



The University of Sydney

**Please note
commencement
time of
meeting**

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, 16 April 1997** in the Professorial Board Room.

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

Erica Ring
for
Sue Chapman
Registrar and Deputy Principal (Administrative Support Services)
9 April 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	5
A8. Report by the Vice-Chancellor and Principal on proctorial matters	5
A12. Report of the Academic Forum	6
B5. Report of the Faculty of Dentistry	8
B7. Report of the Faculty of Education	9
B9. Report of the Faculty of Health Sciences	10
B11. Report of the Faculty of Medicine	10
C1. Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee	11
C2. Report of the Graduate Studies Committee	12
C3. Report of the Teaching and Learning Committee	16
C4. Report of the Research Committee	18
C5. Report of the Library and Information Technology Committee	21
C6. Report of the Academic Staffing Committee	23
C7. Nomination of members of the Advisory Committee for the Centre for Continuing Education	26

A G E N D A

A1. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Academic Board held on Wednesday 12 March 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 15 April 1997 so that they can be included in the supplementary agenda for the meeting.

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

A2. Business arising out of the minutes

A4. Report of the Chair

Part I

1. Report on Senate Matters

To be tabled at the meeting.

that the Board note the report.

2. Election of Chair of the Academic Board

I am pleased to report that Professor Ros Pesman has been elected unopposed as Chair of the Academic Board, to hold office from 1 June 1997 to 31 December 1998. There will be a one-month hand-over period during May when Professor Pesman and I will work closely together to ensure a smooth transition.

that the Board congratulate Professor Pesman on her election.

3. Admission of Local Fee-paying Undergraduate Students

In his report, the Vice-Chancellor has provided a copy of the background paper presented to Senate on this matter. I am discussing with Professor Lawler, Chair of the Undergraduate Studies Committee, a memorandum to Deans seeking their advice regarding proposed admissions procedures their Faculties wish to adopt in relation to all courses open to fee-paying students in 1998. The Undergraduate Studies Committee will need to consider these and provide appropriate recommendations to the Board for transmission to Senate.

that the Board note the report.

P 4. West Review of Higher Education

The *ad hoc* group that I convened to look at the guidelines for submissions to the West Review had a brief meeting before Easter in order to provide some informal advice to Professor Pesman. As Acting Chair, she met with the West Review Committee members who visited the University on 1 April. Subsequent to that visit, the Vice-Chancellor provided a draft of the University submission to Senate for its consideration and has provided with this agenda a copy for information and comment by Board members (see agenda item A5. below).

I plan to re-convene the *ad hoc* group prior to the Board meeting in order that it may consider the draft submission and provide advice to the Board on it.

.....

5. **McGaw Review of the HSC**

In part II of my report I shall summarise briefly discussions I have been involved in since the last Board meeting regarding the recommendations in this Review. This will also provide an opportunity for members of the Board to comment on the Review report.

that the Board note the report.

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

Following recent discussions about semesterisation and the new nomenclature relating to academic programs and the academic year at the Board and some of its committee meetings and at the Forum, I set out below my understanding of the underlying academic principles which have been agreed to. Administrative procedures continue to be developed through a working party of the Student Information System and are communicated separately to deans, faculty managers, heads of department, as relevant.

The basic academic principles on which there has been agreement are as follows, for implementation from 1998 onwards:

- All units of study¹ will be semesterised, both at undergraduate and postgraduate level, except for those components of final honours year or postgraduate courses relating to thesis or other similar research oriented projects for which two or more semesters are normally assigned for completion. This means that any units of study in which students formally enrol must normally be established as being taught and examined in either the March or July semesters (or in both semesters if the course is offered twice).
(Note: The introduction of a summer session is anticipated but is not addressed here.)
- The normal credit point² value for full-time study in a course of study³ will be 24 credit points per semester. A faculty may, on academic grounds, propose a small upward variation on this, but the prescription of 24 credit points as the norm is strongly encouraged.
- Units of study, which are the building blocks for all courses of study, will have a unique credit point value, normally in the range of 3 to 24 points, irrespective of the course of study to which they contribute. A faculty may, on academic grounds, propose the establishment of units of study worth 1 or 2 credit points within a course of study, but these will normally only be accepted if they are available only within that faculty. The use of units of study worth less than 3 credit points is discouraged.

I ask the Board to endorse the above.

that the Board endorse the principles, as requested.

P 7. **Student membership of the Academic Board**

Ms Kate Beattie, the elected undergraduate student member of the Board, has resigned from this position, effective from 17 April 1997.

The Academic Governance Rules relating to the Board provide that such a casual vacancy must be filled by the candidate at the immediately preceding election who was the last candidate to be excluded, and who remains eligible to be elected (Rule 42.1), and that if the vacancy cannot be filled in accordance with Rule 42.1, the Academic Board must fill that vacancy by: (a) appointing an eligible member from the Academic Forum; or (b) if there is no eligible member on the Academic Forum, appointing a student who is eligible to be elected to that category of members to the Academic Forum, after first consulting with the relevant student associations recognised by Senate.

Ms Beattie was declared elected unopposed. The President of the SRC is consulting the student members of the Forum and will forward a nominee for appointment to fill the casual vacancy.

¹ A unit of study is what is currently known as a course (or subject)

that the Board appoint to the casual vacancy.

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

As members are aware, there was discussion at the February Board meeting about making provision for membership of faculties by the Pro-Vice-Chancellors (Colleges) and about whether this should be initiated by the individual faculties or by the Board or Senate. The Board referred this issue to Senate, which, at its March meeting, resolved to advise the Board that it believed that the existing Resolutions of the Senate relating to constitutions of faculties and colleges were appropriate, and that it hoped that the faculties and colleges would invite the Pro-Vice-Chancellors to attend their meetings.

The report from the Faculty of Medicine, that was in the agenda for the March Board meeting, recommended the amendment of the Faculty's constitution to provide for Faculty membership by the PVC (Health Sciences); I had starred the item for discussion in the light of the previous discussion. No decision was able to be made at the March Board in respect of the Faculty's recommendation as the quorum was lost. It was agreed to place the report on the agenda for the April Board meeting, and it appears below, as agenda item B11. Preceding it is are three other faculty reports which also recommend amendments to their respective constitutions:

- the report from the Faculty of Dentistry (agenda item B5.) and that from the Faculty of Health Sciences (agenda item B9.) recommend that provision be made for the PVC (Health Sciences) to become a member of those Faculties; and
- the report from the Faculty of Education (agenda item B7.) recommends *inter alia* that provision be made for the PVC (Humanities and Social Sciences) to be invited to attend all Faculty meetings.

It appears that individual faculties are addressing the issue of membership by their PVCs in different ways. I draw this to members' attention, but do not believe that there is any need for the Board to debate the principle unless any member wishes to do so.

that the Board note the report.

9. Selection Committee for the Deanship of Medicine

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 G Brown, Vice-Chancellor (Chair)

Professor R Pesman (Chair-elect, Academic Board)

Nominees of the Vice-Chancellor, at least two of whom shall be members of the Faculty concerned

Professor D Frewin (Dean of Medicine, Adelaide)

Professor J Kinnear (DVC (International and Development))

Professor J R Young (PVC (Health Sciences))

Nominees of the Faculty

Dr L Baur (Paediatrics and Child Health)

Professor J Chalmers (Medicine)

Associate Professor M J Field (Medicine)

Professor A E Sefton (Physiology)

Professor T Usherwood (General Practice)

Nominees of the Academic Board

Professor P Kuchel (Biochemistry)

Professor J Lawler (Nursing)

that the Board note the report.

10. Introduction of a "summer session"

dates published through to 2002. There may be some overlap with the March Semester in some years and, if so, I shall indicate this in my advice to the May Board.

that the Board note the report.

11. Student Proctorial Panel: student members

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 Curry
Mr K Oliver
Mr T-H Tan

The Presidents of SUPRA and SRC are consulting the student members of the Forum and anticipate being able to forward the names of three more student members by the time of the next meeting of the Forum on 21 April.

that the Board note the report.

12. 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 Assessment Committees and selection committees that have been processed under the “old” appointments procedures and have approved/noted them as appropriate. A report on the appointment of Visiting Professors and FPACs that I have approved is attached.

(see pages 27-34)

that the Board note the report.

13. Work in progress

The following Working Parties are continuing with their deliberations, but I have no recent progress to report:

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

Similarly, I have no recent progress to report on the re-drafting of the following “green papers” considered by the Board/Forum:

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

that the Board note the report.

14. Question Time

I have not received any questions this month.

that the Board note the report.

P Part II

To be presented at the meeting.

A5. Statement by the Vice-Chancellor and Principal

Part I

1. Report on Senate Matters

To be tabled at the meeting.

that the Board note the report.

P

2. Admission of Local Fee-paying Undergraduate Students

An ongoing process of consultation has occurred with the aim of developing appropriate policy for the University with respect to the admission of local fee-paying undergraduate students. After a small group prepared a preliminary paper, discussions were held at two meetings of VCAC and a draft discussion paper was considered by the Senior Executive Group. The background paper, as amended in the light of comments made, was then referred to a broadly constituted Reference Group which provided further comment.

The enclosed discussion paper was considered by Fellows of Senate and at their meeting of 7 April the following resolution was passed:

"that the Senate reluctantly approve in principle the future intake of local undergraduate fee-paying students made possible in 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"

As part of the process of ongoing consultation, I ask that the Board consider the attached paper. *(see pages 35-40)*

.....

P

3. Review of Higher Education Financing and Policy

Members of the West Committee visited the University on 2 April. Mr West was accompanied by Professor Peter Baume, Professor Kwong Lee Dow, Dr Doreen Clark and a member of the Committee's secretariat, Mr William Thorne. Mr West and his colleagues met with myself, the Deputy Vice-Chancellors, the Pro-Vice-Chancellors (College), the Acting Chair of the Academic Board, a range of innovative teachers and researchers, and students. At the meeting of the Board, I will provide an oral report of my impressions of the visit.

The closing date for submissions to the West Committee is 24 April. The University's draft submission is attached and I would be pleased to receive comments from members of the Academic Board. These should be forwarded to my office as soon as possible and before the closing date. *(see pages 41-48)*

.....

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 24 March 1997.

1. Forum focus: Semesterisation and the University

In introducing the discussion, Associate Professor Tony Masters outlined the experience of the Faculty of Science which had progressed one-third to half-way towards full semesterisation. Both a Faculty working party and a review into the structure of degrees had recommended semesterisation, identifying no academic barrier to it, although it had been acknowledged that it could be costly and difficult in some cases (e.g. Chemistry). Courses, enrolment, exams and mid-year entry were seen as the major considerations.

To facilitate semesterisation the Faculty had split into two those one-year courses in which mid-year exams were already being held. This entailed an additional examiners' meeting and changes to the handbook. Revision of the Academic Board's internal accreditation process was still needed, as it was currently based on the assumption of a January entry. The examination process was still being streamlined. The Faculty had introduced a concessional pass, the effects of which would be monitored this year. The Faculty would be half to two-thirds semesterised by 1998.

In the ensuing discussion semesterisation was supported as a move which would increase flexibility for students (especially when there was a need to repeat), cause academics to think more about the curricula and assessment, enable second semester intake, and facilitate provision of summer schools. The Chair of the Academic Board said that advice received over the past three months had indicated that there were no impediments to semesterisation in the faculties of Arts, Education and Science.

A problem identified in Nursing was the difficulty of arranging clinical placements in both parts of the year, especially given the competition with other universities. Semesterisation did not necessarily mean however, that all semester-long units of study would be available in every semester. Some year-long units of study, such as fourth year honours in Arts, did not lend themselves easily to semesterisation, being ill-adapted to mid-year assessment. It could be possible in some such situations to have a non-numerical first semester assessment to indicate satisfactory progress.

The phenomenon of some students' not doing well in first semester (or the first part of a year-long unit) but succeeding in the second unit/part where there was linear progression from one to the next, needed to be addressed. One suggestion was the possibility of changing first semester results in response to second semester performance. The difficulty of maintaining a sense of group identity among undergraduates commencing at different times also needed to be considered.

There were still important issues to be thought through at faculty and cross faculty level. Credit transfer, for instance, was not just a faculty issue as students could study in more than one faculty.

2. Report from the Chair of the Academic Forum

The Forum noted previously circulated reports on: proposals for organisation of the Academic Forum (including establishment of a Steering Committee); proceedings of the Forum focus; and follow-up from the last Forum meeting.

In the meeting the Chair announced that Professor Ros Pesman had been elected unopposed as Chair of the Academic Board, to take effect from 1 June, and extended congratulations on behalf of the Academic Forum. Professor Pesman would bring forward recommendations regarding Deputy Chairs, who would be elected by the Forum prior to 1 June.

The following people were elected in the meeting to the Student Proctorial Panel: Professor Sue Armitage (Nursing), Ms Su Baker (SCA), Professor Ken Brown (Science), Ms Joyce Edwards (Nursing), Associate Professor Christopher Gillies (Science) and Dr Neville Weber (Science). The Forum noted that separate arrangements had been made for election of student members to the Panel.

3. Report from the Vice-Chancellor

The Forum noted the previously circulated report on the new organisational structures and the establishment of colleges.

In the meeting the Vice-Chancellor responded in the following broad terms to eight detailed questions from Dr Gavan Butler about the Universal English College (UEC).

While the arrangement with UEC could be seen to compete with the University's international preparation program, the question was whether one is diverting opportunity or increasing overall scope. Because UEC admits students from such countries as Indonesia and Thailand and specialises in providing additional language and cultural support, it was felt that the arrangement was creating extra opportunities for both students and staff and that the University could withstand the competition. The arrangement would allow for that proposition to be tested.

In granting any kind of credit transfer it was important to argue that it costs more to teach a student at university than at TAFE or a corresponding private provider because the quality of experience was higher, with provision of facilities not available outside a university environment with its investment in research infrastructure. While the University was willing to grant credit transfer, care must be taken as to how to go about it.

The expressed concern that intake of students from UEC would over-tax the already stretched resources of the Faculty of Economics was a valid one. It was necessary, however, to increase the University's international fee-paying student numbers well beyond what was previously envisaged. It was therefore important that the Faculty's estimations in these areas inform the University's strategic planning.

The agreement concerning the Diploma was explicitly confined to full-fee overseas students. If UEC sought to enrol local students in a corresponding program, that would require separate negotiation with the University.

Materials to be supplied included 'course outlines, bibliographies, syllabuses, curriculums, study aids and guidelines for the manner and method of teaching and the setting and assessment of assignments and examinations', so refer to the basics of the course. There was no question of providing lecture notes or other material of the kind which could form part of the current discussions over the University's intellectual property policy.

As for ensuring that the benefits of cooperation are appropriately distributed, the University has never had to face that issue in the area of teaching (as it has consistently with research), except in relation to Kolej Antarabangsa. Tendering was not an automatic solution; in fact, in some cases with universities tendering has had the opposite effect. In all the University's commercial interactions it was important that the senior officers of the University were networking outside the University so that opportunities were brought forward.

Certainly peremptory demands had been made on the Faculty's staff to supply teaching materials, but these demands had been made by UEC staff, not the University. As for 'making good' any damage done to the University's reputation amongst its academic staff, an attempt would be made to make sure that there was full explanation and consultation regarding the agreement. There was some truth in the suggestion that assisting the College to put courses in place would entail work additional to that which teachers were currently expected to undertake, but the contract clearly provided that there would be compensation for any additional work and staff would not be expected to perform abnormal tasks without consultation.

The fact that detailed arrangements had not been spelled out for the University's monitoring of the UEC's appointments, curricula and assessment beyond the inaugural year actually gave the University flexibility in the sense of not having to go through the procedure again if all was working effectively. The contract provided nevertheless that, on an ongoing basis, UEC must implement any reasonable directions for the delivery of courses and reasonably assist and facilitate the University in the implementation of the policy, methods and timing of student assessment.

The academic principle as it affects the University as a whole had been dealt with already over Kolej Antarabangsa and could therefore be dealt with as both an academic and managerial issue within the Faculty of Economics. An assurance had been given that the matter of the UEC had been canvassed at Faculty level. There had been an Academic Board working party in the past that was concerned with credit transfer, resulting in arrangements being entered into. The federal government wanted to encourage private higher education; the example of UEC was a forerunner to what will be happening more frequently in the university sector.

4. **Report from the Chair of the Academic Board**

The Forum noted the previously circulated report, as well as a tabled report on the discussion which had been held, at the March Academic Board meeting, about the Universal English College.

In the meeting Professor Mack reported on two major items that had preoccupied the Committee of Chairs at its most recent meeting:

(1) **McGaw report ('Shaping Their Future: Recommendations for reform of the Higher School Certificate')**

The Committee had expressed concern that implementation within the specified time-frame of three years was unrealistic. Adoption of the recommendation would result in evolution of the curricula, the examination process and reporting procedures. As the Minister would like to make a statement at the end of April, comments should be sent to the Minister's office by mid-April.

(2) **West Review of Higher Education**

It had been reported in the Committee of Chairs' meeting that Mr West and his colleagues had expressed surprise that some universities had 'put a bold face on things' and 'said how good things are', as if responding to a quality round. It was preferable to 'tell it how it is', as the report will go back to the federal government.

It had been noted that at least one member of the review team was knowledgeable in the area of information technology, so it was likely that the team would look at developments in that area.

Those who had been visited had stressed that the Committee put high value on meeting with students.

In the West Review's terms of reference there was a question regarding competition policy. The team would have to come to terms with duplication of services, encouragement of competition between universities and rationalisation of resources due to erosion of funding.

The University's working group would be meeting that or the following week. Professor Anderson was arranging for the review team to meet with students in an hour-long session.

that the Board note the report.

B5. Report of the Faculty of Dentistry

The Faculty met on 14 March 1997.

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

The Faculty **recommends** that the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Constitution of the Faculty of Dentistry (p 237, *Calendar 1996, Vol I*) be amended with immediate effect:

- by inserting the following new section 1 (b):
 1. (b) the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Health Sciences);
- and
- by re-numbering existing sub-sections 1(b) to 1(p) as sub-sections 1(c) to 1(q) respectively.

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

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

B7. Report of the Faculty of Education

The Faculty met on 20 March 1997.

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

The Faculty **recommends** that the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Constitution of the Faculty of Education (pp 286-7, *Calendar 1996*, Vol I) be amended, with immediate effect, as follows :

- (1) By inserting the following new sub-sections in section 1:
 - (b) Honorary Professors, Honorary Associate Professors, Honorary Readers, Honorary Senior Lecturers, Honorary Lecturers and Honorary Associate Lecturers in the Faculty of Education;
 - (i) the Dean of the Faculty of Nursing or the Dean's nominee;
 - (j) the Dean of the Faculty of Law or the Dean's nominee;
 - (p) four persons, being members of the staff of the Faculty of Education, who, in the opinion of the Faculty, have a close and appropriate association with its work of teaching and research; and

and
by re-numbering existing sub-sections 1(b) - (g), (h) - (l) and (m) respectively as sub-sections 1(c) - (h), (k) - (o) and (q) respectively.
- (2) By deleting the words 'eight', 'four' and 'six' in the new sub-sections 1(d), 1(e) and 1(f) respectively and by substituting instead the words 'four', 'two' and 'three' respectively.
- (3) By deleting section 2 and by substituting instead the following new section :
 2.
 - (a) Subject to subsection (d), the members appointed in accordance with subsections 1(d) to (p) inclusive shall hold office for a maximum period of two years, in the first instance, commencing on 1 January following their appointment. All appointments shall cease on 31 December 1997, and then every two years after that date.
 - (b) Members shall be eligible for re-appointment or re-election.
 - (c) A person shall cease to hold office if that person ceases to hold the qualifications by virtue of which that person was eligible to hold office.
 - (d) If a vacancy occurs in the office of a member appointed in accordance with sections subsections 1(d) to (p), the vacancy may be filled in like manner to the appointment, and the person so appointed shall hold office for the balance of the term of the person being replaced.
- (4) By inserting the following new section :
 3. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Humanities and Social Sciences) is invited to attend all meetings of the Faculty of Education.

The purpose of these amendments is to:

- (1) provide membership of the Faculty of Education for honorary appointees and the Deans of the Faculties of Nursing and Law and to provide Faculty staff representation other than for those members of academic staff currently provided for in the Constitution;
- (2) amend the number of representative members from the Faculties of Arts, Science and Economics; and
- (3) to enable the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Humanities and Social Sciences) to attend all meetings of Faculty.

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

B9. Report of the Faculty of Health Sciences

The Faculty met on 20 March 1997.

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

The Faculty **recommends** that the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Constitution of the Faculty of Health Sciences (p 355, *Calendar 1996, Vol I*) be amended with immediate effect:

- by inserting the following new section 1 (h):
 1. (h) the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Health Sciences);

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

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

B11. Report of the Faculty of Medicine

A. First report of the Faculty of Medicine

The following report had been circulated in the agenda for the March 1997 Board meeting. No decision was able to be made on the recommendation in the report as the quorum was lost. It was agreed to place the report on the agenda for the April Board meeting,

The Faculty met on 21 February 1997.

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

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

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

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

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

B. Second report of the Faculty of Medicine

The Faculty met on 20 March 1997.

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

The Faculty **recommends** that the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Constitution of the Faculty of Medicine (pp 383-4, *Calendar 1996, Vol I* and as amended by the Senate at its meeting on 2 September 1996) and as recommended by the Faculty at its meeting on 21 February 1997) be further amended

- by inserting in section 1. (a) the words "Canberra Clinical School" after the word "Biochemistry";
- by replacing in section 1. (l) the words "Woden Valley Hospital" with the words "The Canberra Hospital"; and
- by inserting in section 1. (k) after the words "Western Sydney Area Health Service" the words "and the Chair of the ACT Health and Community Care Services Board".

Hospital and to provide for membership of the Faculty by the Chair of the ACT Health and Community Care Services Board.

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

C1. Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee

The Committee met on 18 March 1997, when there were present: Professor Jocalyn Lawler (Chair), Professor Hilary Astor, Ms Su Baker, Associate Professor Geoff Barton, Ms Ricky Campbell-Allen, Associate Professor Lloyd Dawe, Professor Brian Farrow, Dr Ross Gilbert, Associate Professors Christopher Gillies and Jill Gordon, Professor Richard Johnstone, Dr Gary Lee, Dr Edith Lees, Associate Professor Ewan Mylecharane, Dr Greg Patmore and Mr Ross Wilson. Miss E R Ring was in attendance.

Proceedings of the Committee

1. Committee membership

The Committee welcomed Ms Ricky Campbell-Allen in the category of an undergraduate student member nominated by and from the undergraduate student members of the Academic Forum.

2. Priority areas for the Committee

Following its inaugural meeting in February 1997, the Committee reported to the Board that it had agreed to four priority tasks. At its March meeting, the Committee, proceeded with its deliberations on each of these areas as follows:

(1) New nomenclature and credit point values

The Committee discussed various aspects of the new nomenclature and credit point values, and several members expressed concern about:

- the lack of provision for a mechanism to indicate the semester in which a course (unit of study) would be offered/taken.
- the artificiality of semesterising courses which were taught over the whole academic year, such as final honours year courses.
- the choice for 24 units/credit points (as distinct from another number of units/credit points) being specified as the norm for a full-time enrolment in a semester.
- the difficulties associated with the preparation of handbook entries in accordance with the new nomenclature given the time constraints;
- designating the semester of offer.
- the relatively uneven dissemination of information among and within Faculties.
- identifying year long courses.
- lack of clarity about what a 'credit point' represented.

The Chair undertook to investigate the issue of information flow and to ask that those members who were working on curricular matters be included on information distribution lists, and also to seek advice on a more precise definition of what a credit point represented.

(2) 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 comprised the following persons and that a meeting would be arranged shortly:

Professor Jocalyn Lawler (Chair)
 Professor Brian Farrow
 Dr Ross Gilbert
 Dr Gary Lee

(3) Admissions

The Committee noted that the working party to look at admissions policies, the array of admissions mechanisms, and how to draw these together comprised the following persons and that a meeting would be arranged shortly:

Associate Professor Ewan Mylecharane (Chair)

Associate Professor Lloyd Dawe

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

(4) Evaluation of the Committee's performance

The Committee noted that it needed to assess its operational efficiency and to report on this to the Board. It agreed to consider the appointment of a working party on the assessment of performance at its next meeting.

The Committee also addressed the following matters:

(5) Terms of Reference of the USC

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.

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

The Committee received a memorandum from the Chair of the Teaching and Learning Committee, listing academic policies in the area of teaching and learning that the Teaching and Learning Committee believed it should review, and those which it considered appropriate for review by other Board committees. The Committee concurred with the proposed allocation of responsibility for policies.

3. New award programs**(1) Bachelor of Science and Technology/Bachelor of Laws**

The Committee noted that the Faculty of Law had not yet been consulted in respect of the proposal for the introduction of a new Bachelor of Science and Technology/Bachelor of Laws program and agreed that no further action be taken on this matter at present.

(2) Liberal Studies/Liberal Arts course

The Committee noted that it had not been possible to clarify sufficient detail for the new Liberal Studies/Liberal Arts program for it to be made available in mid-1998. A series of meetings between the three Deans had been held, and while a high level of agreement had been reached, there were still areas needing further discussion.

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

C2. Report of the Graduate Studies Committee

The Committee met on 10 March 1997 when there were present: the Chair (Professor J R Lawrence) presiding, Dr L C Campbell, Ms C Davidson, Dr S Ellis, Professor J Gero, Dr M King, Associate Professor K C Kwok (for Professor Y-W Mai), Dr M J Mahony, Dr R Mitchell, Mr K Oliver, Associate Professor R Pratt, Dr R Ross, Associate Professor C D Shorey and Mr C Wood. Professor G Berry was present by invitation. Miss E R Ring was in attendance.

1. Amendment and rescission of Resolutions of the Academic Board**Rescission of Resolutions of the Academic Board****Background**

The Chair of the Academic Board had received advice recommending the rescission of

or because they are expressed in other Resolutions of the Senate. The Chair had referred those relating to postgraduate matters to GSC for its advice.

Recommendation

The Committee considered the following Resolutions and agreed to recommend that they be rescinded:

ELECTRON MICROSCOPY FOR HIGHER DEGREE CANDIDATES

All postgraduate students using the facilities of the Electron Microscope Unit for higher degree candidature are required, unless exempted by the Director of the Electron Microscope Unit, to attend a course or courses conducted by the Unit.

POSTGRADUATE STUDENTS: FACULTY IN WHICH CANDIDATURE SHOULD NORMALLY PROCEED

As a general rule, postgraduate students should undertake their postgraduate work in the faculty in which they completed their undergraduate studies, but where it is not possible for a student to proceed to postgraduate work in the proposed field of study in the faculty where he or she completed his or her undergraduate degree, he or she should be permitted to proceed to postgraduate work in another faculty, provided that other faculty agreed.

RESEARCH STUDENTS IN THE SCIENTIFIC LABORATORIES

1. Research students may be admitted to the University laboratories from year to year on the recommendation of the head of the department in which they propose to work.

2. A research student in any University laboratory shall be under the control of the head of the department as regards the use of the laboratory apparatus and materials. The professor, as director of the laboratory, shall have the right to become acquainted with the character and progress of the work done by any research student working in the laboratory.

3. Research students may work in the University laboratories during laboratory hours in term time, and at such other times as may be arranged by the professor in charge.

4. Each research student shall pay to the University the appropriate research fee per term for the expense of material, etc. All expensive apparatus or material required for special investigations shall be purchased by the research student.

The professor in charge shall be the sole judge of what apparatus and material should be provided by the University or purchased by the student. The University should be provided with printed copies of all scientific papers published by research students.

Amendment of Resolutions of the Academic Board

The Committee was also asked to consider recommending an amalgamation of the current separate Resolutions of the Academic Board relating to the form and binding of PhD theses (pages 111 and 118, *Calendar 1996, Vol I*); the Committee agreed to recommend this amendment, as set out below:

Form and binding of the thesis

The four copies of the thesis submitted for examination for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy shall normally be on International A4 size paper and may be bound in either a temporary or a permanent form.

Supporting material should be bound in the back of the thesis as an appendix or in a separate set of covers. In accordance with section 14 of the resolutions of the Senate relating to the degree, published papers of which the candidate is the sole author may, with the approval of the faculty concerned, be included in a thesis, provided that:

- (a) the papers are based on work undertaken during the candidature for the degree;
- (b) the papers are identified as published work; and

Any other papers of which the candidate is sole or joint author may, with the approval of the faculty concerned, be lodged in support of the thesis.

A thesis submitted in a temporary binding should be strong enough to withstand ordinary handling and postage. The preferred form of temporary binding is the 'Perfect Binding' system: ring-back or spiral binding is not acceptable. Each copy of a thesis submitted in temporary form shall have fixed to the cover a label clearly identifying the name of the candidate, the title of the thesis and the year of submission.

A thesis submitted in permanent form shall normally be sewn and bound in boards covered with bookcloth or buckram or other binding fabric and printed on acid-free or permanent paper. The Xerox Demand Binding system is, however, acceptable both for temporary and permanent purposes. The title of the thesis, the candidate's initials and surname, the title of the degree, the year of submission and the name of the University of Sydney should appear in lettering on the front cover or on the title page. The lettering on the spine, reading from top to bottom, should conform as far as possible to the above except that the name of the University of Sydney may be omitted and the thesis title abbreviated.

The degree shall not be awarded until a permanently bound copy of the thesis (containing any corrections or amendments that may be required) has been submitted.

that the Board 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 Committee considered the attached report from the Working Party it had appointed to consider levels of award and grading systems for master's degrees and agreed to adopt the report and **commend it to the Board.** *(see pages 49-50)*

The Committee agreed to consider other issues emanating from this report and further refinements at a later date.

that the Board adopt the report and its recommendations.

3. **Proceedings of the Committee**

(1) **Administration of graduate candidatures**

Higher doctorates

Admission to candidature and appointment of examiners

The Committee confirmed the action of the Chair in approving a recommendation from the Faculty of Arts for the appointment of examiners for a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Letters.

Award of degree

The Committee confirmed the action of the Chair in approving a recommendation from the Faculty of Science for the award of the degree of Doctor of Science to Professor M A Aitkin.

Non award of degree

The Committee considered a report from the Faculty of Medicine and unanimously resolved that the degree of Doctor of Medicine not be awarded to a candidate.

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

The Committee noted that there was a pressing item of business for the new Postgraduate Awards Selection Sub-Committee and agreed to appoint Professor Gero as Acting Chair of the Sub-Committee so that the Sub-Committee could proceed with its deliberations.

(3) Medium or form in which theses are presented

During the discussion of the proposed amendment of the Resolutions of the Academic Board relating to the form and binding of PhD theses, the Committee agreed that it would be timely for the University to consider the feasibility of making provision for the submission of theses in electronic form rather than in paper form only.

The Committee appointed a Working Party to consider this issue, asking that it report back in two months. The Working Party comprises Dr M King (Convenor), Professor J Gero, Dr R Ross and Mr C Wood and it has the right to co-opt members.

(4) Meeting of Departmental Postgraduate Co-ordinators

The Committee agreed to ask Associate Professor Masters to convene a meeting of all departmental postgraduate co-ordinators. This meeting would provide the opportunity to clarify the role for those members of staff who were new to the role and also for those experienced in it to provide the benefit of their experience. It was agreed that members promote this event within their faculties.

(5) Graduate Studies Coursework Sub-Committee

The Committee agreed to establish a Coursework Studies Sub-Committee comprising some six or seven members. It was recognised that it would be desirable to have a broad representation of the different sections of the University on the Sub-Committee, but that a small group would be more efficient and effective than representation by each faculty and college. It was agreed that members forward nominations for membership (for either themselves or others) to the Committee Secretary, and that the Committee would consider the nominations at its next meeting.

(6) Seminars for Supervisors of Postgraduate Students

The Committee noted that seminars for supervisors of postgraduate students had been conducted for a number of years con-jointly by the Centre for Teaching and Learning and the Committee and that the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) had asked the Committee to appoint a working party to look at the 1997 version of the workshops which will be supported by U2000 funds.

It was agreed to appoint a Working Party comprising the Chair of the Committee (Professor Lawrence), Dr L Campbell, Associate Professor A Masters, Dr R Mitchell and Mr K Oliver.

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

The Committee noted that Professor Sherington had written to Deans, Directors and College Principals and to the Chairs of faculty boards of postgraduate studies requesting the return of 1996 annual reports on postgraduate teaching and on reviews of postgraduate coursework by 1 April 1997. It was agreed that members remind their colleagues about the need for the timely return of submissions.

(8) Postgraduate Studies Handbook

The Chair reported that there had been on-going difficulties in the organisation of the production and distribution of the Postgraduate Studies Handbook. No budget-line had been established for it, and the suggestion had been made that it be produced as a user-pays publication as is the case for other handbooks. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Planning and Resources) had determined however, that it should be available as a free publication for research students, in the spirit of the U2000 project. He hoped that it would be printed shortly and then be able to be distributed to all postgraduate students free of charge and to appropriate academic and administrative staff. It would also be loaded onto the Web to replace the 1996 version.

(9) 1997 postgraduate enrolments

difficulties (for one faculty) to the large number of overseas students who had accepted offers of admission but then failed to enrol (for several faculties). It was generally agreed that the enrolment process had proceeded more smoothly this year than last year, but that the failure of international students to take up offers was an area for concern. It was noted that this latter problem now fell within the area of responsibility of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International and Development) and the International Relations Committee which was to become a Committee of the new Board. Several members reported that they were analysing which programs/countries of provenance of the students had been of most effect and agreed to communicate their findings to the Chair.

(10) Work in progress

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

- (a) UMI Dissertation Service
- (b) Structure of the initial year of the PhD

that the Board note the report.

C3. Report of the Teaching and Learning Committee

The Teaching and Learning Committee met on 6 March 1997 when there were present: Professor A Sefton (Chair), the Director, Centre for Teaching and Learning, Associate Professor J Lublin, the Chair, Library and Information Technology Committee, Professor R McPhedran, and the President of SUPRA, Mr K Oliver. In attendance: Ms N Downey

1. Priority Areas

Priority areas for 1997, suggested at the previous meeting, were discussed and it was agreed to proceed as follows:

High Priority

(1) Review of Generic Attributes of Graduates

Review of the current document on Generic Attributes of Graduates with particular reference to the inclusion of IT skills.

To be undertaken by Associate Professor Lublin and Professor McPhedran, taking into account the comments made on the document at a recent Heads of Department Forum.

(2) Graduate Students' Teaching Loads

Review of aspects of the teaching work being done by graduate students, specifically to try to ensure that appropriate training is offered and that such work is appropriately recognised.

Mr Oliver would commence work on this. The Committee noted that some of the relevant issues were:

- students should be able to ask their supervisor to complete a standard form documenting their teaching experience, with they could include in a dossier;
- the extent to which teaching undertaken as a graduate student should affect the level at which the student could subsequently apply for a teaching position;
- students need to receive advice on how they should set out the areas that need to be covered when documenting their teaching experience.

(3) Upgrading of Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers

Courses available for the upgrading of the qualifications of secondary school teachers and what the university is doing to support those teachers who wish to undertake such courses.

critical in ensuring that students enter the university with sufficient skills. It was important, therefore, for the University to consider the ways in which teachers' skills could be upgraded, such as by offering modular courses.

In the light of these discussions, the Committee agreed that it would like to see 'Continuing Education for Secondary School Teachers' as a topic for discussion at a meeting of the Academic Forum. Alternatively, the topic might be broadened to consider many aspects of continuing education for our graduates, both for award and non-award programs in view of the interest expressed in short updates and skill development across many faculties.

(4) Distance Education/Flexible Learning

The Committee discussed the issue of flexible delivery of courses in relation to postgraduate coursework and in the context of information technology and teaching and learning. 'Flexible delivery of courses' could cover issues such as distance or other off-campus modes of delivery of education or the delivery of courses outside the present normally scheduled times.

This was an area to which the Committee would assign a high priority.

(5) Intellectual Property

In considering issues relating to distance education, the Committee noted the implications this might hold for the intellectual property of lecture notes or other elements of teaching, such as jointly prepared curriculum material, prepared by University Staff. It was agreed that Professor Sefton should advise the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) that this Committee considers this an important and urgent matter in relation to the development of the policy on intellectual property and that it hopes it will be reflected in the redrafted policy.

(6) Brokering Role

The issue of determining ways to bring together information and ideas on teaching and learning across the university was seen to be important but not the highest priority at present.

Associate Professor Lublin advised that the Centre for Teaching and Learning was developing a register of innovations in teaching across the University.

Areas considered Important but Deferred at this Stage

- (i) Developments in information technology as they relate to teaching and learning.
- (ii) Teaching areas that relate to promotion.

2. Policy Review

The Committee agreed to proceed with a review of academic policies as follows:

(1) Examinations and Assessment

Professor Sefton and Associate Professor Lublin, assisted by Ms Downey, to review existing documentation with the aim of producing clear policies and guidelines, which would incorporate all relevant documents as appendices.

(2) Communication Skills of Students

Associate Professor Lublin to discuss with the Learning Assistance Centre in the first instance.

(3) Statement on the Management of Teaching Activities

Associate Professor Lublin to consider this document in relation to the other issues the Committee was looking at. In a revised form, it may be an appropriate introduction to all the policies.

3. Other Issues

(1) WAMs and the Honours Year

The Committee noted its interest in the philosophical issues underlying the current discussions concerning WAMs and the Honours Year.

(2) Size of the Committee

Professor Sefton expressed some concern that the Committee might be a little too small in relation to the tasks it would be required to undertake. Discussion on this issue was deferred.

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

C4. Report of the Research Committee

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

1. Report of the Australian Research Council Visit to The University of Sydney on 1 October 1996

The committee noted that all issues covered by the report were being, or have been dealt with by the University.

that the Board note the report.

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

Professor Cockayne noted that he had received a memorandum from The University's Teaching and Learning Committee listing those University policies considered to be the province of the Teaching and Learning Committee and seeking the Research Committee's concurrence. The Committee agreed the policies listed were appropriately the responsibility of the Teaching and Learning Committee and did not wish to comment on any of them.

that the Board note the report.

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

As requested by The University Library and Information Technology Committee, Dr Neil Radford's paper entitled "Key Issues in Australian Electronic Publishing" has been reviewed by a sub-committee of the Research Committee, comprising Professor R Tanner, Dr A Reynolds and Mr K Croft (for Dr C Baxter) who have prepared a report of their review. The Research Committee noted this report and agreed that the advice it provided should be referred to The University's Library and Information Technology Committee.

that the Board note the report.

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

As agreed at the meeting of the Committee in February, Professors Cockayne, Hume and Garton have worked with representatives of the ARC and NHMRC Research Fellows and have prepared a document outlining the conditions to be provided to ARC and NHMRC Research Fellows. It was noted that the title 'Research Fellow' was widely used across the University, but that as in previous discussions of the Committee of research fellows, the prepared document referred only to ARC and NHMRC appointed Research Fellows. After discussion, the following was agreed by the Research Committee for consideration by the Academic Board:

University, and as a result of issues raised by a number of research only academic staff, the Research Committee instigated a meeting with a representative group of research and postdoctoral fellows to discuss concerns held about the infrastructure support and recognition they receive from the university and from Departments. The Fellows were then invited to prepare a paper, which they discussed with the Research Committee.

The Research Committee, following advice from a sub-committee, is of the view that the standing of fellows in the academic community of The University needs to be endorsed by the Academic Board, and that certain provisions need to be put in place to ensure that fellows do not encounter unnecessary difficulties in carrying out their research. Because of some lack of clarity as to what provisions are already accorded to different research-only staff, the Research Committee restricts its recommendations to a subset of research-only staff, but has cast those recommendations in a form that allows for enlarging the subset.

To this end the Research Committee **recommends** to the Academic Board that:

- a) All categories of fellow listed below should be accorded the same school/departmental facilities and school/departmental resources as are accorded to other academics of equivalent academic status in their school/department.
- b) In recognition of their special research only status, fellows listed below should be awarded a start-up budget (once only per fellow), to provide them with research support (to be spent at their discretion, upon approval by the Head of Department) in addition to the resources covered by point (a). The level of this budget should be set by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) (whose resources they should come from), after appropriate consultation.
- c) The Overseas Conference Travel Grant scheme and The University Research Grant Scheme should be open to those fellows listed below.
- d) The list of fellows should be reviewed periodically by the Research Committee, which should have the authority to add or remove categories of fellows whenever it is deemed appropriate, after consultation with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research).
 - ARC Australian Postdoctoral Fellows, Australian Research Fellows/Senior Research Fellows
 - ARC QEII Fellows
 - NHMRC Research Fellows/ Senior Research Fellows/ Principal Research Fellows/Senior Principal Research Fellows
 - NHMRC Burnett Fellows
 - NHMRC R D Wright Fellows
 - NHMRC Australian Applied Health Sciences Fellows
 - NHMRC C J Martin Fellows (for the period of the fellowship spent at The University of Sydney)
 - NHMRC Neil Hamilton Fairley Fellows (for the period of the fellowship spent at The University of Sydney)
 - NHMRC Australian Postdoctoral Fellowships (for the period of the fellowship spent at The University of Sydney)
 - NHMRC, PHRDC Australian Postdoctoral Fellows (for the period of the fellowship spent at The University of Sydney)
 - NHMRC INSERM Exchange Fellows (for the period of the fellowship spent at The University of Sydney)."

In relation to the question of whether Research Fellows should have responsibility for teaching and postgraduate supervision, as raised in their paper presented to the Committee in February 1997, the Committee agreed that Professor Cockayne should refer this matter, and the Research Fellow's papers to Professor J Lawrence, Chair, Graduate Studies Committee.

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

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

Professor Tanner reported that he is considering options of how the University might be able to assist ARC and NHMRC research grant holders who might have problems meeting the cost of salary increases, as agreed in the recent round of enterprise bargaining, for staff employed on grant funds. He advised that he is meeting with Deans on 25 March to discuss options. Professor Tanner noted, that if The University was able to assist, that this would be a one-off allocation due to the unforeseen circumstances of these salary increases in 1997, and that in coming years subsequent increases will have to be budgeted for and met by grant holders, Departments and Faculties.

Professor Tanner acknowledged that the decision in late 1996 by the Industrial and Arbitration Commission in relation to separation payments for some staff at the end of their employment contracts is also likely to create problems for grant holders. He agreed to meet with the University's Manager, Industrial Relations to determine what is being done to manage this problem.

Professor Tanner noted that the Special Research Centre for the study of Ecological Impacts of Coastal Cities is to be officially opened on 24 March.

He indicated that he has asked for a report from the International Office to determine whether the academic standard of overseas postgraduate students coming to the University this year is any different from previous years as a result of the living allowance now being provided to them by the University.

Professor Tanner noted he is assisting in the preparation of submissions being made to the West Higher Education Review by both the AVCC Standing Committee on Research and the Academy of Science. Professor Tanner agreed to convene a sub-committee, comprising Professors Gill, Garton, Hume and Cook, to look at issues relating to research that might be included in the University's submission to the West Review.

Professor Tanner noted that, as part of the U2000 initiative, he was about to promote a scheme for matching with U2000 funds (up to APA rates), new industry funds attracted to the University for postgraduate scholarships. He emphasised that this would relate strictly to new funds brought into the University, not existing or continuing funds in University foundations or the like, and that there would be an annual limit on the total amount of funds to be provided in this category.

He again reminded Committee members that they should be encouraging their colleagues to prepare DEETYA Research Infrastructure (Equipment and Facilities) Grant applications. (The closing date in the Research and Scholarships Office is Monday 14 April.)

Professor Tanner advised that he would be retiring from the University on the 8 June 1997, and would be taking up a half-time appointment as P N Russell Professor of Mechanical Engineering in the University. The Committee indicated it would be very sorry to see him leave both the position of Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research), and the Research Committee.

that the Board note the report.

6. Report from the Director, Business Liaison Office.

Dr Baxter indicated that there had been considerable interest from new applicants for ARC Collaborative Grants and APA (Industry) Scholarships which close in May. She indicated that the Business Liaison Office held four very well attended seminars for potential applicants over the last few weeks.

that the Board note the report.

7. Report of the Director, Research Development

Ms Robb said that she had assisted applicants during the recent Business Liaison Office Seminars for potential ARC Collaborative and APA (Industry) Scholarship grants, and that she was working one day per week at the Cumberland Campus of the Faculty of Health Sciences assisting researchers.

8. Report of the Director, Research and Scholarships Office

Mr Cook reported that during January, February and early March the Research and Scholarships Office had been largely preoccupied with assisting ARC and NHMRC grant applicants. A total of 259 project grant applications (c.f. 244 in 1996) and 90 ARC fellowship applications (same as last year) had been processed and submitted. There had been a substantially increased workload for the staff of the Office this year, as, unlike previous years, all data entry of ARC-required information from each application to the ARC database had to be done by the Office through the ARC website. In previous years this had been done by ARC. With the late development by ARC of their website, there were consequential frequent failures of the website, and this had hampered the data entry. The Office had however met all deadlines set by ARC.

A total of 152 NHMRC grant applications of which 6 were fellowship applications (c.f. 137 in 1996) were processed and submitted.

58 ARC grant applicants took advantage of the early closing date set by the Office whereby a detailed check of the application could be made. 9 NHMRC applicants took advantage of the early closing date. Approximately 50 % of ARC applications arrived after the second and final University closing date and approximately 40% of NHMRC applications.

Despite this slow submission rate, Research Office staff were able to provide a very detailed check of all except a handful of very late ARC and NHMRC applications. The response from applicants to this service, and the suggested changes to their applications were very well received and suggests that if applicants can have their applications in by the University closing dates an even higher standard of checking of applications may be possible in future years.

Mr Cook reported that the University closing date for the resubmission of the 1996 Publications Return (ie 1995 data) to DEETYA had passed, and that it appeared that Departments had reviewed approximately 70% of the data. Departments with late entries would be followed up urgently. The University closing date for the 1997 Publications and Finance Return (ie 1996 data) was 9 April, and Departments appeared to be slowly collecting publications data. There had been a delay in the Financial Services Department providing 1996 research income data to the Research and Scholarships Office for up-loading to 'Lotus Notes' for checking by Departments but this was now in hand and should be available shortly.

The AVCC has recently written to the Minister, Senator Vanstone, seeking changes to both the Finance and Publications Returns with immediate effect, and Heads of Department had been kept informed of the details of this and its likely effects. The latest news from the AVCC was that a decision by the Minister was imminent.

Mr Cook reported that he was meeting with the University's Internal Auditor to discuss the requirements and parameters of a University audit of the resubmission of the 1996 Publications Return and the submission of the 1997 Finance and Publications Return.

that the Board note the report.

9. Research Forum

It was noted that the first Research Forum for 1997 would be held on 26 March.

that the Board note the report.

C5. Report of the Library and Information Technology Committee

The Committee met on Monday 17 March 1997 at 2pm in the Western Tower Room, when there were present: Professor R McPhedran (presiding), the Chair of the Academic Board (Professor J Mack), the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic Support) Professor R Johnstone, Ms J Campbell (Acting Librarian), Dr S Carlile, Associate Professor E Cornell, Professor M Harris, Associate Professor N Newhigin and Professor I Rosenberg. Ms R Olde and Dr C O'Brien were in attendance.

1. Chair of the IT Reference Group

It was agreed that Dr S Carlile would be appointed Chair after the departure of Professor J Rosenberg.

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

The working party was established to devise a common policy on student access to dedicated laboratories and the membership is as follows:

ITC Associate Professor K Sinclair, Dr David Levy and Mr J Rosauer
LITC Professor R McPhedran, Dr S Carlile and Mr R Stevens

3. Paper on ITC and its Sub-Committees

Professor Mack undertook to send a separate memorandum to Deans requesting information as to their present committee structures in the light of the establishment of LITC and the proposed International Relations Committee of the Academic Board.

4. Proposed membership of Reference Groups

The Deans had been requested to supply nominees for the Library and IT Reference Groups

Library Reference Group

Committee Chair or Nominee: Professor R McPhedran (Science)

Committee Deputy Chair for Library Matters: Professor M Harris (Arts)

LITC Members nominated on basis of expertise in Library Matters:

Associate Professor E Cornell (Health Sciences)

University Librarian or Nominee:

Two Student Representatives:

Up to eight other members:

Associate Professor S Lechner (Dentistry)

Dr E L Houghton (Economics)

Dr C Campbell (Education)

Ms A Lange (Health Sciences)

Associate Professor C Murphy (Medicine)

Dr P Dunbar-Hall (Sydney Conservatorium of Music)

Associate Professor D Ridley (Science)

Dr E Bailey (College of the Arts)

Professor R Johnstone (*ex officio*)

Information Technology Reference Group

Committee Chair or Nominee:

Professor R McPhedran (Science)

Committee Deputy Chair for IT Matters:

Professor J Rosenberg (Computer Science)

Dr S Carlile (Medicine)

LITC Members nominated on basis of expertise in IT Matters:

Union Representative:

University Librarian or Nominee:

Two Student Representatives:

Up to eight other members:

Dr G Murray (Dentistry)

Dr M T Barboux

Dr J Harvey (Education)

Associate Professor M Allars (Law)

Dr M Peat (Science)

Dr R Johnson

Associate Professor T Koppi (NeTTL)

Professor R Johnstone (*ex officio*)

5. Library Issues for Referral to Library References Groups

It was noted that implementation matters were the outstanding issues rather than the

The following issues were identified:

- Electronic Publishing: matters arising from the AS 4390 Records Management Report
- Intellectual Property Report:
The Committee requested an updated report from Professor Tanner in order to consider issue of copyright of lecture notes.
- Brief report on use of University facilities by other Universities and Institutions. In view of the implications of the Metropolitan University Borrowing Agreement (MUBA) and the Universal English College's apparent access to the Library without prior consultation, the Committee noted the increased demand on scarce resources of the Library. As well, concern was expressed that Library and IT skills may not have been sufficiently acquired in co operative arrangements entered into with other institutions.

Follow-up actions to be taken were:

- (i) write to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Professor K Eltis requesting information as the use of University facilities by other Universities in terms of forward planning.
- (ii) ask for clarification from the Pro-Vice-Chancellors (Colleges)
- (iii) preparation of a draft motion for the next Academic Board meeting relating to the consideration for Library and Information Technology in any co operative agreement entered into by the University of Sydney. Initial draft advice to be sought from Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Professor J Kinnear and Professor R Johnstone
- planning and construction of the combined Science Library as part of the Capital Management Plan.

Professor Mack will liaise with the Chancellor as to whether it can form part of the Sesquicentenary project.

6. IT Issues for Referral to IT References Groups

The following issues were raised:

- open access laboratories i.e. issues relating to software, generic attributes, identification of sites and incentives required to encourage departments to modify teaching
- student access to IT
- policies relating to academics and infrastructure
- marketing and promotional campaigns for school and alumni require co ordination.

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

C6. Report of the Academic Staffing Committee

A. First report of the Academic Staffing Committee

At its March 1997 meeting, the Board received a report from the February meeting of its Academic Staffing Committee; item 3 in the report (on Promotions Committee Procedures and Guidelines) was starred for discussion.

During discussion of this item, there was general agreement over a minor change that should be made to the guidelines, as set out below. While there appeared to be general support for the recommendations, the quorum having been lost, the item was held over for consideration at the next meeting of the Board, on the understanding (stated by the Chair) that the recommendations (including the proposed minor change) would be implemented for the 1997 promotions rounds.

Amendment to the recommendations

The composition of FPACs should be amended to provide that the two members from another Faculty have promotion committee experience. The amended section reads:

Although Faculties may set up committees of different sizes and composition it is

must be members of the Faculty, and two members with promotion committee experience from another faculty.

Item 3 is set out below

3. Matters referred to Committee - Promotion appeals

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

11. a) Report of the FPAC

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

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

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

b) Review of FPAC Reports

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

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

a ensure that they have deposited two copies of three pieces of

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

that the Board approve the recommendations, subject to the amendment set out in the preamble to the report.

B. Second report of the Academic Staffing Committee

The Committee met on 26 March 1997. There were present: Professor R Pesman (Chair), Professor D Anderson, Professor S Armitage, Associate Professor R Arnold, Associate Professor D Davey, Ms S Jamieson and Dr P Whiting; Ms J Deitch and Mr G Deakin were in attendance. Apologies: Professor L Burgess.

1. Title of Emeritus Professor

The current informal criteria for the conferring of the title of Emeritus Professor were referred to the Committee which **recommends** in the following terms:

The title of Emeritus Professor may be conferred by Senate on a retiring Professor of the University in recognition of outstanding and sustained service to the University.

The recommendation is made by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (College) on the advice of the Head of Department and Dean.

The recommendation of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor to Senate should consider and advise upon:

- (1) The Professor's distinction of service to the University by reference to intellectual and scholarly contribution and to other services, and
- (2) the length of such service, in all ranks, to the University.

The recommendation is intended to replace custom with a clear policy and to align that policy with that of other major Australian universities.

that the Board endorse the recommendation and recommend its adoption by Senate.

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.

that the Board note the report.

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

The "Policy Document - Support and Progression of Academic Staff" includes policies and procedures relating to induction, support and development, probation and confirmation, incremental progression, and promotion. The Committee is at present preparing a draft document on promotion and discussed the draft of the section on teaching prepared by the Teaching Committee of the Board. The Committee also discussed the first draft of a document that relates to criteria for service and leadership and the first report of the sub-committee appointed to develop a document on professional service.

The Committee discussed the issue of academic activity which does not fit into any of the normal categories of criteria. It was agreed that the "Policy Document - Support and Progression of Academic Staff" should allow scope for academics to compose their own citation for recognition. The Committee will discuss this draft document further and progress will be reported to the Academic Board.

that the Board note the report.

4. Research only positions

A question was raised regarding the definition of various levels of research only positions. Professor Anderson and Ms Deitch agreed to investigate the issue, with the assistance of Ms Cathy Clarke, and report back to the Committee.

that the Board note the report.

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

The Chair advised that the Manager, Organisation Development Unit, Mr P Pogson, is organising information sessions on selection committee techniques for Academic Board nominees.

that the Board note the report.

6. Committee membership

Following the resignation from the Committee of Professor D Napper, the Chair **recommends** that the Board appoint Professor L Field, from the School of Chemistry, to replace Professor D Napper.

that the Board approve the recommendation.

P C7. Nomination of members of the Advisory Committee for the Centre for Continuing Education

The Board is asked to nominate two members of the academic staff of the University for appointment to the Advisory Committee for the Centre for Continuing Education by Senate at its meeting in May 1997. The term of office is for one year.

The current Board nominees are Dr S MacAlister and Professor T Underwood.

that the Board nominate the following persons for appointment to the Advisory Committee for the Centre for Continuing Education:

.....
.....

Action by the Chair under delegated authority

College of Health Sciences

Appointment of Faculty Promotions Assessment Committees

Personal Chairs

Faculty of Medicine

Core

Dean of the Faculty

Professor P Kuchel (Biochemistry)

Professor J P Seale (Pharmacology)

*Professor A Woolcock (Medicine)

Professor R I Tanner (Mechanical Engineering)

Professor Judith Kinnear (Health Sciences)

Additional

Applicant 1: Associate Professor D F Davey (Head, Physiology)
 Professor D J Handelsman (Medicine)
 Professor I McCloskey (Director, Prince of Wales Medical Research Institute)
 Professor P Gage (John Curtin School of Medical Research, ANU)

Applicant 2: Associate Professor C D Shorey (Head, Anatomy and Histology)
 Professor D G Allen (Physiology)
 Associate Professor B E Kemp (St Vincent's Medical Research Institute, Melbourne)
 Professor F Gibson (John Curtin School of Medical Research, ANU)

Applicant 3: Professor A Sefton (Physiology)
 Professor S Touyz (Psychology)
 Professor T R Parmenter (Medicine)
 Professor R Sanson-Fisher (Behavioural Sciences, University of Newcastle)

Applicant 4: Professor G Berry (Public Health and Community Medicine)
 Professor J Chalmers (Medicine)
 Professor R Heller (CCEP, University of Newcastle)
 Professor D Henderson-Smart (Obstetrics and Gynaecology)

Applicant 5: Associate Professor C D Shorey (Head, Anatomy and Histology)
 Professor J Stone (Anatomy and Histology)
 Professor N Hunt (Pathology)
 Professor P F Bartlett (Walter and Eliza Hall Institute, Melbourne)

Applicant 6: Associate Professor D F Davey (Head, Physiology)
 Professor D G Allen (Physiology)
 Professor J Chalmers (Physiology)
 Professor S B Harrap (Physiology, University of Melbourne)

Faculty of Nursing

Core

*Professor R L Russell (Dean) (Chair)

*Professor J Lumby (Clinical Nursing)

Professor P Armitage (Behavioural and Social Sciences in Nursing)

*Professor A Sefton (Faculty of Medicine)

*Professor F Jones (Family and Community Health in Nursing)

Additional

Applicant 1: *Dr J Godden (Head, Behavioural and Social Sciences in Nursing)
 *Professor J Parker (School of Postgraduate Nursing, University of Melbourne)
 *Professor B Cass (Dean, Faculty of Arts)
 Professor T Parmenter (Director, Centre for Developmental Disability Studies,

*Associate Professor/Principal Research Fellow***Faculty of Health Sciences**Core

- *Associate Professor E Cornell (Acting Dean) (Chair)
- *Professor B Reid (Health Information Management)
- Professor D Fraser (Veterinary Sciences) **
- *Associate Professor C Mullavey-O'Byrne (Occupational Therapy)
- Associate Professor J Crosbie (Physiotherapy)
- * Professor J Black (Pharmacology) **

Additional

- Applicant 1: Dr R Balnave (Head, Biomedical Sciences)
 - *Professor A Sefton (Faculty of Medicine)
 - Professor G Gill (Government and Public Administration)
- Applicant 2: *Dr R Cant (Head, Behavioural Sciences)
 - Professor G Berry (Public Health and Community Medicine)
 - Professor C Kerr (Public Health and Community Medicine)
- Applicant 3: Associate Professor M Thompson (Head, Exercise and Sport Science)
 - Dr A Bowen-James (Occupational Therapy)
 - Dr W Spinks (Human Movement Studies, UTS)
 - *Ms J Steele (Biomedical Sciences, University of Wollongong)

Faculty of MedicineCore

- Professor S Leeder (Acting Dean) (Chair)
- Professor R T Dean (Heart Research Institute)
- Associate Professor R Christopherson (Faculty of Science) **
- *Associate Professor J Simpson (Public Health and Community Medicine)
- Professor E L Bokey (Surgery)
- *Professor S Armitage (Nursing) **

Additional

- Applicant 1: Professor J P Seale (Head, Pharmacology)
 - Professor G Johnston (Pharmacology)
 - Professor I Kennedy (Agricultural Chemistry and Soil Science)
 - *Dr J Maddison (Pharmacology)
- Applicant 2: Associate Professor C D Shorey (Head, Anatomy and Histology)
 - Associate Professor C G dos Remedios (Anatomy and Histology)
 - *Associate Professor R Mason (Anatomy and Histology)
 - Professor P Kuchel (Biochemistry)
- Applicant 3: Professor R Houghton (Head, Obstetrics and Gynaecology)
 - *Professor T Sorrell (Medicine)
 - Professor D Henderson-Smart (Obstetrics and Gynaecology)
 - Professor D M Saunders (Obstetrics and Gynaecology)
- Applicant 4: Associate Professor C D Shorey (Anatomy and Histology)
 - Professor B Dreher (Anatomy and Histology)
 - Professor J McLeod (Medicine)
 - Associate Professor R Bandler (Anatomy and Histology)
- Applicant 5: Professor G Berry (Public Health and Community Medicine)
 - Associate Professor L Irwig (Public Health and Community Medicine)
 - Associate Professor S Chapman (Public Health and Community Medicine)
 - Associate Professor P Mitchell (Clinical Ophthalmology and Eye Health)
- Applicant 6: Associate Professor J Simes (Head, NHMRC Clinical Trials Centre)
 - Professor G Berry (Public Health and Community Medicine)
 - Associate Professor L Irwig (Public Health and Community Medicine)

- Emeritus Professor P Castaldi (Medicine)
 Clinical Professor P Vincent (Kanematsu Laboratories)
 *Clinical Associate Professor N Lickiss (Palliative Care, RPAH)
- Applicant 8: Professor J Turtle (Head, Medicine)
 Professor G A Broe (Medicine)
 *Professor D Saltman (General Practice)
 Professor A McLean (Medicine)
- Applicant 9: Professor J Turtle (Head, Medicine)
 Professor R St C Barnetson (Medicine)
 Professor A Basten (Experimental Medicine)
 Professor N Hunt (Pathology)
- Applicant 10: Associate Professor J Simes (NHMRC Clinical Trials Centre)
 Professor J P Seale (Pharmacology)
 Professor D Kelly (Medicine)
 Associate Professor L Irwig (Public Health and Community Medicine)
- Applicant 11: Professor C Harper (Head, Pathology)
 Professor N Hunt (Pathology)
 *Professor A Sefton (Physiology)
 *Professor J Black (Pharmacology)
- Applicant 12: Professor C Harper (Head, Pathology)
 Professor N Hunt (Pathology)
 Professor J Pollard (Medicine)
 Associate Professor J Hilton (NSW Institute of Forensic Medicine)
- Applicant 13: Professor P Gatenby (Head, Canberra Clinical School)
 Professor C Houghton (Obstetrics and Gynaecology)
 Professor D Ellwood (Canberra Clinical School/Obstetrics and Gynaecology)
 Professor A McLean (Canberra Clinical School/Medicine)
- Applicant 14: Professor J Turtle (Head, Medicine)
 Professor J McLeod (Medicine)
 Professor J Pollard (Medicine)
 *Professor A Sefton (Physiology)

* Females

** Have served on Promotions Committees

College of Humanities and Social Sciences

1. Appointment of Visiting Professors

The following appointments have been recommended by the relevant Pro Vice-Chancellor on the advice of the relevant Heads of Departments:

Professor Robert Russell	Economics	April 1997 to September 1997
Professor Makoto Ito	Economics	July 1997 to September 1997

2. Appointment of 1997 Faculty Promotion Assessment Committees

Personal Chairs

Arts

Core

Professor Bettina Cass (Dean) (Chair)
 Professor Hugh Clarke (Asian Studies)
 Professor Diane Austin-Broos (Anthropology)
 Professor Judyth Sachs (Teaching & Curriculum Studies)
 Professor Dan Potts (Archaeology Classics & Ancient History)
 Professor Graeme Gill (Government & Public Administration)

Additional

- Applicant 1 Associate Professor Stephen Garton (Head)
 Professor Roy MacLeod (History)
 Professor J Mulvaney (Archaeology) (Australian National University)
 Professor Graham Connah (Archaeology) (University of New England)
 Dr John Ward (History) (Reserve)
 Professor Jim Allen (Archaeology) (LaTrobe University) (Reserve)
- Applicant 2 Professor Margaret Harris (Head)
 Professor Michael Wilding (English)
 Professor Terry Smith (Fine Arts)
 Professor Bruce Bennett (English) (Australian Defence Force Academy)
 Professor Brian Fletcher (History) (Reserve)
- Applicant 3 Professor Keith Campbell (Head)
 Associate Professor Alan Chalmers (History & Philosophy of Science)
 Professor Cliff Hooker (Philosophy) (University of Newcastle)
 Professor John Bigelow (Philosophy) (Monash University)
 Dr Stephen Gaukroger (Philosophy) (Reserve)

LawCore

- Associate Professor Rosalind Atherton (Acting Dean) (Chair)
 Professor Ivan Shearer (Law)
 Professor Hilary Astor (Law)
 Professor Margaret Harris (English)
 Professor Chris Adam (Graduate School of Business)

Additional

- Applicant 1: The Hon Justice W M C Gummow (High Court of Australia)
 Mr John Basten Q.C. (Barrister-at-Law)
 Professor R J Vann (Acting Head)
 ** Other additional member to be advised
- Applicant 2: The Hon Justice Paul Stein (Land & Environment Court)
 Professor David Farrier (University of Wollongong)
 Associate Professor Robert Fowler (University of Adelaide)
 Professor R J Vann (Acting Head)
- Applicant 3 Associate Professor Sandra Egger (UNSW)
 Professor Arie Freiberg (University of Melbourne)
 Professor David Brown (UNSW)
 Professor R J Vann (Acting Head)

*Associate Professorships/Readerships***Arts**Core

- Professor Bettina Cass (Dean) (Chair)
 Associate Professor Elspeth Probyn (Women's Studies)
 Associate Professor John Clifton-Everest (Germanic Studies)
 Associate Professor Adrian Mitchell (English)
 Dr Peter White (Archaeology Classics & Ancient History)
 Associate Professor Jennifer Gribble (English) (Reserve)
 * Professor Hilary Astor (Law)
 *Associate Professor Ben Tipton (Economic History)
 * To be confirmed

Additional

- Applicant 1 **Additional members to be advised
- Applicant 2 Associate Professor Margaret Sankey (Head)

Associate Professor Tim Fitzpatrick (Italian/Performance Studies)
*Professor Giovanni Carsaniga (Italian)

* also teaching referee but Department argues that applicant would be disadvantaged otherwise

Applicant 4 Associate Professor Paul Patton (Acting Head)
Dr Stephen Gaukroger (Philosophy)
Professor Genevieve Lloyd (Philosophy) (UNSW)
Professor Diane Austin-Broos (Anthropology) (Reserve)
Professor Rifaat Ebied (Semitic Studies) (Reserve)

Applicant 5 Professor Stuart Rees (Acting Head)
**Other additional members to be advised

Applicant 6 Professor Ann Sefton (Acting Head)
**Other additional members to be advised

Applicant 7 Professor Stuart Rees (Acting Head)
**Other additional members to be advised

Law

Core

Associate Professor Rosalind Atherton (Acting Dean) (Chair)
Associate Professor Patrick Parkinson (Law)
Associate Professor Jane Swanton (Law)
Professor John Carter (Law)
Professor Ron McCallum (Law)
Associate Professor Ann Brewer (Graduate School of Business)

Additional

Applicant 1 Associate Professor Kay Lauchland (Bond University)
Mr Phil Greenwood (Barrister at Law)
Associate Professor Margaret Allars (Head)

Applicant 2 Professor W Brent Fisse (Law)
Professor Stanley Yeo (Southern Cross University)
Associate Professor Margaret Allars (Head)

College of Sciences and Technology

Appointment of Faculty Promotions Assessment Committees

Personal Chairs

Faculty of Engineering

Core

Professor John P Carter (Acting Dean, Faculty of Engineering)
Professor John R Booker (Civil Engineering)
Professor Brian S Haynes (Chemical Engineering)
Professor Nhan Phan-Thien (Mechanical & Mechatronic Engineering)
Professor Roger I Tanner (Mechanical & Mechatronic Engineering)
Professor Gregory J Hancock (Civil Engineering)
Professor Marwin A Jabri (Electrical Engineering)

Additional

Applicant 1: Associate Professor John C Small (Acting HOD, Civil Engineering)
Mr John Nutt (Chief Executive Officer, Ove Arup & Partners)
Professor Steve Bakoss (Civil Engineering, UTS)
Dr John Holmes (Mechanical Engineering, Monash)

Applicant 2: Professor David I Hill (Acting HOD, Electrical Engineering)

Professor Gary Anido (Electrical & Computer Engineering, W'gong)
 Dr Mark G Sceats (Director, Australian Photonics CRC) (**Reserve**)

Applicant 3: Professor David J Hill (Acting HOD, Electrical Engineering)
 Professor Richard E Collins (Physics)
 Professor Gerard Ledwich (Electrical & Computer Engineering, N'cle)
 Professor Ian Morrison (Electrical Engineering, NSW)
 Dr Mark G Sceats (Director, Australian Photonics CRC) (**Reserve**)

Science

Core

Professor Robert G Hewitt (Dean, Faculty of Science)
 Professor E Norman Dancer (Mathematics & Statistics)
 Professor Leslie D Field (Chemistry)
 Professor Margaret A Harris (English)
 Professor Ross C McPhedran (Physics)
 Professor David J Patterson (Biological Sciences)
 Professor Basil D Roufogalis (Pharmacy)
 Associate Professor Anthony F Masters (Chemistry) (Pro-Dean) (**Reserve**)

Additional

Applicant 1: Professor R Gerald M Wake (HOD, Biochemistry)
 Professor Karl H Reickmann (Army Malaria Institute)
 Professor Philip W Kuchel (Biochemistry)
 Professor John De Jersey (Biochemistry, Queensland)
 Professor Ian D Caterson (Biochemistry, **Internal Reserve**)
 Professor Nicholas Hoogenraad (Biochemistry, Queensland, **External Reserve**)

Applicant 4: Professor Richard E Collins (HOD, Physics)
 Professor Roger I Tanner (Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Research)
 Professor Lance Leslie (Mathematics, UNSW)
 Professor David R McKenzie (Physics, **Internal Reserve**)
 Professor John O'Callaghan (CEO, Advanced Computing Systems CRC, ACSys, **External Reserve**)

Applicant 5: Associate Professor Christopher J Durrant (HOD, Mathematics & Statistics)
 Professor Gustav I Lehrer (Mathematics & Statistics)
 Professor Ross H Street (Mathematics, Physics, Computing & Electronics Macquarie)
 Professor Garth Gaudry (Mathematics, UNSW, **External Reserve**)
 Professor Norman Y Foo (Computer Science & Engineering, UNSW **External Reserve**)

Associate Professors/Readerships

Agriculture

Core

Professor Lester W Burgess (Dean, Faculty of Agriculture)
 Associate Professor Patricia J Armati (Biological Sciences, Science)
 Associate Professor Robert H Bartels (Economics, Econometrics)
 Associate Professor Leslie J Copeland (Agricultural Chemistry & Soil Science)
 Associate Professor Ross Drynan (Agricultural Economics)
 Associate Professor Frank W Nicholas (Animal Science)

Core (Reserves)

Associate Professor Robert L Batterham (Agricultural Economics)
 Associate Professor Andrew Beattie (Western Sydney)
 Associate Professor Rosalind T Hinde (Biological Sciences, Science)

Professor Alexander B McBratney (Agricultural Economics & Soil Science)
 Associate Professor Christopher Moran (Animal Science)
 Associate Professor Michael E O'Neill (Crop Sciences)
 Professor Peter R Reeves (Microbiology)
 Professor William E Schworm (Economics)
 Professor Alan D Woodland (Econometrics, Economics)
 Associate Professor Judith N Yates (Economics)

Additional

Applicant 1: Professor T Gordon MacAulay (Agricultural Economics)
 Associate Professor Denzil G Fiebig (Econometrics, Economics)

Applicant 2: Professor Brian J Deverall (Crop Sciences)
 Associate Professor Michael B Slaytor (Biochemistry, Science)

Science

Core

Professor Robert G Hewitt (Dean, Faculty of Science)
 Professor S I (Charlie) Benrimoj (Pharmacy)
 Associate Professor Janette C Brand Miller (Biochemistry)
 Associate Professor Terence M Gagen (Mathematics & Statistics)
 Associate Professor Christopher B Gillies (Biological Sciences)
 Associate Professor John H Kent (Mechanical Engineering)
 Professor Leonard F Lindoy (Chemistry)
 Professor Alexander B McBratney (Agricultural Chemistry & Soil Science)
 Associate Professor Anthony F Masters (Chemistry) (Pro-Dean) (**Reserve**)

Additional

Applicant 2: Professor Richard E Collins (HOD, Physics)
 Associate Professor Rodney C Cross (Physics)
 Professor David R McKenzie (Physics)
 Professor Ross C McPhedran (Physics, **Reserve**)

Applicant 6: Associate Professor Robin F Warner (HOD, Geography)
 Professor Murray Wilson (Geoscience, Wollongong)
 Associate Professor Hilary Winchester (Geography, Newcastle)
 Associate Professor Deirdre J Dragovich (Geography, **Reserve**)

Applicant 7: Professor Stephen W Touyz (Head, Psychology)
 Professor Robert A Boakes (Psychology)
 Associate Professor John Sheppard (Behavioural Sciences, Cumberland)
 Professor Stewart M Dunn (Psychological Medicine, **Reserve**)

Applicant 8: Professor Peter J Davies (Acting as HOD, Geology & Geophysics)
 Associate Professor Andrew D Short (Geography)
 Associate Professor Colin Ward (Applied Geology, UNSW)
 Professor Iain M Mason (Geology & Geophysics, **Reserve**)

Applicant 9: Professor R Gerald Wake (HOD, Biochemistry)
 Associate Professor Cristobal G dos Remedios (Anatomy & Histology)
 Professor Leslie D Field (Chemistry)
 Associate Professor Maxwell J Crossley (Chemistry, **Reserve**)

Applicant 13: Professor Stephen W Touyz (Head, Psychology)
 Associate Professor John Sheppard (Behavioural Sciences, Cumberland)
 Dr Lazar Stankov (Psychology)
 Professor Stewart M Dunn (Psychological Medicine, **Reserve**)

Applicant 14: Professor R Gerald Wake (HOD, Biochemistry)
 Dr Brian J Morris (Physiology)
 Professor Ronald J A Trent (Medicine)
 Associate Professor Peter Schofield (Biotechnology, UNSW, **Reserve**)

Applicant 15: Professor R Gerald Wake (HOD, Biochemistry)

Dr Peter Molloy (CSIRO, Molecular Engineering, **Reserve**)

Veterinary Science

Core

Professor David R Fraser (Dean, Faculty of Veterinary Science)

Professor Michael M Bryden (Veterinary Anatomy & Pathology)

Professor Brian R H Farrow (Veterinary Clinical Sciences)

Associate Professor Rosalind Hinde (Biological Sciences, Faculty of Science)

Associate Professor Robert J Love (Animal Health)

Dr Rebecca S Mason (Physiology, Faculty of Medicine)

Associate Professor Terence L W Rothwell (Veterinary Pathology)

Professor Alan J Husband (Veterinary Anatomy & Pathology) (**Reserve**)

Additional

Applicant 1: Associate Professor Gary Cross (Animal Health)

Professor John R Egerton (Animal Health)

Applicant 2: Associate Professor Derick Balnave (Animal Science)

Associate Professor Grant M Stone (Animal Science)

THE ADMISSION OF LOCAL FEE-PAYING UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

BACKGROUND DISCUSSION PAPER

1. Background

Since the late 1980's the Government has been steadily deregulating requirements with respect to tuition fees in universities. Initially universities were permitted to charge fees to international students, with minimum fee levels set by Government. The universities were permitted to charge local students fees for postgraduate courses, with progressively fewer restrictions. The current Government has now provided that from 1998 universities may charge fees to local undergraduate students, permitting up to an additional 33% of local fee-paying load once HECS-liable quotas are met. The Government has also indicated that universities may charge fees to normally HECS-liable local students for summer session courses for catch-up or acceleration purposes. This paper explores the implications of the Government's decision with respect to local fee-paying undergraduate students for the University of Sydney. This matter is now particularly urgent given the Government's decision to reduce operating grants in 1997, 1998 and 1999.

2. Overriding Principles

2.1 Nature of the University

The University's goals include promoting excellence in its teaching and enhancing its international reputation for research. It is now moving to a regime where there is the likelihood of increased numbers of fee-paying students as described below. The University remains committed to an admissions policy that is based not only on the principles of merit and equity, but also on the principle that students once admitted are given support that enhances their opportunity to complete their studies satisfactorily.

Local fee-paying undergraduate students

The Government's policy changes in this area alone will theoretically allow the University to have in a steady state some 7000 additional undergraduate students on a fee-paying basis. An increase of that magnitude would have a huge infrastructural and philosophical impact on the University and require significant changes in approach. Achievement of growth is more likely to occur through smaller iterative changes to infrastructure and modes of delivery than through overnight expansion, and such growth will be a function of policy decisions taken within the University and market forces.

Local fee-paying postgraduate students

The University will keep an agreed level of HECS-liable places in designated postgraduate coursework programs and in equity places but otherwise such programs will be offered only on a fee-paying basis.

International students at undergraduate and postgraduate levels.

The University intends to increase the level of international student numbers from a base that is relatively low compared with other comparable institutions.

2.2 In a new fee-paying context, the resultant mix of discipline and level of students will be arrived at through a strategic planning process with outcomes in accordance with an overall University Plan, including an agreed preferred size and shape of the University. The University does have the capacity to move load within its DEETYA target to meet its strategic objectives. This will require revisiting the academic and strategic benefits of current load distribution. Attempts to maximise the number of fee-payers that can be taken in particular courses will not result in the University over enrolling against its total HECS-liable DEETYA target any more than is necessary to maintain a stable undergraduate population or in unplanned distortions of the academic integrity of the institution as a whole. Academic reasons will continue to be the primary determinant of load shifts. Clearly, the enrolment processes, including the determination of offer rates and cut-offs, will require careful central monitoring.

2.3 Equity considerations

The University has made a fundamental commitment to equity and merit programs and, especially at the undergraduate level, has been innovative and successful in this area. It closely monitors its performance against targets with respect to access, participation, success and retention of women

three special admissions schemes: the Broadway scheme, which was commenced in 1988 to provide a method of admission to school leavers who had suffered long term educational disadvantage; the Special Admission Scheme which provides a method of admission for people who are of mature age or who have been disadvantaged in their education; and the Cadigal Program, which commenced in 1993 and allows for a broad range of factors to be taken into account when determining the admission status of Aboriginal applicants. The University supplements the Government provided equity and merit scholarships with merit entry scholarships provided from its own funds. The University will seek to increase the number of merit scholarships offered to students on the basis of their performance at University. The introduction of local undergraduate fee-payers provides an opportunity to further enhance these equity and merit programs, including scholarships, for all students. (Proposals for enhancement are given below.)

2.4 Quality delivery for all students

The University is committed to quality in the delivery of its courses. A number of factors will require greater explicit demonstration of that commitment. The new *Strategic Quality Outcomes Statement* to be introduced as part of the Educational Profile process will require the use of Performance Indicators and Targets. Local fee-paying students are likely to pay critical attention to the quality of their programs and their delivery. The University must be sure that no diminution of quality occurs as a result of the admission of additional fee-paying students. The University and its graduates are best served when it can demonstrate that its academic standards are not only maintained but raised. Its flagship programs of academic excellence are most likely to maximise the impact on the University's reputation as an international, research based, University whether or not such programs have a high proportion of fee-payers.

Part of the University's service responsibility is to provide necessary counselling and support services for all its students. As it increases its income from fee-paying students a determined proportion of this will be assigned to provide higher levels of service in these areas. Greater numbers of fee-paying students will, for example, increase the need for provision of financial advice and assistance.

The admission status of individual students will be treated in confidence. All students should expect to be treated equally.

2.5 Contributions to the University

Income growth, obtained via any of its activities, provides a means of supporting the overall growth and development of the University. Acceptance of this philosophy will require the University to balance the immediate needs of particular areas against local incentives for participation to ensure that local areas benefit directly from their participation. At the same time it is important that longer term considerations of infra-structure and capital development for the benefit of the University as a whole are given priority.

3. Potential for fee-paying students

It is possible to identify particular courses on the basis of current demand figures and quality of unsuccessful first preference applicants as being ones where there is likely to be interest from local fee-paying students. Some of these courses will also be attractive to students transferring in with advanced standing. The uniqueness of particular courses (eg Veterinary Science) and the quality of alternative courses available at other institutions where this University is not the sole provider are factors to be taken into account. There will also be opportunities for collaboration with other institutions. There will be detailed discussions with Deans concerning the potential for their faculties and how they will manage additional fee-paying load (if any) on top of their existing load including issues of:

- space
- staffing
- administration
- variations to scheduling of delivery (day/evening, summer)
- flexibility of delivery modes /mixed mode and course structures
- benefit to the faculty
- impact (including possible benefits) on HECS-liable students
- desirability of reducing overall load
- strategic importance to the University

4. Academic Issues

4.1 Program delivery

An advisory working party to the Vice-Chancellor is currently exploring issues relating to mid-year intakes and summer sessions. Semesterisation can be used to enhance attractiveness of course offerings for fee and non fee-paying students. Acceleration and catch up opportunities can be offered through fee-paying summer session programs. The full benefits of these changes will require enhanced feedback to students on progress through ongoing assessment and more timely semester-linked assessment.

Variations to scheduling of delivery of programs(day/evening, summer) and flexibility of delivery modes/mixed mode are possible outcomes. Such flexibility might be considered by faculties in terms of identifying niche markets for particular courses.

These changes will be managed in such a way as to provide opportunities for all students.

4.2 Selection into courses

It is essential that the University maintain its reputation through the preservation of actual and perceived standards and the integrity and transparency of selection processes.

Faculties will be asked to set a minimum TER for each course that recognises, in so far as is possible, the minimum standard as expressed by the TER that the Faculty considers appropriate for students attempting that course. This minimum TER will also take into account the impact that the demand for the course has on the current make up of the student population within that course.

The University should emphasise publicly that, as a general principle, it has been moving from using the TER as a sole selection indicator to using a variety of selection instruments more appropriate to particular courses and better able to predict the potential of students to succeed. Thus a TER together with subject-specific or other relevant criteria may be expected to be more widely employed in selection processes, for all its students, fee-paying or HECS-liable. A significant outcome of the discussion on fee-paying courses has been a refocussing on the broadening of the selection criteria for admission.

The resultant revised admissions process will see greater scrutiny of the detailed records, including performance in individual HSC subjects, of applicants in a band around the anticipated TER cut-off. (This is similar to the proposals in Recommendation 25 of the McGaw Review.) Rankings will be determined which may not be identical to those derived simply from consideration of the TER. The following diagram illustrates the process, assuming for a particular program an historical TER cut-off of 70 and a minimum TER of 65.

HECS-liable students	Offers made on TER alone
	TER >75
HECS-liable students	Offers made after ranking on TER and other relevant information including individual subject performance
HECS Quota filled	
Fee-paying students	
Total Quota Filled (HECS + agreed % Fee-paying)	
	TER < 65
	No offers made

It will be important that advice about these changes in emphasis be conveyed to Year 10 students as they make their HSC subject choices.

5. Offer process

Assuming that the decision is made to offer places for local undergraduate fee-paying students the following processes will apply.

In the first instance in most, but not all faculties, the enhanced selection process referred to in section 4.2 will not be in place for selection for 1998 for either HECS-liable or fee-paying students. Selection will continue to be based primarily on the TER and will be carried out through UAC with students including a fee-paying preference on their UAC application if they wish. As part of the overall UAC selection process, once the desired number of HECS-liable offers had been made for a particular course, offers for fee-paying places will be made up to the agreed percentage or down to the agreed minimum TER or other selection criteria. The University will ask UAC to extend the number of preferences available to, say, ten.

In the longer term, the University will move to enhancing its selection processes and will also develop a parallel direct advance offer scheme. The University will still require all potential local fee-paying students to apply through UAC, thus ensuring that the University has access to a wider pool of information about all applicants and enabling the acquisition of base data. Applicants interested in receiving an advance offer will also apply directly to the University and pay a registration/application fee and a deposit. Students will be offered a place after consideration of their overall record contingent on meeting the minimum TER for that course or some equivalent if, for example, they were currently enrolled in tertiary study. They also will be required to submit an application through UAC. If students meet the TER (or equivalent) for selection into a HECS-liable place for the course in question and enrolls they will be refunded their deposit. If they do not gain a HECS-liable place but meet the minimum TER their deposit will be credited against their first year fee. If they fail to reach the minimum TER the deposit will be refunded.

When an advance offer scheme is in place students will still be able simply to include a fee-paying preference on their UAC application. To the extent that there are fee-paying places available after advance offers (if any) have been confirmed students will then be selected in competition with other applicants, the minimum TER and other selection criteria for each course still applying.

Such processes assume close liaison between the University and schools as decisions are made about likely success in the HSC. It should be noted that taking into account the full range of advice about direct applicants will ensure that equity considerations are addressed even if those with an advance offer may not perform as well as those going directly through UAC.

The direct offer approach will require resources dedicated to promotion and explanation of the scheme and to the assessment and ranking of applicants. It may be that some faculties will not be able to commit such resources to allow a direct advance offer scheme and will wish to operate solely through UAC. The processes will be carefully phased in and might generally be offered on a trial basis only in the first instance.

6. Capital issues

The University is already committed to a program of refurbishment and renewal of its capital stock and renovation of teaching space has had and continues to have a high priority. The level of usage of particular lecture theatres has played a major part in determining the sequence of works. To the extent to which there will be additional pressures in some areas because of fee-paying students the sequencing of works already scheduled and the allocation of accommodation generally will be reviewed. There will also be a re-examination of space needs and of technology appropriate for delivery and a re-examination of capital provision for social and support services.

7. Fee issues

7.1 Determination of level of fees.

The Government has set minimum international course fees for international students for 1998 as follows:

- (including a capital component of \$1330) for Law, Humanities, non lab based Science etc
- (\$1890) for Science (lab based), Engineering, Paramedical, Pharmacy, Agriculture
- (\$2550) Medicine, Dentistry, Veterinary Science

The University has set its international fees at a higher level than these minimum levels but

a commencing undergraduate in 1997). Students pay their medical insurance and any visa charges on top of these fees.

BA	\$10,900
BEc	\$11,400
BE	\$15,000
BHlthSc	\$15,500
BPharm	\$16,000
BVSc	\$24,000
BDS	\$25,000
MBBS	\$30,000

The new HECS levels are

- Band 1 \$3300
Arts, Humanities; Social studies/Behavioural science; Visual/Performing Arts; Education and Nursing
- Band 2 \$4700
Mathematics, Computing; Other Health Sciences; Agriculture; Architecture; Sciences; Engineering; and Administration, Business, Economics.
- Band 3 \$5500
Law, Medicine, Dentistry and Veterinary Science.

It should be recalled that the Government has indicated that it will deduct \$9000 plus \$2474 for each fee-paying student if the University has to include such students to meet its DEETYA undergraduate target load.

While these figures may be taken as reference points actual fee levels will be determined following a consultation process with faculties with outcomes that support both flexibility and consistency across similar disciplines and recognise level of demand for places and proposed delivery modes of teaching.

In setting the fee levels consideration will be given to including a flat rate capital component that would be set aside for the provision of student facilities, including student housing.

Although HECS is calculated on a unit of study basis it would seem preferable to set a fixed annual course fee for a load of, say, 48 credit points allowing an additional enrolment of up to 6 units without further charge.

7.2 Policies

Clear policies with respect to refunds will be required. Policies already exist for local postgraduate fees and international fees but these may need some review before they can be applied in the undergraduate local fee-paying situation. The current enrolment and fee collection process will be reviewed.

Policies with respect to scholarships and other merit awards will be developed in order that they apply equitably to all students. It is proposed that scholarships based on merit will be awarded to fee-paying students after one or more years of meritorious study, with retention of the scholarship contingent on continuing meritorious performance. Care will have to be taken when comparing the levels of performance required with the levels expected for admission with advanced standing on a HECS-liable basis. Consideration will be given to a policy that enables all fourth year honours students to be enrolled on a HECS-liable basis. Advice will be required from faculties.

The University considers it a priority that income from fee-paying students should also be used to support equity and merit subsistence scholarships for honours students, thereby supporting the University's strategies with respect to increasing its research higher degree student population.

8. Funds distribution

Just as the process of fee-setting needs to be transparent so does the process for the distribution of income to cover direct teaching costs, academic development at the faculty/department level, course development and promotion costs and costs of infrastructure support.

The Funding Model Working Party is recommending that a flat percentage of income from all fee-paying courses be returned to the centre for University-wide use. Central activities concerned with

9. Project management

Recent University experience in managing operations with cross faculty and divisional impact has shown the benefit of having a small group responsible for the management of the project supported by a project manager. Consistent policies will have to be developed and implemented and effective liaison between faculties and elements of the administration will be essential. Integration with initiatives being taken with respect to mid-year intakes and summer semesters will also be necessary. The industrial implications of potential changes to conventional workplace practices should also be borne in mind.

1 April 1997

University of Sydney

Submission to the Review of Higher Education Financing and Policy

Introduction

The University of Sydney welcomes the opportunity to present a submission to the Review of Higher Education Financing and Policy. Staff, students and senior officers of the University also have had the chance to meet with members of the Higher Education Review Committee when the views of individual members of the University communities were expressed. In this submission the University, as requested, addresses the key themes identified by the Committee from its Terms of Reference. Noting the sector-wide nature of submissions made by bodies such as the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee the University believes that it would be most useful for the Committee to receive comments on these themes as they relate to the particular position of the University of Sydney, as a very significant member of the higher education sector.

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

Since its foundation in 1850 as Australia's first university, the University of Sydney has made a major continuing contribution to the nation through its high quality, comprehensive teaching and research programs, as well as through the success of its distinguished graduates. Beyond these obvious roles the University has contributed in every facet of community service. As the University said in its submission to the 1995 Committee for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (CQAHE) review of research and community service it is particularly in the role of the "public intellectual" that those associated with the University engage in policy debate, articulate community needs, set the agenda for change and contribute towards all aspects of the cultural life of the community. Such contributions by University of Sydney staff are evident in the activities of professional, scientific and academic organisations, in the provision of advice to governments and statutory authorities and active participation through the professional, business and university sectors of the community. Further these contributions extend naturally beyond national boundaries. The University over the next 20 years will continue to preserve the knowledge and traditions of society at the same time as challenging its assumptions and making it confront its future.

It is vital that those universities, including the University of Sydney, with a prime focus on international levels of research and high quality teaching and learning continue to play a major part in contributing to and influencing Australian society. To achieve these goals they must not be held back by public funding reductions at a level and rate of implementation which compromises their ability to contribute to Australia's economy and culture. Neither should their efforts be circumscribed by Government regulation. The direct contribution made by the University to the economy through collaboration with industry will continue to grow and help Australia to sustain its position as a key player into the next century. 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.

Australians aspire to higher education and the nation benefits in economic and cultural ways from a better educated population. These aspirations are translated into the educational opportunities that the University of Sydney offers to ever increasing numbers of students. The issue of course is how these increasing numbers of students can be funded; inevitably there will have to be increasing levels of privatisation of funding. A responsibility for the University of Sydney will be to ensure that equity and merit issues remain to the fore.

The exponential growth in information technology and its increasing user friendliness will go some way to meeting the continuing demand for education. Already courses and whole degrees are being offered over the Internet. IT provides opportunities for increased sharing by institutions, both nationally and internationally, of curriculum materials and the tutorial will gain in importance relative to the lecture. The individual student will spend less time on campus (a trend already brought about by financial pressures on students) not that degrees will be any shorter in aggregate time. That said, a large and important part of the university experience is being on a campus - staff and students mixing, students engaging in extra-curricular activities and live intellectual intercourse.

appropriate recognition of their prior learning and establishing, where relevant, appropriate bridging courses. It believes, however, that other institutions are better placed to develop close relationships in the offering of undergraduate courses and sharing programs in a lower cost environment. The principle that teaching quality in undergraduate courses is underpinned by the active engagement of academic staff in scholarship of international standard has inescapable funding implications. It also produces difficulties concerning credit transfer arrangements with TAFE and with private providers, in the sense that widespread recognition of narrowly directed programs in a 'no-frills' setting would dilute the overall quality of the first degree.

The University seeks further development of 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 retraining programs for those already in employment and of industry-directed courses partly provided in the work-place.

The University has developed a statement of generic attributes of graduates of the University of Sydney. As a result of completing any undergraduate degree course at the University graduates will be more employable, more able to cope with change and more developed as people. They will have acquired knowledge skills; thinking skills; personal skills; personal attributes and relevant practical skills. Curriculum development is used to ensure that attributes such as communication skills are attained.

The higher education sector has a responsibility to ensure that it contributes as effectively as possible to Australia's society, culture and economy. This will be assured, not by Government regulation, rather by processes of competition and collaboration between institutions. The local managements of institutions are themselves effectively interacting with Australia's communities and should be left to continue such developments.

The background statistics quoted by the Committee disguise the diversity that exists within the higher education sector, and particularly in the University of Sydney following amalgamations in 1990.

35.6 per cent of students at the University of Sydney were aged 25 or more in 1996 compared with sector figure of 41 per cent. 19.2 per cent of undergraduate students were aged 25 or less.

Only 3.6 per cent of students are studying externally and overall 71.9 per cent are studying internal full time.

At the University of Sydney 9.5 percent of all students are higher degree research students compared with 5.3 per cent for the sector.

The University grew by some 40 per cent in 1990 as a result of amalgamations and grew further in 1994 with the inclusion of Orange Agricultural College. The process of amalgamation has been successful. The University is now more diverse than it was and this diversity has resulted in fruitful collaborations and interdisciplinary developments such as research collaborations between the Sydney College of the Arts and the School of Chemistry. The University has seventeen faculties and colleges, now aligned into three Colleges - Humanities and Social Sciences; Sciences and Technology; and Health Sciences. It teaches on campuses throughout the Sydney metropolitan area and elsewhere in New South Wales including campuses at Camden and Orange with research stations at Moree, Narrabri and Jerilderie. It seeks to ensure quality teaching in every area of the University. While research is being undertaken across all seventeen faculties and colleges, recognition of particularly excellent areas is provided through the University's internal funding mechanisms.

The University has a broad array of very strong honours programs. For example in the Bachelor of Arts degree honours can be taken in 48 subject areas. This wealth of offerings is made available to students who choose to transfer in from other institutions to complete an Honours Year at the University of Sydney. This strength also explains in part the buoyancy of the research higher degree enrolments.

As the Committee suggests, the distinction between full and part time students and between on and off campus students may be less relevant but there will be a continued place for interaction between students and staff even if technology eliminates, at least in part, the need for large lecture

to their studies without having to seek full time employment. Moreover, as previously noted, that university experience which takes place outside the classroom is an important component of a student's learning and personal development experience.

The University of Sydney has responded to changes in the school system over the years in its curricula including recognising the needs of especially talented students in areas such as Mathematics and Physics.

The Higher Education Council's recent report on Professional Education and Credentialism concluded that the relationships between the universities and the professional bodies are very complex and vary significantly between professional fields. They found little evidence of unreasonable demands impacting on institutional autonomy. The University of Sydney could paint a similar picture of its longstanding positive relationships with the professions. The University is exploring the greater use of broad based degrees before entry to professional training together with double degrees suggesting a blend of generalist and vocational study. The new Graduate Medical Program sees students entering on the study of medicine only after completing a first degree. This program is seeking not to impart a body of knowledge so much as to develop life long approaches to a role as a professional. Paralleling the developments in Medicine has been the introduction of a two-year program of professional preparation for teachers - the first of its kind in New South Wales - leading to an MTeach award. These new programs are examples of the University's responsiveness to the needs of its client groups and its willingness to support innovative approaches in teaching and learning.

Whatever funding regime is put in place, difficulties will attach to programs which can be represented as extending the university experience. One must find a balance between inappropriate encouragement of the 'perpetual student' and provision of those 'well-rounded' citizens which society needs. While the case for our graduate medical program is straightforward, we believe also that high-achieving students should be able to make a case for support for further study - even where this is broadening at the undergraduate level rather than specialising in research or in sharply focussed professional development. Society can derive as much benefit from an engineer who studies South-East Asian culture as from a mathematician who proceeds to research in neural networks.

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

Demand for higher education is likely to increase, provided that the sector remains diverse and that reasonable levels of funding enable quality to be maintained.

The University of Sydney will wish to ensure that it continues to provide broad based, flexible programs with an international focus on which particular needs can subsequently be built through postgraduate and continuing education using a variety of forms of delivery. It believes that there will be growing demand for high quality challenging programs at the undergraduate level.

The University can anticipate a situation whereby other universities would encourage their students to take advantage of the University of Sydney's strength in its honours programs by moving to this University to complete their studies. This already is occurring and the University will wish to further encourage this provision of opportunity. In particular a major role of regional universities could be to provide the first one or two years of higher education for transfer students. These universities would have pockets of international research excellence (allowing reverse transfer) but would not aspire to a full spectrum of such activity. Such a model provides opportunities for rationalisation and cooperation.

At the same time the University will be seeking to serve the needs of an aging population likely to have an increasing interest in postgraduate study as well as actively participating in meeting the needs of the working population for retraining and for redirecting their intellectual focus.

The University has had a significant part to play in the public intellectual life of the nation. In the next two decades it looks to being a major contributor and leader of opinion within what has been termed the global village enhancing Australia's already significant international reputation. Here again there are practical opportunities for collaboration with TAFE and with regional universities.

The continuing strength of the sector will depend on the opportunities provided for young scholars

maintain a balanced age and experience profile amongst its staff and to enable academics to keep abreast of scholarship in their fields.

Higher education providers have shown themselves to be innovative. Deregulation of the system would lead to greater flexibility and allow these challenges to be tackled at the institutional level, given reasonable base funding.

The University recommends that the Committee commission research into comparative costs between comparable UK, US and some Asian institutions which might enable it to answer its own questions about competition on the basis of cost.

Theme three: regulatory and administrative framework for higher education

Since 1994 the higher education sector has gone through an exhaustive quality assurance exercise with the CQAHE concluding that the sector was showing increasing improvement above what it considered was, in world terms, already a very satisfactory level of performance in teaching and learning. What the sector does not now need are further intrusive investigations. Quality assurance should ideally be self assessed with institutions preserving their reputation and market share by publicly demonstrating their quality outcomes. There may be a case for voluntary codes of conduct developed through the AVCC and policed through clients. On the other hand, bureaucratic attempts to ensure 'quality' across the system carry the inherent danger of discouraging diversity and reducing performance to a lowest common denominator.

The University recognises the importance of ensuring the strong links between the higher education sector, VET and, particularly the school sector. The transition from school to University is a very important matter which can be enhanced in a number of ways. There could well be more opportunities in the future, for secondary students to study University courses while still at school. Generally the current interfaces are working and the University does not recommend any particular changes. The University appreciates its good relationships with the State Government, even though the vast majority of its funding comes from the Commonwealth. It will be vital to maintain strong links as increasingly diversified and specialised institutions develop. Each part of the sector will need to be aware of the opportunities that will develop for cooperation and the formation of strategic alliances.

The universities in New South Wales operate in accordance with their individual and distinctive missions and goals. This diversity serves the State well, so long as there is effective coordination of efforts. In practice coordination has worked well through largely informal processes and with constructive interactions with the State Government. The University sees no need for change to these synergies.

National Competition policy principles

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. While there remain restrictions upon the private activities of public institutions private institutions should not have access to their facilities.

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

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.

The University can accept that where it is offering services in a competitive environment that some element of overheads should be incorporated. However it must be clear that since the majority of overheads borne by the University relate to core, non business activities attempts to identify stand alone costs as a benchmark are inappropriate given the reductions in costs available from economies of scale and scope.

Both DEETYA and the NSW Government argue that pricing principles and other elements of competitive neutrality should apply with respect to short courses. 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 activity, and indeed it forms a significant route for many mature age or disadvantaged students into university study. In the spirit of the competition policy the University could build in to its charges 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.

Both DEETYA and the NSW Government argue that pricing principles and other elements of competitive neutrality should apply in the area of commercial research and development and consultancies. The University accepts the principle 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.

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.

The University fears that the necessary flexibility and rationalisation of course offerings between institutions that should be an ongoing part of a healthy higher education system may be thwarted by the application of competition policy to higher education provision. This would not be to the benefit of the sector or the States.

Theme four: financing higher education teaching and research training

It is universally acknowledged in Australia that the University system confers important - indeed, essential - public benefits beyond those advantages obtained by private individuals. 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.

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.

At the same time, the move to "smaller government" and lower taxes, and the increasing demands and pressures on governments, make it unlikely that the Commonwealth will bear all of the costs associated with maintaining and improving the higher education system. Consequently, moves

The current over-regulated system results in a number of absurdities and rigidities, inhibiting diversity, innovation and excellence, in favour of a bland homogeneity. The idea of the level playing field is meant precisely to promote competition - it is not meant to be an end in itself.

In the circumstances, the national interest would be served best by allowing the maximum deregulation of the higher education system. Universities should be permitted to set fees for all courses which reflect the full cost of provision at an appropriately high standard. It is expected that private providers will increase in number and scope, and they too will be required to demonstrate their quality and outcomes.

There is some merit in considering the establishment of a scholarship/voucher scheme (provided in part by the universities and in part by governments) which promotes differentiation among providers; maximises student/consumer choice; rewards competitive success in attracting and retaining the top students and staff; and provides flexibility for universities to design - and to fund - high quality programs. Vouchers would likely have to possess to an assigned value, which in an individual case could be determined solely on the basis of the course chosen, or perhaps in a more sophisticated fashion based as well on a range of other factors, including academic merit to date, financial need, and perhaps equity concerns. However, rather than replicating the unhappy experience with the relative funding model with some disciplines rigidly consigned to the "low cost" band, universities should be free to determine for every course a "top-up fee" beyond the value of the voucher, which would promote experimentation, diversity and, ultimately, differentiation.

Postgraduate research students similarly could be provided with direct funding, including elements of research infrastructure funding, which they could carry with them to the institutions which admit them.

In such a deregulated environment, 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.

It is also true that 'equity is expensive' - and thus that 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.

Funding on this basis would lead to competition and specialisation and would encourage the development of strategic alliances within a diversified system. There would be no need for universities to enter into educational profile contracts, the contract being with the student in the form of the voucher. In such a deregulated environment, the University recognises that it would have to pay even greater attention to student needs and expectations.

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 community languages, such as Italian, Yiddish and Hindi. 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.

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

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.

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.

Theme five: funding of higher education research

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. 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.

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.

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.

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

Conclusion

The demand for mass higher education is unlikely to abate in the foreseeable future and it is socially desirable to attempt to accommodate community aspirations. While Government must cap spending on the sector, it should not allow this pressure to focus attention on private benefits. Public subsidy 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.

The University of Sydney accepts that the challenge is to 'do more with less' and emphasises that this presupposes 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. As well as increasing the quality of performance this will improve working conditions for staff and students. In the light of announced Government cuts, however, this strategy is dependent on income generation and that, in turn, relies on a suitably deregulated environment.

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.

Report of the Working Party on levels of award and nomenclature for Master's degrees and grading systems for postgraduate award programs

Background

Early in 1996, the former Committee for Graduate Studies noted that inquiries had been received from the Faculties of Law and Veterinary Science about broadening the grades of award of master's degrees in those faculties. The Committee noted that a variety of award provisions existed: some master's degrees were awarded in the pass grade only, some with provision for the award with merit; some master's degrees were awarded with Honours; and some were awarded without any distinction. There were differences also in the levels of award generally available for coursework master's as opposed to research master's degrees, with an added complication where the one award was available at both pass and honours level.

The Committee discussed the issue of the need to codify current practice and to review the various forms of nomenclature in use. The Committee believed that while uniformity across the faculties was desirable, there was also a need to acknowledge some diversity.

The Committee agreed to ask its Deputy Chair, Associate Professor Sherington, to review this issue, in the light of the work of a previous working party that met in 1993.

Information was requested from the faculties on the following aspects of the master's degrees that they offered:

- the title of each Master's degree offered;
- whether it is offered as a research degree, coursework degree or in both methods (using the DEET definition of a research degree);
- the entry requirement for each degree (eg, pass bachelor's or honour's bachelor's degree, etc);
- the level at which each degree may be awarded (eg pass only, or pass with merit, or honours or honours I and II, etc); and
- the grading system(s) used for the courses offered in each degree (including the thesis component of a coursework degree) - ie, advice on whether marks with corresponding undergraduate grades of Pass, Credit, Distinction etc are awarded for all courses or just "Pass"/"Fail" or "Satisfactory" or whether some other system is used.

Professor Sherington prepared a report based on the information received from the faculties that was considered by the Committee at its meetings in July and September 1996. The survey confirmed the wide variety of practices across the University and also that, on occasions, such variety occurs not only between faculties but also within individual faculties, which have adopted different practices for different degrees. Despite some inconsistencies, the grading system appears fairly uniform throughout the University with most faculties adopting either an undergraduate pattern of grades or a Pass/Fail mode. There is far less consistency in the level of awards. The following points appear to be of some concern:

- The use of the term 'pass' and 'honours' for both coursework and research degree awards gives no indication as to the nature of the degree. Previously it seems that 'Pass' may have applied principally to coursework degrees and 'honours' to research degrees, but this is no longer the standard pattern in the University. It now appears that coursework degrees can be awarded with honours and a research degree in the 'Pass' mode only.
- The use of the term 'with merit' applies also to both coursework and research degrees.

After some discussion of the general principles of whether or not there should be standardised levels of award and grading systems across the university in respect of all postgraduate award programs, the Committee agreed to establish a Working Party, comprising the Deputy Chair (Associate Professor G Sherington) (Chair), Professor J Gero, Mr M Mackey and Associate Professor G Stone, to give consideration to this issue.

The Working Party met on 3 October 1996, when all members were present.

The Working Party deliberated the issues identified by the Committee and agreed that it would be beneficial both within as well as outside the University if there were uniformity in the levels of award and grading systems used by the various faculties, irrespective of the sort of

The Working Party presented a set of recommendations to the Committee at its meeting in October 1996. The Committee agreed to ask its members to discuss the Working Party's recommendations with their colleagues and to report back on their faculties' views to the Committee's next meeting.

The new Graduate Studies Committee, at its meeting in November 1996, considered the advice from faculties and agreed to ask the Working Party to reconvene in order to consider the faculties' responses and to progress its recommendations further.

The Working Party met on 11 December 1996, when all members were present but for Mr Mackey from whom an apology was received.

The Working Party addressed those issues that had been discussed at the last meeting of the Graduate Studies Committee, and, in the light of the comments and advice provided, revised some of its original recommendations. The Working Party's report and recommendations were presented to the Graduate Studies Committee at its meeting in December 1996. After considering the Working Party's amended recommendations, the Committee asked the Working Party to reconvene again to consider the issue of the grading systems. The Working Party did so in February 1997, when all members were present but for Mr Mackey from whom an apology was received. At that meeting the Working Party revised its recommendations on grading systems.

Recommendations

Grading systems for all Master's degrees and graduate diplomas and graduate certificates

- All faculties which award grades for coursework in postgraduate award programs, whether research degrees or coursework award programs, are asked to use the same grading system that is used University-wide for undergraduate programs (that is, the Fail, Pass, Credit, Distinction and High Distinction system) and that marks also be supplied in accordance with the undergraduate mark scale. A Pass/Fail result is available for use for practicum results only by those faculties which do not wish to award the former grades and marks for this part of the award requirements.
- In respect of research Master's degrees, examiners should be asked to allocate a grade of Pass, Credit, Distinction or High Distinction for theses so that faculties are able to award one of these grades as a thesis final result; this result will then be entered upon candidates' transcripts of academic record and can be used for scholarships ranking.
- Faculties will need to inform examiners of the range of marks used by the University for awarding grades.
- Results of "Satisfactory" and "Unsatisfactory" and other such "grades" should no longer be used.
- Explanations of the grades and marks should be published in handbooks and other relevant publications.

Levels of award for Master's degrees

- In respect of research degrees, a degree may be either awarded or not awarded at the end of the examination process, as for the PhD, and no provision should exist for research degrees to be awarded with any class or classes of honours or with merit or other distinction. Provision should be made for the thesis to be allocated a grade, however, as set out above.
- In respect of coursework degrees, provision should exist for the award either without honours or, preferably, with just one class of honours, but the award with merit is an acceptable alternative to the award with honours.

Nomenclature of Master's degrees

- Faculties should use nomenclature for degrees that distinguishes between research degrees and coursework degrees, and the same award should not be available by the two methods of candidature.
- Faculties are asked to give consideration to amending their master's degree offerings to provide that they offer only one research degree if possible, the degree of "Master of Philosophy in ... (*name of Faculty*)". It is considered that the addition of the name of the Faculty to "MPhil" will avoid any possible confusion over whether the degree is a science- or humanities-based degree. It is recognised, however, that some faculties award more than one research degree and that the entry requirements for these degrees are not always the same.



The University of Sydney

Academic Board

Meeting held on Wednesday 12 March 1997

Minutes of the meeting of the Academic Board held at 2.00 pm on Wednesday 12 March 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, J R Lawrence and R Pesman), the Acting Deputy Chair (Professor A Sefton), the Vice-Chancellor and Principal (Professor G Brown), Professor D Anderson, Associate Professors R Arnold and H C Beh, Drs R Bohringer and A E Brew, Professors K K Campbell and B Cass, Associate Professors L J Copeland and E Cornell, Ms K Curry, Professor R Dunn, Associate Professor C J Durrant, Professors K Eltis and G Gill, Associate Professors C B Gillies and J Gordon, Professor M A Harris, Ms C Hyde, Associate Professor P Jones, Professor J F Kinnear, Associate Professor A F Masters, Professor R McPhedran, Dr R A Mitchell, Associate Professor N E Newbiggin, Mr K Oliver, Mr M G Partridge, Dr M Peat, Professor S E Pretty, Emeritus Professor N Quarry, Dr A Reynolds, Professors B D Roufogalis, R L Russell and S M Salsbury, Associate Professor M Sankey, Professor W Schworm, and Associate Professor G M Stone.

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

Present by invitation were: Professor G Berry, Ms L Maral, Dr C O'Brien and Ms B Olde.

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.

12/97 Minutes

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

13/97 Business arising out of the minutes

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item A2.)

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

14/97 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.

- P 2. New nomenclature relating to academic programs and the academic year**
 In speaking to this item, the Chair reported that while most of the issues relating to the new nomenclature were administrative ones, there were a couple of underlying academic issues, as set out in his written report.
 *** After a brief discussion, the Board agreed to adopt the Chair's recommendations.
- P 3. Extension of delegation of authority to the Chair**
 The Chair spoke to his written report and also said that there were some areas of staffing work not covered by the new appointments procedures in which the former Standing Committee had acted on behalf of the Board. These areas, such as tenure, probation and promotions, were being addressed by the Academic Staffing Committee, but a mechanism was needed for approving matters in these areas until new policies and procedures were in place. He therefore sought a further delegation of authority from the Board to act on staffing matters under the "old procedures" during this interim period.
 *** The Board agreed to note the report and to extend the delegation of authority to the Chair in respect of approving recommendations for short-term visiting professor appointments, committees to consider academic/clinical/other honorary titles and other staffing matters under the "old procedures" that had been dealt with in the past by the Standing Committee of the former Board, such as the appointment of Faculty Promotions Assessment Committees. It was noted that monthly reports on any FPACs approved by the Chair would be referred to the Board for information.
- P 4. West Review of Higher Education**
 In response to a question, the Chair said that he was still awaiting advice from some of the deans in respect of nominees for the Working Party. He would ask the Vice-Chancellor to speak about the Review in his report.
 *** The Board agreed to note the report.
- P 5. Meeting commencement time and afternoon tea**
 *** It was agreed that future Board meetings commence at 2.15 pm and that there be a 15-minute adjournment for afternoon at 3 pm.
- 6. Election of Chair and Deputy Chairs of the Academic Board**
 *** The Board agreed to note the report regarding the amendment of the Academic Governance Rules relating to the election of the Chair and Deputy Chairs of the Board.
- 7. Fees and charges for students**
 *** The Board agreed to note the report.
- 8. Rescission of Resolutions of the Academic Board**
 *** The Board resolved to rescind its resolutions relating to Transfer of Students and Admission after Exclusion, as recommended.
- 9. Committee of Chairs**
 (a) **Scaling of HSC English courses**
 (b) **McGaw Green paper**
 (c) **Intellectual Property**
 (d) **ACTA Report on the Relative Performance of Commencing Undergraduate Students**
 (e) **Nomination of University staff to HSC Examination Committees**
 (f) **Fee-paying Undergraduate Enrolments**
 (g) **The Academic Year**
 *** The Board agreed to note the report.
- 10. Action under delegated authority and reports from the Academic Groups**
 *** The Board agreed to note the report.

- P
11. **Work in progress**
- (a) **Working Party on the Academic Year**
It was reported at the meeting that concerns had been raised elsewhere about the need for consultation between unions and management regarding proposals to introduce a summer session and mid-year intakes, *inter alia*. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Professor Anderson, advised that he was yet to be informed of the claimed concerns and would, if necessary, report further on this to the Board.
- *** The Board agreed to note the report.
- (b) **Working Party to examine the present procedures for student appeals against academic decisions**
- *** The Board agreed to note the report.
- (c) **Progress on re-drafting of “green papers” considered by the Board/Forum in 1996**
- *** The Board agreed to note the report.
12. **Question Time**
- *** The Board agreed to note the report.
13. **Amendment of the By-laws: the Student Proctorial Panel**
- *** The Board agreed to adopt the Chair’s recommendations, *viz*:
- to recommend to Senate that the By-laws be amended as an interim measure as recommended;
 - to proceed with the election of the Proctorial Panel in accordance with the proposed By-law amendments, on the basis that those appointments will be ratified when the amendment to Chapter 13 is promulgated; and
 - to rescind the Resolutions of the Academic Board relating to the Election of Student Proctorial Panel as recommended.
14. **1997 TER Statistics**
- *** The Board agreed to note the report.

P **Part II**

At the meeting the Chair reported on the following matters:

1. **Welcome to new Senior Management**

The Chair welcomed Professors Eltis and Kinnear to their first meeting of the Board as the new Deputy Vice-Chancellors, Professors Napper, Weisbrot and Young as the new Pro-Vice-Chancellors (Colleges) and Professor Quarry as Dean of Architecture.

2. **McGaw Review of the HSC**

The Chair reported that a small number of copies of the McGaw report had been received by the University that morning, and he tabled the following copy of Recommendation 25 which refers to the supply of HSC results to the universities for use in selection of students, subject to certain conditions. *(see Recommendation 25 as tabled)*

There was a lengthy discussion of this recommendation and of other matters raised in the review report, held in the knowledge that there had been no opportunity for those who had received a copy of the report to study it in any detail.

Note: The report, entitled “Shaping Their Future: Recommendations for reform of the Higher School Certificate”, is on the Web at <http://www.dtec.nsw.gov.au/HSCRecommend/>

3. **Universal English College**

Professor Gill referred to the program being conducted by the Universal English College and asked why this academic matter had not been referred to the Board. The Chair said that at the end of last year he had been asked to provide advice on a draft agreement, which he had done, but that he had not seen the final agreement.

The Vice-Chancellor reported on the background to the matter in the following terms: A private provider had approached the University, proposing the establishment of an

arrangement similar to the one with the Kolej Antarabangsa. The proposal provided for the College to teach the first year of Sydney's Bachelor of Commerce degree to students with English language difficulties; if the students performed at an appropriate level they would be admitted to the Sydney degree, with credit, as full fee paying international students. The Dean of the Faculty of Economics had brought the proposal forward as a request by the Faculty, after consultation with the Heads of Department. The Faculty had regarded this proposed arrangement as similar to the arrangement with the Kolej Antarabangsa, for which the academic principle had been approved. The Chair of the Academic Board had raised some concerns over the proposal, and these concerns had been referred back to the Faculty; the general response had been, however, that the proposal was consistent with the principle that had already been approved. The Dean of Economics had then forwarded the formal agreement which had been technically approved. Subsequently, it had become clear that the consultation process had been less clear to those consulted than to the Dean, and it had been embarrassing when staff teaching the first year of the Sydney program had been asked to provide copies of their lecture notes for use by the College. The basic proposition had not been unreasonable, however, as Sydney did not have the infrastructure to accept large numbers of international students with English language deficiencies, and the quality of prospective students coming through this private provider would be assured. The issue at hand was one of process; the proposal had had to be "fast-tracked" for marketing purposes, but the general academic approvals were in place. It was the consultation process which had broken down.

Professor Salsbury said that the problem had arisen because the opportunity for this venture had become available late in October 1996 for implementation this year. He had consulted with all Heads of Department, and while not all had been wildly enthusiastic about the proposal they had agreed to go along with it. There had been time constraints on the consultative process, and he accepted responsibility for what some saw as inadequacies in that process. While the Faculty had been prudently managed, there was nevertheless the need to earn additional income for next year, and he had not wanted to turn down this opportunity to do so. The College would provide the Faculty with good students, given that a Credit average at the College would be the minimum entry requirement to the Sydney BCom. The academic standard of the program at the College would be the same as that here at Sydney, with marking being as similar as possible. There had been a misunderstanding behind the request to staff to supply their lecture notes; the College had just needed course outlines to ensure course equivalence and that examining was up to the Faculty's standard. More consultation could have taken place, but there had been a need to respond quickly to the opportunity in the way that other universities were able to respond with speed.

The Chair said that it was important that the distinction be made between the role of the Board and faculties in such matters. When he had considered the original proposal he had raised concerns over several issues, such as the labelling of courses with the names used by University and the lack of a separate provision for monitoring the English language competency of the students. In respect of the underlying principle of the University entering into an agreement with a separate provider establishment, he had thought that principle to have been agreed upon in the past and therefore had not thought it necessary to bring this particular proposal to the Board. He had not been aware that the final agreement had been signed until problems became manifest. He believed that procedures needed to be established to deal quickly with these sorts of proposals in the future and said that he had discussed this matter with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International and Development).

During the ensuing discussion, Ms Curry said that the SRC was ideologically opposed to out-sourcing. She raised the issue of the effects of such a proposal on staff in terms of quality control and work conditions and the impact of the influx of students from the College into the second year of the BCom program on current students in respect of standards and infrastructure. She said that she would like to see a copy of the contract with the College.

The Chair said that these were management matters which could be addressed to the Dean. Professor Salsbury said that the scheme was not one whereby the university was "contracting", but rather was accepting students from another institution, as in the case of the Kolej Antarabangsa. There were no disadvantages for local students under this arrangement, but rather benefits from the additional revenue brought in by international

students. Local student enrolments did not generate sufficient funds, and without this additional funding the Faculty would be forced to shed positions. International students enhanced the quality of education, and it was good for students to mix.

In response to subsequent comments by Board members, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic and Staffing), Professor Anderson, said that the arrangement with the Kolej Antarabangsa was not one of "twinning"; there were two contracts with that institution: one at undergraduate level and one at postgraduate level. There was a distinction between twinning and the provision of service. The arrangement with the Universal English College was one of educational service, and he questioned whether the Board would really wish to see the detail of every contract of educational service.

Members raised issues of how such arrangements impacted upon the enterprise agreement with academic staff and the potential for academic aspects to be swept up with industrial issues and for these to be addressed in arenas where students were not represented rather than at the faculty and Academic Board level.

The Vice-Chancellor re-iterated that the University had to be in a position to act swiftly when an opportunity was offered. The Chair said that the Board and the Forum provided the opportunity for these sorts of issues to be raised, and that while academic matters would be referred to the Board at the appropriate stage of the process, management issues were addressed in other fora.

*** The Board noted the Chair's report.

15/97 Statement by the Vice-Chancellor and Principal

The following reports had been circulated and tabled:

(see agenda and supplementary agenda item A5.)

Part I

P Two items in the report were starred for discussion:

(3) UniPower

In response to a question from Professor Campbell about the future of UniPower and the implications for the Student Information System, the Vice-Chancellor reported in the following terms: The original CASMAC initiative had been developed with two different families: UniOn and UniPower; the University of Sydney had joined the Unipower group of universities. The research administrative application seemed reasonably satisfactory, the financial application was being tested and it appeared that it would be satisfactory, the human resources application would be satisfactory, but the student administration application was seen as a disaster here as at all the universities in the UniPower group. After unsuccessful negotiations, the UniPower Board had decided that it would have to take legal action and claim damages; in the absence of successful legal resolution, a loss of some \$20 million had been quoted, and that might be an accurate amount. Many universities had appointed project teams for the project over many years with results that were adequate but not impressive. Sydney had not made a large infrastructural investment, so it was less committed financially to the project, but each participating university in the UniPower group had to contribute about \$250,000 each year, committed two years in advance, in order to belong to the project. Careful consideration was being given to what could be salvaged from the project, and the UniPower Board was meeting on the following day to discuss this. It was a difficult management issue to address: if another \$5 million were invested in the project, it could work; but it might be better to cut one's losses and abandon the project. The Registrar, who was the University's representative on the UniPower Board, was providing direct feed-back, and the situation was being monitored carefully. There was also speculation over whether the UniOn family could be joined.

The Chair added that Sydney's SIS was not dependent upon the UniPower project and could be developed separately and further when the need for this was determined.

(13) Refurbishment

Professor Campbell expressed concern over some of the recent refurbishments and the re-allocation of some Faculty of Arts teaching space, and sought assurance that the needs of teaching activities would be given proper consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there was a need to plan for the future with regard to increasing student numbers and a changing university profile. He endorsed the view of the importance of appropriate teaching space, and said that the Quadrangle was not only an icon, but also a place that students wanted to have classes, and that the retention of teaching space in it was therefore particularly important. The re-allocation of the teaching space to Arts had been done in consultation with the Dean, and this was as far as the inroads would go, with only upgrading now being undertaken.

During the discussion that ensued, Professor Salsbury said that more use could be made of existing teaching space with an expansion of evening classes. There was a brief discussion of this in the context of the changing nature of teaching modes.

*** The Board noted the report.

P Part II

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

1. West Review of Higher Education

The Vice-Chancellor said that it was planned to prepare a draft University response for Senate prior to the visit to the University by Mr West and some of his Committee on 1 April. He did not believe that the University response should be a negotiated amalgam of the views of all the sections of the University but rather the response as Senate determined. It might be appropriate for separate responses to be made to the Review Committee by different sections of the University which might hold different views and emphases about the issues raised by the Review. The "Group of Eight" would also be making a submission to the Review.

The Vice-Chancellor also reported on recent advice he had received on the progress of the Dearing Report on higher education in the UK.

2. Fees for local undergraduate students

The Vice-Chancellor said that discussions were being held at VCAC on all the issues involved with the prospect of charging up-front fees for undergraduate programs and that various possibilities were being canvassed. Deans had been asked for comment, and a special meeting of the Senior Executive would be held the next day to consider the issue further and to develop a "base" paper. There was a need to consult broadly across the University, and the issue would generate heated debate, with ideological opposition from various sectors. The consultative process would be a difficult one, and many different issues needed to be addressed, such as provision for scholarships. He hoped that those who were ideologically opposed to the proposal would nevertheless make constructive input to the development of possible modes of implementation. The University had very few options for addressing the shortfall in Federal funding and it was being proactive in this proposal; the proposal had the potential to be educationally beneficial and to enhance aspects of the higher education system. It was hoped to have the "base" paper distributed broadly as soon as possible.

*** The Board noted the report.

P 16/97 Report of the Faculty of Medicine

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item B11.)

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

*** The quorum having been lost, it was agreed to consider this item at the next meeting of the Board.

17/97 Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C1.)

1. **Membership**
 2. **Amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate**
Faculty of Medicine - Graduate Medical Program: Restriction upon Re-enrolment
 3. **Librarian's statement in proposals for new or amended undergraduate award programs**
 4. **Prioritisation of tasks**
 5. **Credit point values**
 6. **Review of approval mechanisms for new courses and major changes to existing courses**
 7. **Admissions Policies and Procedures**
 8. **Means by which the Undergraduate Studies Committee will assess its performance in 1997 - performance indicators, processes**
 9. **Proposed University Preparation Course: Introduction to Science**
 10. **Joint Working Party of the Undergraduate Studies Committee and the Teaching and Learning Committee, and possibly the Graduate Studies Committee**
 11. **Member of the Undergraduate Studies Committee to sit on the Teaching and Learning Committee**
 12. **Policy on Student Evaluations of Courses**
 13. **Liberal Studies/Liberal Arts course**
 14. **Annual Reports of Faculty Teaching Committees**
 15. **Quality of Performance in Teaching**
- *** The Board agreed to note the report.

18/97 Report of the Graduate Studies Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C2.)

1. **Terms of reference of the new Graduate Studies Committee**
Amendment of the Academic Governance Rules relating to the Academic Board:
Membership of the Graduate Studies Committee
Establishment of Sub-Committees of the new Graduate Studies Committee
 - (1) **PhD Award Sub-Committee**
 - (2) **Postgraduate Awards Selection Sub-Committee**
- *** The Board agreed to note the report and to recommend the amendment of the Academic Governance Rules relating to the Academic Board, as recommended.
2. **Amendment of the Resolutions of the Academic Board: PhD examination process**
*** The Board agreed to note the report and to amend its resolutions relating to the examination process for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, as recommended.
 3. **Proceedings of the Committee**
 - (1) **Administration of graduate candidatures**
 - (a) **PhD Award Sub-Committee**
 - (b) **Higher doctorates**
 - (2) **Report of the Working Party on a Generic Doctoral Program**
 - (3) **Appeals by postgraduate students**
 - (4) **Faculty reports on postgraduate teaching and reviews of postgraduate coursework**
 - (5) **Meeting of Departmental Postgraduate Co-ordinators**
 - (6) **Seminars for Supervisors of Postgraduate Students**
 - (7) **Work in progress**
 - (a) **Levels of award and grading systems used for Master's degrees**
 - (b) **UMI Dissertation Service**
 - (c) **Structure of the initial year of the PhD**
- *** The Board agreed to note the report.

19/97 Report of the Teaching and Learning Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C3.)

- 1. Committee to Consider Awards for Excellence in Teaching**
- 2. Priority Areas for 1997**
- 3. Language Issues**
- 4. Policy Review**
- 5. Appointments/Promotions Documents: Teaching**

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

20/97 Report of the Research Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C4.)

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Paper Referred from The University of Sydney Library and Information Technology Committee**
- 3. Presentation by Research Fellows of their Paper Entitled "Research Fellows at The University of Sydney"**
- 4. Report from the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research)**
- 5. Report from the Director, Business Liaison Office.**
- 6. Report of the Director, Research and Scholarships Office**
- 7. Report of the Director, Research Development**
- 8. Review of The University of Sydney Research Grants Scheme**
- 9. Order of Australia to Professor John Booker**

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

21/97 Report of the Library and Information Technology Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C5.)

- 1. Internet Charging and access**
- 2. Electronic Publishing**
- 3. Functioning of LITC and its Reference Groups**
 - (a) Chair of IT Reference Group**
 - (b) Paper on ITC and its Sub-Committees/Nature of Library User Groups**
 - (c) Membership of the Reference Groups**
- 4. Priority topics for action in 1997**
- 5. Open Access Laboratories**
- 6. Farewell to Pro Vice Chancellor Professor R Hewitt**

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

22/97 Report of the Academic Staffing Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C6.)

- 1. General Business**
- *** The Board agreed to note the report.

- 2. Projects for 1997**
- *** The Board agreed to note the report.

- 3. Matters referred to Committee - Promotion appeals**
 In response to questions about the Committee's recommendations in respect of FPACs, Professor Pesman said that they were proposed as an interim measure pending the finalisation of a new policy document. A number of appeals which had been received had indicated that there was a need to modify the guidelines and procedures currently in place in order to make the process more transparent. These modifications, however, were only an interim measure.

During discussion, there was general agreement over a minor change that should be made to the guidelines, as set out below.

- *** While there appeared to be general support for the recommendations, the quorum having been lost, it was agreed that the item be held over for consideration at the next meeting of the Board, on the understanding (stated by the Chair) that the recommendations (including the proposed minor change) would be passed and implemented for the 1997 promotions rounds.

Amendment to the recommendations

The composition of FPACs should be amended to provide that the two members from another Faculty have promotion committee experience. The amended section reads:

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

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

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

5. Matters referred to Committee - Appointment on Nomination

*** The Board agreed to approve the recommendation.

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

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

7. Policy Document - Support and Progression of Academic Staff

*** The Board agreed to note the report.

23/97 Appointment of members of the Core Committee to Consider Tenure for Tenurable Staff

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C7.)

*** The Board agreed to appoint the Core Committee members, as recommended.

24/97 Appointment of members of the Central Promotions Committees

The following reports had been circulated and tabled:

(see agenda and supplementary agenda item C8.)

Personal Chair

Associate Professor/Reader

Senior Lecturer

Lecturer

*** The Board agreed to appoint the Committee members, as recommended.

25/97 Reports of the Academic Groups on Chairs

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item D1.)

*** The Board agreed to note the reports.

26/97 Report of the Tenure Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item D2.)

Senior Lecturer

*** The Board agreed to note the report.