



The University of Sydney

---

## Academic Board

---

### Supplementary agenda

for the meeting on Wednesday 16 July 1997

**P** *The following items have been starred:*

- A4. Report of the Chair, Part II
- A5. Statement by the Vice-Chancellor and Principal, Part II
- B19. Report of the Faculty of Veterinary Science
- C1. Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee
  - Item 1: Amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate
    - (4) Sydney Conservatorium of Music
      - (a) Bachelor of Music
      - (b) Bachelor of Music Studies
- C5. Report of the Library and Information Technology Committee
  - Item 2. Code of Conduct for use of Internet based services

---

### **additional and amended material**

*Agenda page*

*new material*

#### **A4. Report of the Chair**

##### **Part I**

##### **1. Report on Senate Matters**

*(Main agenda, page 1)*

Senate, at its meeting on 7 July 1997:

- (1) on the report of the Academic Board:
  - (a) approved the proposal of the Faculties of Arts and Science for the introduction of the new award program, the Bachelor of Liberal Studies, for introduction from 1998; and passed the amendments to the Resolutions of the Senate and new Resolutions of the Senate as recommended, to effect the introduction of the new program;
  - (b) approved the proposal of the Faculty of Economics for the introduction of the new award program, the Bachelor of Commerce (Liberal Studies), for introduction in 1998; and passed the amendments to the Resolutions of the Senate and new Resolutions of the Senate as recommended, to effect the introduction of the new program;
  - (c) noted the Chair's report on the following:
    - (i) Faculty reports on teaching
    - (ii) Policy Document on Academic Promotions Appeals
    - (iii) Intellectual Property
    - (iv) Code of Conduct
- (2) noted that the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws had been conferred on the Vice-Chancellor by the University of St Andrews at a ceremony in June.

*new items*

**9. Full-fee paying local undergraduate students**

As Chair of the Board, I was a member of the Fees Reference Group appointed to provide feedback to the Project Management Group and to advise the Vice-Chancellor and Senate on the appropriateness of the principles and procedures developed by the Management Group for the introduction of full fees for local undergraduate students.

A copy of the report of the Management Group is attached. (Pages 4-13)

# **that the Board note the report.**

**10. Membership of the Board**

The Faculty of Engineering has advised that Professor Grant Steven has replaced Professor John Carter as the elected academic staff member from the Faculty.

# **that the Board note the report and welcome Professor Steven to membership of the Board.**

*new material*

**A5. Statement by the Vice-Chancellor and Principal**

**Part I**

**1. Report on Senate Matters**

*(Main agenda, page 3)*

Senate, at its meeting held on 7 July 1997:

- (1) noted progress with respect to the University Private Hospital proposal, and that the Vice-Chancellor would seek further advice on site options prior to finalising the date of the public forum and reporting to Senate.
- (2) endorsed the report of the Local Fee-Paying Undergraduate Students Project Management Group.
- (3) noted an update on the following:
  - (i) UniPower Australia
  - (ii) The formation of the Association of Pacific Rim Universities
  - (iii) Other Higher Education Developments
- (4) noted a report on possible linkage of the Australian Graduate School of Management and the Graduate School of Business.
- (5) resolved to endorse Professor Anderson's action in approving an acting appointment to the Directorship of the Museum of Contemporary Art *pro tem*; and to instruct the Vice-Chancellor to ask Mr Reid, the Chair of the Board of Directors, to provide a description of the appointment process used by the Board and to report back to the next meeting of Senate.
- (6) noted that an offer of appointment had been made for the position of University Librarian.
- (7) approved the following dates for the following Senate elections:

Election of one Fellow by and from the undergraduate students to be held on 17 October 1997

Election of five Fellows by and from the graduates to be held on 22 October 1997

Election of one Fellow by and from the postgraduate students to be held on 24 October 1997

Election of one Fellow by and from the non-academic staff to be held on 29 October 1997

Election of four Fellows by and from the academic staff to be held on 5 November 1997
- (8) appointed the following selection committee for the appointment of the Dean of the Faculty of Law:

**Ex-officio members**

The Vice-Chancellor (Chair)

The Chair of Academic Board: Professor Ros Pesman

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor with supervisory responsibility for the Dean:

Professor David Weisbrot

**Members appointed by Senate**

Three members (plus two reserves) nominated by the Faculty:

Ms Barbara McDonald  
Associate Professor Julie Stubbs  
Professor Richard Vann

Ms Rosemary Lyster (Reserve)  
Mr Les McCrimmon (Reserve)

One member, external to the University, nominated by the Vice-Chancellor:  
Professor Michael Crommelin

Additional member, being a practising member of the profession:  
Mr John McCarthy QC

- (9) approved the change of the name of the 'North Shore Heart Foundation Chair of Cardiology' to the 'Ray Williams Chair of Cardiology'.
- (10) resolved to extend its congratulations to Professor Iven Klineberg, Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry, who was made a Member of the Order of Australia in the Queen's Birthday Honours.
- (11) approved the appointment of Mr Frank Astill as Director of the Law Extension Committee.
- (12) resolved to extend its congratulations to Professor David Weisbrot who had been appointed an acting judge of the District Court of NSW.
- (13) noted reports on the following:
  - (a) the establishment of the National Voice Centre
  - (b) the establishment of the Herbal Medicines Research and Education Centre
  - (c) Parents Seminar - 21 June 1997
  - (d) Conservatorium of Music
- (14) approved the University's participation in Australian Synchrotron Research Program Incorporated.

*amended recommendations*  
*(amendments underlined)*

## **C1. Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee**

### **1 Amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate**

- (4) Sydney Conservatorium of Music *(Main agenda, page 6)*
  - (a) Bachelor of Music  
# **that the Board:**
    - **approve the proposal; and**
    - **acting on behalf of Senate, amend the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the degree of Bachelor of Music, subject to confirmation of the consistency of Sections 9 to 12 of the proposed Resolutions relating to the BMus with the Resolutions of the Senate relating to Admission made pursuant to Chapter 10 of the By-laws.**
  - (b) Bachelor of Music Studies  
# **that the Board:**
    - **approve the proposal; and**
    - **acting on behalf of Senate, adopt the new Resolutions of the Senate relating to the degree of Bachelor of Music Studies, subject to confirmation of the consistency of Sections 7 to 10 of the proposed Resolutions relating to the BMusStudies with the Resolutions of the Senate relating to Admission made pursuant to Chapter 10 of the By-laws.**

Note: Section 5. of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the BMus degree should also be amended by adding the following words "and the testamur for the degree shall specify the area of specialisation".

## **Report of the Local Fee-Paying Undergraduate Students Project Management Group**

### **Introduction**

Senate, at its meeting on 7 April 1997, resolved as follows:

“that 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”. Senate had had before it a Background Discussion Paper.

Senate at its May meeting was advised that the Vice-Chancellor had appointed a Local Fee-Paying Undergraduate Students Project Management Group and a Local Fee-Paying Undergraduate Students Reference Group with the Membership and Terms of Reference as set out in Appendix 1.

The Management Group has held eight meetings leading to the production of this report. Some of its members met twice with the Fees Reference Group when it discussed earlier versions of this report. The Management Group will need to continue to meet throughout the year to ensure effective coordination of activity in this area. The Management Group was advised of the tenor of the discussion at Senate when Senate Fellows passed the “in principle” motion with respect to local undergraduate fee-paying students. In the light of that discussion it has developed the following report including a set of principles against which the policies and procedures outlined should be referenced.

### **Policy**

The University has to find additional sources of income so that it can secure the University’s future by continuing to maintain the quality and diversity of its staff and course offerings in a context of funding shortfalls brought about by cuts in Operating Grants in 1997, 1998, 1999 and 2000 and unsupplemented salary increases. One potential source of income is local fee-paying undergraduate students.<sup>1</sup>

The Government’s policy changes in this area alone will theoretically allow the University to have in a steady state up to 7000 additional undergraduate students on a fee-paying basis. An increase of that magnitude would have a huge infrastructural 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 of market forces.

The total contribution to the expected deficit from local fee-paying undergraduate fees will be limited in the first year. Faculties have taken a conservative approach in estimating likely enrolments. However, the estimated income (derived from the table included as Appendix 2) of a little over \$4 million in the first year represents a sum equivalent to the budget of some of the University’s smaller faculties. The cumulative effect over the next four years would indicate a minimum contribution of some \$15 million per annum (very conservatively stated). A delay in commencing the program for a year would reduce the total income over the next four years by \$15 million.

In this context it is worth noting that load from local postgraduate fee-paying students has increased from 317 in 1991 to 1098 in 1997 and is projected to increase to 1406 in 1998, representing an additional \$2.2 million income (at the conservative rate of \$7,000 per EFTSU) in 1997 over 1996 and a similar increment in 1998. International fee paying students have increased over the same period from 893 in 1991 to 2100 in 1997, with an increase between 1996 and 1997 of 370, representing an

---

<sup>1</sup> Since the late 1980s 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. Then universities were permitted to charge local students fees for postgraduate courses, with progressively fewer restrictions. Since 1997, the current Government has cut the number of HECS-liable places available for postgraduate coursework students. The University, as a consequence, moved the majority of its coursework programs to a fee-paying basis, with a good take up of such places. The 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, leading to a maximum of 25% of the total expanded load being fee-payers. The Government has also indicated that universities may charge fees to HECS-liable local students for summer session units of study for catch-up or acceleration purposes, provided such units are also available in the normal semesters. The Government does not permit the charging of premium fees to HECS-liable students and has set out strict guidelines with respect to ancillary charges for such students.

additional income of \$5 million (at the average rate of \$13,670 per EFTSU). It is to be expected that the Summer School will also experience modest initial enrolments followed by strong incremental growth. Taken together over a period of time, these sources of revenue represent considerable additional income to the University as it makes its plans to sustain its quality teaching and research programs.

The Strategic Planning Advisory Committee has begun the process of revising the University Plan, which includes consideration of the preferred size and balance of the University. The immediate planning with respect to local fee-paying undergraduate students has been undertaken within the context of the University being able to meet its outstanding DEETYA penalty obligations through over-enrolling in 1996, 1997 & 1998. The pipeline effect of that over enrolment allows the University in 1998 both to meet its continuing DEETYA commitments and absorb local undergraduate fee-paying students.

Although the expected demand for fee-paying undergraduate places is not evenly spread across the University's course offerings, the benefit from this additional income stream will be spread across the University. The University must seek to maintain and enhance the quality of its teaching in all its areas and provide the opportunity for academic careers to outstanding postgraduates and contract junior staff, a high proportion of whom are women. The restructuring of the University into three Colleges and the funnelling of funding for teaching and research through those Colleges will provide a mechanism for the equitable distribution of income from all sources across all faculties.

It is essential for the University that its position on selection criteria and admissions policy be publicly known. It should also be noted that the University, as a general principle, has been moving from using the TER as a sole selection indicator to using a variety of selection instruments and methods more appropriate to particular courses and which are expected to improve the validity of selection procedures. 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.

### **Principles**

Principles governing admission procedures following the introduction of fee-paying admissions for local undergraduate students will remain consistent with the University's previous policy and practice in relation to all present categories of students. The principles which currently apply are summarised below.

1. Selection into any award course offered by the University will continue to be merit-based, supplemented by the use of equity considerations for various special categories of admission.
2. The University's first priority in offering places to new or continuing students has to be to ensure that its agreed HECS-liable target load is met annually.
3. Merit criteria used to rank applicants (both fee-paying and HECS-liable) for selection will be consistent with overall University policy but may involve additional, course dependent, criteria approved by Senate on the recommendation of the Academic Board.
4. Equity criteria for special categories of admission will continue to be derived from recognised forms of relative disadvantage that have an impact upon an applicant's previous educational performance or access to normal entry pathways.
5. Merit and equity criteria for selection purposes will continue to be determined and publicised sufficiently in advance so as not to disadvantage prospective applicants for admission. In practice, this needs notification at least two years in advance of any change to criteria affecting school-leaver applicants and at least one year in advance for changes affecting other applicants.
6. Neither merit nor equity criteria approved for selection purposes shall be applied to offer entry to applicants whose previous academic performance would cast doubt on their capacity to complete first year successfully, unless the faculty concerned is able to provide additional learning support for those admitted in such cases.
7. All students, once enrolled, shall be treated equally, regardless of the category of admission. Information about a student's enrolment status will be restricted to those areas of the administration which need to know, eg for the purposes of load calculation and meeting DEETYA reporting requirements. Individual members of the teaching staff will not generally be aware of the status of individual students just as is the case with respect to international students.
8. A local student admitted to a course on a HECS-liable basis continues on that basis within the course but may elect to apply for another course as a HECS-liable or fee-paying student. A student admitted to a course on a fee-paying basis may apply through the normal UAC

procedures to transfer to a HECS-liable place in that course or in another, or may apply to transfer on a fee-paying basis into another course. All such applications shall be determined on the merit-based criteria used to determine admission into, or transfer into, the relevant course.

9. A proportion of the fee income shall be used to support University-wide initiatives, including enhancement of student support and service facilities, through the University's Academic Development Fund.
10. While existing scholarships available to HECS-liable students will continue to apply only to such students, some additional funds derived from student fees or other sources will be used to enhance scholarships for HECS-liable students on both merit and equity grounds, as well as to develop some merit-based scholarships for award in later years to local fee-paying students.
11. Fees for local undergraduate fee-paying students must be set so as to ensure no cross-subsidisation of fee-payers occurs from funds provided by Government for HECS-liable places. The benefits to be gained from fees will be for both sets of students.

### **Transitional arrangements**

The Management Group is of the opinion that the admission of undergraduate local fee-paying students will have to be managed somewhat differently in the first year of operation from the arrangements which will be put in place in the longer term. For 1997/98, admissions procedures will be kept as simple as possible while not sacrificing any integrity in the admissions process. As explained below, during 1998 more attention can be paid to developing more finely tuned selection procedures. This transitional year is in part necessary to prevent overburdening existing student enrolment systems but it is also a function of introducing change in a measured way. There will be a focus on ensuring effective coordination of activity across the University and adequate explanation of the University's policies to the public. The Management Group does not wish to imply that the University is not properly prepared for the introduction of undergraduate local fee-paying students. Indeed, progress made in 1996, 1997 in overcoming our shortfall in enrolments in 1994/5 has given the University a strong platform from which to admit local fee-paying students at the undergraduate level.

### **Availability of fee-paying places**

Faculties have provided information on their willingness and ability to take local fee-paying students into particular award programs. These figures have been refined in the course of profile discussions with faculties during June and incorporated into the University's overall planning Profile and projected out to the year 2000. The University's strategy remains to meet its DEETYA targets and quotas and to maintain overall load at approximately the 1997 level. A schedule of programs, target enrolments and fees for 1998 is attached.

The DEETYA Guidelines require that, on an EFTSU basis, the number of domestic<sup>2</sup> undergraduate fee-paying places must be limited to 25 per cent of the total number of local places in any given award course. As a transitional measure, in the years 1998, 1999 and 2000 local fee-paying places are limited by the Government to 25% of the total number of domestic places in each award course which are occupied by students who commenced at the University after 31 December 1997.

An "award course" is a program of study formally approved by the University leading to an academic award of the University. In terms of reporting enrolments in award courses to DEETYA the University has until now simply used internal degree codes which often multiply the number of 'awards' through codes for new and old regulations etc (eg separate codes currently exist for BA (Old Res) DH000 0000, BA (Old Res) Honours DH000 H000, BA DH020 0000, BA (New Res) Honours DH010 H000, BA (Second) DH006 0000 etc). These codes will be rationalised and consolidated for the purposes of DEETYA reporting but there is no intention to artificially merge programs that are clearly seen within the University as separate programs. Specialisations within programs, given separate codes at present, will be incorporated for reporting purposes into the one program (eg BA (New Res) European Studies will be counted in the BA program and BSc (Environmental) will be counted in the BSc program). Each combined degree program will be regarded as one complete award program and it will not be possible to commence on such a program on a HECS-liable basis and progress to a fee-paying regime.

---

<sup>2</sup> DEETYA uses the term "domestic" fee paying undergraduate students in its guidelines. The terminology used in the discussion of fees has typically been to refer to "local" fee-paying students and this term will be used throughout this report.

### **Admissions policies and criteria**

The Management Group received a briefing from Professor Mack, the former Chair of the Academic Board, on the responses he and Professor Lawler (Chair of the Board's Undergraduate Studies Committee) had received from faculties on questions related both to the admission of local fee-paying students and on progress towards broadening the selection criteria used for admission for all students, particularly with respect to students in a band around a notional cut-off. A number of faculties plan to develop processes to give greater consideration to the group gathered either side of the notional TER cut-off. The willingness of applicants to pay fees will not be a consideration in the ranking of applicants within this band. However, as it is not possible to advise prospective applicants for 1998 entry of any changes in our admission processes, it is agreed that such measures should not apply with respect to admission into local fee-paying courses for 1998, except where the use of additional criteria in the selection process has already been established, as is the case, for example, with the Conservatorium, Dentistry, Pharmacy and Veterinary Science. Procedures for the award of some entry level scholarships may, as in previous years, depend on additional criteria.

The 1998 process will essentially involve taking the UAC Rankings (derived from TERs and other evidence) and offering HECS-liable places in a particular course until the quota is filled and then offering fee-paying places until the fee-paying quota has also been filled or a predetermined floor has been reached.

It has been agreed that it would not be sensible to publish in advance predetermined floors, especially for the first, transitional, year. Generally the University will set as a floor a cut-off three to five points below the expected cut-off which would then normally still be above the cut-off currently allowable for Broadway<sup>3</sup> applicants (usually 6 TER points below the cut-off). In this way we are continuing to accept students who can be expected to complete successfully the courses in which they are enrolling. The University will continue to ensure that its selection processes for all students do not lead to the admission of students who could not reasonably be expected to complete the course in question within usual time limits.

During 1997/98, the University will move to establish and conduct trials of expanded academic selection criteria for student admissions that might be applied for the 1999 intake, focusing more specifically on degree-specific issues, especially for those grouped on either side of the notional TER cut-off.

Around 10% of the students admitted each year through UAC do so with advanced standing, that is they are admitted to the second or later year of a course on the basis of previous tertiary study at this or another institution. When the UAC admissions quota for each course is decided a separate sub-quota of advanced standing students is also determined. This sub-quota is filled in the same way as the first year quota, namely by selecting on the basis of a ranking determined by UAC on the basis of general advice provided by the faculties. Selection of local fee-paying students over and above the advanced standing quotas can proceed in the same way as for the first year students, noting that there are additional Government restrictions on the total number of local fee-paying students in any particular course that will apply for 1998-2000. High demand faculties in particular have traditionally provided advice on the minimum levels of performance required for selection with advanced standing and it is not expected that this would change. Faculties have provisions within their degree resolutions relating to the amount of credit that can be granted in respect of courses completed elsewhere or towards another award of the University of Sydney. The introduction of local fee-paying undergraduate students will not necessitate any changes to these provisions.

A number of faculties permit graduates of other institutions to enrol directly into Fourth Year Honours and then to graduate with a University of Sydney degree. These students are usually very well qualified students wishing to take advantage of the University's exceptionally strong Honours offerings, and are admitted to the program only if their past record indicates the likelihood of their obtaining at least an Honours II(1). (If their record is not so good they may be admitted to a Graduate Diploma.) The Management Group believes that such students, who are the students the

---

<sup>3</sup> The University provides 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 performance of students admitted under these schemes is monitored and their progress has been found to be satisfactory.

University wishes to attract and retain in its postgraduate research programs, should not be expected to pay fees. In some faculties it may be appropriate, once advanced standing quotas have been filled, to offer additional fee-paying places to students who wish to complete honours preparation courses at the second and third year level as a precursor to admission to Fourth Year Honours on a HECS-liable basis. Where such students already hold a pass degree such an enrolment would be very similar to non-award enrolment where the Government for a number of years has required institutions to charge fees.

#### **Admissions processes**

The Management Group has proceeded on the basis that the admissions process will be managed through UAC with courses to be offered on a fee-paying basis having separate codes, thus allowing applicants to clearly indicate their preferences for both HECS-liable and fee-paying courses. It was proposed by the University that UAC should increase the number of preferences above the current six preferences. UAC was not able to accommodate this request for 1998 and indeed argued that this was not necessary as 90% of successful applicants now receive an offer for one of their first three preferences. The Management Group was also aware of the facility for applicants to change preferences once their HSC results were known, which in any case was likely to be earlier than in previous years. UAC has agreed that there should be a further review of the whole admissions process early in 1998.

UAC intends to publish a supplement in August giving details of fee-paying courses which it will distribute to schools. Copy for this supplement will be required by no later than mid-July and will be coordinated through the Management Group.

The Management Group believes that there is merit in exploring an arrangement for advance direct offers, including use of deposits, but is of the opinion that it would not be practicable for the initial 1998 intake since a lot more work is necessary before such a scheme could be implemented. The operation of such a scheme will be less difficult when the University has some feeling for the size of the eligible and interested applicant pool in each degree. It is anticipated that such a scheme will be introduced for the 1999 intake.

#### **Principles and policies with respect to fee levels and payment**

The Management Group considered advice from faculties about preferred fee levels and the principles on which these levels were based. A range of strategies was proposed which included relating fees to a multiple of the relevant HECS level or relating fees to international levels. Market considerations, including levels of fees charged by private providers, have also been seen as factors which need to be taken into account. Faculties raised issues with respect to the proportion of fees to be retained at the faculty level, which in their view would have an impact on the levels that should be set. It was also noted that it might be expected that students would not necessarily remain on a full fee-paying regime throughout a course as some might gain a HECS-liable place or receive partial remission of fees through scholarships. (See below.)

The Management Group considered it vital that the University should be in a position to explain how fee levels were determined, and to be able to demonstrate that the costs of providing courses including overhead and infrastructure elements were being taken into account and fee levels set such that there was no cross subsidy from Government funded places. The Government has determined that fees should not be set below the full differential HECS level. (It has also set a penalty of \$11,247 per EFTSU if the University has to include such students to meet its DEETYA undergraduate target load.) The Commonwealth itself sets minimum fee levels for overseas students, designed to ensure that Commonwealth resources are not diverted towards the provision of services for overseas students. The University has, as a matter of policy, set its fees for overseas students above the minimum level, in part to reflect the additional costs of providing the high quality teaching experience it offers. The minimum overseas fees include a capital component. (A schedule of the 1998 international fees is attached.) The argument has been put that local fee-payers not be levied this component because of the contribution they, and their parents, have made or will make through the taxation system. However it should be noted that substantial increases in numbers of fee-paying students may lead to the necessity for further capital investment by the University - which suggests that the capital component should not be excluded from the fee calculation.

The Management Group recommends that the principle be accepted that local fees should generally be equivalent to international fees. Some qualifications of this principle are necessary. The Management Group believes that there is scope for reviewing the method that has been adopted for determining international fee levels and for simplifying fee structures. It recommends that such a

review be undertaken. It recognises that the results of such a review would not take effect before 1999 at the earliest because of publication deadlines. The international fees include the compulsory subscriptions. The Management Group recommends that these be charged separately for local undergraduate fee-payers as is the case with local postgraduate fee-payers.

The Management Group has accepted the argument that fees for the generalist degrees should be set and publicised on the basis of so much per credit point rather than on the basis of a degree or a full-time year. Differential HECS is calculated on a unit of study basis, generally linking units to departments which are linked to bands. (The allocation to bands has been made by the Government and takes into account both costs of provision and future earning capacity of graduates.) Actual amounts due then relate to the proportion any particular unit of study forms of the particular degree. Where degrees are not structured in accordance with the standard pattern of 48 units of study per year this leads to the situation where students in the same unit of study pay differing amounts of HECS depending on the degrees in which they are enrolled. With respect to fees for degree courses offered by the Faculties of Arts, Economics, Education and Science, where there is a substantial element of student choice within programs, it would be expected that similar arrangements would apply. Departments and corresponding units of study would be allocated to a limited number of cost bands and students would pay according to their choice of units of study. The cost bands would be set so as to approximate the current international fee charges for degrees in these areas.

With respect to the professional offerings in Dentistry and Veterinary Science the Management Group has recommended (with Faculty agreement) that a lower fee level apply in the early years of the course but the fee be applied on a year rather than a unit of study basis. The overall fee for the degree program would still be comparable with the international fee as revised following the review referred to above. In other cases fees would be directly related to current international fee levels.

The Management Group has applied these principles to develop fee levels as set out in the Schedule. These fee-levels have been discussed with Deans and endorsed by the Pro-Vice-Chancellors (College), who, the Management Group recommends, should have the on-going responsibility for monitoring and setting fee-levels, both local and international, while consulting on this schedule at a central level.

The Management Group considered the issue of whether fee levels should be maintained for individual students at the level of entry to a program or whether the University would retain the right to adjust the fees annually. The existing policy with respect to postgraduate fee-payers is that the fees for continuing students should not rise at a rate higher than the CPI. A number of issues must be considered. Students might be wary if they have no guarantees about fee stability. On the other hand while inflation in recent years has been low that has not always been the case. Students might be in a program, if part-time, for six or seven years. There are implications for programming and systems development, in both the continuing and new Student Systems, as cohort tracking will be quite complicated especially with respect to students entering with advanced standing. There may well prove to be good reasons for significantly varying fee-levels in a particular course after a period of time either for pedagogic or market-driven reasons.

The Management Group recommends that the University reserve the right to increase fees but, except in special circumstances, will not do so at a rate higher than the CPI for continuing students for a period of time equal to the minimum time for the course in question plus one year. In all cases, students commencing as local fee-paying undergraduate students should be given clear advice as to their position. Where the University decides to reduce the level of fees in a program students who had previously enrolled in that program would not be entitled to any refund but would be charged the new reduced rate for any further enrolments.

It may well be that the administrative costs with respect to tracking the 1998 cohort are such that this group would be allowed to continue without fee increases, and more sophisticated arrangements introduced for cohorts commencing in 1999 and thereafter.

There are current University policies with respect to refunds for withdrawals from Local Fee-Paying Postgraduate Courses and from international courses. These have been amended to apply to undergraduate courses and are attached. It is recommended that students be permitted to pay their fees on a semester by semester basis. Suggestions have been made with respect to discounts for early payment etc. It is not proposed that these be pursued further in the first year of operation.

### **Merit incentive scholarships**

Students admitted to a program as fee-payers will have the opportunity to apply through UAC in the normal way for HECS-liable places with advanced standing on the basis of their academic performance. The Management Group proposes that some scholarships be provided in each faculty to be awarded on a competitive basis to students whose academic performance was not sufficiently high to gain a place within the small advanced standing quota but were nevertheless academically performing well, either in the course concerned or in another program. Comparable to the arrangements which currently apply with respect to international students, there could be a range in the value of such scholarships from around 25% of the normal fee up to an amount equivalent to HECS. The expectation would be that students achieving a level of performance sufficient to be admitted into a fourth year honours program would be given a scholarship reducing the fee to the equivalent of HECS and would be eligible to apply for an Equity and Merit Maintenance Scholarship.

#### **Equity issues**

The Management Group believes that the equity concerns expressed by Senate should be addressed in a number of ways. Faculties should be encouraged to develop policies so as to make more HECS-liable special admissions places available where there is a pool of qualified applicants, in proportion to the numbers of fee-paying students being admitted. This can be done either by increasing the total number of HECS-liable quota places available in a particular faculty or by increasing the proportion of Broadway places within existing quotas.

The Management Group also recommends that five percent of the gross income from fee paying students should be used for the provision of University of Sydney Equity and Merit Scholarships either to supplement the Government provided HECS exemption scholarships, particularly for students beyond first year, or to provide financial assistance for students in need or to accommodate both possibilities. These scholarship funds will be pooled and administered at the College level and may be supplemented from the Academic Development Fund. The principal source of funds for the Academic Development Fund is the General Operating Grant. This allocation is then supplemented by a proportion of fee-income. A proportion of the funds built up in the Academic Development Fund will be allocated for enhanced student support and social services available for all students.

#### **Loans**

The University has had preliminary discussions with two banks with respect to the establishment of a loan scheme for both HECS-liable and local fee-paying students. There are financial advantages for HECS-liable students who can pay all or part of the HECS fee up front rather than deferring it to the taxation system. The loans culture that exists in other countries with respect to students is not yet a feature of Australian society and the University will need to continue to encourage financial institutions to offer services in this area. The Management Group is of the view that the question of loans extends beyond the University of Sydney and should be taken up with the Government by the AVCC. This issue should also be taken up with the State Government. The proposition was put that the University itself should make loans available for students. This was seen as not being feasible.

#### **Fee income distribution**

The Management Group is aware that the Vice-Chancellor is considering how student fee income, from all sources, should be divided between the Colleges, the Equity and Merit Scholarships Fund, the University Library and the Academic Development Fund, noting the principle that the benefits should be applied to the University as a whole. The Management Group's terms of reference do not include the provision of advice in this area, other than with respect to equity issues.

#### **Space and timetabling issues**

Faculties were asked to comment on the immediate need for additional capital facilities and have indicated that they considered that existing facilities were adequate. A survey of space use in 1997 has also been undertaken and, given the likely levels of student numbers in 1998, no major problems are anticipated. The Capital Development Program Coordinating Group will keep this issue under review.

#### **Monitoring of activities**

It will be important that the outcomes of this initiative be carefully monitored. The Management Group will have responsibility for monitoring the implementation of the new arrangements. The

Academic Board has responsibility for ensuring academic policies are adhered to and in particular will review admissions policies and practice. Senate will expect to receive reports on the overall outcomes including the equity activities undertaken. 1998 will be a transitional year which will provide a benchmark for future reporting.

**Marketing and related issues**

A number of practical issues relating to marketing and publicity, including the source of financial support for such activities, are still to be considered by the Management Group.

Senate at its May meeting was advised that the Vice-Chancellor had appointed a Local Fee-Paying Undergraduate Students Project Management Group and a Local Fee-Paying Undergraduate Students Reference Group with the Membership and Terms of Reference as set out below.

**Local Fee-Paying Undergraduate Students Project Management Group**

Professor Ken Eltis (Chair)  
Professor Richard Johnstone  
Associate Professor Rosalind Atherton  
Professor Bettina Cass  
Professor Robert Hewitt  
Dr Jim Kitay  
Professor Jocalyn Lawler  
Dr Bill Adams, Director, Student Services and Acting Registrar  
Mr David Bowan, Student Centre  
Mr Derek Peat, Director, Marketing & Publications  
Mr Charles Davidson, Director, Planning Support Office

**Terms of Reference**

- To critically review estimates of likely enrolment levels in 1998 and beyond and formulate advice for the Strategic Planning Advisory Committee.
- To review space and timetabling issues and provide advice to Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Planning & Resources).
- To review advice from faculties on fee levels, formulate principles and provide advice to the Vice-Chancellor.
- To establish effective admission procedures (including relating to advanced standing) and to provide advice to the Undergraduate Studies Committee on admission policies and criteria in the light of advice from the faculties.
- To develop policy with respect to
  - payment and refund of fees
  - transfer to HECS-liable status
  - transfer to scholarships
  - access and equity
- To provide advice on marketing strategies and develop policy with respect to costs of marketing.
- To provide advice on the distribution of funds to enhance equity and merit programs and for enhanced student support and social services.

**Local Fee-Paying Undergraduate Students Reference Group**

Professor Ken Eltis (Chair)  
Mr Carl Green  
Dr Ken Macnab  
Mr John McCarthy QC  
Professor Ros Pesman  
Mr Danny Sriskandarajah  
Professor David Weisbrot  
Professor Sir Bruce Williams

**Terms of reference**

- To provide feedback to the Project Management Group on the appropriateness of procedures and policies it develops.
- To advise the Vice-Chancellor and Senate on the appropriateness of procedures and policies recommended.

**Schedule Local Undergraduate Fee Paying Students**

Faculty	Degrees	HECS-liable quota	Fee-paying intake	Fee per credit point	Fee per EFTSU	Notes
<b>Agriculture</b>	BAgrEc	75	1	\$225	\$11,000*	
	BAgrSc & BHortSc	60 15	1 1		\$12,000 \$14,000	Year 1 Later years
<b>Architecture</b>	BScArch	70	12		\$12,000	
	BArch	50	12		\$12,500	
<b>Arts</b>	BA	1200	30	\$220	\$10,500*	
	BA/BSW	40	5	\$220	\$10,500*	
	BA/BSc	90	30	\$220 - \$310	\$13,000*	
	BA/BCom	120	30	\$220 - \$225	\$11,000*	
	BLibStud	50	5	\$220 - \$310	\$13,000*	
<b>Dentistry</b>	BDS	53	15		\$15,000 \$22,000	Years 1 &2 Years 3-5
<b>Economics</b>	BCom/BEc (Acc)	273	30	\$225	\$11,000*	
	BEc/BEc(SocSc)	282	5	\$220	\$10,500*	
<b>Education</b>	BEd(HME)	65	20	\$220	\$10,500*	
	BEd (Prim)	95	10	\$220	\$10,500*	
<b>Health Sciences</b>	BAS Physio	180	5		\$15,000	
	BAS Sp Path	76	4		\$15,000	
	BAS Orthop	40	3		\$15,000	
	B Ex & SptSci	75	5		\$15,000	
<b>Law</b>	LLB	70	14		\$14,500	
	Combined Law	220	30		\$14,500	Non Law units as per relevant partner faculty
<b>Nursing</b>	BN	119	10		\$10,500	Registered Nursing only
<b>Science</b>	BPharm	150	25		\$16,500	
	BMedSc	110	10	\$220-\$310	up to \$15,500*	
	BCST	50	5	\$220-\$310	up to \$15,500*	
	BPsych	35	5	\$220-\$310	up to \$15,500*	
	BSc	682	0	\$220-\$310	up to \$15,500*	
<b>Sydney College of the Arts</b>	BVA	142	9		\$10,500	
<b>Veterinary Science</b>	BVSc	67	16		\$15,000 \$21,000	Year 1 Later years
<b>Total</b>		4384	345			

\* Approximate figure. The actual cost per year will depend on the particular units of study chosen. Compulsory subscriptions are payable in addition to these fees.