragmatist ethos. In keeping with this, the term 'research education' should be used in preference to 'research training'.

Concern was expressed that the West Review's terms of reference revealed a lack of vision. Nothing was said, for instance, about the good of the environment.

Misgivings were expressed about endorsing the voucher system. It was suggested that vouchers would be spent on new private instead of public institutions, with the result that the public institutions, already under strain, would find difficulty making ends meet. A decrease in the quality of higher education was a likely result.

It was pointed out that at present the paper spoke of a public subsidy as if the country were moving towards private universities. It was thought important that the University stress it was talking about a public education system and wanted to see that system preserved, but that it was concerned about sources of funding to take us into the next millennium. We should stop talking about 'expenditure' and say 'public investment' instead.

The view was expressed that the University's choice of a deregulated system was disloyal to students who would face great difficulties under such a system.

It was suggested that the University should refuse to fit in with the government's

Professor Mack responded in the following broad terms. A problem in writing the University's submission was the need to recognise political reality. There were difficulties with deregulation, yet a regulated system with the current government could be more problematic than having one's freedom.

Given that most high quality universities were very small, an option might be to allow this University to become small. This was not, however, a favoured option. Rather we should argue that a university of our size and quality can survive in the current unsympathetic environment of looking out for oneself.

The University's submission would argue that support of high quality education was in the best interests of the nation and that equitable access was needed. The best utilisation of what we had to offer was to attract the best (not necessarily the richest) students. The submission would say clearly that no university of stature in the country was a private university. Currently the University did not have the money to support the equity program it wanted, so it was necessary to attract funds to put the program in place. If we don't find ways of funding that are community oriented, we can't do that.

The submission would point out that the government should encourage private enterprise to support education, such as by providing tax benefits for doing so. If we said we wanted to stay purely publicly funded, the University would cease to exist.

2. Report from the Vice-Chancellor

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

VCAC had evaluated a proposal to adopt a six-week pilot summer school, commencing in January 1998, which would go to the June meeting of Senate along with the considerations of the Academic Board. The summer school was not to be confused with the semester summer schools some universities had as part of restructured academic years.

Following from Senate's decision to offer to local undergraduates fee-paying access to the University, Pro-Vice-Chancellors would meet with Deans to nominate applicable courses which the Vice-Chancellor would take to the June Senate.

The redrafted 'green papers' on Code of Conduct, Intellectual Property and Outside Earnings would go to the Senior Executive Staff group on 28 April, then to the Academic Board for further consideration.

To date six applications had been received for appointment to the position of University Librarian. Applications would close on 1 May and the selection process would take place on 24 June.

Responding to questions, Professor Anderson reported that: (1) the Vice-Chancellor wished to hold fora over the next fortnight with students, general staff and academic staff concerning student fees; and (2) while the Vice-Chancellor had had no intention of being present at the meeting between students and the West Review team, his presence had been requested by Mr West.

Subsequent questions essentially concerned the proposed summer school about which the following points were made.

The pilot proposal was coordinated by Professor David Weisbrot who had prepared a paper (based on an earlier draft prepared by the Dean of Economics) which had been endorsed rather than approved by VCAC. Prior discussion had taken place with the Faculty of Arts with the resultant agreement that the summer school should be a University rather than a joint-faculty initiative.

The quality of the six-week course would be no less than that of a semester long course, and all courses offered in the school would be accredited. The purpose of the school would be to enable students who wished to do so to accelerate or otherwise facilitate their progress by intensive study. Involvement of academic staff and students would be voluntary, not compulsory. There would be no key courses and no compulsion for students to catch up or otherwise accelerate progress, or manage their courses differently.

calendar of the academic year and publicising it well in advance, hence what will be proposed won't be gazetted as an official part of the teaching year. He urged faculties to rethink the paper on restructuring the academic year. The Board would provide advice to Senate on whether procedures put forward for management of delivery, examination and reporting for the summer school had been consistent with the Board's overall policies.

When questioned regarding comparison with the US situation whereby students were admitted from other local and overseas universities, Professor Anderson said he thought that the capacity would be there to attract such students, as well as secondary school students.

Some Forum members expressed concern about the implications for equity of the acceleration potential which would be available to fee-paying students. They believed choice was not an issue for students, many of whom worked long hours to support themselves and still carried a debt when they left the University. In response Professor Anderson said that the pragmatism of the political/economic environment of today was pushing the University into the position it had to take and that if the University didn't increase its income by the end of 1998, approximately 700 redundancies could result. In contrast a view was expressed that there were revenue-generating alternatives to charging fees and that the University should not allow itself to be forced into a position of complicity with the government's fee-income strategy.

Professor Anderson stressed that equity was one of the University's first considerations; generation of income must be transferred into scholarships, although to what extent was yet to be decided.

3. Report from the Chair of the Academic Board

The Forum noted the tabled report on the Academic Board meeting of 16 April.

In the meeting Professor Mack reported that he and Professor Lawler had written to deans asking them to look carefully at selection and eligibility criteria for programs they wish to offer on a fee-paying basis next year. Deans would need to demonstrate that they were not giving up principles of equity and access and to show how they proposed to review their entire process of admission. Senate did want to know on what basis offers of admission would be made.

The issue of what constituted 'consultation' was raised and Professor Mack reported that there would be a series of fora where groups would be consulted.

In response to questions on semesterisation and standardisation of credit points for programs, Professor Mack said that the Board would like faculties to follow its framework unless they could provide good reason to do otherwise. It was reiterated that every unit of study would have the same number of credit points irrespective of the course to which it was contributing. It was highly desirable that degrees be standardised for credit points across a year and largely this had been achieved. If the load exceeded the number of credit points for a program there would be additional HECS, as there is now, determined on a discipline rather than unit basis.

Professor Mack announced that it was the last meeting of the Forum and Academic Board where Sue Chapman would be present. On behalf of the Forum and the Board he wished her well in her forthcoming senior position in the New South Wales Public Service.

4. Report from the Chair of the Academic Forum

The Forum extended its congratulations to the recipients of the honours and distinctions as set out in the agenda papers.

The Forum made a further appointment to membership of the Forum and the Chair urged those faculties who had casual vacancies in their representation to put forward nominations to fill these vacancies.

The Chair reported that a number of faculties were debating the issue of summer schools with the aim of having something in place for January 1998. How summer schools would be constructed and their ramifications for other parts of the curriculum and the general

Members were reminded that nominations for appointment of Deputy Chairs of the Academic Board would close on 30 April, followed by election by ballot if necessary.

The Chair reported that SUPRA and the SRC were yet to forward names of three students to fill the remaining vacant positions on the Student Proctorial Panel.

The Chair announced details of a postgraduate coordinators' workshop, organised by the Graduate Studies Committee, to be held at 2 pm on Wednesday 21 May in the Professorial Board Room, and of postgraduate supervision workshops organised by the Centre for Teaching and Learning.

5. Question time

With reference to incidents surrounding the previous Senate meeting, it was suggested that if the forthcoming Senate meeting were to be broadcast into a lecture theatre, there would be no grounds for complaint. Professor Anderson said he would take this commendation to the Vice-Chancellor and Chancellor as long as a guarantee could be provided that the proceedings would not be howled down.

Concern was expressed that much of the Academic Forum's meeting time was taken up by management statements, leaving little time for the body to be a genuine forum of debate.

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

C1. Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee

The Committee met on 23 April 1997. There were present: Professor Jocalyn Lawler (Chair), Ms Su Baker, Ms Ricky Campbell-Allen, Associate Professor Lloyd Dawe, Dr Ross Gilbert, Associate Professor Christopher Gillies, Associate Professor Jill Gordon, Associate Professor Jan Horsfall, Professor Richard Johnstone, Dr Edith Lees, Associate Professor Ewan Mylecharane, Dr Greg Patmore, Associate Professor Richard Waterhouse and Mr Ross Wilson. Ms E Bergmann was in attendance.

1. Full proposal for major changes to existing awards/courses

Orange Agricultural College:

Bachelor of Business (Agricultural Commerce) (Honours)

Bachelor of Management (Honours)

The Committee resolved to **recommend** the proposal of Orange Agricultural College - to make a generic honours program available to suitable students enrolled in the College's degree programs, Bachelor of Business (Agricultural Commerce) and Bachelor of Management - to the Academic Board for approval for introduction at the start of semester 1, 1998. Resolutions of the Senate will be submitted to a later meeting.

The purpose of the proposal is to enable suitable students from the degree programs to continue on to undertake research training at postgraduate level as well as prepare for a career in research in industry.

The Committee noted that an initial proposal for approval in principle had not been submitted; following advice from the Chair of the former Standing Sub-Committee for Award/Course Approvals in 1996, the College had proceeded directly to a full proposal, for approval. While the closing date for full proposals, for introduction in 1998, was 1 June 1996, there were no implications for the UAC Handbook and therefore no impediments to the Committee considering a proposal for introduction in 1998.

that the Board agree in principle to approve the introduction of the generic honours program at Orange Agricultural College.

Note: The Chair of the Academic Board advises that the relative weightings to be assigned to the TER/tertiary results component and the STAT component will be determined shortly and forwarded to the Board.

2. Admissions matters

Faculty of Science - Proposal to change selection criteria

The Committee resolved to **recommend** the proposal to introduce new selection criteria for the degree of Bachelor of Pharmacy - to include the STAT test, to be administered by UAC - to the Academic Board for approval for introduction in 1998.

that the Board recommend that Senate approve the new selection criteria for the degree of Bachelor of Pharmacy.

3. Credit point values and nomenclature

Professor Lawler undertook to provide a paper on credit point values and nomenclature for the next meeting, based on detailed material provided by the Planning Support Office.

that the Board note the report.

4. Approval mechanisms for new courses and major changes to existing courses

The Committee noted that the working party to consider processes and procedures for undergraduate course approvals would meet shortly.

that the Board note the report.

5. Admissions

Consideration of a memorandum which was tabled and which recommended a series of amendments to the By-laws and Resolutions governing undergraduate admission and enrolment, incorporating the new nomenclature for courses and units of study, would be held over to the next meeting, and in the meantime would be circulated to Deans for comment.

that the Board note the report.

6. Evaluation of the Committee's performance

The Committee appointed a working party comprising Professor J Lawler (Chair), Associate Professor J Gordon and Mr R Gilbert, to assess its operational efficiency.

that the Board note the report.

7. Terms of Reference

At the March meeting, the Committee noted that it needed to consider its functions before coming to the Board with considered proposals about reviewing or extending its Terms of Reference and that this would be a matter for consideration at a future meeting.

that the Board note the report.

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

The Committee agreed to consider at the next meeting a memorandum from Professors Mack and Lawler seeking Deans' responses on admissions/selection procedures, with a view to provide advice to the Academic Board.

that the Board note the report.

9. Equity and Merit Scholarships

A letter from Professor Leeder - concerning the awarding of Equity and merit-based Scholarships - was referred to the committee being set up to review the 1996 Equity and Merit Scholarships process.

that the Board note the report.

10. New courses and major changes to existing awards/courses

Full proposals for a new academic program

(1) Faculty of Economics:

Bachelor of Commerce (Liberal Arts)

The Committee resolved to defer consideration of the proposal to introduce a new degree in 1998, the Bachelor of Commerce (Liberal Arts), so that it might be considered with the Bachelor of Liberal Studies at the next meeting.

(2) Faculties of Arts and Science:

Bachelor of Liberal Studies

The Committee noted that the proposal for a Bachelor of Liberal Studies had not yet been finalised, and deferred consideration to its next meeting.

that the Board note the report.

C2. Report of the Graduate Studies Committee

A. First report

The Committee met on 7 April 1997 when there were present: the Chair (Professor J R Lawrence) presiding, Ms C Davidson, Dr S Ellis, Associate Professor M Gatens, Professor J Gero, Dr M Halliwell (for Dr P McCallum), Dr M King, Associate Professor K C Kwok (for Professor Y-W Mai), Associate Professor A F Masters, Mr K Oliver, Associate Professor R Pratt, Dr R Ross and Mr C Wood. Professor G Berry was present by invitation. Miss E R Ring was in attendance.

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

During a discussion of the reports of the PhD Award Sub-Committee, the Committee noted the following advice from its Chair, Professor Berry: There seemed to be an increasing number of Faculty recommendations coming to the Sub-Committee where the comments of the most critical examiner, particularly when that examiner recommended revise and resubmit, were being disregarded without proper justification. The PhDASC expects to see a recommendation based on academic criteria related to the examiners' reports. It cannot accept a recommendation based on a "2 to 1 voting" argument or on a retrospective assessment of the examiners' relative competence.

The Committee endorsed Professor Berry's comments and agreed to report in these terms to the Board.

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

2. Proceedings of the Committee

(1) Administration of graduate candidatures

(a) PhD Award Sub-Committee

On the reports of the meetings of the PhD Award Sub-Committee held on 25 February and 18 March 1997, the Committee noted that:

Meeting held on 25 February 1997

Doctor of Philosophy

- the award of the degree had been approved, without further qualification, to two 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 24 candidates;
- one candidature had been referred back to the Faculty of Law and one candidature had been referred back to the Faculty of Nursing;
- the degree had not been awarded to one candidate in the Faculty of

Doctor of Juridical Studies

- examiners had been appointed for one candidate.

Meeting held on 18 March 1997*Doctor of Philosophy*

- the award of the degree had been approved, without further qualification, to three candidates;
- the award of the degree had been approved, subject to correction of typographical errors, to five candidates;
- the award of the degree had been approved, subject to emendations, to 11 candidates;
- one candidature had been referred back to the Faculty of Arts, two candidatures had been referred back to the Faculty of Education, and one candidature had been referred back to the Faculty of Veterinary Science;
- the degree had not been awarded to one candidate in the Faculty of Medicine and one candidate in the Faculty of Science, both of whom had been permitted to revise and re-submit; and
- examiners had been appointed for 11 candidates

Doctor of Juridical Studies

- the award of the degree had been approved, subject to emendations, to one candidate.

The Committee expressed some concern over several candidatures that appeared to have been most protracted and asked that a report be made on these at its next meeting.

Higher doctorates*Award of degree*

The Committee confirmed the action of the Chair in approving a recommendation from the Faculty of Medicine for the award of the degree to the following candidate:

Degree of Doctor of Medicine

John Francis Thompson

(2) Coursework Sub-Committee

The Committee agreed to appoint the following of its members to the new Coursework Sub-Committee. The Committee agreed that in the first instance the membership of the Sub-Committee should be confined to its own members, but that it might review this at a later date.

Dr Russell Ross (Economics) (Chair)
 Dr Susan Ellis (Graduate School of Business)
 Dr Mike King (Education)
 Dr Mary Jane Mahony (Orange Agricultural College)
 Mr Kyle Oliver (SUPRA)
 Associate Professor Rosalie Pratt (Nursing)

(3) Seminars for Supervisors of Postgraduate Students

The Committee considered a report from the Centre for Teaching and Learning on the Development Program for Postgraduate Supervisors that included the proposed program for 1997. The Committee agreed that the Working Party it had appointed (comprising the Chair of the Committee, Professor J R Lawrence, Dr L Campbell, Associate Professor A Masters, Dr R Mitchell and Mr K Oliver) commend a continuing program to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) and discuss with him its structure and content.

The Committee agreed on the importance of faculties encouraging attendance at the seminars.

(4) Workshop for Postgraduate Co-ordinators

Wednesday 21 May 1997. The meeting will clarify the role of Postgraduate Co-ordinators in respect of the recruitment of postgraduate students, the appointment of supervisors, the determination of the research topics, probationary candidatures, the examination process and appointment of examiners, disputes and appeals and the Postgraduate Studies Handbook.

The Committee noted that this meeting was aimed primarily at research-related matters and that the newly-created Coursework Studies Sub-Committee could assess whether or not such a meeting should be organised for those co-ordinating postgraduate coursework.

(5) Postgraduate coursework units of study

The Committee received an extract from the "Nomenclature" memorandum of 16 January 1997 which had been sent to Deans and Faculty Managers, and which had subsequently been included in the February Academic Board agenda. The Committee considered the section on the unit code numeric field and agreed that the following allocation of levels was inappropriate, noting that there were no programs specifically designated as "advanced Masters" and "Advanced Doctoral" and that coursework was not offered at "Postdoctoral work" level:

5 - 5th year, postgraduate unit (eg. Masters level)

6 - 6th and above year postgraduate unit (eg., advanced Masters, Doctoral)

7 - Advanced Doctoral or Postdoctoral work

The Committee agreed that:

- two year-levels (5 and 6) should be allocated for postgraduate coursework at Graduate Certificate, Graduate Diploma and Master's level; and
- one level (7) should be allocated to coursework at research degree level.

The Chair undertook to communicate this advice to the working party on the Student Information System.

(6) Electronic Publication of Theses

The Committee considered a report by Professor Berry on the UMI dissertation service and adopted his recommendation to establish a Working Party to:

- (a) advise on the desirability and feasibility of the University adopting an electronic full-text database for PhD theses; and
- (b) explore sources of funding.

The Committee agreed that the Working Party would comprise:

- (a) two members of the Graduate Studies Committee: Professor J Gero and Dr M King (Convenor of the Working Party considering the medium or form in which theses are presented);
- (b) Professor G Berry;
- (c) a member from the University Library;
- (d) a member from the University IT Committee; and
- (e) a postgraduate student representative.

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

The Committee noted that ten of the 19 faculties/colleges/boards of studies had yet to forward their 1996 reports on postgraduate teaching and reviews of postgraduate coursework and agreed that its members would remind their colleagues about the importance of these reports being forwarded as a matter of urgency.

(8) Postgraduate Studies Handbook

The Chair reported that while the Postgraduate Studies Handbook was being printed, and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Planning and Resources) had determined that it should be available as a free publication for research students, in the spirit of the U2000 project. There were still problems associated with its distribution after publication, however. He was addressing this matter and hoped that it would reach a satisfactory conclusion.

(9) Postgraduate Appeal

The Chair reported on the result of an appeal by an overseas PhD student. In conjunction with other information, the Appeals Committee requested that the particular potential problems of overseas research candidates be brought to the attention of faculties, schools and departments who accept such students. An appropriate report is being prepared.

(10) Membership of the Teaching and Learning Committee

The Chair reported that there was provision for membership of the Teaching and Learning Committee by a member of the Graduate Studies Committee, nominated by the Chair, and that he was filling that role until such time as the new Deputy Chairs of the Board were elected.

(11) Work in progress

The Committee noted that work on the following matters was in progress:

- (a) Structure of the initial year of the PhD
- (b) Medium or form in which theses are presented

that the Board note the report.

B. Second report

The agenda for the meeting scheduled to be held on 28 April 1997 was considered by circulation, and the Committee reports as follows:

Proceedings of the Committee**1. Administration of graduate candidatures****PhD Award Sub-Committee**

On the report of the meetings of the PhD Award Sub-Committee held on 15 April 1997, the Committee noted that:

Doctor of Philosophy

- the award of the degree had been approved, without further qualification, to six candidates;
- the award of the degree had been approved, subject to correction of typographical errors, to four candidates;
- the award of the degree had been approved, subject to emendations, to 11 candidates;
- the reports of the examiners of a candidate in the Faculty of Education were referred to the other examiners;
- a fourth examiner who was to act as an assessor was appointed for a candidate in the Faculty of Medicine;
- the degree had not been awarded to one candidate in the Faculty of Education who had been permitted to revise and re-submit; and
- examiners had been appointed for 36 candidates.

2. Postgraduate Coordinators' Workshop

The Committee noted that Associate Professor Masters, who was co-ordinating the Workshop for Postgraduate Co-ordinators, had sent the following information to Heads of Department:

Postgraduate Coordinators' Workshop

2:00 PM Wednesday 21 May, Professorial Board Room

As reported to the Wednesday 16 April meeting of the Academic Board, the Graduate Studies Committee has organised a Workshop for Postgraduate Coordinators, to be held at 2:00 PM on Wednesday 21 May in the Professorial Board Room.

It is intended that the workshop cover such issues as the role of the Postgraduate Coordinator, the Postgraduate Handbook, the recruitment of candidates, the appointment

progress, the examination process, international students, disputes and appeals and the perspective(s) of postgraduate students.

The Graduate Studies Committee recognises that whilst a group of experienced people assumed the initial roles of Postgraduate Coordinators when the position was established a few years ago; with time, the Postgraduate Coordinators and the requirements upon them had changed.

Could Heads please bring this workshop to the attention of the Postgraduate Coordinator in their Department or School.

Tony Masters
On behalf of the Graduate Studies Committee

that the Board note the report.

C3. Report of the Teaching and Learning Committee

First Report

The Teaching and Learning Committee met on 3 April 1997 when there were present: Professor A Sefton (Chair), Professors R Johnstone and J Lawrence, Associate Professor J Lublin and Mr K Oliver. In attendance: Ms N Downey.

1. Annual Reports of Faculty Teaching Committees

Faculties had been requested to submit their Teaching Committee Annual Reports by 17 March 1997. Only eight of those reports had been received at the time of this meeting.

The Committee commented on the variable quality of the reports and noted in particular that:

- Further discussion on the purpose of the reports was necessary;
- Some questions were probably not clearly expressed with the result that the information provided was not always sufficiently focused on innovations and initiatives within faculties.
- Further information/clarification would be requested from some faculties.

The Committee agreed that it would prepare a summary report for the Academic Board once all reports had been received, with suggestions for possible future improvements in the reports.

The form and content of the summary report that would be forwarded to the Academic Board and the Senate was discussed. It was agreed that it should:

- Be shorter than that presented in 1996, with specific areas highlighted rather than giving detailed information about every faculty;
- Identify good practice;
- Indicate the process that involved the Committee in interaction with faculties.

The Committee discussed the extent to which the model of rewarding research performance could be transferred to teaching performance. In particular, it was suggested that the University might consider ways in which teaching could be rewarded on a faculty and departmental level rather than an individual basis. It was noted that the climate for academic staff had changed in recent years and that they recognised that there were rewards to be gained from teaching excellence.

One of the priority areas under review by the Committee is Graduate Students' Teaching Loads and the connection between this and the general issue of teaching excellence was recognised. First year teaching was, for instance, frequently undertaken by the most junior staff or by graduate students.

2. Priority Teaching Areas

(1) Distance Education/Flexible Learning

The Committee noted a brief summary of the DEETYA Evaluations and Investigations Program Report entitled 'Flexibility, Technology and Academics' Practices'.

It was suggested that flexible learning might be an appropriate issue for discussion at a future Vice-Chancellor's Forum on Teaching. It was pointed out, however, that it was important to define 'flexible learning' since it had a range of meanings. In this University it related particularly to the use of technology to enhance and enrich our ways of teaching. The Committee also discussed the ways in which it might assist in the promulgation of information relating to new and innovative ways of teaching.

(2) Graduate Students' Teaching Loads

Mr Oliver informed the Committee that he was about to conduct a survey of graduate students on teaching loads.

(3) Progress was also reported action taken in relation to:

- Revision of 'Generic Attributes of Graduates'
- Upgrading of the Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers
- Innovations in Teaching.

3. Policy review

(1) Examination and Assessment

Professor Sefton reported that a general framework for consolidated and revised policy in this area would be:

Broad overview of Teaching and Learning, including Statement on the Management of Teaching Activities and Codes of Practice

Specific Guidelines on Assessment (to be complemented by guidelines on teaching)

Individual Policy documents such as those developed by the EARS committee, which would be cross-referenced to the Guidelines.

(2) Statement on the Management of Teaching Activities

It was noted that changes needed to be made to this document to reflect, among other things, the changed responsibilities of faculty teaching committees. It would be a useful overarching document for all teaching and assessment policies.

that , items 1 to 3, the Board note the report.

Second Report

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

1. Annual Reports of Faculty Teaching Committees

Most reports had now been received and the Committee would prepare a consolidated report for the June meeting of the Academic Board. The report would highlight good practice.

The Committee agreed that in future reports it should focus on degree programs rather than faculties.

that the Board note the report.

2. Priority Teaching Areas

(1) Generic Attributes of Graduates

The Committee agreed **to recommend** to the Academic Board the adoption of the following revised Generic Attributes of Graduates (changes to existing document underlined):

GENERIC ATTRIBUTES OF GRADUATES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

As a result of completing any undergraduate degree course at the University of Sydney graduates will be more employable, more able to cope with change and more developed as people. In specific terms, graduates of any Faculty, Board of Studies or College of the University should have:

1. Knowledge skills

Graduates should

- (a) have a body of knowledge in the field(s) studied;
- (b) be able to apply theory to practice in familiar and unfamiliar situations;
- (c) be able to identify, access, organise and communicate knowledge in both written and oral English;
- (d) have an appreciation of the requirements and characteristics of scholarship and research; and
- (e) have the ability to use appropriate technologies in furthering all of the above.

2. Thinking skills

Graduates should

- (a) be able to exercise critical judgement;
- (b) be capable of rigorous and independent thinking;
- (c) be able to account for their decisions;
- (d) be realistic self evaluators;
- (e) adopt a problem solving approach; and
- (f) be creative and imaginative thinkers.

3. Personal skills

Graduates should have

- (a) the capacity for and a commitment to life-long learning;
- (b) the ability to plan and achieve goals in both the personal and the professional sphere; and
- (c) the ability to work with others.

4. Personal attributes

Graduates should

- (a) strive for tolerance and integrity; and
- (b) acknowledge their personal responsibility for
 - (i) their own value judgements; and
 - (ii) their ethical behaviour towards others.

5. Practical skills

Graduates should

- (a) be able to use information technology for professional and personal development;
and, where, appropriate, be able to:
- (b) collect, correlate, display, analyse and report observations;
- (c) apply experimentally-obtained results to new situations;
- (d) test hypotheses experimentally; and
- (e) apply technical skills appropriate to their discipline.

that the Board adopt the revised statement on the Generic Attributes of Graduates of the University of Sydney, as recommended.

(2) Teaching and Learning Committee as Broker

(a) Image Database

One of the unmet needs of staff was the provision of an image database. Developments were occurring in some areas and it was important to update staff skills as well as share knowledge and skills already acquired. This should be done in conjunction with the Centre for Teaching and Learning.

(b) Flexible Learning/Distance Education

Developments in some areas, including the Faculty of Health Sciences and Orange Agricultural College were noted. It was agreed that this should be included as a topic for the next Vice-Chancellor's Forum on Teaching.

(c) CUTSD Grants

The Committee noted the need for it to develop strategies to assist staff in the next round of CUTSD (Committee for University Teaching and Staff Development) grants.

that the Board note the report.

C4. Report of the Research Committee

The Committee met on 10 April 1997 when there were present: Professor D Cockayne, Deputy Chair Academic Board (Presiding Member), Professor G J Gill, Professor R I Tanner, Professor J R Booker, Professor D B Melrose, Associate Professor D Cook, Associate Professor S R Garton, Dr J Lingard, and Mr K Oliver. In Attendance: Professor L Field, Dr A Reynolds, Dr C Baxter, Mr P Cook, Ms M Robb.

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

Professor Cockayne noted that, as the recommendation to the Academic Board from the last meeting of the Research Committee in relation to conditions to be provided to ARC and NHMRC Research Fellows included a budgetary implication (ie the provision of start-up grants), if the recommendation was approved by the Board it would need to be referred to the Vice-Chancellor. The Committee agreed that Professor Cockayne should discuss with the Chair of the Academic Board the possibility of separating out that part of the recommendation relating to the start-up grant and putting it separately to the Board at its meeting on 16 April.

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

2. Taxation Status of Postgraduate Scholarships

Mr Oliver expressed concern that, while an interim 1994 ruling of the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) in relation to the taxation status of postgraduate scholarships had to date not been implemented, it is believed that the Federal Treasurer has included consideration of this issue in broader proposed reforms of the taxation status of universities as part of a taxation package for consideration for inclusion in the May budget.

There was uncertainty about the likely effect if the 1994 ATO ruling was implemented in full, but it was likely that APA (Industry), RIRDC and a range of industry funded scholarships might be then taxable.

The Committee indicated that it shared Mr Oliver's concern about the likely effect of such a policy when it was already becoming difficult in some disciplines to convince students to take up postgraduate studies with the low level of scholarship income compared to the salaries such students could attract. This was of particular concern in Sydney with its high cost of living.

Mr Oliver indicated that SUPRA was likely to be mounting a campaign in an attempt to convince the government not to extend the current taxation status of scholarships.

Professor Tanner indicated that this would be an item at the AVCC Standing Committee for Research and that he would ensure the Committee's concerns were presented.

that the Board note the report.

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

Dr Lingard reminded the Committee that, in accordance with the AVCC Guidelines for the Responsible Practice in Research, Heads of Departments/Schools were required to hold, for all publications of their staff, a completed proforma indicating authorship, information about the location of data, and the published manuscript including all revisions. She explained that as a consequence, a large amount of paper was now accumulating to meet this requirement.

The Committee was reminded that, as part of the Heads of Departments/Schools responsibility in relation to the annual DEETYA Publications Return, they had to both sight each publication reported and also be able to produce the publication at the time of audit of the Return by DEETYA.

The Committee agreed **to recommend** to the Academic Board that while Heads should collect both the proforma and the final manuscript submitted for publication, they need not keep all revisions. It was further agreed that once the manuscript was published, a copy of the published manuscript should be kept on file in place of the version submitted for publication.

that the Board agree:

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

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

Professor Tanner again reminded the Committee to do whatever it could to encourage staff to provide 'expressions of interest' to the Research and Scholarships Office in relation to DEETYA/ARC Research Infrastructure (Equipment and Facilities) Grant applications as soon as possible.

He indicated that he had recently sent another memorandum to Heads of Departments/Schools reminding them of University policy in relation to the charging of overheads on competitive research, contract research and consultancies, and reminding them that only Dr Baxter and Mr Cook had Senate delegation to sign contracts in relation to research and consultancies.

Professor Tanner said that he had met with Deans and had subsequently written to them in relation to a proposal to provide limited additional financial support to National Competitive Grant holders who may in 1997 have difficulty in meeting salary increases as a result of enterprise bargaining for staff employed on grants. He also said he had met with the Director of Industrial Relations, Ms P Croxon, to express the concern of the Research Committee for the implications of the recent decision by the Industrial and Arbitration Commission in relation to severance payments for staff on contracts and was assured that plans were in place to assist College personnel teams in dealing with this.

Professor Tanner had met with Professors Gill, Garton, Hume and Cook to examine issues relating to research that might be included in the University's submission to the West Review of Higher Education.

He also explained that he, along with a range of staff, had met representatives of the West Review on 1 April. His impression was that the representatives were not particularly interested at this stage in the mechanisms and infrastructure for research.

5. Report from the Director, Business Liaison Office.

Dr Baxter indicated that she was currently completing documentation in relation to the 'Registered Research Agency' status of the University and that this had reinforced for her the need for the University to ensure it charged outside organisations at full cost recovery (ie including all overheads) for research and consultancy.

She said that the Business Liaison Office (BLO) was increasing the number of Departmental visits to try to identify opportunities for staff interested in industry collaboration and commercialisation of research. The BLO would be holding two seminars in May, one on the 'incubator' at the Australia Technology Park, and another on patenting.

that the Board note the report.

6. Report from the Director, Research Development

Ms Robb reported she was assisting SPIRT scheme (old ARC Collaborative grants) applicants and assisting in sorting out conflict in relation to a particular grant.

that the Board note the report.

7. Report of the Director, Research and Scholarships Office

Mr Cook reported that 216 Overseas Conference Travel Grant Scheme (OCTG) and 61 University Research Grant (URG) Scheme applications had been received in the recent round. The URG selection committee will meet in early May and the OCTG Committee on 21 April to consider applications.

The Human Ethics Committee scheduled for 14 April had had to be postponed to 21 April due to disruption in the Main Quadrangle by a student meeting on 14 April.

University of Sydney ARC Small Grant Panel Chairs had met recently and revised the documents relating to advice and instructions to applicants in relation to ARC Small Grant applications for 1998, in particular eligibility criteria.

Since the last meeting of the Research Committee, the Minister, Senator Vanstone, had reduced to 4 from 22, the categories of publications to be reported to DEETYA in the annual research publications return. These four categories are:

- Authored Research Books
- Book Chapters (in authored research books)
- Articles in Scholarly Journals
- Refereed Conference Publications

All Heads of Departments/Schools and Departmental contact officers had been informed. The University would still collect an additional two categories for its own purposes, namely 'major written or recorded works' and 'individual exhibition of original work'. Departments can choose to collect data in all 22 former categories but only the DEETYA designated four categories would be reported to DEETYA and the University required six categories used internally.

As the resubmission by Departments of the 1996 DEETYA Publication Return was now a month beyond the University internal closing date, no further entries would be accepted after Friday 11 April. An audit of this return would commence in the week of 14 April. The 1997 DEETYA Publication Return internal closing date was 9 April, and at that time it appeared that Departments had only completed about 50% of the exercise. Departments will be expected to complete this exercise soon as it is planned to conduct an audit of it in the near future. The 1997 DEETYA Financial Return internal closing date has been extended to 2 May due to initial problems in obtaining financial data from the Financial Services Department. This return will be audited by the NSW Auditor General in May.

that the Board note the report.

8. Eligibility Criteria for ARC Small Grants

Professor Field raised a concern with the recently revised (but not yet promulgated)

they would have an appointment at the University for the period of the grant being applied for. The Committee agreed that such staff should be eligible to make application, but that the award of a grant only proceed once their appointment for the period of the grant was able to be confirmed. Secondly, that it should be made clearer that the only research-only staff eligible to apply should be those categories of ARC and NHMRC Fellows defined by the Research Committee at its meeting of 13 March 1997 and put to the Academic Board on 16 April 1997 as part of a recommendation from the Research Committee in relation to conditions to be provided to ARC and NHMRC Fellows. The Committee agreed to this proposal.

The Research Committee also indicated that additional wording should be included to the effect that the Research Committee would periodically review the categories of fellows eligible whenever it is deemed appropriate after consultation with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research).

Concern was expressed about the varying appointment procedures between College (and the former Group) Personnel teams in relation to the appointment of research only staff, in particular, the use of the title 'Research Fellow.' It was noted that some were specifically appointed as Level A or B academic staff, and some as general staff with salary levels aligned with academic salary scales for Level A or B academic staff. The Research Committee indicated it might choose to examine this issue at a future meeting.

that the Board note the report.

C5. Report of the Library and Information Technology Committee

The Committee met on Monday 28 April 1997 in the Senate Room, when there were present: Professor R McPhedran (presiding), the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic Support) Professor R Johnstone, Ms J Campbell (Acting Librarian), Associate Professor E Cornell, Professor M Harris, Associate Professor N Newbigin, and Professor J Rosenberg. Mr P J Nicolarakis. Mr Tim Robinson was in attendance.

1. Membership of Reference Groups

Membership of both the Library and IT Reference Groups is to be finalised.

2. Report from the Chair of the Library Reference Group

The Library Reference Group held its first meeting at which it received a report from the University Librarian concerning the 1997 Library budget. Other matters related to the Metropolitan Universities Reciprocal Borrowing Scheme, progress on the integration of College libraries, and new IT developments including those for the graduate medical program. The Group also considered the use of University facilities by members of the other universities, the combined science libraries and a paper on electronic publishing prepared by Dr Radford.

3. Report from the Chair of the IT Reference Group

The Group determined items for future agenda. The matter of charging for Internet access within the University received considerable attention. Professor Rosenberg and Dr Carlile are to prepare a discussion document.

4. Generic Attributes of Graduates of the University of Sydney

Professors Lublin and McPhedran had proposed some amendments to the document. Following discussion a revised document was produced for endorsement by the Teaching and Learning Committee prior to submission to the Academic Board.

Note: *The Teaching and Learning Committee has endorsed the revised statement. See agenda item C3.*

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

Professor McPhedran undertook to discuss the matter with the Chair of the Academic Board.

6. Provision of IT Accounts for Fellows of Senate

The desirability of enabling all Fellows of Senate to have Internet access was recognised. Training and hardware implications were recognised. A survey of Fellows is to be undertaken to determine their needs.

7. Copyright and the WWW

Following discussion on the copyright implications of electronic dissemination of intellectual property, the desirability of the production of guidelines for staff and students on such matters was raised. The item will be further considered at future meetings of the Committee.

that, items 1 to 7, the Board note the report.

C6. Report of the Academic Staffing Committee

The Committee met on 23 April 1997. There were present: Professor R Pesman (Chair), Professor D Anderson, Associate Professor R Arnold, Professor L Burgess, Associate Professor D Davey, Professor L Field and Dr P Whiting; Ms P Croxon, Ms J Deitch and Mr J Upcroft were in attendance.

1. Modes of Employment

Ms P Croxon provided a general report to the Committee on the various modes of employment available to the university.

2. Promotions Appeals

The issue of appeals in the promotion process and specifically, the current document relating to appeals, were discussed. The Committee will discuss this issue further and progress will be reported to the Academic Board.

3. Policy Document - Support and Progression of Academic Staff

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

4. Criteria for Promotion relating to Professional Service

The issue of criteria for promotion relating to professional service was discussed. The Committee will discuss this issue further and progress will be reported to the Academic Board.

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

Selection into fee paying undergraduate courses in 1998

Memorandum to: Deans, Directors and College Principals

15 April 1997

Deans will have by now seen the background paper on fees presented to Senate on 7 April. We refer in particular to section 4.2 of that document, in which a procedure is proposed for selection of (specifically, school-leaver) applicants into fee paying undergraduate courses in 1998.

In summary form, the essence of the proposal is to ask faculties to distinguish between eligibility criteria for entry into a course, and a selection procedure employed in order to determine offers of places, whether these be based upon HECS-liable admission (under any admissions procedure, eg, Special Admission) or fee-based admission.

We remind deans that the policy on admissions was broadened this year by allowing faculties to include consideration of criteria other than the TER when looking at applications around a 'notional TER cutoff', and we shall be addressing this in more detail below. This new policy also assisted in proposing, in section 4.2, that faculties might set an additional TER point, namely a TER at or above which faculties would be prepared to make an offer based solely on the TER to any eligible school-leaver applicant. (We use 'eligible' to indicate that, if current admission criteria specify a prerequisite or other component of selection (such as an audition/interview/ presentation of work) in addition to a TER or as alternative to it, then it is assumed that these continue to apply to all applicants and will be used equitably by faculties in making offers, irrespective of mode of entry.)

Senate, in approving the proposal to admit some fee-paying applicants in 1998, made it very clear that it expected to receive from the Academic Board explicit advice on the selection procedures that faculties wishing to admit such applicants propose to use for ALL applicants into each course open to fee-paying applicants. Advice from the Academic Board to Senate on admissions/selection procedures will be based upon advice provided to the Board from its Undergraduate Studies Committee, which has responsibility for providing policy advice on all matters relating to admission.

Our purpose in writing to you now is to ask you to consider exactly how your faculty proposes to select students for admission into those courses you expect to offer to prospective fee-paying applicants in 1998. In making your decisions on which courses so to offer, we assume you will have obtained information from the PSO on evidence for demand based on UAC data for the past few years, but our concern is exclusively in relation to selection. Specifically, we ask you to address the following matters (and any others we may have missed but which you advise are relevant to a course in your faculty) and provide preliminary advice, by fax or email, to Professor Lawler, Chair of USC, by **FRIDAY, 9 May**. The fax and email addresses given below are those of the Academic Board Office and should be used for your responses. Also, if you seek clarification of any aspect of this memo, then use the same fax/email addresses to send in such a request.

TO ASSIST YOU IN CONSIDERING THE REQUESTS BELOW, WE ATTACH TO THIS MEMO A COPY OF INFORMATION ON 1998 COURSES IN OUR UNDERGRADUATE PROSPECTUS.

1. Do you intend to offer any course (single/combined/double) as available to fee-paying applicants in 1998? If NO, please advise asap. If YES, please indicate exactly which courses will be so offered.
2. For each such course, and based on advice to you if yours is the only faculty involved, but based on joint advice and a joint response if two or more faculties are involved:
 - a) What is the TER below which you would not wish to make any offers to school-leavers (unless there are extenuating circumstances as may arise, eg in cases of educational disadvantage)?
 - b) What is the TER at or above which you are prepared to make an offer based solely on the TER? (If possible here, go to a full percent TER such as 98 85 75 etc. This

one you set, depending upon quality and quantity of demand from school-leaver applicants.)

3. If you are able to meet your entire quota for all types of applicants at a cutoff equal to or above the TER set in 2. above (assuming equivalence for tertiary record applicants etc), then all offers to all types of applicants for such a course will be based on a straight ranking based on this TER plus, where relevant, any other advised selection criteria for entry into that course. (The use of a TER for, eg, Broadway applicants, would also suffice, if their TER was at or above the above set figure.) However, in many cases, we would expect that a 'notional TER cutoff' for your normal entry quota of applicants, based say on 1996/7 admissions data, will be at a rank somewhere between the two ranks you have set in 1. and 2. above.

Given this, and given the potential for you to exercise greater flexibility in selection in 1997 for applicants in a band around the 'notional TER cutoff', we ask you to consider whether or not you would wish to include additional factors into selection, for applicants (irrespective of their proposed mode of admission) in a band around the expected TER cutoff. We note that, if you did propose to do so in 1998, then, in our view, the only factors that could legitimately be considered would be those related either to 'assumed knowledge' criteria as detailed in the UAC guide for 1998 admissions, OR new factors such as an additional test offered to a band of applicants (this could only be done once HSC/TER results were known to school-leaver applicants in 1998) OR perhaps by an interview procedure applied to a band of applicants around the notional cutoff. We state this because we do not believe it would be fair to current HSC students to impose at this stage in Year 12, any additional selection factors that might have influenced their choices of subject for the HSC, or their study plans for the HSC.

With sufficient advance notice, possible other factors could be developed and applied in later years.

If you do intend to consider such additional factors, then we would suggest that it may be necessary to consider eligible applicants in a band up to 4-5 TER ranks below your notional cutoff and up to a similar sized band above the cutoff, unless you expect your notional TER cutoff to be 95 or higher, where a smaller upper band could be used.

NOTE THAT EXISTING UNIVERSITY POLICY IN RELATION TO ADMISSION CRITERIA, SELECTION PROCEDURES AND EQUITY AND MERIT PRINCIPLES WILL APPLY TO THE MORE GENERAL SITUATION ENVISAGED IN 1998 AND LATER YEARS, EXCEPT WHERE CHANGES IN PROCEDURE, COMPATIBLE WITH THESE PRINCIPLES, ARE ADOPTED BY SENATE ON THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD.

4. Next, we ask you to advise on how you wish to select non-school leaver applicants into the first year of your possibly fee-paying u/g courses in 1998, so as to demonstrate that the processes used for these are equitable when compared with those you propose to use for TER-based applicants, again, independently of mode of entry (ie, HECS-based or fee-paying).
5. Next, we ask if you intend to offer any fee-paying places with advanced standing into the second year of a course? We assume here that criteria for admission are exactly as for currently admitted applicants with advanced standing and that NO dilution of these criteria will apply. We therefore expect your advice to relate to procedures for ranking ALL eligible applicants for such entry.
6. Finally, we ask that those faculties with a stand-alone Honours year advise us if they already admit directly to that year graduates/graduands from other courses with appropriate qualifications, and if so, if they intend to extend that possibility to prospective fee-paying applicants. If so, then please again confirm that a merit based ranking will apply to all such applicants, with NO diminution of existing criteria.

The Undergraduate Studies Committee will draft guidelines covering the matters above fairly soon after receiving your responses. these will be circulated for comment prior to the Committee producing recommendations to the Academic Board covering both policy and guidelines and

As a separate matter, and one upon which the Board would wish to be advised at a later date, after fees and fee distribution procedures have been developed, we ask you to advise the Board as to the use of faculty or departmental income derived from fees for the provision of additional equity or merit based scholarships in later years, available to all students.

John Mack and Jocalyn Lawler.

Fax number for response is (02) 93513572

Email address for response is: mpoynter@postbox.usyd.edu.au

Please head your response -

ADVICE RE MEMO OF 15/4/97 ON SELECTION PROCEDURES IN 1998.

GUIDELINES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT AND VARIATION OF AWARDS, PRIZES AND SCHOLARSHIPS

1 TYPES OF AWARD

- 1.1 Scholarship with Stipend**
 - 1.1.1 ARC/NHMRC/Other Government Funds
 - 1.1.2 University Research Grants
 - 1.1.3 Sydney University Postgraduate Scholarships (SUPS)
 - 1.1.4 Department-funded extensions to existing scholarship holders
- 1.2 Supplementary Scholarship**
- 1.3 Grant-in-aid**
- 1.4 Travelling Scholarship**
- 1.5 Prize**
- 1.6 Undergraduate Scholarship**
- 1.7 Bursary**

2 GUIDELINES AND REQUIREMENTS

- 2.1 University Guidelines**
 - 2.1.1 General conditions of award
 - 2.1.2 Guidelines for setting up 'non-established' postgraduate scholarships
- 2.2 Advertising**
- 2.3 Scholarships and Taxation**
- 2.4 Number of Scholarships which May be Held**

3 PROCEDURES FOR CREATING AN 'ESTABLISHED' AWARD AND MODIFYING EXISTING AWARDS

- 3.1 Drafting of a Proposal for a New Award or for Modification to an Existing Award**
 - 3.1.1 Proposal to establish a new award
 - 3.1.2 Conditions of award
- 3.2 Approval by Faculty**
- 3.3 Approval by Research and Scholarships Office under Delegated Authority of the Academic Board**
- 3.4 Setting up New Account Codes**
- 3.5 Calendar Entry**

4 PROCEDURES FOR CREATING A 'NON-ESTABLISHED' AWARD

- 4.1 Proposal to Create a 'Non-Established' Postgraduate Scholarship**

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A NEW AWARD

APPENDIX 2: SAMPLE CONDITIONS OF AN ESTABLISHED AWARD

APPENDIX 3: PROPOSAL TO CREATE A NON-ESTABLISHED POSTGRADUATE SCHOLARSHIP

APPENDIX 4: SAMPLE ADVERTISEMENT

APPENDIX 5: CONDITIONS OF AWARD: AUSTRALIAN POSTGRADUATE AWARD

APPENDIX 6: CONDITIONS OF AWARD: UNIVERSITY POSTGRADUATE AWARD

APPENDIX 7: CONDITIONS OF AWARD: SYDNEY UNIVERSITY POSTGRADUATE SCHOLARSHIPS

GUIDELINES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT AND VARIATION OF AWARDS, PRIZES AND SCHOLARSHIPS

In the Report of the Review of the Research and Scholarships Office in 1995, it was recommended that awards, prizes and scholarships (hereafter referred to as awards) which are specific to a Faculty, School or Department would be most efficiently and effectively administered by that responsibility unit.

The accounts for such awards lie within the 'responsibility centre' of the Faculty, School or Department, and the selection for the awards is often done at that level or would be better done at that level. Following the selection process, a considerable amount of time is currently spent by Faculties/Schools/Departments communicating results of selection committees to the Research and Scholarships Office to enable offer letters to be produced and to arrange for payment of awards. It has been agreed that if an equal amount of time were spent advising applicants directly of the results of their applications and arranging payment directly with Group Accounts/Personnel Teams as required, it would:

- benefit both students and Faculties/Schools/Departments in terms of speed of response,
- reduce the risk of error, and
- produce a much more localised and personalised service to individual award recipients.

A proposal to implement this recommendation has been widely supported by the University and received Academic Board approval in October 1996.

This document outlines the University's requirements and the processes which should be followed for establishing new awards (*ie* scholarships, prizes and bursaries) or varying the terms and conditions of existing awards within the University. The document entitled *The Administration of Awards, Scholarships and Prizes* explains the administrative procedures involved in the advertisement, selection and payment of the award once it has been established.

The procedures will depend upon whether the award is to be offered on an ongoing basis (*ie* an 'established' award which will be included in the University Calendar) or whether it is a 'one-off' (*ie* non-established) award which is established for a limited period using University funds or funds obtained from an external source.

This document details:

- The University guidelines and requirements for awards
- The types of award
- The procedures for creating an award and modifying existing awards

Particular attention should be paid to the sections on procedures for creating and modifying awards. You will be aware that the Awards Committee no longer exists under the new structure of the Academic Board. Particular attention should be paid to paragraph 3.3 of this document which outlines the new division of responsibility here.

The document *Administration of Awards, Scholarships and Prizes* details the administrative processes involved.

1 TYPES OF AWARD

Awards are typically funded from:

Bequests
 Industry Donations
 Personal Donations
 Departmental/School/Faculty/University funding
 ARC Large Grants
 NHMRC Grants

Where awards are funded by bequests, the Development Office of the University of Sydney advises Senate, and accepts the bequest on the advice of Senate. Details of the bequest will then be forwarded to the Department/Faculty concerned.

Where the funding is provided by industry, the Faculty/Department should draw up the terms of

agreement about intellectual property is involved, the Department/Faculty should liaise with the Business Liaison Office.

If scholarships are funded by Research grants, attention should be paid to the terms and conditions of the grant. Advice may be sought from the Research Office if the terms of the grant are unclear.

1.1 Scholarship with Stipend

Scholarships with stipend provide a living allowance to students. The award may include a relocation allowance, maintenance allowance, thesis allowance, conference travel allowance, sick leave and maternity leave. These scholarships are often set up to provide some or all benefits in line with Australian Postgraduate Awards (APA - Conditions of Award included in Appendix 9) which are indexed annually by DEETYA.

1.1.1 ARC/NHMRC/Other Government Funds

When it is proposed to offer a scholarship using grant funds from ARC, NHMRC, or other government funds the stipend should be set at or above the level of the APA (eg \$15,637 in 1997). The payment of thesis and maintenance allowances is optional. Scholarships funded from ARC grants commencing after 1996 have a maximum tenure of three years. A six month extension may be offered only where this extension is to be funded from other sources. At all times, the scholarship must be established in accordance with the conditions as set out in the offer of grant from the granting body. Any proposed variation must be negotiated with the granting body.

1.1.2 University Research Grants

When it is proposed to offer a scholarship using funding from University of Sydney Research Grants, permission must first be obtained from the selection committee for the University of Sydney Research Grants, through the Research Office.

1.1.3 Sydney University Postgraduate Scholarships (SUPS)

In November 1992, the Academic Board agreed that Sydney University Postgraduate Scholarships (Conditions of Award included in Appendix 11) may be established in Departments which choose to support postgraduate research in this way. The Scholarships are offered through the Department which clears the use the funds necessary with College Administration.

SUPS are administered by the Department and may be advertised at the same time as APAs. Departments may elect to consider APA applicants for SUPS. Applicants are therefore ranked for APAs and those in the appropriate fields who have been unsuccessful in obtaining APAs/UPAs may be offered a SUPS.

1.1.4 Department-funded extensions to existing scholarship holders

Additional funding may be provided for short periods of time to allow scholarship holders extra time to complete their degree. These awards require the approval of the Head of Department and usually do not need to be advertised. The Scholarships Office should be consulted when consideration is being given to setting up such an award.

1.2 Supplementary Scholarship

Supplementary awards, commonly called a 'top-up', provide an additional allowance to assist with living expenses to existing scholarship holders and generally have the same tenure (and extensions) as the main scholarship.

1.3 Grant-in-aid

Grants-in-aid are awarded as a one-off payment and are designed to provide supplementary living allowances, travel grants or some other kinds of financial support as deemed appropriate by the selection committee unless otherwise stated in the conditions.

The generic conditions state that applicants must be:

- (a) enrolled in a higher degree at the University of Sydney; and
- (b) citizens or permanent residents of Australia.

and the more general awards which are determined by the Academic Board are subsequently allocated with a view to maximising the use of available resources.

1.4 Travelling Scholarship

The following resolutions in regard to the award of travelling scholarships were adopted in 1982 by the Senate:

- (a) That all candidates for travelling scholarships shall be graduates or graduands of the University of Sydney who are of not more than four years' standing from qualifying for the first degree appropriate to the proposed course of study overseas.
- (b) That all candidates shall be citizens or permanent residents of Australia.
- (c) That candidates who have previously held awards designed to promote study overseas and which offer similar benefits to travelling scholarships shall be ineligible for consideration, unless exceptional circumstances apply.
- (d) That the scholarships shall normally be awarded to enable scholars to undertake studies or research in some place or places overseas approved by the Academic Board.
- (e) That the scholarships shall not normally be held for longer than one year unless the holder is enrolled for a higher degree. A scholarship shall not be renewed for a third year unless the holder is a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and renewal shall be subject to satisfactory progress.

In November 1982 the Academic Board adopted a resolution whereby *Calendar* entries for travelling scholarships highlight only those conditions of named travelling scholarships that are at variance with the conditions of University of Sydney Postgraduate Research Travelling Scholarships.

1.5 Prize

Prizes may take the form of money, a medal or an item (eg a book.). They are usually awarded either on examination results or on general proficiency in a certain area of a course upon the recommendation of the Head of Department. Some prizes are awarded upon the outcome of a 'competition' in which applicants submit an application (eg prize essay compositions).

1.6 Undergraduate Scholarship

Undergraduate scholarships rarely offer a full living allowance. Most awards are based on HSC results or on University examination results although there are a few prestigious ones for which there are application procedures.

1.7 Bursary

The bursaries at the disposal of the University have principally been created by private foundations. The capital sums are held in perpetuity with the bursary funded from the income from interest on the capital. The value of such bursaries currently ranges from \$100 to \$1000.

As stated in the University Calendar, the conditions under which the bursaries are awarded are:

- (a) That the Vice-Chancellor shall have received satisfactory assurance that the candidate's own means, and those of his or her parents, guardians, 'or other friends' (as expressed in some of the foundations), are insufficient to enable him or her to bear the cost of attending the University without the assistance of a bursary.
- (b) The bursaries shall be awarded from year to year on academic merit and the holder shall be diligent and of good conduct.
- (c) The bursary or bursaries shall normally be awarded for an undergraduate degree course.

2 GUIDELINES AND REQUIREMENTS

It is the responsibility of the proposer of the award (Dean or Head of Department/School as explained later in this document) to ensure that the award meets the requirements which govern the award of scholarships and prizes within the University of Sydney, and to ensure that the procedures set out in this document for the establishment, variation and administration of the award are followed. The conditions of awards which are funded from bequests must always remain

are sought, it is likely that the approval of the Attorney General will be required. This process usually takes a minimum of six months.

2.1 University Guidelines

2.1.1 General conditions of all awards

These guidelines must be adhered to when setting up any award in the University.

According to the University of Sydney Statutes, (1994-95, p459 Establishment and Award of Scholarships and Prizes):

- (a) The Academic Board shall take the following factors into account when considering offers to establish awards:
 1. that the award observes the spirit of anti-discrimination legislation;
 2. that the University administers the award, including selection of the successful applicant;
 3. that the conditions of award are determined by the University within the donor's general terms of reference;
 4. that a postgraduate scholarship or fellowship be tenable for a sufficient period of time to enable a holder to make substantial progress towards the degree in which the holder is enrolled;
 5. that continuance of a prize, scholarship or fellowship is assured for a minimum period of time;
 6. that the value of a postgraduate scholarship or fellowship which is intended to provide a living allowance is such that the holder is not under pressure to supplement the stipend with part-time earnings;
 7. that the value of a prize or undergraduate scholarship is sufficient to make a reasonable contribution towards the cost of a student's books and/or equipment;
 8. that the field in which a scholarship or fellowship may be held is not unduly narrow;
 9. that any progress report required of a scholarship or fellowship holder is subject to the approval of the University and not of the donor;
 10. that any decision as to whether a scholarship or fellowship holder's work justifies renewal of the award is subject to the approval of the University which may, if the merits of the circumstances so dictate, consult with the donor;
 11. that the results of a postgraduate scholarship or fellowship holder's work are not subject to any restriction on publication.
- (b) The Academic Board shall seek a report from the Deans of any relevant Faculties when undergraduate scholarships might have an effect on recruitment into cognate disciplines within a faculty.
- (c) The Academic Board shall have the authority to award all prizes, scholarships, fellowships and other awards.
- (d) The Academic Board shall be responsible for the determination of the terms and conditions of awards established within the University, either by donation or bequest, in accordance with any terms of the gift and following acceptance of the offer by the Senate.

2.1.2 Guidelines for setting up 'non-established' postgraduate scholarships

The Academic Board has set out the following guidelines for the award of non-established scholarships. It is the responsibility of the scholarship proposer to ensure that the scholarship meets the requirements, as set out below, governing the award of scholarships from University and external funds:

- (i) The object of each scholarship is to promote and encourage postgraduate research within the University of Sydney.
- (ii) Awards shall be granted to graduates who are eligible for admission to candidature for a higher degree by research and who enrol accordingly as full-time candidates.
- (iii) A scholarship shall be awarded on the basis of academic merit.
- (iv) A scholarships shall be awarded by the Pro Vice-Chancellor on the advice of the Head of Department or School most concerned.

- (v) A scholarship shall be tenable for one year in the first instance but subject to satisfactory progress may be renewed for a second year and in the case of a PhD candidate for a third, and in special circumstances, a fourth year.
- (vi) A scholarship may be renewed subject to:
 - (a) progress satisfactory to the Head of Department or School and the Pro Vice-Chancellor, and
 - (b) availability of funds
- (vii) The annual value of a scholarship may be recommended by the Head of Department or School who shall take into account:
 - (a) availability of funds, and
 - (b) the general level of the value of scholarships offered by the University.
- (viii) A scholarship may provide allowances if the Head of Department or School so recommends, subject to the availability of funds.
- (ix) A holder of a scholarship shall acknowledge the donor of the funds in any publication arising out of the research.

2.2 Advertising

In October 1989, the Academic Board resolved that the advertising of non-established scholarships be mandatory. New scholarships must be advertised to comply with University's policies on EEO. Scholarships must be advertised in the *Bulletin Board* and may also be advertised in other publications, including the Saturday edition of the *Sydney Morning Herald* and the *Higher Education Supplement* in the *Australian*. Advertising in the *Bulletin Board* is free. The costs of advertising in other publications must be borne by the scholarship account or the Department/Faculty advertising the scholarship. All advertisements for scholarships may also be placed on the WWW Homepage of the Scholarships Office. Closing dates for applications should be at least 10 days after publication.

2.3 Scholarships and Taxation

Section 23(z) of the *Income Tax Assessment Act* generally considers Australian Postgraduate Awards and equivalent as tax exempt. A scholarship becomes taxable where the student is required to provide a service. The Australian Taxation Office (ATO) regards the assignment of intellectual property and the requirement to submit progress reports as a contractual agreement in line with employment and so deems the living allowance taxable. Currently, the taxation status of postgraduate awards is unclear pending the finalisation of a new taxation ruling by the ATO. The University recommends that students seek independent advice about the taxation status of a scholarship, particularly postgraduate students who are engaged in research as part of their postgraduate studies.

2.4 Number of Scholarships which May be Held

In December 1988, the Academic Board resolved that:

An undergraduate student shall not be allowed to hold at any one time more than two scholarships awarded on the basis of performance at the HSC Examination

A postgraduate student may hold no more than one scholarship providing a living allowance although this may be held with a scholarship providing a supplementary allowance, unless otherwise permitted by the Chair of the Academic Board who shall take into account the value of the awards and their purposes.

3 PROCEDURES FOR CREATING AN 'ESTABLISHED' AWARD AND MODIFYING EXISTING AWARDS

These procedures should be followed when establishing a new award which is intended to be offered regularly and therefore should be included in the University Calendar. Modifications to existing awards should also be drafted using these guidelines. Conditions of award for scholarships funded from bequests must remain in keeping with the intention of the bequest. Where variation from the original terms of a bequest are sought, it is likely that the approval of the NSW Attorney General will be required. This process usually takes a minimum of six months. Terms of the bequest

3.1 Drafting of a Proposal for a New Award or for Modifications to an Existing Award

3.1.1 Proposal to Establish a New Award

Where a new award is being established, the form entitled *Proposal to Establish a New Award* (Appendix 1) must be completed. It includes information on the following:

- (a) **Title of the Award** as agreed by funding body and Faculty.
- (b) **Preamble:** History of the award and where the money came from.
- (c) The **objective/purpose** of the award (*eg* to further postgraduate research in a particular field of study).
- (d) The **type of award** should be specified.
- (e) **Eligibility Criteria:** This should include restrictions on eligibility:
 - (i) **Faculty/Department** in which the award is tenable.
 - (ii) **Candidature:** is the scholarship intended for undergraduates, postgraduates, graduates of less than four years standing *etc*?
 - (iii) **Course/Field of Study:** does the student have to be enrolled in a particular course or be researching in a particular field of study?
 - (iv) **Other Eligibility Criteria:** are there any restrictions on citizenship/residency? Are there any qualifications considered prerequisite to application for the award (*eg* Honours I).
- (f) **Tenure** - how long the award provides support for. The conditions for continuing support should be clearly stated. The conditions for renewal would normally be “satisfactory progress” which may be in a particular course. Please note that where conditions reflect the provision of a service (*eg* the assignment of intellectual property, over-extensive reporting requirements), the scholarship will be taxable (see Section 2.3 above).
- (g) **Method of award:**
 - (i) **Application procedure:** This should state whether the prize/scholarship is awarded on application or on proficiency.
It is a resolution of the Academic Board that:
 - * Awards for which applications are required shall be made by a Faculty or the Postgraduate Awards Sub-committee of the Academic Board or some other body within the University
 - * Awards for which applications are not required shall be made on the recommendation of a Head of Department or School, a Dean of a Faculty or Chairperson of a Board of Studies or a Board of Examiners
 - (ii) **Selection procedure:** This may be on the recommendation of a particular office (*eg* Head of Department or Dean). If a selection committee is required, its composition must be stated. Please note you must comply with the University Statutes noted earlier in this document, which state that the University must be responsible for the selection of the successful applicant. A selection committee may include members of an external funding body, but the award must be responsibility of the University.
- (h) **Value:** For a scholarship which offers a living allowance, it is good practice to link the value to Government awards such as APAs; to the size of the capital (5% of the value of the parent account for Capital Preserved Trusts); or to index it (to a figure at a nominated date). For a prize or a supplementary scholarship, the value could be set at a specific figure (subject to the availability of funding), or the value may be at the discretion of the selection committee, Head of Department or the Dean. It may be linked to the size of the capital (5% of the value of the parent account for Capital Preserved Trusts) or indexed (to a figure at a nominated date).
- (i) **Other Benefits:** Any allowances such as relocation allowance, maintenance allowance, thesis allowance, sickness and maternity leave benefits included should be clearly stated.

3.1.2 Conditions of Award

conditions of award and the *Proposal to Establish a New Award* form must then be submitted to the Dean of the Faculty.

3.2 Approval by Faculty

The Faculty in which the scholarship is tenable must approve all new awards and changes to existing awards. It is the Faculty's responsibility to ensure that awards are in line with Academic Board recommendations and other guidelines noted in this document. Only once this is confirmed should the Dean refer the new or revised award to the Manager, Scholarships Office.

3.3 Approval by the Scholarships Office under Delegated Authority of the Academic Board

Requests for approval of new awards or revised awards must be lodged with the Scholarships Office. The Scholarships Office is responsible for checking that all new awards and amendments to existing awards conform to the guidelines in this document before they will be considered for approval by the Office under the delegated authority of the Academic Board. Once a new award has been approved, the Faculty should request that their Group Accountant sets up a new account for it. Where a prize is to be paid by the Student Centre, the Faculty should send details of the conditions of new or modified awards (with account code information) to the Prizes Officer, Examinations.

3.4 Setting up New Account Codes

Accounts which provide for ongoing scholarship payments to postgraduate research candidates are set up by the Research and Scholarships Office. Details must be forwarded to the Finance Officer, RSO and must include the Responsibility Centre where the account should be set up and the contract and any other correspondence relating to the grant. Accounts for all other types of award such as a scholarship which does not provide an ongoing living allowance to a research student or a scholarship which provides a living allowance to an undergraduate or a Masters by Coursework student must be set up through the appropriate College Accountant.

3.5 Calendar Entry

Where appropriate, upon approval of a new award or a revision to an existing award, the conditions of award are updated in the University Calendar by the Scholarships Office.

4 PROCEDURES FOR CREATING A 'NON-ESTABLISHED' AWARD

These procedures should be followed when setting up a 'non-established' award. This is essentially a one-off scholarship and is typically paid out of a research grant for research into a specific area of a larger research project. The University guidelines for setting up these awards are detailed in Section 2.1.2 of this document and it is the responsibility of the proposer to ensure that the scholarship meets these guidelines, whether the funding comes from University or external sources.

4.1 Proposal to Create a 'Non-Established' Postgraduate Scholarship

The first step to create a 'non-established' postgraduate scholarship is to complete the form entitled *Proposal to Create a 'Non-Established' Postgraduate Scholarship* (Appendix 3). The form must be supported by the Head of Department or Head of School and the forwarded to the Manager, Scholarships Office for approval. The award must then follow the same administrative procedures as established scholarships. These are set out in the document *The Administration of Scholarships, Awards and Prizes*.

APPENDIX 1: PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A NEW AWARD

This form should be used for awards which are intended to be offered regularly and which should therefore be included in the University Calendar.

1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Title of Award: _____

Preamble: _____
(history of the award)

Objective of the Award: _____

Type of Award: *(tick as appropriate)*

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Postgraduate Scholarship | Prize |
| Supplementary Scholarship | Bursary |
| Undergraduate Scholarship | Travelling Scholarship |
| Grant-in-aid | Other <i>(please specify)</i> |

2 ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Faculty/Department: _____
(in which award is tenable)

Candidature: Undergraduate/Postgraduate/Graduate *(delete as applicable)*

Course/Field of Study: _____
University policy requires that students on scholarships be enrolled full time for a degree

Other Eligibility Criteria: _____
(eg residency, Honours I, age)

3 TENURE One-off payment OR

_____ **(minimum in years)**
_____ **(standard maximum in years)**
_____ **(possible extension)**
Renewal subject to: _____

Full-time postgraduate students have a reasonable expectation that funding will be available for the duration of their studies. Scholarships should therefore be offered on the basis of a minimum of two years support for a Masters candidate and a minimum of three years for a doctoral candidate. A further six months extension may be offered to PhD students, in line with the conditions of the Australian Postgraduate Award

4 METHOD OF AWARD

Application procedure: On application/on examination results/
by recommendation or on nomination *(delete as applicable)*

Any Special Application Procedures: _____

Selection Committee: _____
(if required) _____

OR Nominator: _____
(where selection on basis of nomination)

5 VALUE

Value/Funding information:

Funding Source: _____

Value of award: _____

6 OTHER BENEFITS

Other Allowances: _____
(eg: maintenance, relocation, conference travel, thesis, sick leave, maternity leave) _____

7 APPROVAL BY FACULTY

Account code to be Charged: _____

Approval Details:

Name of Proposer: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Head of Department or School: _____
(if required)

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Approved by Dean of Faculty: _____

Date: _____

All new awards or changes to existing awards must be approved by the Dean of the appropriate Faculty

PLEASE ATTACH TO THIS FORM THE DRAFT CONDITIONS OF AWARD AND FORWARD THEM BOTH TO THE DEAN OF YOUR FACULTY FOR APPROVAL BEFORE SUBMITTING BOTH TO THE MANAGER, SCHOLARSHIPS OFFICE, A14.

APPENDIX 2

SAMPLE CONDITIONS OF AN ESTABLISHED AWARD

Richard Claude Mankin Scholarship

Established in 1973 by a bequest with an estimated value of \$185 000 comprising the residual estate of Winifred Ruby Mankin MSc MBBS. The purpose of the bequest was to promote and encourage research at the University of Sydney related to water conservation.

- 1 The scholarship will be known as the Richard Claude Mankin Scholarship, and its objective is to encourage research related to water conservation at the University of Sydney.
- 2 The scholarship shall be awarded at the postdoctoral or postgraduate levels. A postdoctoral scholarship may be awarded only to an applicant who holds the degree of Doctor of Philosophy or who possesses such equivalent standing as may be approved by Academic Board. A postgraduate scholarship may only be awarded to an applicant who is admitted to candidature for a higher degree by research and who enrolls accordingly.
- 3
 - (a) A postdoctoral scholarship shall be tenable for one year in the first instance but, subject to satisfactory progress, may be renewed for a second year.
 - (b) A postgraduate scholarship shall be tenable for one year in the first instance but, subject to satisfactory progress, may be renewed for a second year, and in the case of a PhD candidate a third year. In exceptional circumstances, a further extension of six months may be granted to PhD candidates.
- 4 The scholarship shall be awarded on the basis of academic merit and appropriateness of the proposed program of research detailed in the application. It shall be awarded by the Academic Board on the recommendation of a committee consisting of the Chair of the Academic Board and the Deans of the Faculties of Agriculture, Architecture, Economics, Engineering, Science and Veterinary Science or their nominees.
- 5
 - (a) A scholarship at postdoctoral level shall be equal in value to the Australian Postdoctoral Research Fellowship.
 - (b) A scholarship at postgraduate level shall be valued at the same rate as the Australian Postgraduate Award.
- 6
 - (a) A relocation allowance, removal expenses and a thesis allowance may be awarded to postgraduate students subject to the conditions of Australian Postgraduate Awards.
 - (b) The scholarship shall provide a research maintenance allowance equal in value to that provided by the corresponding award scale.
 - (c) The scholarship shall provide a travel grant for holders coming from overseas equivalent to economy class air travel by the most direct route and the most economical rate available at the time. A corresponding grant may be made for return travel.

APPENDIX 3: PROPOSAL TO CREATE A NON-ESTABLISHED POSTGRADUATE SCHOLARSHIP**SCHOLARSHIP DETAILS**

Title of Scholarship:	
Department:	
Type:	Scholarship <input type="checkbox"/> Supplementary Scholarship <input type="checkbox"/>
Candidature:	Masters <input type="checkbox"/> PhD <input type="checkbox"/>
Commencement Date:	Duration in Years:

enure: University policy requires that students on scholarships be enrolled full time in a degree course. Such students have a reasonable expectation that funding will be available for the duration of their studies. Scholarships should therefore be offered on the basis of a minimum of two years support for a Masters candidate and a minimum of three years for a PhD candidate. A further six months extension may be offered to PhD students where funding is available, in line with the conditions of the Australian Postgraduate Award.

FUNDING DETAILS

Funding Source/Granting Body:
Academic Staff Member holding Grant/Funding:
Stipend/Supplement to be Paid:
Other Allowances:
Account code to be Charged:

funding: Scholarships funded from grants from the ARC/NHMRC and other government bodies should be offered at the same rate as the Australian Postgraduate Award (\$15,637 in 1997).

ADVERTISING DETAILS

Where do you propose to advertise?
Account code to be charged:

advertising: New scholarships must be advertised in the *Bulletin Board* of the *University News* and may also be advertised externally.

APPROVAL DETAILS

Name of Proposer:	Signature:
Head of Department or School:	Signature:

approval: Non-established scholarships and supplements require the support of the Head of Department or School

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS FORM AND RETURN IT TO THE SCHOLARSHIPS OFFICE, MAIN QUADRANGLE, A14

APPENDIX 4: SAMPLE ADVERTISEMENT**Postgraduate Scholarship in Applied Mathematics**

A postgraduate scholarship is available for a suitably qualified candidate with a good honours degree in science or engineering to undertake research studies leading to a PhD in applied mathematics. The project is to investigate the dynamic stability and bifurcation behaviour of yarn balloon equations as they apply to the textile yarn manufacturing process of ring spinning and two-for-one twisting. Applicants should have a particular interest in the computational solution of systems of non-linear partial differential equations. The scholarship is valued at \$15,637 per annum and may be renewed for up to three years. Applicants must be Australian citizens. Further information can be obtained from Dr Smith, School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Sydney NSW 2006 *phone: fax: e-mail:.* Applications should be sent direct to Dr Smith at the above address by *[closing date]*.

APPENDIX 5: CONDITIONS OF AWARD: AUSTRALIAN POSTGRADUATE AWARD

University of Sydney

AUSTRALIAN POSTGRADUATE AWARDS WITH STIPEND (APA)

CONDITIONS OF AWARD

Eligibility

1. Graduates or graduands of any Australian or overseas university are eligible to apply.
2. A student must be enrolled in a full-time postgraduate research degree, be an Australian citizen or an Australian resident who has been living continuously in Australia for the twelve months preceding the closing date. Part-time study may be considered under special circumstances (health or care commitments) and is subject to approval by DEETYA.
3. A student must have completed four years undergraduate training, or three years undergraduate followed by a year of graduate training, and must, in the last year of his or her course, have obtained an honours class 1 or hold an equivalent qualification.
4. An award shall be tenable for up to two years in the case of a Master's degree and up to three years for the degree of PhD, with the possibility of an extension of up to six months in special circumstances for a PhD. Periods of study undertaken prior to the commencement of the award will be deducted from the maximum tenure of the award.
5. A student may not hold another scholarship providing a living allowance, in conjunction with an APA, although it may be held with a scholarship providing a supplementary allowance unless otherwise permitted by the Chair of the Academic Board who shall take into account the value of the awards and their purposes.
6. A student must take up his or her appointment before 1st April in the year of the award.

Stipend and Allowances

7. Each award shall provide a tax free stipend of \$15 637 per annum.
8. A student who moves from another Australian city to take up an award may claim a relocation allowance of up to the economy airfare (or concession rate when appropriate) for the student, spouse and dependents to travel to Sydney. The student may also claim removal expenses of up to \$430 per adult and \$215 per child (with a maximum entitlement of \$1 230).
9. A student may claim reimbursement of an amount of up to \$400 to assist with costs for a Master's thesis and up to \$800 for a PhD thesis. The claim should be lodged with the Scholarships Office immediately after the thesis is submitted and not later than 24 months after the termination of the scholarship.
10. Research students shall also be entitled to a maintenance allowance of \$600 per annum; and for coursework students \$300 per annum from funds provided by the University. This amount will be paid into a departmental account in March-April and will be administered by the head of the department.

Other Benefits

11. Postgraduate Award holders with dependent children may be eligible for Family Payment from the Department of Social Security. Students should contact the Department (without delay, as benefits are not payable retrospectively) for details of this and other programs for which they might be eligible (for example, Rent Assistance, Guardian Allowance or Health Care Cards).

Leave Arrangements

12. Students may not normally transfer, suspend or conduct research overseas within the first six months of an award.
13. Students are entitled to 20 days paid recreation leave each year calculated on a pro-rata basis. No more than 20 days recreation leave may be accumulated and leave must be taken during the tenure of the award. It does not attract a leave loading allowance. The supervisor's agreement must be obtained before leave is taken.
14. Research students are entitled to three months paid sick leave and up to three months paid maternity leave within the tenure of an award. Periods less than two weeks may not be claimed and all claims must be supported by a medical certificate. Coursework students are entitled to two weeks sick leave per year.

Employment

15. Students may engage in paid employment up to a maximum of twenty hours per week. Students seeking to engage in employment in excess of these amounts must apply for permission through their supervisor and Head of Department to the Dean. No student holding an award may hold another position within the University which could cause him or her to exceed this restriction.

Research Overseas

16. Students may conduct up to 12 months (18 months for students of Anthropology and other special cases) of their research outside Australia. Approval must be sought from the student's supervisor, head of department and the Scholarships Office, and will only be granted if the research is essential for completion of the degree. All periods of overseas research are cumulative and will be credited to a student's candidature. Students must remain enrolled at the University and submit a Permission to Count Time Away form through the relevant faculty office.

Research at other organisations

17. Students may conduct substantial amounts of research at organisations outside the higher education system under the supervision of their department.

Masters to PhD

18. A student may convert a Master's research award to a PhD research award or vice-versa provided such change in candidature is approved by the relevant Faculty.

Transfer

19. Awards won in competition at The University of Sydney may not be taken up at another institution. Awards may be transferred from The University of Sydney to another institution only after at least six months and provided that there are sound personal or academic reasons for doing so (eg. supervisor moves, spouse moves, lack of adequate supervision).

Suspension

20. Students may apply for up to 12 months suspension for any reason during the tenure of their award. Periods of suspension are cumulative and may be extended for up to two years in special circumstances only. Approval to suspend must be given both by the Scholarships Office and by the head of the department concerned. Periods of study undertaken during suspension will be deducted from the period of tenure.

Termination

21. The award will be terminated two weeks after the thesis is submitted or at the end of the award, whichever is the earlier. Awards will be terminated before this time if after due enquiry the University concludes that a student has not fulfilled his or her obligations, the eligibility criteria or is not making satisfactory progress

Appeal

22. The University recognises the right of any student to appeal to the Pro-Vice Chancellor (Research) against any decision affecting the award or tenure of an Australian Postgraduate Awards with Stipend (APA).

APPENDIX 6: CONDITIONS OF AWARD: UNIVERSITY POSTGRADUATE AWARD**Sydney University Postgraduate Awards (UPA)****CONDITIONS OF AWARD 1997****Eligibility**

1. Graduates or graduands of any Australian or overseas university are eligible to apply.
2. A student must be enrolled in a full-time postgraduate research degree, be an Australian citizen or an Australian permanent.
3. A student must have completed four years undergraduate training, or three years undergraduate followed by a year of graduate training, and must, in the last year of his or her course, have obtained an honours class 1 or hold an equivalent qualification. A small number of UPAs may be made available to applicants with Honours 2i who are very strongly supported by a Department/Faculty and for whom there is clear evidence of late demonstration of academic excellence and research potential in the proposed field of study.
4. An award shall be tenable for up to two years in the case of a Master's degree and up to three years for the degree of PhD, with the possibility of an extension of up to six months in special circumstances for a PhD. Periods of study undertaken prior to the commencement of the award will be deducted from the maximum tenure of the award.
5. A student may not hold another scholarship providing a living allowance, in conjunction with an UPA, although it may be held with a scholarship providing a supplementary allowance unless otherwise permitted by the Chair of the Academic Board who shall take into account the value of the awards and their purposes.
6. A student must take up his or her appointment before 1st April in the year of the award.

Stipend and Allowances

7. Each award shall provide a stipend of \$15 637 per annum.
8. A student may claim reimbursement of an amount of up to \$400 to assist with costs for a Master's thesis and up to \$800 for a PhD thesis. The claim should be lodged with the Scholarships Office within 6 months of submission of the thesis and not later than 24 months after the termination of the scholarship, whichever date is earlier.
9. Research students shall also be entitled to a maintenance allowance of \$600 per annum; and for coursework students \$300 per annum from funds provided by the University. This amount will be paid into a departmental account in March-April and will be administered by the head of the department.

Other Benefits

10. Postgraduate Award holders with dependent children may be eligible for Family Payment from the Department of Social Security. Students should contact the Department (without delay, as benefits are not payable retrospectively) for details of this and other programs for which they might be eligible (for example, Rent Assistance, Guardian Allowance or Health Care Cards).

Leave Arrangements

11. Students may not normally transfer, suspend or conduct research overseas within the first six months of an award.
12. Students are entitled to 20 days paid recreation leave each year calculated on a pro-rata basis. No more than 20 days recreation leave may be accumulated and leave must be taken during the tenure of the award. It does not attract a leave loading allowance. The supervisor's agreement must be obtained before leave is taken.
13. Research students are entitled to three months paid sick leave and up to three months paid maternity leave within the tenure of an award. Periods less than two weeks may not be claimed and all claims must be supported by a medical certificate. Coursework students are entitled to two weeks sick leave per year.

Employment

14. Students may engage in paid employment up to a maximum of twenty hours per week. Students seeking to engage in employment in excess of these amounts must apply for permission through their supervisor and Head of Department to the Dean. No student holding an award may hold another position within the University which could cause him or her to exceed this restriction.

Research Overseas

15. Students may conduct up to 12 months (18 months for students of Anthropology and other special cases) of their research outside Australia. Approval must be sought from the student's supervisor, head of department and the Scholarships Office, and will only be granted if the research is essential for completion of the degree. All periods of overseas research are cumulative and will be credited to a

Research at other organisations

16. Students may conduct substantial amounts of research at organisations outside the higher education system under the supervision of their department.

Masters to PhD

17. A student may convert a Master's research award to a PhD research award or vice-versa provided such change in candidature is approved by the relevant Faculty.

Suspension

18. Students may apply for up to 12 months suspension for any reason during the tenure of their award. Periods of suspension are cumulative and may be extended for up to two years in special circumstances only. Approval to suspend must be given both by the Scholarships Office and by the head of the department concerned. Periods of study undertaken during suspension will be deducted from the period of tenure.

Termination

19. The award will be terminated two weeks after the thesis is submitted or at the end of the award, whichever is the earlier. Awards will be terminated before this time if after due enquiry the University concludes that a student has not fulfilled his or her obligations, the eligibility criteria or is not making satisfactory progress

Appeal

20. The University recognises the right of any student to appeal to the Pro-Vice Chancellor (Research) against any decision affecting the award or tenure of an University of Sydney Postgraduate Awards (UPA).

APPENDIX 7: CONDITIONS OF AWARD: SYDNEY UNIVERSITY POSTGRADUATE SCHOLARSHIPS

Sydney University Postgraduate Scholarships (SUPS)

CONDITIONS OF AWARD 1997

Eligibility

1. Graduates or graduands of any Australian or overseas university are eligible to apply.
2. A student must have completed four years' undergraduate training, or three years' undergraduate followed by a year of graduate training, and must in the last year of his or her course have obtained at least honours class II, division I or hold an equivalent qualification.
3. Scholarship holders must be enrolled for a full time Masters or Doctoral postgraduate research degree at the University of Sydney.
4. A scholarship shall be tenable for up to two years in the case of a Master's degree and up to three years for the degree of PhD, with the possibility of an extension of up to twelve months in special circumstances for a PhD.
5. A student must take up his or her appointment before 1 April or 1 August in the year of award.

Stipend

6. Each award shall provide a tax free stipend of \$10,000 per annum.

Leave arrangements

7. Students are entitled to 20 days paid recreation leave each year with part years calculated on a pro rata basis. No more than 20 days' recreation leave may be accumulated and leave must be taken during the tenure of the award. It does not attract a leave loading allowance. The supervisor's agreement must be obtained before leave is taken.
8. Students are entitled to three months' paid sick leave and up to three months' paid maternity leave within the tenure of an award. Periods less than two weeks may not be claimed and all claims must be supported by a medical certificate.

Availability and Employment

9. Casual teaching/demonstrating may be available to scholarship holders up to a maximum number of contact hours that is not more than ten times the number of teaching weeks in the year. Departments shall indicate a stated minimum number of hours that will be offered.
10. The scholarship holder is encouraged to take up the offer of part time teaching within the department but is not obliged to do so.
11. Teaching duties will be confined to tutorials, laboratory demonstration and marking.
12. Teaching duties may be carried out throughout the calendar years excepting that the scholarship holders shall have a block of at least six weeks clear of teaching duties for research in addition to recreation leave.

Supervision and Reports on Progress

13. The Heads of Departments in which the scholarship holders are located shall ensure that the students and their supervisors are clear on the rights and obligations attendant on taking up the scholarship. The supervisor should, in particular, be aware of the constraints that any teaching responsibilities may place on the student and monitor progress carefully.
14. Students will be subject to the annual review and report process normal for postgraduate students and scholarship holders.

Masters to PhD

15. A student may convert a Master's research award to a PhD research award or vice versa provided such change in candidature is approved by the relevant Faculty.

Termination

16. The award will be terminated two weeks after the thesis is submitted or at the end of the award, whichever is earlier. Awards will be terminated before this time if after enquiry the University concludes that a student has not fulfilled his or her obligations, met the eligibility criteria or is not making satisfactory progress.

Appeal

17. The University recognises the right of any student to appeal to the Pro Vice Chancellor (Research) against any decision affecting the award or tenure of a Sydney University Postgraduate Scholarship.

Action by the Chair under delegated authority

College of Health Sciences

Nil report.

College of Humanities and Social Sciences

Nil report.

College of Sciences and Technology

1. Appointment of Visiting Professor

Name	Department/School	Period
Professor Wladyslaw Szczotka	Mathematics & Statistics	7 July 1997 to 5 September 1997

2. Appointment of Faculty Promotions Assessment Committees

Personal Chairs

Architecture

Core

Professor Neville D Quarry (Dean, Faculty of Architecture)

Professor Peter G Webber (Architecture)

Professor John P Carter (Dean, Faculty of Engineering)

Professor Peter Hein (Professional Fellow, Architectural and Design Science)

Emeritus Professor Henry Cowan (Architectural and Design Science)

Additional

Applicant 1: Associate Professor Fergus R Fricke (Acting Head, Architectural and Design Science)

Professor Trevor W Cole (Electrical Engineering)

Professor John R Booker (Civil Engineering)

Professor Norman Foo (Computing Science and Engineering, NSW)

Science

Additional

Applicant 2: Associate Professor Christopher J Durrant (HOS, Mathematics & Statistics)

Professor Michael G Cowling (Mathematics, NSW)

Professor John A Loxton (Mathematics, Physics, Computing & Electronics, Macq)

Professor Garth Gaudrey (Mathematics, NSW, **External Reserve**)

Professor Derek W Robinson (Mathematical Science, ANU, **External Reserve**)

Applicant 3: Professor Noel Cant (Chemistry, Macq)

Professor Donald B Melrose (Physics)

Professor Brian S Haynes (Chemical Engineering)

Professor Robert W Bilger (Mechanical & Mechatronic Engineering, **Internal Reserve**)

Professor Frank Larkins (Chemistry, Melb, **External Reserve**)

Applicant 6: Associate Professor Deirdre J Dragovich (Acting for HOD, Geography)

Professor Eric Colhoun (Geography, N'cle)

Professor Harry G Poulos (Civil Engineering, **Internal Reserve**)
 Professor Jim Bowler (Earth Sciences, Melb, **External Reserve**)

Associate Professors/Readerships

Science

Additional

- Applicant 1: Professor Leslie D Field (HOS, Chemistry)
 Associate Professor John C Mackie (Chemistry)
 Professor Leo Radom (Chemistry, ANU)
 Emeritus Professor Noel S Hush (Biochemistry **Internal Reserve**)
 Professor Michael N Paddon-Row (Chemistry, NSW, **External Reserve**)
- Applicant 3: Professor Leslie D Field (HOS, Chemistry)
 Professor Sever Sternhell (Chemistry)
 Professor David Black (Chemistry, NSW)
 Professor John Bremner (Chemistry, W'gong, **External Reserve**)
 Professor Walter C Taylor (Chemistry, **Internal Reserve**)
- Applicant 4: Professor David J Patterson (HOS, Biological Sciences)
 Associate Professor Barry Fox (Biological Sciences, NSW)
 Professor Ian D Hume (Biological Sciences)
 Dr Alan W Meats (Biological Sciences, **Internal Reserve**)
 Professor Michael Archer (Biological Sciences, NSW, **External Reserve**)
- Applicant 5: Professor Leslie D Field (HOS, Chemistry)
 Associate Professor James K Beattie (Chemistry)
 Professor Ian G Dance (Chemistry, NSW)
 Professor Alan M Sargeson (Chemistry, ANU, **Reserve**)
- Applicant 10: Professor David J Patterson (HOS, Biological Sciences)
 Professor Philip W Kuchel (Biochemistry)
 Professor Ronald A Skurray (Biological Sciences)
 Associate Professor William G Allaway (Biological Sciences, **Reserve**)
- Applicant 11: Professor David J Patterson (HOS, Biological Sciences)
 Professor Ann Ashford (Biological Sciences, NSW)
 Professor Anthony W Larkum (Biological Sciences)
 Professor Ronald A Skurray (Biological Sciences, **Reserve**)
- Applicant 12: Professor David J Patterson (HOS, Biological Sciences)
 Associate Professor Christopher R Murphy (Anatomy & Histology)
 Professor Richard Shine (Biological Sciences)
 Associate Professor Jean Joss (Biology, Macq, **Reserve**)

Senior Lectureships

Agriculture

Core

- Professor Lester W Burgess (Dean) (Chair)
 Dr John W Bowyer (Crop Sciences)
 Associate Professor Wayne L Bryden (Animal Science, Veterinary Science)
 Professor Brian J Deverall (Crop Sciences)
 Associate Professor Denzil G Fiebig (Econometrics, Economics)
 Mrs Carolyn Tanner (Agricultural Economics)
 Associate Professor Robert L Batterham (Agricultural Economics) (**Reserve**)
 Associate Professor Ross G Drynan (Agricultural Economics) (**Reserve**)
 Dr Edith M Lees (Agricultural Chemistry and Soil Science) (**Reserve**)
 Professor Donald R Marshall (Plant Breeding Institute, Cobbitty) (**Reserve**)
 Dr Peter B New (Microbiology) (**Reserve**)
 Associate Professor Frank W Nicholas (Animal Science, Veterinary Science) (**Reserve**)

Additional

- Dr Brett Summerell (Royal Botanic Gardens) (**Reserve**)
- Applicant 2: Professor Robert A McIntosh (Plant Breeding Institute, Cobbitty)
Dr Colin Wellings (Department of Agriculture, Cobbitty)
Dr Brett Summerell (Royal Botanic Gardens) (**Reserve**)
- Applicant 3: Professor Thomas G MacAulay (Agricultural Economics)
Dr Ernest L Houghton (Econometrics)

Engineering

Core

- Professor Judy Raper (Dean Elect) (Chair)
Professor John P Carter (Acting Dean)
Associate Professor Fergus R Fricke (Architectural and Design Science, Architecture)
Associate Professor Stephen W Simpson (Electrical Engineering)
Associate Professor Mary Lou Maher (Architectural and Design Science, Architecture)
Dr Murray J Clarke (Civil Engineering)
Dr Karkenahalli Srinivas (Aeronautical Engineering) (**Reserve**)

Additional

- Applicant 1: Professor Brian S Haynes (Chemical Engineering) (HOD)
Associate Professor Geoffrey W Barton (Chemical Engineering)
Dr Timothy A G Langrish (Chemical Engineering)
Associate Professor Assaad R Masri (Mechanical and Mechatronic Engineering)
Associate Professor John P Barford (Chemical Engineering) (**Reserve**)

Science

Core

- Associate Professor Anthony F Masters (Pro-Dean) (Chair)
Associate Professor Carol L Armour (Pharmacy)
Dr Margaret M Harding (Chemistry)
Dr John B Keene (Geology & Geophysics)
Dr Robyn L Overall (Biological Sciences)
Associate Professor Denis E Winch (Mathematics & Statistics)
Dr Peter A Robinson (Physics)
Dr Edith M Lees (Agricultural Chemistry & Soil Science, Agriculture)
Dr Gavan I Butler (Economics)
Associate Professor Christopher B Gillies (Pro-Dean) (**Reserve**)

Additional

- Applicant 1: Professor Robert G Wake (Head, Biochemistry)
Dr Emma Whitelaw (Biochemistry)
Professor Ronald J Trent (Molecular & Clinical Genetics)
Dr Anthony S Weiss (Biochemistry) (**Reserve**)
- Applicant 2: Associate Professor Robin F Warner (Head, Geography)
Dr Michael F Barbetti (Electron Microscope Unit)
Dr Julia M James (Chemistry)
Associate Professor Deirdre J Dragovich (Geography) (**Reserve**)
- Applicant 3: Professor Richard E Collins (Head, Physics)
Dr Richard W Hunstead (Physics)
Professor Donald B Melrose (Physics)
Dr Michael I Large (Astrophysics) (**Reserve**)
- Applicant 4: Professor Stephen W Touyz (Head, Psychology)
Dr Alan E Craddock (Psychology)
Professor Robert A Boakes (Psychology)
Dr Michael B Walker (Psychology) (**Reserve**)
- Applicant 5: Associate Professor Christopher J Durrant (Head, Mathematics &

Dr Charles C Macaskill (Mathematics & Statistics)
 Dr D J Galloway (Mathematics & Statistics) (**Reserve**)

- Applicant 6: Associate Professor Christopher J Durrant (Head, Mathematics & Statistics)
 Professor John Robinson (Mathematics & Statistics)
 Associate Professor Malcolm P Quine (Mathematics & Statistics)
 Professor Eugene Seneta (Mathematics & Statistics) (**Reserve**)
- Applicant 7: Professor Richard E Collins (Head, Physics)
 Professor David R McKenzie (Physics)
 Professor Ross C McPhedran (Physics)
 Dr P J Martin (CSIRO) (**Reserve**)

Veterinary Science

Core

Professor David R Fraser (Dean, Veterinary Science)
 Dr David B Church (Veterinary Clinical Sciences)
 Dr Edith M Lees (Agricultural Chemistry & Soil Science, Agriculture)
 Associate Professor Daria N Love (Veterinary Anatomy & Pathology)
 Dr Jill E Maddison (Pharmacology, Medicine)
 Dr William C Maxwell (Animal Science)
 Associate Professor Grant M Stone (Animal Science)
 Professor Brian R H Farrow (Veterinary Clinical Sciences) (**Reserve**)

Additional

Applicant 1: Associate Professor Garry M Cross (Animal Health)
 Professor John R Egerton (Animal Health)

Changes to FPAC memberships

Associate Professors/Readerships

Agriculture

Core

Professor Peter R Reeves (Microbiology) replaces Associate Professor Frank W Nicholas (Animal Science).

Associate Professor Frank W Nicholas is added to the **Reserve** list.

Associate Professor Judith N Yates (Economics) is removed from the **Reserve** list.

Additional

Applicant 1: Dr Fredouni Ahmadi-Esfahani (Agricultural Economics) is added as the **Reserve** member

Applicant 2: Dr Harley A Rose (Crop Sciences) is added as the **Reserve** member.

Science

Additional

Applicant 7: Associate Professor Dianna T Kenny (Behavioural Sciences, Health Sciences) replaces Professor Robert A Boakes (Psychology)

The University of Sydney

**SUBMISSION TO THE REVIEW OF HIGHER EDUCATION
FINANCING AND POLICY (April 1997)**

Introduction:

In granting recognition across her Empire for degrees awarded by the University of Sydney, Queen Victoria deemed it her duty 'to hold forth to all classes and denominations of our faithful subjects encouragement for pursuing a regular and liberal course of education. Her Majesty further required any subsequent change in the University's Act of Establishment shall not alter this recognition "so long as the same or a like standard of knowledge is in the opinion of the said Governor (of NSW) preserved as a necessary condition for obtaining the aforesaid degrees".

The University of Sydney Act, 1989 (as amended) states in part:

6. (1) The functions of the University (within the limits of its resources) include:
 - (a) the provision of educational and research facilities at university standard;
 - (b) the promotion, advancement and transmission of knowledge and research;
 - (c) the commitment to the development and provision of cultural, professional, technical and vocational services to the community; and
 - (d) the conferring of the degrees of Bachelor, Master and Doctor and the awarding of diplomas and other certificates.

Explicit mention of the qualification regarding 'the limit of its resources' is perhaps the most succinct way by which this University can contrast the spirit of its Royal Charter with more recent attitudes of governments to the role of higher education in Australia. The University of Sydney is resolute in its intention to adhere to the spirit of its Charter, and responds accordingly to the issues raised by the Review.

Theme one: the role of higher education in Australia's society and economy

1.1 This submission focuses on the role and position of the University of Sydney as a pre-eminent institution in the Australian higher education sector. The sector, which historically has been marked by considerable diversity, continues, and will inevitably continue, on this path. In this context of diversity, the University of Sydney is committed to making a major contribution to Australian society through its high-quality teaching and research, and its professional and community activities. It is concerned to exercise leadership in the extension, synthesis, consolidation, application, and critical appraisal of knowledge. It seeks to produce graduates who will join the next generation of leaders in research, education, the professions, business, industry, and the public sector.

1.2 The many challenges facing Australian society at present and in the immediate future include the necessity of achieving more equitable, cohesive, and efficient bases for social and economic activity, of forging a more competitive and strategic Australian presence in the international arena, and of coping with, and making best use of, rapid and continuous change. The impact of new technologies, the knowledge-intensive basis of future economic development, and the limits to Australia's capacity to shape and control its future independent of global and regional circumstances are only some examples of the deep-seated and complex problems facing Australians now and in the next generation.

1.3 The University of Sydney is firm in its commitment to exercising leadership, not only in the higher education sector but also in Australian society generally. It has sought to contribute, through its role as "public intellectual", in the setting of public agendas, and in contributing to informed debate and providing critical analysis in a broad range of areas to do with the short-term and long-term national interest.

University to fulfil those expectations and aspirations placed on it by the community. In the context of seeking the best balances between public and private funding of various kinds, the fundamental point needs to be made that no great university of international stature can continue as such without substantial financial support from government.

1.5 Questions of capacity are therefore central to how the University seeks to build on its commitment to excellence, relevance, and leadership. Much depends on its ability to continue attracting outstanding staff and students, for whom in this place teaching and research are closely connected. The University is committed to engaging staff of the highest calibre, and to providing them and their students with the necessary support and infrastructure. Attracting and paying for international quality academic staff, for example, is necessarily expensive, and requires *inter alia* government commitments to ensure appropriate academic salary levels in a lead institution such as the University of Sydney.

1.6 Questions of infrastructure are particularly important for an institution such as the University of Sydney. It must continue to be in a position to build up and replace technological, communication, and information infrastructure consistent with that leadership. Just as students, graduates, and staff are expected to keep abreast of and shape developments in their fields, so too must physical infrastructure keep pace with developments. The University, despite being a heavy investor in infrastructure, nevertheless faces particular challenges given its size and diversity, its relative age, and its commitment to relevance and excellence. While partnerships with outside bodies can go some way in addressing infrastructural needs, there can be no substitute, given the complexity of on-campus teaching and research demands, for public support for infrastructural development.

1.7 The University is committed to attracting and retaining the most talented students in the country regardless of their economic circumstances, and again would emphasise the need for public support to enable them to be admitted and supported. The University's commitment to quality and merit is tightly bound up with its understandings of equity, and it remains firm in its intention to support public aspirations and government policies for a more equitable and fairer society.

1.8 An important part of all interface linkages is the University's commitment to equity of access, while recognising merit as a key criterion for selection. The University would wish to continue to allocate a proportion of its available funds to maintaining and, if possible, increasing the proportion of students admitted at all levels on the basis of combined equity and merit criteria thus moving a little further towards emulating Harvard's academically desirable 'needs-blind' admissions policy. The Government's recent Equity and Merit Scholarship program provides a fresh basis for seeking additional matching private and private sector support for our equity programs. The University particularly will be seeking to enhance equity aspects of its postgraduate research training activities and of its transfer provisions of undergraduates seeking to enter honours level research-oriented programs.

1.9 In addressing the national interest, the University sees as fundamental its capacity to produce graduates with the knowledge, skills and dispositions to engage in the challenges facing Australian society, to exercise leadership in relation to them, and to manage working lives marked by the need to keep abreast of rapidly changing circumstances and their implications for the lifelong up-dating of skills and knowledge. Accordingly, the University is committed to ensuring that its programs of vocational and professional education are underpinned by a broad and flexible approach to general education. The University's commitment to giving its students a set of generic attributes illustrates the point, with its emphasis on analytical, problem-solving, communication, and interpersonal skills, on the ability to apply and adapt such skills divergently, and on the readiness of graduates to accept learning as a lifelong necessity.

1.10 Of some significance in this context is the enthusiasm with which students, employers, and the professions have supported the development in recent years of combined degrees, such as Arts/Commerce and Arts/Engineering, and which foster the development of persons with attributes which are highly relevant to the needs of society, for example by combining technological skills and knowledge with foreign languages, understandings of social policy,

education. The University of Sydney is strongly committed to these approaches, and, through the Committee, urges the Commonwealth to continue its support (for publicly-funded students) for the entire duration of a degree sequence or an appropriate double-degree professional sequence.

1.11 The need for graduates to embrace the principles of lifelong learning imposes an obligation on the University to look beyond the initial provision of degrees followed by postgraduate awards for some. Our provision of award and non-award courses designed to meet the demand for updating skills and knowledge, and the development of new modes of delivery for such courses, is expanding and needs to grow further.. The University is also moving to the provision of more flexible policies for graduate admissions and the recognition of many and varied forms of relevant prior learning. These are examples of areas in which the University is keen to extend its collaboration with TAFE and other training providers.

1.12 The University's role in contributing directly to the economy through high-level expert collaboration with industry will continue to grow and help Australia to sustain its position as a key player in the global marketplace. The Australian Technology Park, which includes a consortium of the University of Sydney, the University of New South Wales and the University of Technology, Sydney, is just one example of universities working together and with industry.

1.13 The University plans to develop further its relationships with industry in research and development and in continuing professional education and training. In the latter area there is scope for increased collaboration with TAFE NSW, both in course provision and in the development of delivery platforms. This recognises the fact that as industry faces rapid technological changes there is an additional need for development of re-education programs for those already in employment and of industry-directed courses partly provided in the work-place.

1.14 Australia's future depends on its willingness to continue and strengthen its efforts to be an outward-looking and integral member of the international community. The University of Sydney has a deep-seated commitment to ensuring that its considerable academic resources and expertise are made available, in the national interest, to strengthen Australia's international position. This itself is, in part, dependent on the Government's recognition of these activities, a matter which should be identified by the Review. The University currently looks to the further enhancement of its already high standing in the international community of scholars and sees increasing internationalisation as a natural element of the University's life and work. Key examples of this process are commitment to international benchmarking, expansion of participation in international research and development projects, further growth and diversification in international student enrolments and links with international alumni, further consolidation and expansion of the University's already rich international network of teaching and learning, and continuing its historically significant contribution to Australia's overseas aid program.

Theme two: factors affecting the demand for and provision of higher education over the next 10 to 20 years

2.1 We now operate in the environment where a majority of young Australians aspire to higher education. Higher education is coming under understandable pressure to accommodate the demand through both expansion and reorientation. This change challenges traditional concepts of higher education to include notions of mass education.

2.2 The new developments in information technology can do much to help meet the increasing demand for higher education. They have the potential to energise teaching and learning (as well as research), to diversify the range of techniques and provide some efficiencies in cost and to generate greater student initiative and self direction in learning. But the limitations of the technologies must be recognised. The University of Sydney strongly believes that the quality of its outcomes derives substantially from the wealth of interactions that occur in a campus environment. Furthermore, that university experience which takes place outside the classroom is an important component of a student's learning and personal development experience.. While the University will indeed strive to be a leader in the application of new technologies in its work, both on-campus and off-campus, the prospect of the "virtual university" is incompatible with what the University

option for delivery a generation ago, so too will the thought of mass demands for affordable higher education being met through reliance on the interface between telephone, computer and television.

2.3 The University, in this context of supply and demand, would also highlight a trend strongly evident in recent years concerning the part-time employment of students. However desirable the principle might seem whereby full-time students gain work experience, current realities point to large numbers of full-time students engaged, for reasons of economic survival, in many hours per week of unskilled and semi-skilled labour. Not only might that work be done by others who need to find work; the quality of our full-time students' learning is also under threat through insufficient financial support.

2.4 A further aspect of rising demand for higher education which receives insufficient community and political attention is the attraction, training and on-going development of academics. The objective decline in salary levels, working conditions and morale observable in the academic profession will, in time, place serious obstacles in the way of guaranteeing both the quality and size of Australian higher education and its capacity to contribute to national and international interests. The University of Sydney believes that Australia has been well served by its academics in a period of considerable change, reorientation and declining resources. Productivity and quality appear to have been protected by a strong sense of professionalism, but the question needs to be posed as to how sustainable this protection can be and what prospects are in sight for ensuring the maintenance of the best possible teachers and researchers in Australian higher education.

Theme three: regulatory and administrative framework for higher education

3.1 The University advised the Hoare Inquiry of its concerns in relation to the load placed on it by statutory (and ad hoc) reporting requirements. It is hopeful that the current review of this area will further rationalise these and thereby limit our servicing costs. The University has recognised that much of what it provides is necessary to governments and to itself and has welcomed the increasing use of better technology and better interfaces enabling it to provide 'one-shot' reporting to state and Federal bodies. It also raised its concerns regarding constraints, related to institutional profile requirements, that, in its view, imposed unnecessary and potentially damaging restrictions on its capacity to respond effectively and well to changing external factors influencing its work. The University has welcomed recent relaxations of some of these former constraints and is willing to take a proactive role in recommending further modifications to existing policy in cases where it believes they will enhance its capacity to utilise more effectively its available resources.

3.2 Within NSW, the diversity of services provided by its universities will continue to serve the State well so long as effective coordination at State level is maintained. In practice, this coordination is in place and has worked well through largely informal processes and with constructive interactions with the State Government. The University advocates the continuation of these synergistic arrangements.

3.3 The 1994/95 Quality Rounds gave public recognition to the University of Sydney's excellent outcomes in teaching and research and to its internal quality assurance processes that contributed to its outstanding ranking in those rounds. The University has provided advice to the HEC on quality monitoring and assurance. Its position supports greater self-regulation, within an agreed national framework, as the most effective method of providing satisfactory quality control. This is seen as both necessary and sufficient, because of the demands placed upon all Australian Universities to demonstrate their international and national competitiveness in a dynamic and increasingly globally competitive context, combined with the internal constraint requiring that quality control processes be institutionally specific, readily adaptable to changes in practices, and add minimally to the costs of teaching and research while providing relevant checks on the quality of provision.

3.4 The University accepts the world as its marketplace. Given that, its responsibilities within the nation and the state are acknowledged as requiring it to address effectively its relevant intersectoral linkages. These linkages, already strong in key areas such as the school-university interface and the graduate level interface within the higher education sector, will require further strengthening on each sector, and the educational demands of the private and government

courses on the one hand, and for greater access by the most talented to university-level subjects during their final secondary years. As another example, it is likely that cooperation in the higher education sector might involve increasing numbers of transfers occurring during undergraduate study to enable students to access the highest quality course provision (especially at honours level) in specialist or infra-structure intensive fields. This University is well positioned to contribute positively to such developments, provided that, in so doing, the quality of provision is not diminished. It is also well placed to provide further specialist development courses at graduate level, relevant to business, industry, the professions and aspects of the VET sector, at minimal additional cost by recognising at this level a range of prior learning experiences and utilising expert teachers in a properly equipped, technologically rich environment.

3.5 The Committee has identified national competition policy principles as relevant to its task. University core activities are the provision of high quality undergraduate and postgraduate teaching and the support of scholarship and research. In addition the University is constrained through its Act and through the provisions of the HEFA to contribute to the communities it serves. It has considerable legislative and moral responsibilities to ensure access and equity. The University's business activities have, therefore, to be seen within this context.

3.6 Structural readjustment within and between higher education institutions to improve operational efficiencies or to rationalise course offerings has been, is currently, and this University believes should remain an unconstrained policy goal for this sector. The University expects that the necessary flexibility and rationalisation of course offerings between institutions, which it sees as an aspect of an ongoing healthy higher education system, will continue to be stated as a policy goal. Enhanced, directed institutional funding policies, applied to a more diversified sector, will add further weight to the effective addressing of this goal, as it applies to the publicly funded aspects of university work.

3.7 Outside its core activities the University is engaged in pre-competitive exploratory ventures with business and industry. It is well known that the seeding of R & D with commercial potential is highly risky and that venture capital is very difficult to obtain in this country. Accordingly, universities in collaboration with government have an important role to play in providing protected incubators where companies with no prior connection are collaborating with universities to produce new synergies. Any application of national competition principles should take appropriate account of this. When such ventures move into free-standing commercial activity then it is desirable that they be 'spun off' as separate entities, as has happened at the University of Sydney, for example, with the development of the Portable Remotely Operated Drill (PROD), which will revolutionise sampling of the sub-seabed. Otherwise, business activities are generally a limited aspect of the activities of departments operating within a devolved funding regime and are normally generated from the core work of the departments in teaching and research. Typically such activities are contributing to industry or the wider community through the provision of knowledge and expertise. It would not be feasible within each of the academic units across the University to establish quarantined corporate structures. In general, an alternative requirement of all such activity to operate within a University-wide corporate structure would be administratively complex and expensive, with the likely losers being the community whom the University seeks to serve. Attempts to establish threshold levels of "significant activities" should recognise the internal structure of the organisation and the way it operates.

3.8 Both DEETYA and the NSW Government have argued that pricing principles and other elements of competitive neutrality should apply with respect to short courses and in the area of commercial research and development and consultancies. In a University such as Sydney much of the short course activity is closely linked to the normal teaching programs of departments, using departmental resources provided for those programs. Much of it is associated with the University's obligations to extend into industry and the community. For example, there is an expectation that Co-operative Research Centres will engage in information transfer through the provision of appropriate courses. Many of these short course offerings are designed in such a way as to enable their aggregation into award courses. Nevertheless the University operates centrally a significant Continuing Education Program which it has quarantined financially. The University does not seek to subsidise this important program. It has a responsibility to the community to provide such

some tax equivalence for this particular program but it would wish to then reinvest that income in its core teaching, research and community service activities.

3.9 The University accepts the principle with respect to commercial research and development and consultancies that overheads such as the use of utilities, rent and depreciation form part of the cost and should be recovered. At the same time it is usually the case that such activity is closely linked to the normal research activities of departments including interaction with industry, without which the consultancy would not have been possible in the first place. The issue therefore is how best to formalise a system of overheads which reflects these additional considerations. The University would be prepared to institute a standard averaged overhead charge which is then re-invested in its core activities.

3.10 As previously mentioned, it would be to the benefit of the universities and the States if the uncertainties regarding the sector's future position with respect to competition policy were resolved as soon as possible. The University believes, for example, that the creation of an excellent venture such as the Australian Technology Park would not have been possible in the ambivalent state of the current environment.

Theme four: financing higher education teaching and research training

4.1 The University recognises the mutual benefits of involving many players in the support of higher education, and especially in supporting students to experience higher education and expect lifelong involvement with it. Public funding of higher education, including student maintenance and support, is, as stated previously, considered essential if mass higher education, and indeed an adequate high quality component within it, is to remain a Government policy goal. In the national interest, Government cannot retreat from its responsibility to support the higher education sector and to ensure that the quality of the sector remains among the highest in the world.

4.2 The resources available to Australian universities (including salaries, grants, scholarships and infrastructure) for teaching and research already fall well short of those available in the better universities in the United States and some of our other competitors. This situation may be most readily apparent in areas of medical and scientific teaching and research, but is no less true in the humanities and social sciences, and in the professions.

4.3 The University stresses the need for government to provide all possible incentives to the private sector to support university level education for the nation. Current taxation policy in Australia militates in many ways against individual and organisational support for higher education, by comparison with the USA, and the University thinks that self-interest alone would encourage more private money coming to the sector if there was a more US-like policy in place.

4.4 The introduction of fee-paying places, and, the total costs of HECS places in some courses, warrants a caution regarding graduate outcomes. Recent North American evidence shows that, in those professions where graduates emerge with a substantial education-derived debt, they tend to focus their careers on high-income-earning specialities. Thus, the net effect is not necessarily that greater access to a service is obtainable simply by training more professionals in the relevant field, via methods which result in debt-burdened graduates. Within Australia, there is evidence of changes in social behaviour derived from greater debt levels being carried forward by young people

4.5 The University sees little merit in replacing present admissions procedures and HECS-based funding arrangements unless their replacement mechanism is at least as equitable to applicants as is the present system, is no more expensive to administer, and is conducive to the continuing efficient use of resources in higher education. Recent discussion on vouchers has so far failed to indicate how such a system would achieve any of the above. Vouchers could be developed as an extension of an Equity and Merit scholarship scheme, applying to, say, 20% of the annual intake, and carrying with them additional institutional funding as an incentive for competition within the sector together with a needs based student support component over and above Austudy, in recognition of a partly merit-based awarding process. There is some merit in giving Universities the flexibility to combine public and private subsidy for university places, promoting differentiation among providers, maximising student/consumer choice, rewarding competitive

4.6 It is on occasion suggested that universities such as the University of Sydney should be drawing substantial financial support from their alumni, on the North American model. The University does not believe that there is a substantial untapped source of funds amongst this population. Rather it considers that through maintaining strong links with its graduates in their various professional and business roles it enhances the opportunities for cooperation and heightens its awareness to the needs of the many communities it serves.

4.7 In the deregulated environment to apply with respect to local fee-paying students, the community - and the Commonwealth - would be entitled to expect that universities pay close attention to issues of access and equity. This University, for one, would certainly not require continued federal regulation in order to maintain its strong commitment and strong record in the area of access and equity. In fact we would do so out of conviction, in the belief that the University and the community are best served by the presence of a diverse student body. We would also wish to preserve the strengths of this University as a place of diverse intellectual endeavour and would thus apply the income earned for the common good of the entire University and its various communities. Equity is expensive and this University believes that current levels of Government support for students in need is far from adequate. Achieving outstanding outcomes in equity and diversity will be more possible in a deregulated environment in which the University has adequate funds, than in a contracting sector in which privilege pre-determines access to scarce resources.

4.8 The University is increasingly developing strong links with commerce, industry, the professions and community organisations for the support of teaching through the endowment of academic positions, including Chairs. Examples include industry-funded Chairs in Computing Science and Engineering, law firm sponsored Chairs in Law, and funded positions for teaching a range of languages, such as Modern Greek and Yiddish. Moreover we seek to forge alliances to provide technical infrastructure for undergraduate training. In some cases, eg the computer industry, there is some progress - but we are not always able to give access to expensive 'state-of-the-art' equipment. (One notable exception has been the success of our Electron Microscope Unit, where as a result of joint ventures with other institutions, CSIRO and industry, honours and research students enjoy access to very advanced facilities.) Sandwich courses, short-term industrial placements and site visits can assist, but the University would advocate a coordinated program for shared training facilities with partnership of universities, industry, TAFE and government. It is notable that where we collaborate in activities overseas eg in Singapore and Korea, we find technical provision of a much higher standard.

4.9 One further issue, which has particular relevance to the University of Sydney, is the cultural stewardship role which it undertakes on behalf of the State and the Nation. The costs of maintaining significant museums and collections-are borne by the University without additional Commonwealth funding. We seek, and, indeed, benefit from private donations and bequests for the acquisition of art, rare books and antiquities, but find it difficult to solicit funds for their maintenance and display. The University notes that some galleries and museums are selling part of their collections to generate such funds but notes also that such important cultural activities contribute to the public good so that relative government funding could take account of the relative level of commitment in this sphere. The University would be unhappy if it were forced into selling parts of its collections which it did not wish to lose. An additional aspect of this cultural stewardship role relates to serious problems faced by the University in maintaining its heritage buildings. For many years the University was denied capital funds as these were generally directed to the expansion of the sector. It welcomed the new capital roll-in provision, which has given the University the opportunity to begin redressing the forced neglect of former years, but this remains an issue when considering relative funding principles.

Theme five: funding of higher education research

5.1 The University of Sydney aspires to continue to provide a strong research base of international standing. By Australian standards it is performing at a high level, providing quality research training for the largest number of research students in the country. It has attracted funding support for a wide range of Special Research Centres and Collaborative Research Centres such as the Ecological Impacts of Coastal Cities Special Research Centre and the Sustainable Cotton

Centre for the Humanities and Social Sciences. The size of this endeavour provides tremendous opportunities for intellectual interaction. It has been a leader in many aspects of quality assurance in postgraduate research supervision and continues to improve its performance. It has extensive and growing collaborative activities with industry.

5.2 The University believes that the strength of its overall research operation has been weakened by the reduction in the Research Quantum. It argues that this should be significantly increased as a proportion of Operating Grant. Resources for research within Australia should be concentrated in the existing areas of research strength in the eight major research universities, while international peer review should be the primary method of assurance that research activity within these areas of strength continues at internationally high standards. The University of Sydney believes that not only is it important to provide adequate levels of physical infrastructure in universities to allow research to be undertaken but also an adequate level of human infrastructure to undertake that research. The current level of funding for ARC Large Grants, which supports much of Australia's basic research, is inadequate in the sense that the current application success rate is only about 20%. This is so low as to have an adverse effect on the morale of the great bulk of the staff who apply and to be discouraging to early career researchers. There is agreement among those who administer the program that a success rate of say, 33% could be sustained without any dramatic deterioration in the quality of the research that would be supported. Any future increase in funding to provide for a higher success rate would provide an important boost to both the careers and morale of Australian academics, as well assisting Australian universities to maintain their international competitiveness.

5.3 It is important to recognise the structural funding problem which gives rise to these comments. Competitively won government research grants do not provide adequate infrastructure or overheads, and, in fact require the University in most cases to generate additional local support. While the ARC, for example, does provide some limited infrastructure funding, it should be noted that the NH&MRC does not provide any infrastructure or overheads with its project grants; indeed, successful projects appear always to be funded at levels that are substantially below their real operating costs. On the other hand, general operating grants (with the exception of the Research Quantum which has shrunk to 4.9%) take no account of the level of scholarship and research within the university. This implies that the greatest level of public subsidy for teaching goes to the lowest performing institutions, in so far as the others, of necessity, cross-subsidise research training and research infrastructure.

5.4 The University accepts an argument that there should be some incentive to encourage the high-performers to raise private funds through industry collaboration but that is effective only when university research is seen by industry as an internationally competitive resource. We urge the Committee to undertake international comparisons to evaluate whether the current Australian funding mechanisms facilitate the stable existence of world class research institutions.

Conclusion

The importance to Australia of a productive, accessible higher education system, capable of rapid and effective response to changing demands, requires a firm government commitment to public investment in it. A high level of public funding is necessary to provide essential infrastructure, allow the support of specialist disciplines, pure scholarship and research and to ensure that this country has some universities of true international standing.

Public funding alone cannot support and maintain high quality service in a time of continual change. There must be a public expectation that the private benefits derived from ongoing access to the services of higher education are recognised by increasing private support for it. This is best encouraged by provision of taxation incentives appropriate to its significance.

The University of Sydney accepts that the challenge is to 'do more' and emphasises that this presupposes significant public support and a regulatory framework which fosters institutional self-help. We have already committed significant resources to enhancement of our research and teaching activities over the period leading to the next century, with the intention of increasing the quality of performance and improving working conditions for staff and students. In the light of

The University is aware of the magnitude of the task being undertaken by the Committee and is willing to provide further development of particular issues canvassed in this submission.

Appendix

The University of Sydney: Some facts and figures

The University of Sydney, the oldest university in Australia, was incorporated by an act of the Legislature of New South Wales in 1850.

The most recent major change in the structure of the University occurred in 1990 when the University amalgamated with the Cumberland College of Health Sciences, the Sydney College of the arts, the Sydney Conservatorium of Music, and the Sydney Institute of Education and the Institute of Nursing of the former Sydney College of Advanced Education. In one year the enrolments of the University rose by 8600 (45 per cent), its staff by 1,400 (36 per cent) and its academic programs by 22 per cent, including the introduction of a range of disciplines not previously taught at the University.

A further change took place in 1994 with the incorporation of the Orange Agricultural College, formerly part of the University of New England.

The University teaches undergraduate and postgraduate students in all 10 Broad Fields of Study recognised by DEETYA.

Quality Reviews

The University has received favourable reports in the three CQAHE Reviews. In 1993 the University was placed in Band 2 with the report commenting that many of the University's quality assurance processes then in place had only recently been formalised in their current form and that it was equally clear that many of the 'new' and now formal processes owe much to a history of generally good practice in the institution which relied on, rather than required, staff compliance with a set of generally accepted standards. In the 1994 round which concentrated on teaching and learning, the University was placed in Band 1. In 1995 the emphasis was on Research and Community Service. The University was one of the five universities which were placed in Group 1 for each of Research Management Process, Research Outcomes and Research Improvement.

Enrolments and load	1989	1990	1995	1996	1997*
Enrolments(total)	19153	27777	30324	31656	33635
Load (total)	17337	24231	25425	26477	28303
Operating Grant load	17166	22045	25045	24670	26179

Research Higher degree enrolments	1802	1970	3224	3266	
Health Sciences	na	60	155	166	

* provisional

RESULTS OF 1994 GRADUATE DESTINATION SURVEY	
In FT employment in Australia	1,955
In FT study in Australia	1,650
Seeking FT work in Australia	613

Student:Staff Ratio 1996	
University of Sydney	12.5
National Average	16.3

STAFF (FTE)	1989	1996
Academic	1,578	2,518
General	2,615	2,972
Total	4,193	5,490

**University of Sydney Rank on Research Income
by Field of Research, 1994**

Agricultural Sciences	1
Medical And Health Sciences	2
Physical Sciences	3
Social Sciences	3
Chemical Sciences	4
Computer and Communication Technologies	4
Biological Sciences	4
Humanities	4
Mathematical Sciences	5
General Engineering	5
Applied Sciences and Technology	12
Earth Sciences	19

Source: Patterns of Research Activity in Australian
Universities
ARC 1996

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A (PILOT) SUMMER SCHOOL

Mission

It is proposed that the University establish a stand alone "Sydney Summer School", on a pilot basis, commencing January 1998. The Mission of the Summer School is to provide quality teaching during the normal summer "vacation" period, with units of study taught in a concentrated fashion over a 6 week period.

Units of study available

Only units of study which already have been approved by Departments, Faculties and the Academic Board may be offered in the Summer School. In each case, the relevant Head of Department also will be required to certify that: (a) the unit of study is one which is appropriate for teaching (and assessment) in a concentrated period, and (b) the staffing and other teaching arrangements are suitable in the circumstances. (Specified pre-requisites for enrolment in a particular unit of study would continue to apply to units offered in the Summer School.)

The program may include both undergraduate and postgraduate units of study. It is understood that some Faculties may wish to focus mainly on undergraduate units, which should include some of the large First and Second Year subjects.

Consideration could be given down the track to offering non-award courses and auditing rights for the purposes of community education. However, the pilot Summer School will be restricted to award courses, with the other programs remaining with the Centre for Continuing Education.

Candidature

Consistent with recent Commonwealth Government policy on "ancillary charges", all units in the Summer School will be offered on a full fee basis (including for local students who are otherwise HECS-liable). A number of fee-waiver scholarships will be provided, in order to meet the University's strong commitment to access and equity.

Having regard to the intensive nature of the program, no student should be permitted to do more than two units of study (or a prescribed number of credit points) in a given Summer School.

Enrolment in the Summer School will be entirely voluntary. For example, enrolment on a fee basis should *never* be a condition applied to HECS-liable students who have been asked to show cause, or who are subject to some other form of academic discipline. Similarly, units which form a basic part of an award course (ie compulsory units or popular electives) should not be withheld from offering during the normal academic year in order for them to be mounted on a fee basis in the Summer School,

The opportunity to attend a Summer School should prove attractive to a wide range of students. The Summer School will enable our own students to:

- make up lost units/credit points where they have failed, or have made slower than expected progress (eg, through past illness or misadventure, or family or work responsibilities);
- accelerate their progress through a degree program - including students from the country or overseas, who may thus be able to reduce the time away from home;
- manage their studies and workload more effectively, by (eg) taking a somewhat lighter load during the normal academic year and then picking up units in the summer;
- experience a period of study in another discipline (or disciplines), which may not otherwise be permissible or practical as part of their award courses.

Students enrolling in the Summer School from outside the University will have the opportunity to study at this institution, with our excellent teaching staff, and perhaps taking particular units which may not be available at their home institutions.

First preference in enrolment should be given to University of Sydney students; however, suitably qualified students from other universities (in Australia and overseas) also should be eligible to

[Consideration also could be given to permitting secondary school students to enrol – those who have completed high school but have not yet commenced their tertiary studies, and perhaps those who are still at school. The latter category would meet the recommendation in the McGaw Report that students be encouraged to undertake university studies while at school, as a means of supplementing (or eventually replacing) the existing Distinction course program. More thinking would need to be done on entry standards and fee policies for such students, and it is suggested that the pilot program not be open to such students in the first year.]

Structure and administration

The pilot Summer School should operate on a “stand alone” basis - with its own administration and accounting system. It will support the broad educational aims of the University as a whole, and not focus on a particular Faculty or College.

The Governing Board (“the Board”) of the Summer School should consist of: the Vice-Chancellor or his nominee; the Deans of participating Faculties; the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Planning and Resources) or his nominee; one or more of the PVCs (College); the PVC (Academic Support); and the Chair of Academic Board or her nominee.

The day-to-day administration of the Summer School will be the responsibility of the Director, who will report to the Board. This position should be advertised, with a duty statement and selection committee settled by the Board. The Board, consistent with need and available finances, will approve additional administrative support (including, perhaps, a Deputy Director).

The Summer School’s administration will be responsible for, among other things:

1. Liaising with departments and faculties to determine which units they wish to offer (and have approved for offering) in the Summer School.
2. Producing the appropriate teaching timetables, including room bookings.
3. Marketing the Summer School, including through advertisement, events, and the production of brochures and other promotional materials.
4. Enrolling students, and collecting (and accounting for) fees.**
5. Coordinating the provision of all ancillary academic and administrative services (eg, Library, labs, learning assistance, counselling, building attendants, cleaners, security) necessary to ensure the effective running of the program.
6. Coordinating the examination process, from the production of exam timetables to the recording of marks. (However, it will be up to each Faculty to conduct its own Board of Examiners meeting.*)
7. Mounting any special events associated with the Summer School, such as public lectures.
8. Liaison with the University Union, the Sports Associations (and others) to ensure the adequate provision of student amenities.
9. Administering the financial aspects of the program (including planning and budget development).

* It will be matter for faculties (and departments) to consider and specify related policy questions relating to assessment, such as the availability of supplementary examinations.

** It is understood that the provision of student services will involve close liaison with the Student Centre in relation to such matters as: admission, enrolment, timetabling, variations and discontinuations, billing (or notification of HECS liability in some cases), collection of fees, notifications to DEETYA, and management of the examinations process. See the attached letter from the Registrar.

Utilisation of teaching staff

The teacher (or teachers) for each unit of study offered in the Summer School will be nominated by the relevant Dean or Head of Department. It is envisioned that most, if not all, of the teaching will be carried out by academics already in the employment of the University. Participation will be entirely on a voluntary basis - in no case will a member of academic staff be directed to teach in the Summer School by his or her Head of Department, nor shall teaching in the Summer School be considered part of an academic’s “normal” teaching load.

Payment for such *extra* teaching should be available to academic staff on the same general principles and through the same mechanisms which regulate academic staff earning outside income

The level of payment should be set at a level sufficient to attract our top teachers to participate in the Summer School from time-to-time, and should recognise the extra responsibility inherent in teaching and assessing a unit in the Summer School (including the need to adapt units for intensive delivery and assessment). Payment should be available on either a cash basis or by deposit into a University research account (which is then applied for legitimate research support purposes).

In certain cases, the Summer School may hire teachers from outside this University, on the nomination of the relevant Dean or Head of Department. For example, this facility may be used to attract distinguished teachers from other universities in Australia or overseas, where their presence and participation would benefit our own students and staff.

Utilisation of general staff

Where the operation of the Summer School involves specific, additional duties for members of the general staff of the University, appropriate additional compensation may be made through existing award provisions for higher duties loadings and overtime payments.

As many members of the general staff take their annual leave in the summer period, it is anticipated that additional part-time and casual staff may need to be hired to administer the Summer School. (It should be noted, in passing, that this would create opportunities for the part-time employment of our own students during the summer.)

Policies on fees

The Board will approve the fee structure for the Summer School, including tuition fees and other charges (eg lab fees). Regard should be had to, among other things, the differential levels of HECS liability, fees currently charged (for FFPOS and PG CW), and - notwithstanding the desire for simplicity - the advice of the relevant Deans about the exceptional cost of mounting certain units (eg, intensive language training, fieldwork programs, etc).

Tuition fees should be the same for local and international students; however, an additional charge may be levied upon the latter in order to meet certain capital management and maintenance costs.

The Board should set a minimum enrolment figure for units offered in the Summer School (20 is suggested). Where enrolments (or perhaps pre-enrolments) fall below this figure, the unit will not go ahead and fees will be refunded. At the other end, large class sizes should be monitored to ensure the quality of the teaching and learning experience for students.

The Board also should set policies in relation to such matters as: (a) the provision of equity and merit scholarships and fee waivers; (b) withdrawal without financial penalty, and (c) withdrawal with only a partial penalty.

Budget matters

It is intended that the pilot Summer School be entirely self-funding, with its own budget. A sophisticated accounting structure will be developed to take account of the true, *full* costs of running the program (including all salaries of teaching and administrative support staff, advertising and promotion, capital maintenance, fee waivers and scholarships, other overheads and on-costs, etc).

After meeting all of the expenses associated with the Summer School, any remaining funds would be disbursed as follows: (a) 20% to the Vice-Chancellor's discretionary fund which supports strategic initiatives; and (b) the remainder to Faculties (and then departments) in proportion to their share of student load (on an EFTSU basis) in the Summer School, in order to support on-going academic programs (including teaching, research, scholarships, etc).

Raising the seed capital for the initial pilot program could be achieved either through contributions by the participating Faculties or by a float from centrally managed University funds. In either case, repayment of the seed capital would be a first charge against income.

Timetable for development

Having received "in principle" support from the VCAC, the Governing Board should convene in early May - after consideration by the Academic Board and the Senate - to commence planning for the pilot Summer School.

At the same time, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic Affairs) should commence discussions

The Director's position should be advertised (on a two-year contract basis) in time for the person to be in post no later than 1 July 1997.

Among other things, the Board should design a process for a review of the pilot program after two years.

Professor David Weisbrot
PVC (CHASS)

Attachment



The University of Sydney

Academic Board

Meeting held on Wednesday 16 April 1997

Minutes of the meeting of the Academic Board held at 2.15 pm on Wednesday 16 April 1997 in the Professorial Board Room.

There were present: the Chair (Professor J M Mack) presiding, the Deputy Chairs (Professors D J H Cockayne, J Lawler and R Pesman), the Acting Deputy Chair (Professor A Sefton), the Vice-Chancellor and Principal (Professor G Brown), Professors C Adam and D Anderson, Associate Professors R Arnold and R Atherton, Ms S Baker, Ms K Beattie, Associate Professor H C Beh, Dr R Bohringer, Professors L W Burgess, K K Campbell, J P Carter, B Cass and R E Collins, Associate Professors L J Copeland and E Cornell, Ms K Curry, Associate Professor C J Durrant, Professors K Eltis, L D Field, D R Fraser and G Gill, Associate Professors C B Gillies and J Gordon, Professor M A Harris, Ms C Hyde, Associate Professor P Jones, Professors J F Kinnear and I J Klineberg, Associate Professor A F Masters, Professor R McPhedran, Dr R A Mitchell, Mr K Oliver, Mr M G Partridge, Dr M Peat, Emeritus Professor N Quarry, Dr A Reynolds, Professor S M Salisbury, Associate Professor M Sankey, Professor W Schworm, Associate Professor G M Stone and Mr R Wilson.

Present as observers were: Mrs S Chapman (Secretary to the Academic Board), Professor L M Koder, Mrs J Campbell, and Professors D Weisbrot and J A Young.

Present by invitation were: Ms L Maral, Mr A Potter, Mr T Robinson and Professor G E Sherington.

In attendance: Miss E R Ring.

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

27/97 Minutes

*** It was agreed that the minutes of the meeting of the Academic Board held on Wednesday 12 March 1997 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

28/97 Business arising out of the minutes

None.

29/97 Report of the Chair

The following reports had been circulated and tabled:

(see agenda and supplementary agenda item A4.)

Part I

1. Report on Senate Matters

*** The Board agreed to note the report

2. Election of Chair of the Academic Board

*** The Board agreed to congratulate Professor Pesman on her election.

3. Admission of Local Fee-paying Undergraduate Students

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

P

4. West Review of Higher Education

In speaking to the additional report that he had provided in the Supplementary agenda for the meeting, the Chair said that the Working Party had agreed that there were several areas in the working draft of the University's submission that it would like to see addressed differently. Little was known about the voucher system and what it entailed, and the Working Party had agreed that this issue should be considered. Those members who had attended the visit by the West Committee had advised that the support for students might be limited to three years. The Working Party had agreed that it should not necessarily be limited to three years, and not necessarily even just to first degrees, if recognition were to be given to flexible learning and career adaptability; there was a growing trend towards generalist education followed by professional degrees, such as the combined degree programs and programs restricted to graduate entry. The Working Party had also had concerns about the National Competition Policy and felt that the University should make a stronger statement about the need to quarantine the public sector teaching and research activities of higher education from sensible structural readjustments that could be prohibited by attempts to apply this Policy strictly within the sector. The Working Party had also been concerned about the necessity for there being a substantial continuing public commitment to the university sector and the possible lack of awareness that even the best private universities (such as Harvard) received half their operating funds from the public sector.

The Chair said that, in view of the imminent closing date for submissions, he sought authority from the Board to act in its best interest in respect of the preparation of a submission.

During the ensuing discussion, the Chair said that the Working Party would like the University's submission to have a much more positive conclusion rather than one that conceded that certain outcomes were inevitable.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would be happy to receive additional suggestions and comments about the draft submission and that he too would prefer a single University submission to be made.

The Vice-Chancellor said that while the Board was focussed on the issue of the West Review, he would make the comments at this juncture that he had intended to make under item 3 of his report in respect of the visit by the West Committee. Three members of the Committee had visited the University mid-way through their round of visits. He had gained no sense of the Committee having developed firm ideas on any particular issues, and it had been difficult to distinguish between the members' personal views on matters as opposed to a Committee view and the recommendations it might be formulating. Following the visit he had received a friendly note in which Mr West had stressed the notion of diversity; this issue should therefore be incorporated into the University's submission, and he would pass the information on to the group working on the submission. The comments about diversity had indicated that the University should focus on the particular role of the University of Sydney within the wider, diverse educational system. The draft submission focussed initially on the University and then became more general; it should be more customised.

The Chair added that the terms of reference of the Review and the guidelines for submissions were difficult to reconcile, which made the preparation of a submission more difficult.

*** The Board agreed to note the report and to authorise the Chair to act on its behalf in respect of the preparation of a submission.

5. McGaw Review of the HSC

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

6. Semesterisation and nomenclature relating to academic programs and the academic year

*** The Board agreed to endorse the principles, as requested.

7. Student membership of the Academic Board

*** The Board agreed to appoint Mr Jesse McNicoll to the casual vacancy.

P

8. Membership of Faculties by Pro-Vice-Chancellors (Colleges)

Mr Oliver expressed a number of concerns about the principle of provision being made for the Pro-Vice-Chancellors (College) to become members *ex officio* of faculties, as recommended by the Faculties of Dentistry, Health Sciences and Medicine. He made the following points:

- Pro-Vice-Chancellors are senior executive officers with administrative responsibility for co-ordinating the activities of the several faculties in ways that may, from time to time, satisfy some or none of them. Their *ex officio* membership of faculties (as opposed to regular administrative liaison with them) would consequently create the potential for confusion about the proper role of the Dean, who is formally the chief officer of the Faculty.
- Since membership of a Faculty carries with it, at least in a formal sense, amenability to the discipline of that Faculty, *ex officio* membership of multiple Faculties would render it possible for PVCs to be censured by Faculties in their official capacity. Since the exercise of faculty disciplinary powers over their own members is, in a formal sense, entirely legitimate, simultaneous amenability to the discipline of more than one faculty could, in future, be a source of embarrassment to PVCs.

In the ensuing discussion that addressed these concerns, Professor Young made the following points in support of the principle:

- There was precedent for the membership of faculties by the University's Executive/Senior Management as exemplified by the provisions for the Vice-Chancellor and Deputy Vice-Chancellor to be members *ex officio* of all faculties and boards of studies as well as of most other University committees.
- In respect of Board membership, the Vice-Chancellor reported to the Board through its Chair and in that context was open to censure by the Board. This provided a parallel in respect of provision for PVCs to be members of faculties, and in any event they would be open to faculty censure whether or not they were voting members of faculty.
- Pro-Vice-Chancellors were academics and were chosen, as were Deans and Deputy-Vice-Chancellors, to provide academic leadership as well as for management expertise. They were therefore best placed to work with faculties as one of their members.
- On a personal level, he was a Professor of Physiology and continued to work in that role. By virtue of holding that Chair, he was a member of both the Faculties of Medicine and Science and would not be resigning from faculty membership in that capacity.

Professor Weisbrot indicated that he did not wish formally to be a member of all of the constituent faculties in his College. Rather, he would prefer to receive the papers for all faculty meetings, would attend meetings from time to time to inform himself about local issues and concerns, and would always attend a meeting if specifically invited to do so. Professor Weisbrot suggested that formal membership and regular attendance by PVCs could have the effect of undermining the authority, or perceived authority, of Deans within their faculties.

The Chair observed that there appeared to be support for the notion of flexibility between how the various faculties and colleges addressed this matter, and that, at Mr Oliver's request, he would ask the Board to vote on each of the recommendations from the faculties in the College of Health Sciences.

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

9. Selection Committee for the Deanship of Medicine

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

10. Introduction of a “summer session”

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

11. Student Proctorial Panel: student members

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

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

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

13. Work in progress

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

14. Question Time

*** The Board agreed to note the report

P**Part II**

At the meeting the Chair reported on the following matter:

Board of Studies and the McGaw Report

The Chair reported that the Board of Studies was continuing to meet to consider issues emanating from the McGaw Report. The key recommendation for the Board of Studies was the structure of the curriculum in the senior years, this having significant implications for the school system. Recommendation 12 in the Review Report sought to produce consistency with a basic structure of two 2-unit courses being available in most subjects, with some overlap in material leading to assessment on a common scale. This would have an enormous impact on schools, given that at present their offerings depended in most part on their size. It would be of great concern not only to the tertiary sector in terms of university preparation but also in respect of equity if all schools were not able to offer the 2 plus 2 structure in Mathematics and Languages other than English (LOTE). More information was needed, however, before statements about this were made more public.

Many areas for concern were being discussed further by the parties concerned. The provision in Recommendation 25 that universities only receive university applicants' TERs had proved unworkable when the 1996 HSC results had been re-run on that basis: the relative scaled means of those subjects that traditionally go up were brought down, and vice versa, so that there was an overall movement closer to the original mean. It was believed, however, that a solution would be able to be provided to the Minister that would satisfy Freedom of Information and Privacy concerns but still allow the tertiary sector use of data allowing it to operate in a fair and equitable way in its selection processes. If the curriculum question could be resolved then the matter of assessment would require more work than the McGaw time-frame allowed: it needed a more gradual approach.

Professor McPhedran expressed concern that the Sciences would be disadvantaged in this change to scaling procedures, and that the McGaw Review was failing to recognise the importance of scientific literary education. The Chair said that it was appropriate for these sorts of concerns to be relayed to the Minister. He added that another area of concern was that the Review abolished the subject spread requirement in the HSC; the Board of Studies had been advised of survey results which indicated that some students would take only Mathematics and Science subjects for the HSC, together with English but no humanities subjects at all. He hoped that the spread requirement would be given further consideration.

Professor Eltis said that he had attended a DTEC briefing at which the two 2-unit courses issue had generated the most interest; schools were being asked to see if this structure could be time-tabled. There had also been discussion about the number of units required for the TER and the possibility of a larger number of vocational subjects being included. The universities would be asked for comment on how they would select students. The issue of membership of the Board of Studies being based on expertise rather than on constituency groups had also been discussed. The time-line for the implementation of the changes was currently seen as impossible.

The Vice-Chancellor reported that Professor Niland and he had been to see the Minister regarding the McGaw Report. They had raised the on-flow affects of the abolition of the 3-unit course in Mathematics for tertiary studies in areas such as engineering; as difficulties were perceived in

making an exception for one subject, this cast doubts over the wider proposal. They had also made the point about using the full cohort for determining TERs, especially in subjects with small candidatures.

*** The Board noted the report.

30/97 Statement by the Vice-Chancellor and Principal

The following reports had been circulated and tabled:

(see agenda and supplementary agenda item A5.)

Part I

1. Report on Senate Matters

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

P

2. Admission of Local Fee-paying Undergraduate Students

The Vice-Chancellor said that the paper presented to Senate had also been presented to the Board as it was one of the various groups which he wished to consult on the implementation of this initiative. Many of the issues and concerns which had been raised in respect of the initiative were based on a concern by some that any contact with privatisation inevitably corrupted, and the view was therefore expressed by some that tertiary education should be based totally on government funding. There was also a more moderate view, to which he personally ascribed, which recognised a balance between the external demand for higher education and the capacity of an institution to provide this given the public funding available at a given time, and which sought to find a reasonable compromise between the two.

In response to questions and comments, the Vice-Chancellor advised that every conceivable means of income generation, other than the introduction of places for local fee-paying undergraduate students, had been considered and continued to be considered. There were many issues associated with this initiative which needed to be discussed broadly within the University and he encouraged debate which would provide constructive comment.

The Chair said that areas of particular interest to the Board were the policies in respect of the admission and progression of students and the development and approval of courses. As indicated in his written report, he and the Chair of the Undergraduate Studies Committee had written to Deans seeking their advice on the admission procedures they wished to adopt for those courses which would be available to fee-paying students.

Concern was expressed about the potential for students to sue the University under the Trade Practices Act for failure to deliver what it advertised, and attention was drawn to the importance of the establishment of grievance resolution procedures. Concern was also expressed that policies and procedures which were adopted by the Board were not necessarily always implemented, and that there needed to be some form of executive/central action to ensure that faculties and departments implemented central policy.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the issue of fees highlighted what were areas of real concern. Recent events obliged the University to look carefully at the relations between faculties and the central management of the University. This was a sensitive area, but one that needed to be addressed. The Chair said that while the Board determined many policy matters, which were sensible and could be implemented, it could not assume or take responsibility for their implementation. This was a matter for the Chief Executive Officer to address through the Pro-Vice-Chancellors (Colleges) and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research).

In the ensuing discussion about what appeared to be false advertising by another tertiary institution and about the danger of misleading advertisement, there was general agreement on the importance of publicity material being checked thoroughly by faculties for its accuracy.

In response to questions about why only deans had been asked for advice on the selection procedures for fee-paying students, rather than the Board or even a wider spectrum of the University, the Chair said that the responses from the deans would be considered by the

Undergraduate Studies Committee, which in turn reported to the Board. There was no reason to suppose that any faculty would recommend procedures in variance with the current policies and practices of the Board. Once fee-paying students were admitted, their candidatures would be administered under the same rules and procedures as those of all other students. Associate Professor Atherton also pointed out that the request for advice from deans was only the beginning of the consultative process; the faculties were broadly representative sections of the University and their memberships comprised, *inter alia*, student and external members. Initial consultation through deans was a sensible way to begin.

In respect of questions about how equity and access issues were to be addressed, the Chair said that the memorandum to deans reminded them that once the level of income distribution from fees was known, faculties would be expected to provide advice on how the provisions for increased access and equity would be addressed. He said that he would provide a copy of the memorandum to deans for inclusion in the May Board agenda papers. He would welcome advice on the process of making offers, which would be the next step of the process.

In response to a question about how consultation with students would be structured, the Vice-Chancellor responded in the following terms: There was no one single consultative mechanism, but rather an ongoing, evolving process, progressing from Senate's agreement in principle based on the background discussion paper to actual implementation. He envisaged a number of discussion papers being circulated for comment as each stage of the process was developed. He encouraged broad consultation, and was happy for the discussion papers to be referred formally to the student associations for comment.

*** The Board noted the report.

P **3. Review of Higher Education Financing and Policy**

*** The Board noted that the Vice-Chancellor had reported on this matter under the Chair's report.

P **Part II**

*** The Board noted that the Vice-Chancellor's oral report had been given under the Chair's report and under Part I of his report.

31/97 Report by the Vice-Chancellor and Principal on proctorial matters

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

32/97 Report of the Academic Forum

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item A12.)

1. **Forum focus: Semesterisation and the University**
2. **Report from the Chair of the Academic Forum**
3. **Report from the Vice-Chancellor**
4. **Report from the Chair of the Academic Board**

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

P **33/97 Report of the Faculty of Dentistry**

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item B5.)

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

The item had been starred and the request had been made that the Board vote on the Faculty's recommendation.

*** The Board agreed, on the voices, to recommend the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate, as recommended. Mr Oliver requested that his dissent be recorded.

34/97 Report of the Faculty of Education

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item B7.)

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

*** The Board agreed to recommend the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate, as recommended.

P 35/97 Report of the Faculty of Health Sciences

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item B9.)

Amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate: Constitution of the Faculty of Health Sciences

The item had been starred and the request had been made that the Board vote on the Faculty's recommendation.

*** The Board agreed, on the voices, to recommend the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate, as recommended. Mr Oliver requested that his dissent be recorded.

P 36/97 Report of the Faculty of Medicine

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item B11.)

A. First report of the Faculty of Medicine

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

The item had been starred and the request had been made that the Board vote on the Faculty's recommendation.

*** The Board agreed, on the voices, to recommend the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate, as recommended. Mr Oliver requested that his dissent be recorded.

B. Second report of the Faculty of Medicine

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

*** The Board agreed to recommend the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate, as recommended.

37/97 Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C1.)

Proceedings of the Committee

1. Committee membership

2. Priority areas for the Committee

(1) New nomenclature and credit point values

(2) Approval mechanisms for new courses and major changes to existing courses

(3) Admissions

(4) Evaluation of the Committee's performance

(5) Terms of Reference of the USC

(6) Reference from the Teaching and Learning Committee: Academic Policies

3. New award programs

(1) Bachelor of Science and Technology/Bachelor of Laws

(2) Liberal Studies/Liberal Arts course

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

38/97 Report of the Graduate Studies Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C2.)

1. **Amendment and rescission of Resolutions of the Academic Board**
Rescission of Resolutions of the Academic Board:
 - Electron Microscopy For Higher Degree Candidates
 - Postgraduate Students: Faculty In Which Candidature Should Normally Proceed
 - Research Students In The Scientific Laboratories**Amendment of Resolutions of the Academic Board:**
 - Form and binding of the thesis
- *** The Board agreed to rescind and amend its resolutions, as recommended.
2. **Levels of award and nomenclature for Master's degrees and grading systems for postgraduate award programs**
- *** The Board agreed to adopt the report and its recommendations.
3. **Proceedings of the Committee**
 - (1) Administration of graduate candidatures
 - (2) Postgraduate Awards Selection Sub-Committee
 - (3) Medium or form in which theses are presented
 - (4) Meeting of Departmental Postgraduate Co-ordinators
 - (5) Graduate Studies Coursework Sub-Committee
 - (6) Seminars for Supervisors of Postgraduate Students
 - (7) Faculty reports on postgraduate teaching and reviews of postgraduate coursework
 - (8) Postgraduate Studies Handbook
 - (9) 1997 postgraduate enrolments
 - (10) Work in progress
- *** The Board agreed to note the report.

39/97 Report of the Teaching and Learning Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C3.)

1. **Priority Areas**
High Priority
 - (1) Review of Generic Attributes of Graduates
 - (2) Graduate Students' Teaching Loads
 - (3) Upgrading of Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers
 - (4) Distance Education/Flexible Learning
 - (5) Intellectual Property
 - (6) Brokering Role**Areas considered Important but Deferred at this Stage**
 2. **Policy Review**
 - (1) Examinations and Assessment
 - (2) Communication Skills of Students
 - (3) Statement on the Management of Teaching Activities
 3. **Other Issues**
 - (1) WAMs and the Honours Year
 - (2) Size of the Committee
- *** The Board agreed to note the report.

40/97 Report of the Research Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C4.)

1. **Report of the Australian Research Council Visit to The University of Sydney on 1 October 1996**
- *** The Board agreed to note the report.

2. Teaching and Learning Committee - Review of Academic Policies in the Area of Teaching and Learning

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

3. Review of the Paper Entitled "Key Issues in Australian Electronic Publishing"

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

P

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

In response to a number of questions about the recommendations, Professor Cockayne responded in the following terms. The ARC had pointed out the differences across the University in the conditions offered fellows, and a great deal of consultation had been undertaken in arriving at the recommendations. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) had thought that about \$5000 would be adequate for each fellow, which would amount to some \$1500 to \$2000 per annum, and was a relatively small amount. While some fellows such as the U2000 Fellows were already supported, it had been considered that all fellows should be provided with this assistance. The issue of whether there were sufficient funds available was a matter for the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) and the Vice-Chancellor. Any changes to the list of fellows in section (d) of the recommendations would be reported to the Board.

*** The Board agreed to adopt in principle the recommendations in respect of the conditions to be provided to the categories of research fellow listed and to commend to the Vice-Chancellor for his endorsement those recommendations with resource implications.

P

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

In response to a question about the source of funding for termination payments, the Chair said that the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) was discussing this with Industrial Relations staff.

Professor Young said that in most cases termination payments were small, unless the person was relatively senior and had been employed for a long time.

*** After a brief discussion, the Board agreed to note the report.

6. Report from the Director, Business Liaison Office.

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

7. Report of the Director, Research Development

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

8. Report of the Director, Research and Scholarships Office

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

9. Research Forum

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

41/97 Report of the Library and Information Technology Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C5.)

P

1. Chair of the IT Reference Group

2. Joint ITC/LITC Working Party on Student access to dedicated student Laboratories

3. Paper on ITC and its Sub-Committees

4. Proposed membership of Reference Groups

Library Reference Group

Information Technology Reference Group

5. Library Issues for Referral to Library References Groups

6. IT Issues for Referral to IT References Groups

The Chair reported that Ms Curry, who had had to leave the meeting, had starred Item 3. in the report with a view to asking about further developments, and about the composition of the proposed International Relations Committee and provision on it for student membership. He reported that a meeting had been held with Professor Kinnear to produce draft terms of reference for the Committee and said that he would look into the proposed membership provisions in respect of student membership. It was hoped that recommendations could be presented to the May Board meeting and that the Committee could be set up in June.

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

42/97 Report of the Academic Staffing Committee

The following reports had been circulated:

(see agenda item C6.)

A. First report of the Academic Staffing Committee

P

3. Matters referred to Committee - Promotion appeals

In response to a request for clarification of the proposed procedures relating to promotions, Professor Pesman said that where the Central Committee did not endorse the FPAC recommendation, the Chair of the Central Committee would prepare a separate report on each candidate, outlining the reasons for its decision, and that that report could then be made available to the unsuccessful applicant.

*** The Board agreed to approve the recommendations, subject to the amendment set out in the preamble to the report.

B. Second report of the Academic Staffing Committee

1. Title of Emeritus Professor

*** The Board agreed to endorse the recommendation and recommend its adoption by Senate.

2. Promotions appeals

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

3. "Policy Document - Support and Progression of Academic Staff"

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

4. Research only positions

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

5. Information sessions on selection committee techniques for Academic Board nominees

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

6. Committee membership

*** The Board agreed to approve the recommendation.

P

43/97 Nomination of members of the Advisory Committee for the Centre for Continuing Education

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C7.)

*** The Board agreed to nominate the following persons for reappointment to the Advisory Committee for the Centre for Continuing Education, subject to their availability:

Dr S MacAlister

Professor T Underwood.