



---

## Academic Board

Board Secretary: Miss E R Ring

Main Quadrangle, A14

Phone: 9351 3305; Fax: 9351 3572

E-mail: [ring@mail.usyd.edu.au](mailto: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 pm on Wednesday, 11 March 1998** in the Professorial Board Room.

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

*Erica Ring*  
for  
Dr W Adams  
Registrar  
4 March 1998

\*\*\*\*\*

The items on this agenda are as follows:	Page
A1.    Starring	2
A2.    Minutes	2
A4.    Report of the Chair	2
A5.    Statement by the Vice-Chancellor and Principal	3
A8.    Report by the Vice-Chancellor and Principal on proctorial matters	3
C1.    Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee	3
C2.    Report of the Graduate Studies Committee	3
C3.    Report of the Teaching and Learning Committee	7
C4.    Report of the Research Committee	8
C5.    Report of the Library and Information Technology Committee	11
C6.    Report of the Academic Staffing Committee	12
C7.    Nomination of members - Advisory Committee for the Centre for Continuing Education	12

## A G E N D A

### P A1. Starring

Members of the Board are invited to star any unstarred item which they wish to have discussed.

# ***that the Board resolve as recommended with respect to all unstarred items.***

### A2. Minutes

#### 1. Minutes of the meeting held on 11 February 1998

The minutes of the meeting of the Academic Board held on Wednesday, 11 February 1998 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 Tuesday, 10 March 1998 so that they can be included in the supplementary agenda for the meeting.

# ***that the Board confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 11 February 1998 as a correct record.***

#### 2. 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. April Board meeting

While there is provision in the 1998 Academic Board meeting schedule for the cancellation of the April Board meeting, it is **recommended** that the Board meet in April as there will be a number of important issues coming forward.

# ***that the Board agree to hold the Board meeting scheduled provisionally for 15 April.***

#### 3. Terms of reference of Board committees

As the new Board has been in operation for more than a year, each of the Board committees has been asked to review its terms of reference. In this agenda, the Library and Information Technology Committee recommends an amendment to the Academic Governance Rules relating to its constitution (agenda item C5.3). It is suggested that the Board support this recommendation, but defer its transmission to Senate, awaiting changes recommended by other Board committees.

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

#### 4. Membership of the Board

Enclosed separately for members' information is the current Board membership list.

*(see separate enclosure)*

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

#### 5. Code of Conduct and Corruption Prevention Strategy documents

Professor Eltis has advised that the Corruption Prevention Committee agreed late last year that the University's Code of Conduct (endorsed by Senate on 7 October 1997) and the

University's Corruption Prevention Strategy (approved by the then Acting Vice-Chancellor, Professor Anderson, on 8 October 1997) be promulgated at a meeting of the Academic Board.

Copies of these documents were published in the *University News* (30 October 1997 edition) and are available on the Web.

# *that the Board note the report.*

**6. Action under delegated authority and reports from the three Colleges**

Under delegated authority, I have considered the recommendations of the three Colleges in respect of academic appointments and the appointment of selection committees that have been processed under the "old" appointments procedures and have approved/noted them as appropriate. A report on the appointment of Visiting Professors is attached. (Page 13)

# *that the Board note the report.*

**7. Questions on notice**

# *that the Board note that no questions have been received this month.*

**P Part II**

To be presented at the meeting.

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

**Part I**

**1. Report on Senate Matters**

To be tabled at the meeting.

# *that the Board note the report.*

**P Part II**

To be presented at the meeting.

**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.*

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

**Part I**

There is no report this month.

**P Part II**

To be presented at the meeting by the Committee's Chair.

**C2. Report of the Graduate Studies Committee**

**Part I**

**A. First report**

The Committee met on 23 February 1998 when there were present: the Chair, Professor J R Lawrence, presiding, Messrs B Buckley and T Clark, Associate Professor S Ellis, Professor J Gero, Associate Professor K C Kwok (for Professor Y-W Mai), Professor G MacAulay (for Dr L C

Campbell), Dr M J Mahony, Associate Professor A F Masters, Drs P McCallum and R Mitchell, Associate Professor R Ross, Professor D Siddle and Dr S West. Professor G Berry was present by invitation, Mrs L Rose was present as an observer and Miss E R Ring was in attendance.

**1. Amendment of the Resolutions of the Academic Board: electronic submission of theses**

The Board, at its meeting in October 1997, approved in principle that the option of receiving theses in an electronic form be made available to examiners where the student has indicated willingness to submit electronically, and that an electronic 'Examiner's report' form be sent to all examiners as a matter of course if the examiner has an e-mail address.

In its report to the October 1997 Board, the Committee noted that the present print form of submission is likely to remain the most used form of submission for the foreseeable future but that this new method will probably become increasingly popular with the passage of time and improvements in technology; it will also provide a saving in thesis printing and binding costs and examining time. The introduction of the electronic option does not detract from the present system in any way and only increases the degree of choice available to both candidates and examiners.

The Committee has addressed a number of procedural matters and now **recommends** that the Resolutions of the Academic Board be amended to make provision for electronic submission and examination of theses as attached, with immediate effect. While the amendment of the Resolutions makes specific provision for electronic submission and examination for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, it is intended that the spirit of these provisions be applied also to research Master's degrees. (Pages 14-17)

In making this recommendation, the Committee notes that these provisions will probably be amended and developed further with ever-growing technological improvements. It may be possible in the near future to take advantage of PDF (Portable Document Format) technology and other new developments.

# ***that the Board adopt the report and amend its Resolutions as recommended.***

**2. Guidelines for usage of the terms thesis, treatise, dissertation, essay and long essay as units of study within coursework programs**

The Committee received the attached position paper from its Coursework Sub-Committee on the usage of the terms thesis, treatise, dissertation, essay and long essay as units of study within coursework programs. (Pages 18-19)

The Committee agreed to adopt the Sub-Committee's recommendations, as set out below:

**Recommendations**

1. There be a transparent hierarchical structure that determines when it is appropriate to use each term to describe the written output of a project undertaken by an individual postgraduate student. The distinction between the terms will be based on the type of degree in which it is undertaken and the length of the written output of the project.
2. The term "thesis" be reserved exclusively for use in research degrees in which it is the sole or major examinable assessment requirement of candidature. As such, it would apply to Doctor of Philosophy degrees, professional doctorates and Master of Philosophy programs (or equivalent), ie, to programs in which the word length requirement is normally of the order of 40,000 to 80,000 words. The term "thesis" would therefore not be used at all in the context of units of study in coursework programs.
3. The term "long essay" will no longer be used.
4. The three terms "treatise", "dissertation" and "essay" would be used only in majority coursework programs in which there is more than one component of examinable assessment, ie, either a second piece of research and/or one or more coursework units of study.
5. The distinction between the terms "treatise", "dissertation" and "essay" to be based on word length in the order listed below under "implementation".
6. Formal supervisory arrangements must be in place for any student project which has a written output in excess of 8,000 words. These projects should constitute a unique unit of study (or whole number multiples of units of study) within a postgraduate research or coursework program.

7. The usage of the terms "treatise" and "dissertation" be as listed below under "implementation" rather than following the dictionary definitions.

**Implementation:**

The entire paragraph on page 4 of the 1997 *Postgraduate Studies Handbook* is replaced by the following:

**Thesis**

The written output from a supervised student project that is the only or major examinable assessment requirement for a research degree.

Word limit: should not normally exceed 80,000 words.

**Treatise**

The written output from a supervised student project that is undertaken towards a majority coursework degree for which some coursework and some research work are examinable components.

Word limit: should not normally exceed 40,000 words.

**Dissertation**

The written output from a supervised student project that is undertaken as a unit of study (or multiples of units of study) within a coursework postgraduate program.

Word limit: should not normally exceed 20,000 words.

**Essay**

The written output from an unsupervised student project that is an assessment requirement for a unit of study within a coursework postgraduate program.

Word limit: should not normally exceed 8,000 words.

# **that the Board endorse the report.**

**3. Appreciation of Professor Geoffrey Berry**

The Committee noted that this would be the last Graduate Studies Committee meeting to be attended by Professor Berry as the Chair of the PhD Award Sub-Committee.

The Committee wished to put on record its deep appreciation of Professor Berry's contributions not just to the work of the Committee as the Chair of the PhD Award Sub-Committee and Deputy Chair of the former Committee for Graduate Studies, but also more broadly for his contributions to the work of the University in these roles.

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

**4. Proceedings of the Committee**

**(1) Membership of the Committee**

The Committee noted that Associate Professor Susan Ellis had replaced Professor Chris Adam (Graduate School of Business) and that Professor Reuben Rose had replaced Associate Professor Grant Stone (Veterinary Science) as members of the Committee. The Committee welcomed Associate Professor Ellis back and welcomed Professor Rose *in absentia*. The Committee also welcomed the new Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research), Professor David Siddle, to his first meeting of the Committee.

**(2) Report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee**

On the report of the meeting of the PhD Award Sub-Committee held on 9 December 1997, the Committee noted that:

*Doctor of Philosophy*

- the award of the degree had been approved, subject to emendations being made to all copies of the theses which are to remain available within the University, to five candidates;
- the degree had not been awarded to two candidates in the Faculty of Arts, and the candidates had been permitted to revise and re-submit;
- an alternative fourth examiner to act as an assessor had been appointed for a candidature in the Faculty of Veterinary Science

- one candidature had been referred back to the Faculty of Law and one back to the Faculty of Medicine; and
- examiners had been appointed for 38 candidates.

**(3) Report of the Coursework Sub-Committee**

The Committee noted that the Coursework Sub-Committee was addressing the following matters:

- annual faculty reports on postgraduate teaching and reviews of postgraduate coursework;
- credit for units of study at postgraduate level; and
- conjoint ventures.

**(4) Postgraduate Studies Handbook**

The Committee noted that given the high cost of printing and distributing the Postgraduate Studies Handbook to all postgraduate students and academic staff, and given that the changes for the 1998 version had not been great, sufficient copies of the *1998 Postgraduate Studies Handbook* had been printed for distribution to new postgraduate students and new academic staff. Re-enrolling students and existing academic staff would be sent supplementary information about the updates made to the *1997 Handbook* and would be advised that the *1998 Handbook* was available on the Web. Copies of the *1998 Handbook* would be sent to faculty offices. The distribution would be undertaken shortly by the Registrar with the assistance of SUPRA, and the 1998 version would shortly be made available on the Web.

**(5) Higher doctorates**

The Committee confirmed the Chair's action in approving recommendations from the Faculty of Medicine for the appointment of a replacement examiner for one candidate and for the appointment of examiners for another candidate for the degree of Doctor of Medicine.

**(6) A proposal for the reclassification of the MMus (Performance) as a Master's degree by research**

The Committee considered a request from the Sydney Conservatorium of Music to convert the classification of its Master of Music (Performance) degree from a coursework degree to a research degree.

The Committee supported the proposal in principle, but identified a number of issues which it asked the Conservatorium to address before the proposal could be forwarded to the Board.

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

**B. Second report**

**A proposal for the reclassification of the MMus (Performance) as a Master's degree by research**

As set out in item 4.(6) of the Committee's First report, the Committee debated aspects of the proposal from the Sydney Conservatorium of Music with particular reference to recognising performance as research. (An extract from the proposal is attached.) In addition, some specific clarification of requirements was sought. (Pages 20-22)

Subsequent to the meeting, the Conservatorium provided the attached recommendations for amendments to the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the MMus(Perf) degree that address the issues.

The Chair, acting on behalf of the Committee, **recommends** approval of the proposal to reclassify the Master of Music (Performance) degree as a research degree and **recommends** the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate as recommended. (Pages 23-24)

# **that the Board:**

- **approve the proposal as recommended; and**
- **acting on behalf of Senate, amend the Resolutions of the Senate as recommended.**

## P Part II

To be presented at the meeting by the Committee's Chair.

### C3. Report of the Teaching and Learning Committee

#### Part I

The Committee met on 5 February 1998 when there were present: Professor Ann Sefton (Chair), Mr Simon Barrie, Mr Tom Clark, Ms Fran Everingham, Professor Richard Johnstone, Ms Janet Jones, Associate Professor Tony Koppi, Mr Les McCrimmon, Professor Ross McPhedran, Dr Mary Peat. In attendance: Ms Louise Maral.

#### 1. Draft guidelines for Excellence in Teaching Awards

A revised document has been forwarded to the Academic Board. (Pages 25-28)

# **that the Board adopt the revised Guidelines for Excellence in Teaching Awards.**

#### 2. Proceedings of the Committee

##### (1) Composition of the Committee

The Committee welcomed as new members: Mr Simon Barrie (Centre for Teaching and Learning), replacing Dr Brew during her leave from February to July; Ms Fran Everingham, representative from the College of Health Sciences; Ms Janet Jones, Head, Learning Assistance Centre; and Dr Mary Peat, representative from the College of Sciences and Technology.

##### (2) Report of Centre for Teaching and Learning

The Committee noted the attached report on the Centre for Teaching and Learning tabled by Mr Simon Barrie. Mr Barrie pointed out that the Centre was offering a graduate certificate in Education based on the revised Academic Induction Program which is now not only open to new staff but also to other staff wanting to develop some scholarly practice. A notice in the University of Sydney News was forthcoming. (Page 29)

Mr Barrie reported that a number of departments had sought the assistance of the Centre in providing courses for postgraduate students who tutor or demonstrate in courses. Mr Clark pointed out that information did not always reach all postgraduate students who wanted some assistance in developing teaching skills. It was agreed that Mr Barrie and Mr Clark would: (1) insert reciprocal pieces in their respective newsletters, and (2) discuss development of appropriate generic courses for postgraduate students and report back to the Committee.

##### (3) Assessment policy

The paper would be circulated to Faculty teaching committees for comment by the end of March, revised accordingly then forwarded to the Academic Board.

##### (4) Flexible learning: guidelines for development of flexible delivery

The Committee noted the previously circulated paper which included a draft of general guidelines for Web development of teaching and learning materials and a checklist of relevant considerations. The paper will be revised on the basis of discussion in the meeting, finalised at the March meeting, then forwarded to the Academic Board.

##### (5) Travel grant entitlements for teaching purposes

The Committee discussed the issue of adequate travel grant entitlements for teaching purposes. Chairs of Faculty Teaching Committees are being asked for information about experiences of staff in applications for such grants.

##### (6) National Council for Open and Distance Education (NCODE)

The Committee noted various previously circulated papers from NCODE.

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

P **Part II**

To be presented at the meeting by the Committee's Chair.

**C4. Report of the Research Committee**

**Part I**

The Committee met on 12 February 1998 when there were present: Professor D Cockayne, Deputy Chair Academic Board (Presiding Member); Professor D Siddle, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research); Professor D Cook; Professor GJ Gill ; Professor M Clunies Ross; Professor D Melrose; Professor I Hume; Dr J Lingard; Mr T Clark. In Attendance: Professor L Field, Ms M Robb, Dr C Baxter, Mr A Walmsley, Ms S Reid (Committee Secretary).

**1. General Business**

Professor Cockayne welcomed the new Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research), Professor David Siddle, who commenced at the University on 24 November 1997.

On behalf of the Research Committee, Professor Cockayne expressed sorrow at the passing of Professor John Booker in January 1998. Professor Cockayne said that Professor Booker had been a positive force within the University, and would be greatly missed.

Professor Cockayne asked that the Research Committee routinely be provided with copies of guidelines and advertisements for internal granting schemes to ensure that any potential problems, such as confusion over eligibility criteria, might be resolved up front by the Committee.

**2. Proposed combined URG/ARC Small Grant Process - Guidelines**

Professor Gill spoke to his paper, providing guidelines for a combined URG/ARC Small grant process. The Research Committee reaffirmed its view that a combined scheme not only offered administrative efficiencies, but also encouraged and provided a development opportunity for less experienced researchers to apply to external funding bodies. The Committee discussed aspects of the proposed scheme and guidelines, agreeing that the upper limits on requests for funding should be the same for the two schemes and that grants should be restricted to one year of funding. In terms of eligibility criteria, the Committee agreed to adopt the definition of Early Career Researchers used by the ARC, namely:

... one who is currently within his/her first five years of academic or other research-related employment, allowing for uninterrupted, stable research development, following completion of postgraduate research training.

The Committee further agreed that the guidelines specify that "only one successful renewal application may be held at one time", and that "a maximum total of 24 months of URG funding may be held by a researcher during his/her period of eligibility".

Professors Cockayne, Siddle and Gill agreed to finalise the guidelines for the combined scheme, for final consideration by the Research Committee at its March meeting.

**3. Policy on dealing with allegations of research misconduct**

Ms Reid advised the Committee that the University had received correspondence from the Office of Research Integrity, Department of Human Services and Health, USA (Public Health Service - PHS), stating that the University must have a policy for dealing with research misconduct which complies with the Public Health Service regulations, or risk losing access to PHS research funds. Ms Reid advised the Committee that one researcher currently held such a grant, worth approximately \$150,000 over three years. The Committee agreed that Ms Reid should examine the ways in which other institutions achieved compliance with the PHS regulation, and that the matter be further considered at the March meeting.

**4. Proposed major issues for 1998 - The role of research in the University funding model**

Professor Cockayne advised the Committee that Professor Eltis had extended an invitation for the Research Committee to have input into the relative emphasis of research measures within the University's internal Funding Model. A subcommittee comprising Professors Cockayne, Siddle, Field, Clunies Ross and Mr Clark agreed to provide a paper for the March or April Research Committee meetings.

**5. Proposed major issues for 1998 - Report from Ethics Committees and review of outcomes from these committees**

The Research Committee agreed to invite the Chairs of the Human Ethics Committee and Animal Ethics Committee to advise the Research Committee on issues which these committees saw as emerging issues for attention over the next one to two years. Professor Clunies Ross reported that the ARC was currently considering development of its own Code of Ethics for research involving humans.

**6. Report of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research)**

**Research Quantum and Research Infrastructure Block Grant**

Professor Siddle reported that the Research Quantum to the University of Sydney in 1998 was less than received in 1997, and was approximately \$870,000 less than the estimate of Research Quantum used in the 1998 University budget. This was the largest percentage decrease experienced by the five leading universities. Professor Siddle said that, in the short term, this meant that the \$870,000 budget shortfall would have to be found from within the budget, but in the longer term, had implications for the way in which the budget is forecast. Professor Siddle reported that the Vice-Chancellor had agreed to provide some funds to meet the shortfall, with the remainder to be met from the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) resources. Professor Siddle reported that in 1997 the shortfall between actual and budgeted Research Quantum had been met entirely from the Major Equipment Fund. This year the shortfall will be met partly by offsetting major equipment against RIBG, and partly through a reduced notional allocation for the URGS. Professor Siddle also reported that the RIBG allocation to the University was greater than in 1997, however the percentage increase was smaller than the other leading universities.

**Key Centres of Teaching and Research**

Professor Siddle reported that 14 expressions of interest had been received for the 1999 Key Centres of Teaching and Research funding round. A committee had reviewed these and eight were selected for further development into full proposals. The committee will further consider these proposals and select up to the maximum 4 applications which may be submitted by each university for consideration by ARC. Professor Siddle also reported that mid-term reviews were underway on two centres awarded in 1995: the Key Centre for Microscopy and Microanalysis and the Key Centre for Transport Studies.

The Research Committee agreed that ARC should be asked to reconsider its decision to exclude Directors of Centres from applying for ARC grants. Professor Siddle advised that this item would be on the agenda for the meeting of Pro-Vice-Chancellors (Research) on 5-6 March 1998.

**High Performance Computing and Communications**

Professor Siddle reported that three major bids had been considered by DEETYA for HPCC funding, including one from a consortium of institutions around Australia, led by ANU, in which the University of Sydney was a part. The Committee decided not to award to any of these bids, but has provided \$100,000 for an interim board, led by ANU, to develop the bid further.

**Issues for the future**

Professor Siddle raised a number of issues which he saw as requiring attention in the coming year or two. These included: a review of the ARC Small Grants Scheme to provide better incentives for researchers to move to applying for external funding; the URGS; a taxonomy of Centres and issues of how they are to be handled when government funding ends; a strategic review of the Research Management Plan; and how post-graduate research students are funded to do their research. The Committee agreed to add these items to the Agenda of the next Committee meeting, to determine how to proceed on each.

7. **Report of the Director, Business Liaison Office**

**Proposed Forum**

Dr Baxter reported that there had been good response from industry to the Pharmaceutical and Biotechnology Forum to be held on 26 March 1998. However, more leading edge presenters from the University were needed.

**SPIRT seminars**

Dr Baxter told the Committee that four seminars on ARC SPIRT Program would be held during the week of 16 February. Attendance at these seminars was expected to be high.

8. **Report of the Director, Research Development**

Ms Robb reported that she had been working with applicants on their ARC Large Grant applications. She noted that, in general, the quality of applications seemed high, although many applicants appeared to be tripping up on minor points within the application.

9. **Report of the Director, Research and Scholarships Office**

**ARC Large Grants and Fellowships**

Ms Reid reported that the closing date for applications for ARC Large Grants and Fellowships was 27 February 1998, and that approximately 250 applications were expected. Applications are being thoroughly checked, to ensure that guidelines are met, even though clarifications of the guidelines by DEETYA (for example font style and size) were an almost daily occurrence. Ms Reid said that, in addition to Ms Robb's close work with researcher on their applications, the assistance of Mr Alan Nicholls, former Head of the DEETYA Research Branch, had also been commissioned by the University.

**NHMRC GrantNet**

Ms Reid reported that all universities were experiencing major problems with the NHMRC's electronic application platform GrantNet. These largely related to problems with access/logins to the system, attaching files and printing, the slowness of the system, and slow response times from the NHMRC GrantNet Helpdesk. Ms Reid reported that, following requests from Directors of Research Offices around the country, AVCC was meeting with NHMRC to request an extension to the application due date.

**1998 Publications Data Collection**

Ms Reid reported that the 1998 collection of 1997 research publications data had begun. Departmental officers have been provided with training on Lotus Notes, the electronic database used by the University, and are currently being issued with logins to start entry of publications in the four categories recognised by DEETYA as part of the composite index calculation. At the discretion of each department, there is also the facility for non-DEETYA recognised publications (eg textbooks and creative works) to be entered onto the database for management information purposes. Ms Reid said that DEETYA had recently made further changes to the specifications relating to the definition of "commercial publishers" as those bodies whose core function was to publish. This meant that bodies such as the Learned Academies were no longer eligible.

10. **Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Research Committee will be held at 8AM on Thursday 19 March 1998.

# *that the Board note the report.*

P **Part II**

To be presented at the meeting by the Committee's Chair.

## **C5. Report of the Library and Information Technology Committee**

### **Part I**

The Committee met on Monday 2 February. There were present: Professor R McPhedran (presiding), Professors R Johnstone and A Martin, Dr M Peat, Dr S Carlile, Associate Professors R Kummerfeld, Mr T Clark and Mr J Shipp. Ms B Olde and Mr T Robinson were in attendance.

#### **1. Report of the University Librarian - outlook for 1998**

The University Librarian reported on the impact of the devaluation of the Australian dollar on the Library's purchasing power. Mr Shipp indicated that major reduction in the purchase of overseas journals would be likely. He also stated that a consultative process with departments was underway to refine journal purchases.

1998 would also see reduction in Library staff as restructuring took effect.

#### **2. Report of the Chair of the IT Reference Group**

Following discussion of the Report of the Chair of the IT Reference Group, the Committee requested the IT Reference Group to draft a letter to Deans and student representative bodies. The letter was to determine the expectations of and for students regarding the use and access to Information Technology.

#### **3. Membership of the Committee**

Mr T Clark requested that Membership point (h) of the Terms of Reference of the Committee be changed. At present it reads:

(h) *one postgraduate student nominated by the elected postgraduate student member of the Academic Board, who is selected for his or her interest in library or information technology matters.*

Mr Clark suggested that (h) be amended to read:

(h) *one postgraduate student, the President of SUPRA or the President's nominee.*

The Committee supported the request and **recommended** that the Academic Board recommend that Senate amend the Academic Governance Rules as suggested. This change to the method of providing postgraduate representation would bring the Library and IT Committee membership into line with the other committees of the Academic Board.

#### **4. Distance Education**

The linkages between Distance Education/Flexible Learning and IT were recognised by the Committee. Following discussion, which noted that the area was one of vital interest to all Academic Board committees, it was suggested that a working group be established by the Chair of the Academic Board to ensure a consistent and informed position is developed on this topic. The working group should contain representation from all relevant Academic Board Committees.

# ***that the Board note the report and, in respect of the recommendation in item 3, that the Board endorse the recommendation but agree to delay its transmission to Senate until the other Board Committees have reviewed their terms of reference and forwarded their recommendations for any changes to the Board.***

### **P Part II**

To be presented at the meeting by the Committee's Chair.

## **C6. Report of the Academic Staffing Committee**

### **Part I**

The Committee met on 18 February 1998. There were present: Professor R Pesman (Chair), Professor D Anderson, Associate Professor R Arnold, Associate Professor R Atherton, Associate Professor D Davey, Professor L Field and Ms S Jamieson. Present by invitation: Ms R Deamer. In attendance: Ms J Deitch and Mr J Upcroft.

#### **1. Draft Policy Document - University Chairs**

The Committee discussed the draft policy document. The Committee will meet again to discuss the document further and expects to present a draft to the April meeting of the Board.

#### **2. Draft Policy Document - Academic and Research Titles**

The Committee discussed the draft policy document. Progress will be reported to the Board.

#### **3. Six monthly reporting on all academic appointments (advertised and appointment on nomination)**

Attached for information, in accordance with the Policy Document on the Appointment of All Categories of Academic Staff, are statistical reports which have been consolidated from the six monthly reporting on the outcome of all academic appointments provided by the Pro-Vice-Chancellors. (Pages 30-33)

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

### **P Part II**

To be presented at the meeting by the Committee's Chair.

## **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 April 1998. The term of office is for one year.

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

# .....

## Action by the Chair under delegated authority

### College of Health Sciences

#### Appointment of Visiting Professors

Name	Department	Period
Emeritus Professor I Pilowsky	Psychological Medicine	2 January 1998 to 31 December 1998
Professor L Longpin	Anatomy & Histology	1 June 1998 to 31 December 1998
Professor Y C Kong	Pharmacy	12 months

### College of Sciences and Technology

#### Appointment of Visiting Professor

The Academic Board **is asked to note** the following appointment which has been approved by the Chair on behalf of the Academic Board, on the recommendation of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, on the advice of the relevant Dean and Head of Department:

Name	Department/School	Period
Professor Behrouz Tabarrok	Aeronautical Engineering	15/01/98 to 31/03/98

## **Amendment of the Resolutions of the Academic Board**

### **Electronic submission of theses**

#### **Form and binding of theses**

It is recommended that the existing resolutions of the Academic Board relating to the “Form of the thesis” (p 111, *Calendar 1996*, Vol I) and to “Binding of theses” (p 118, *Calendar 1996*, Vol I) be rescinded and that new Resolutions be adopted instead, with immediate effect, in order to make provision for the electronic submission and examination of PhD theses.

The proposed new Resolutions appear below, with new and amended text italicised.

#### **Form of the thesis**

*Four copies of the thesis shall be submitted for examination for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and shall normally be submitted in one of the forms set out below in sections 1 and 2.*

1. *The four copies may be bound in either a permanent or temporary form as set out in sub-sections (a) and (b).*

(a) *A thesis submitted in ~~hard-copy~~ permanent binding shall be on International Standard A4 size paper sewn and bound in boards covered with bookcloth or buckram or other binding fabric. 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. Supporting material should be bound in the back of the thesis as an appendix or in a separate set of covers.*

(b) *Theses 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. Theses 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. The Xerox Demand Binding system is acceptable both for temporary and permanent purposes.*

2. *A thesis may also be submitted in electronic form in accordance with the provisions of section 3.*

(a) *When a thesis is submitted in electronic form, four copies must be submitted as set out in sub-section (b).*

(b) *A thesis submitted in electronic form must normally be submitted on disk and must be in Word, WordPerfect or ASCII format, or in such other format which the Faculty determines as acceptable to both the candidate and the examiners(s), with the same structure as the ultimate printed version referred to in sections 1.(a) and 4, and each chapter must be in a separate document.*

*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 on the title page and on a label affixed to the disk.*

*A hard copy of the thesis should normally be submitted for retention by the faculty office, and further copies for any examiner(s) unwilling or unable to examine the thesis electronically. Individual faculties may determine, however, that the copy for retention in the Faculty Office may also be submitted in electronic form.*

3. *Procedures for electronic submission of theses*

*Provision for electronic submission of theses for the purpose of examination may occur where both the candidate wishes to submit in this form and examiners are prepared to examine in this way.*

*Candidates wishing to submit electronically are required to provide earlier advice of their intent to submit so that arrangements may be made with prospective examiners.*

*The usual examination process will be followed when a thesis is submitted electronically, except as set out below.*

- (a) A student who wishes to submit electronically must so advise the Supervisor and the Department at least nine months prior to submission. This advice should be by the completion of a (centrally-designed) form, on which the student must indicate the likely length of the thesis and any special features relating to its format .
  - (b) Examiners must be selected in the normal way and no regard paid to whether or not they would wish to examine electronically.
  - (c) When confirming the appointment of examiners, the Faculty Office should confirm their willingness or otherwise to examine an electronic version of the thesis.
  - (d) Prospective examiners must be advised that the thesis is available in Word, WordPerfect or ASCII format and they must be asked whether they prefer to accept it in that form (on disk, but possibly as an e-mail attachment) or in the traditional hard copy form.
  - (e) Under certain circumstances particular specialised electronic applications may form part of the thesis. In such circumstances, it should be ascertained that the examiner has the capability to accept this format, and this must be done 9 months prior to submission.
  - (f) If an examiner advises that he or she does not wish to examine electronically, then the examiner will be sent a hard copy of the thesis.
4. The degree shall not be awarded until the candidate has submitted a permanently bound copy of the thesis (containing any corrections or amendments that may be required) and printed on acid-free or permanent paper, for lodgement in the University Library.

### **Doctor of Philosophy**

It is recommended that the Resolutions of the Academic Board relating to the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (pp 111-118, *Calendar 1996, Vol 1*) be amended as follows with immediate effect.

Only the text relevant to the submission of theses and the examination process is included here. Existing text proposed for deletion is struck through and new text is italicised (except for headings which were already italicised in the original Resolutions).

### **DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY THE EXAMINATION PROCESS**

#### **1. Appointment of examiners**

*Faculty or college board to seek recommendation for examiners*

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

*Examiners not appointed*

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

*Delays in appointment to be avoided*

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

(2) The head of department should normally have taken the steps outlined below in sections 1.04 to ~~1.11~~ 1.12, noting the provisions of section 1.14, before the thesis is submitted.

*Head to consult and recommend*

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

**1.05** The head of department shall recommend the appointment of three examiners of the thesis of whom at least one shall be external to the University, i.e. not being a member of the staff of the

University or holding a clinical academic title, and of whom normally one shall be a member of the academic staff of the University, or hold a clinical academic title.

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

*Qualifications of examiners*

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

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

*Supervisor as examiner*

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

*Examiners free from bias*

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

*Involvement of candidate*

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

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

*Faculty to appoint examiners*

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

**1.12** (a) The head of department shall make a recommendation to the faculty for the appointment of examiners. In making this recommendation, the head of department should indicate: whether or not he or she has ascertained the prospective examiners' willingness to examine electronically; whether or not they wish to examine in this way, and, if so, the format(s) in which they are able to receive the thesis. Examiners must be selected in the normal way and no regard paid to whether or not they would wish to examine electronically.

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

*Report to PhD Award Sub-Committee*

**1.13** The faculty or college board shall, using the prescribed form, report the names and qualifications of the examiners appointed to the PhD Award Sub-Committee which may itself appoint, or may request the faculty or college board to recommend for appointment, one or more additional examiners. The faculty or college board shall indicate on the form which, if any, of the examiners will be examining the thesis electronically.

*Names not to be disclosed*

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

*Invitation to examiners*

**1.15** After the appointment of examiners by the faculty or college board, the Registrar shall write to each external examiner inviting him or her to act, specifying the conditions applicable to the examination process and enclosing the resolutions for the degree and an information statement ~~and the examiner's report form~~. An examiner's report form will be enclosed with the letter and, if possible, will also be sent to the examiner in electronic form via electronic mail if the examiner is

able to receive it in one of the formats available (ie as a Word or WordPerfect document or as an ASCII file).

**1.16** On receipt of an acceptance of the invitation to act, or on advice from the head of department concerned that the examiner is willing to act under those conditions, the Registrar shall dispatch a copy of the thesis in either hard copy or electronic form if the examiner has indicated willingness to examine in electronic form.

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

*Delegations of authority*

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

## **2. Consideration by examiners**

*Examiners to report within two months*

**2.01** An examiner is required to complete the examination of the thesis and submit a report on the prescribed form within two months of receipt of the thesis. The examiner may return the report by electronic mail, but if using this medium must also send a signed, hard copy of the report by mail or facsimile.

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

## **Guidelines for theses, treatises, dissertations, essays and long essays within postgraduate programs**

### **Background**

The Sub-Committee was asked to re-examine the use of the terms used as descriptors for research-based units of study within coursework programs. The Sub-Committee initially discussed this matter at its July 1997 meeting. It was decided that prior to formulating any recommendations to the Graduate Studies Committee, the Sub-Committee would survey all Faculties as to the current practice in the usage of these terms. Faculties were requested in August to provide responses concerning four specific issues:

1. the usage of the above terms within the faculty;
2. the faculty's understanding of the meanings of these terms;
3. the faculty's requirements (such as expected length) in respect of theses, treatises, dissertations, essays and long essays as units of study within coursework programs; and
4. the faculty's views on the desirability of uniformity in the use of these terms across the University.

All but one faculty replied. A summary of the responses was prepared and tabled at the Sub-Committee's October meeting in advance of a full discussion at the November meeting.

Those responses contain three clear themes.

First, there is widespread support for the proposition that the term "thesis" be used only in research-only programs.

Second, there is a very diverse range of current practices within the University in the application of the other terms and the requirements.

Finally, a clear majority of Faculties indicated support for uniformity across the University, although several were sceptical that it could be achieved.

### **Discussion**

The Sub-Committee is appreciative of the quality of the information provided in the responses from the Faculties and has found the information contained in those responses to be very useful in guiding the sub-committee's deliberations. It is clear that the terms 'thesis', 'treatise', 'dissertation', and 'long essay' should be taken to refer to particular written forms of the output from a student project. In each case, the written output is to be the product of individual research undertaken by a student towards a given program. As scholarly essays, they imply that the student will be expected to demonstrate a knowledge of work in the area of the research undertaken, and to make an original contribution to the understanding of that area, commensurate to the type and scale of research essay being completed.

The Sub-Committee is of the view that it is helpful to have University-wide application of each of these terms. Uniformity in the application of these terms would be of significant benefit to students, academic staff and administrative staff. In particular, the processes involved in a student project would be transparent to all participants. Transparency is most valuable if it makes very clear what a Department can expect from a student and what level of support and supervision the student can expect from the Department. There are two major dimensions which need to be addressed; supervisory arrangements, and word length.

All members of the Sub-Committee agree that major student research essays must involve formal supervision arrangements, the precise details of which will vary according to the scale and scope of the individual research project.

The Sub-Committee believes that the term 'long essay' has created a lot of confusion amongst students and staff. Implicit in the term is the notion of a shorter piece of written work called an 'essay'. The term essay has not been defined, and the distinction between an essay and a long essay is arbitrary. The Sub-Committee proposes that the term 'essay' be given a general definition which distinguishes it from those for a thesis/treatise/dissertation by the lack of academic supervision. The term 'long essay' would no longer be used.

The Sub-Committee has identified a potential problem with the current usage within this University of the terms 'treatise' and 'dissertation'. Dictionary definitions of these two terms

place a dissertation as a more major piece of work than a treatise. This is contrary to the common usage of the two terms at the University of Sydney. Although the Sub-Committee is proposing that the current usage of these terms is maintained, it does draw the Graduate Studies Committee's attention to this dilemma.

### **Recommendations**

1. There be a transparent hierarchical structure that determines when it is appropriate to use each term to describe the written output of a project undertaken by an individual postgraduate student. The distinction between the terms will be based on the type of degree in which it is undertaken and the length of the written output of the project.
2. The term "thesis" be reserved exclusively for use in research degrees in which it is the sole or major examinable assessment requirement of candidature. As such, it would apply to Doctor of Philosophy degrees, professional doctorates and Master of Philosophy programs (or equivalent), ie, to programs in which the word length requirement is normally of the order of 40,000 to 80,000 words. The term "thesis" would therefore not be used at all in the context of units of study in coursework programs.
3. The term "long essay" will no longer be used.
4. The three terms "treatise", "dissertation" and "essay" would be used only in majority coursework programs in which there was more than one component of examinable assessment, ie, either a second piece of research and/or one or more coursework units of study.
5. The distinction between the terms "treatise", "dissertation" and "essay" to be based on word length in the order listed below under "implementation".
6. Formal supervisory arrangements must be in place for any student project which has a written output in excess of 8,000 words. These projects should constitute a unique unit of study (or whole number multiples of units of study) within a postgraduate research or coursework program.
7. The usage of the terms "treatise" and "dissertation" be as listed below under "implementation" rather than following the dictionary definitions. If the Committee wished to bring common usage in to line with the dictionary definitions, the only alterations required in the "implementation" section is inter-changing of the two terms.

### **Implementation:**

The entire paragraph on page 4 of the 1997 *Postgraduate Studies Handbook* would need to be replaced by the following:

#### **Thesis**

The written output from a supervised student project that is the only or major examinable assessment requirement for a research degree.

Word limit: should not normally exceed 80,000 words.

#### **Treatise**

The written output from a supervised student project that is undertaken towards a majority coursework degree for which some coursework and some research work are examinable components.

Word limit: should not normally exceed 40,000 words.

#### **Dissertation**

The written output from a supervised student project that is undertaken as a unit of study (or multiples of units of study) within a coursework postgraduate program.

Word limit: should not normally exceed 20,000 words.

#### **Essay**

The written output from an unsupervised student project that is an assessment requirement for a unit of study within a coursework postgraduate program.

Word limit: should not normally exceed 8,000 words.

## Graduate Studies Committee

### A proposal for the reclassification of the MMus (Performance) as a Master's degree by research

#### Request

The Conservatorium seeks to convert the classification of its MMus (Performance) degree from a coursework to a research degree.

#### Benefits of proposed changes

The request is made to provide opportunities for research-oriented performance students which they do not currently enjoy. This will provide a path for research-oriented performance students to study at the Sydney Conservatorium. Currently research based Master's programs are in existence at the University of Melbourne, the University of Adelaide, Griffith University (Queensland Conservatorium).

It will provide suitably qualified performance students with access to support currently offered to research students, particularly access to APAs, and funding support currently offered to research students.

This change will bring the MMus (Performance) into line with the other three strands of the MMus at the Conservatorium, (MMus (Composition), MMus (Music Education) and MMus (Musicology)) all of which are currently research degrees.

It will provide performance students seeking postgraduate study with two paths, a professionally-based degree by coursework (the Master of Performance) and a research-based degree (the Master of Music (Performance)).

#### Masters degrees and Graduate Diplomas at the Conservatorium

By Coursework	By Research
Graduate Diploma (Performance) Graduate Diploma (Opera) Graduate Diploma (Repetiteur) Graduate Diploma (Accompaniment)	
Mod- ular- ised	
Master of Performance	Master of Music (Performance) (pending acceptance of this proposal) Master of Music (Composition) Master of Music (Music Education) Master of Music (Musicology)

#### Research and Creative Work

The request is made on the basis of equivalent treatment for creative work and research. The Conservatorium Research Management Plan (July 1993: reviewed 1994) defines "research" as follows:

"throughout this document the word " research" stands for traditional research (musicology, music education), creative work (composition), the application of creative work (performance), or any combination of these ...

Research can be said to consist of any activity that extends the known boundaries of an individual's discipline area, that is publicly reported and peer reviewed."

The Conservatorium recognises that not all performance related activities can claim a legitimate equivalence to research. In order for performance projects to be seen as equivalent to research they must extend the boundaries of the discipline of performance through such means as expanded stylistic, or interpretative horizons, investigation of historical performance practice, development

of new performance modes, relationships and techniques, or through enhanced critical, historical or analytical perspectives. Furthermore students must be able to articulate the contribution that their performance project makes towards extending the known boundaries of their discipline. To develop and assess this in a research degree requires additional supervisory arrangements and modifications to assessment procedures as detailed below.

Recognition of the role of inter-relationship of artistic creative work and research can be seen in recent work on Research Performance Indicators which include artistic work categories. Within the University of Sydney, this is reflected in the separate Research Performance Indicators for creative work developed by the Research Committees of the Conservatorium and the Sydney College of the Arts for the Performance Indicators Working Party (University of Sydney, Quality Portfolio, 1995, p. 25). In 1995 the principle of equal value for creative work and research in post-amalgamation universities was also recognised by the AVCC by the inclusion of specific categories for performance, composition and other artistic creative work in the DEETYA research data collection although these were later replaced in 1997 by a set of four 'proxy categories' which were taken as representing research output of other types (including creative work).

However, in the area of graduate students, the notion of equal value for creative work has not yet been achieved for performance students at the Conservatorium. This disadvantages those students in terms of their access to APAs tenable at the University of Sydney, and in terms of the resources allocated to those students under the current funding formula.

#### **Structure of the MMus (Performance)**

The research MMus (Performance) would be administered with the same regulations and through the same structure as the existing MMus (Performance) with minor changes in the requirements and examination of the subject Principal Study 1 - 4, which arose after discussion with the Committee for Graduate Studies in 1995. Changes have also been made to the Credit Point value of units of study to bring them into line with the transition to a model based on 24 credit points per semester.

#### **Proposed Changes**

The minor changes to Principal Study 1 - 4 are designed to support the development of a truly reflective and research-oriented approach to musical performance. This will be achieved through:

- The appointment of appropriately qualified co-supervisors to supervise the development of research projects in performance: these co-supervisors would work with the existing performance teachers to develop a unified program of study involving research and performance.
- Alterations to assessment requirements to include an assessable component entitled Critical Notes for each public performance worth 20% of the mark. A minimum of a pass is required for Critical Notes. The Critical Notes would be required to articulate the research component of the performance and address, where appropriate, historical, critical, analytical, stylistic and interpretative issues, and issues of performance practice in the performances presented.
- Appointment of examination panels for recitals and the long essay take note of the assessment needs of Critical Notes and include persons with suitable expertise.

#### **Points for noting**

The existing course already equips students with the skills necessary to articulate the research component in Seminar 1 (Introduction to Research Method);

The Long Essay which is completed to meet the requirements of the Special Project Seminar, provides a further written research component to the degree including an opportunity to research a performance-related topic. In consultation with their supervisors, students usually select topics related to their performance interest. However the Conservatorium Postgraduate Studies Committee was of the view that it would lessen the value of the Long Essay if the link between the Long Essay topic and performance expertise were to be mandatory. It was pointed out that some instruments provide more viable topics than others for such an essay and that the project was of greater value if the selection of the topic were left to the student and lecturer concerned.

#### **Load**

The load for the research degree would be the same as the existing MMus (Performance), currently 5 students for both years.

**Implementation**

Because there are currently two students who have been offered APAs who wish to enrol in this degree, the Conservatorium asks that the reclassification be implemented in February 1998.

**Background to the Current Proposal**

At the meeting of the Conservatorium College Board of 27 March 1995, following a recommendation from the Conservatorium Postgraduate Studies Committee, it was resolved to recommend to the Graduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board that, subject to the modifications described in this document, the MMus (Performance) award of the Conservatorium be reclassified as a Master's degree by research.

At its meeting of 21 August 1995 this matter was considered by the Committee for Graduate Studies (University). The Committee made three comments on the proposal:

1. A minimum of a pass should be required for Critical Notes.
2. The requirement for originality in performance work should be articulated.
3. Assessment criteria should be revised to incorporate the research focus of the degree.

The proposal was subsequently shelved pending the development of a new postgraduate course, the Master of Performance (by coursework), which caters for students seeking advanced instrumental training of a professional nature.

The existence of this professionally-based Master's degree has highlighted a continuing and significant demand for research-oriented performance study. Evidence for this demand arises from consultation with former students, existing students, lecturers, consultations within the profession, and consultation with the Conservatorium Advisory Council, a consultative body with representatives from major performing organisations including the Sydney Symphony Orchestra, Symphony Australia, Opera Australia and Musica Viva.

At the meeting of the Conservatorium College Board of 29 September, 1997, on the advice of the Conservatorium Graduate Studies Committee, the Board voted to reactivate the initiative to convert the Master of Music (Performance) to a research degree to cater for this need.

## Graduate Studies Committee

### Amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate

#### MASTER OF MUSIC (PERFORMANCE)

The Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Degree of Master of Music (Performance) (pp 488-9, *Calendar 1996, Vol 1*) are amended as follows with immediate effect.

Existing text proposed for deletion is struck through and new text is underlined.

#### MASTER OF MUSIC (PERFORMANCE)

##### Award of the degree

1. The degree of Master of Music (Performance) shall be awarded in one grade, namely the Pass degree.

##### Eligibility for admission

2. An applicant for admission to candidature for the degree shall, except as provided in Chapter 10 of the by-laws—

- (a) be a Bachelor of Music of the Conservatorium of Music (with Merit); or
- (b) have completed studies deemed by the Graduate Studies Committee to be equivalent to the standard of knowledge and ability required for the award of the degree of Bachelor of Music (with Merit) of the Conservatorium of Music; or
- (c) submit such other evidence of general and professional qualifications as will satisfy the Graduate Studies Committee that the applicant possesses the educational preparation and capacity to pursue graduate studies; and
- (d) successfully complete an audition at a level determined by the Graduate Studies Committee.

##### Probationary acceptance.

3. (a) A candidate may be accepted by the College Board on a probationary basis for a period not exceeding one year and, upon completion of this probationary period, the College Board shall review the candidate's work and shall confirm the candidate's status or terminate the candidature.
- (b) In the case of a candidate accepted on a probationary basis under subsection (a), the candidature shall be deemed to have commenced from the date of such acceptance.

##### Time limits

4. A candidate shall complete the requirements for the degree not earlier than the end of the fourth semester from the date of enrolment and, except with the permission of the Graduate Studies Committee, not later than four semesters from the date of enrolment.

##### Supervision

5. The Graduate Studies Committee shall appoint, on the recommendation of the head of department, a full-time member of the academic staff of the department, to act as supervisor of each candidate.

##### Requirements for the degree

6. A candidate shall—
- (a) complete such seminars as may be prescribed by the ~~head of the department~~ Graduate Studies Committee; and
  - (b) submit a ~~long essay~~ thesis on a topic arising from the candidate's performance research; and
  - (c) complete the ~~practical (performance) requirements and other requirements including a minimum of 40 units, four performance projects in the instrument of their Principal Study which demonstrate originality and which investigate and expand the boundaries of the discipline of performance within a certain area of research inquiry such as expanded stylistic and interpretative horizons, investigation of historical performance practice, development of new performance modes, relationships and techniques, technological advances or enhanced critical, historical or analytical perspectives. Performance projects are to be accompanied by critical notes which articulate the place of the performance in the area of research inquiry.~~
7. ~~A candidate shall be required to perform as often as possible in graduate seminars and in concerts at the Conservatorium and elsewhere.~~

- ~~8. Candidates are required to participate in a Conservatorium ensemble for two of the four semesters of the course.~~
- ~~9. Candidates may be required to undertake further work in large ensemble and/or chamber music during their course.~~

**Normal Progression**

7. Normal Progression through the degree is according to the following chart:

<u>Master of Music (Performance) MMus(Perf)</u>				
<u>Required course</u>	<u>Sem. 1</u>	<u>Sem. 2</u>	<u>Sem. 3</u>	<u>Sem. 4</u>
<u>Principal Study 1-4 OR Principal Study Conducting 1-4</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>Introduction to Research Method</u>	<u>8</u>			
<u>Music Analysis Today</u>		<u>4</u>		
<u>Seminar Elective 2</u>		<u>4</u>		
<u>Seminar Elective 4</u>			<u>4</u>	
<u>Thesis Pro-seminar</u>			<u>4</u>	
<u>Thesis</u>				<u>8</u>
<u>Total credit points per semester</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>24</u>
<u>Total credit points for the Award</u>				<u>96</u>

Variation of normal progression and leave

~~8. Candidates may vary their progression through the degree or apply for leave under the regulations set out in rules 4.3 and 4.5 of the Rules of the Sydney Conservatorium of Music.~~

**Progress**

~~10.~~

9. The Graduate Studies Committee may—
- on the recommendation of the head of department, call upon any candidate to show cause why the candidature should not be terminated by reason of unsatisfactory progress toward completion of the degree, and
  - where, in the opinion of the Graduate Studies Committee the candidate does not show good cause, terminate the candidature.

## EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AWARDS

### I. INTRODUCTION

#### A. What is Excellence in Teaching?

Excellent teaching promotes effective learning. In a large and diverse institution, the contexts, settings, requirements and styles of teaching vary, so that it is not possible to specify in advance the range of possibilities. Broadly, excellent teaching can include: teaching and/or supervision in one or more of a wide range of settings, leading to excellent outcomes for students; small- or large-scale educational innovation; scholarship in teaching; educational leadership; and curriculum development. Applicants, nominators and referees, will be asked to provide evidence of excellence in more than one of those dimensions. At the same time, applicants for the award are expected to have a professional approach to teaching and to demonstrate their commitment to, and enthusiasm for teaching. In addition, they must also be seen at least to meet the general criteria for good practice in teaching for their level of appointment.

#### B. Criteria for Excellence in Teaching

The criteria for an award for Excellence in Teaching should be based on:

1. evidence that the applicant(s) generally meet(s) the criteria for Good Practice in Teaching relevant to the level of appointment as set out in the staffing documents on promotion;
2. the demonstration of interest, enthusiasm and commitment (evidenced by student and peer assessment) as well as a professional and reflective approach to the practice of teaching (addressed in the application);
3. evidence of one or more of the following:
  - (a) **face-to-face teaching or supervision of exceptional quality** which produces excellent academic outcomes by challenging, exciting and encouraging the learners but is responsive to their needs;
  - (b) **innovation** in the successful development, introduction<sup>1</sup> and evaluation, for example, of: new classes, units of study or degree programs; novel teaching strategies; new learning materials; innovative methods of assessment;
  - (c) **scholarship in teaching** by: contributing to the literature; presentations at conferences, seminars, workshops on teaching; invitations to teach or assist in curriculum innovation at other institutions;
  - (d) **leadership in teaching** by playing a substantial role in influencing the teaching practices of colleagues.

Demonstrated excellence in one or more of the areas 3a-d may compensate for a lesser performance in others, but cannot substitute for deficiencies in 1 and 2 above.

#### C. The Awards

There are five competitive awards made annually, providing that the applicants meet the criteria.

The award is open to individual teachers or groups of teachers who have been employed at the University of Sydney for at least 2 years.

One of the awards is made to an applicant at Lecturer Level A, providing that the application meets the criteria.

From 1998, one award may be made on the basis of stimulating, inspiring and nurturing excellence at honours and postgraduate levels, providing that the application meets the general criteria.

---

<sup>1</sup> development and introduction here include not only teaching methods and materials that are totally new (eg a computer-based application or a new practical class), but more often reflect the adaptation and implementation of methods used elsewhere

## II. MAKING AN APPLICATION

Interested applicants may nominate themselves, or they may be nominated by students or staff familiar with their teaching. All methods of nomination are treated as equivalent.

The applicant(s) or nominator(s) must indicate clearly in the application the specific ground(s) (I.B.3a-d) in which excellence is claimed.

It is important for applicants, nominators and referees to provide clear, adequate and honest information on all the criteria (I.B.1 and 2 as well as 3a-d). The committee will then not only be in a position to determine the extent to which the criteria have been met but will also have appropriate evidence for making a fair comparative judgement amongst applicants.

Both groups and individuals are asked to keep to the page limits, although more space will be needed to provide information from groups in Section 1 (below).

### A. Setting out the application

#### 1. Basic data

The first page must contain basic academic information about the applicant(s) including:

- name;
- faculty and department or teaching unit;
- current level of appointment;
- a list of previous appointments, significant positions and any relevant awards;
- if nominated, the names and designations of the nominator(s);
- the particular grounds for nomination must be indicated clearly in a short paragraph;
- the nominated individual or group must sign to indicate their willingness to be considered.

Note that for a group, additional pages may be needed.

On a separate page:

- list three referees other than the nominator(s), see below. The contact details should include an email address and a fax number.

If relevant, contributions to scholarship in teaching should be listed on further page(s):

- publications: books, chapters, conference proceedings, abstracts, reports;
- a list of invited participation in: speaking at conferences, leading workshops, consulting on aspects of teaching, reviewing or accrediting units or degrees;
- teaching grants held.

#### 2. Meeting the criteria

In not more than 4 pages, the self-nominated applicant(s) and/or the nominator(s) must address specifically the criteria in I.B.1 - 3 above, highlighting with examples areas of particular strength and indicating any areas of relative weakness or lack of opportunity to undertake particular activities. They must show how they meet criteria 1 and 2, and must provide evidence of the extent to which at least one of the criteria in 3a-d are met or exceeded.

If this section is written by the nominator(s), the applicant(s) must sign the document to indicate that the data are accurate, but it would normally be prepared in consultation.

Referees will be asked specifically to comment on this section.

#### 3. Approaches to teaching and learning

In not more than 2 pages, individual applicants or groups are invited to summarise their philosophical approaches to teaching, learning and/or supervision, together with appropriate examples to highlight their teaching practice, leadership or innovation.

#### 4. Evaluations of teaching

Up to 2 pages should provide summarised data from evaluations by students or staff of teaching and/or supervision together with brief notes from the applicant or group on their reflections and responses to such feedback.

#### 5. Recent teaching experience

Two pages, signed by the Head of Department, should tabulate the two most recent years of teaching experience at the University of Sydney. The Head should include an indication of the average teaching commitment for equivalent staff in the department. Information should be supplied for all members of a group.

## **6. Examples of teaching materials**

Applicants are invited to attach up to 6 pages of annotated examples of their teaching materials or extracts from them. They may be accompanied by any data from evaluations. Referees with expertise in the subject area will be asked to comment specifically on the quality of any materials submitted.

Alternatively, an applicant can submit a web address or one copy of computer-based materials if appropriate. Evaluation data should be supplied, if available. The Director of NeTTL or an appropriately qualified expert may be asked to comment on their educational and design quality.

**Applicant(s) or nominee(s) are responsible for ensuring that their referees are available to act and that each is supplied with an application and any submitted materials.**

## **III. ROLES OF NOMINATORS, APPLICANT(S) AND REFEREES**

### **A. Applicant(s)**

Applications are sought for the awards from across the University. Individual teachers, Heads of Department and Deans are urged to identify appropriate levels of excellence and to encourage and support applicants.

An application for an Award for Excellence in Teaching may be made on behalf of an individual or a group. An individual applicant must not have already received such an award at the University of Sydney, but a group applying may include one or more members who have previously received an individual award. A group which has won a group award is ineligible to apply for a second group award but an individual who has previously been part of a successful team may apply for an individual award. Applications from groups are particularly encouraged, since major educational reform and innovation is usually dependent on contributions from a team, rather than an individual.

Applicants may nominate themselves or may be nominated by one or more members of academic staff or by current or former students. All methods of application are treated as equivalent and there is no distinction made on the basis of nomination by self, staff or students.

Applicants are reminded that excessive length and detail will detract from the application. They are asked to use a 12 pt font size, not to exceed the page limits and not to attach more documentation than that requested.

Successful applicants will be expected to contribute to a seminar on excellence in teaching to be held after the announcement of the awards.

### **B. Nominator(s)**

Nominator(s) may include current and/or past students and/or staff. They must first ascertain that the individual or group is prepared to be considered for the award.

The application is so designed that some components can be prepared by nominator(s), but they are advised to do so in consultation with the nominee(s) who will be asked to confirm the accuracy of the information supplied.

Nominators may not be referees.

### **C. Referees**

Each application must contain the names of three referees, at least two of whom must be familiar with the applicants' face-to-face teaching; nominators may not act as referees. At least one nominator must come from the relevant discipline area. Former (but not current) students may act as referees. (There are potential conflicts of interest if current students act in that capacity; their pooled views are included in section 4 above).

Referees can provide assistance to the committee particularly by commenting on the extent to which the criteria have been met by the applicant(s). Referees will be asked specifically to:

1. review the criteria and indicate: whether the general criteria I.B.1 and 2 have been met; and the extent to which one or more of the nominated specific criteria (I.B.3a-d) have been met or exceeded (section 2 of the application);
2. comment overall on the application and judge how accurately it reflects the strengths and weaknesses of the applicant(s);

3. offer additional insights (eg comments on observed teaching or presentations, comparisons with workloads and evaluations of other comparable staff, reviews of classes or resources prepared) or aspects that were not included or emphasised;
4. critically appraise any materials submitted from a discipline-based perspective;
5. indicate, for an individual who has been associated with a group or team, his/her specific contribution.

#### **IV. Information for applicants, nominators and referees**

Applicants, nominators and referees will all be provided with the Guidelines for Application as set out above, together with the criteria for good practice in teaching at different academic levels of appointment.

Referees will receive a covering letter, asking specifically for the information required (see above).

#### **V. ADVICE FOR UNSUCCESSFUL APPLICANTS**

Unsuccessful applicants are invited to seek advice and feedback from the Chair of the Committee.

**Centre for Teaching and Learning**  
**Bi-monthly Report to the Teaching and Learning Committee**  
 5 February 1998

The last report of the CTL summarised the work of the CTL with individuals and groups in faculties and departments in 1997. This report notes some of the significant initiatives the CTL has planned for early in 1998.

**1) Revised Academic Induction Program**

On the basis of research and development in 1997, the CTL has replaced the Academic Induction Day it has offered in the past with a co-ordinated ongoing program to support academic staff of the university during their first year of employment. The new program begins with an orientation workshop which deals with the following key issues:

- Accessing information and resources (electronic and other) in the university
- Research: Getting started and finding funding
- Teaching and Learning Issues and Challenges, including the use of information technology
- Planning a successful academic career
- Establishing support networks.

The workshop will model best practice in teaching and learning and involve new staff as active participants.

As a follow-up to the orientation workshop staff will be offered a selection of specialist workshops throughout the year dealing with major aspects of the academic role; (i) Teaching and Learning, (ii) Research, (iii) The role of the university in the wider community and (iv) Service to the university.

**2) Graduate Certificate in Educational Studies (Higher Education)**

In 1998 the CTL will offer a two unit course on university teaching and learning as a formal qualification through the Faculty of Education. This course is specifically designed for university teachers seeking to develop a scholarly basis for their teaching practice. The course aims to encourage participants to reflect on and improve their own teaching based on an understanding of the discipline of higher education. Tuition costs for academic staff of the university enrolling in the course in 1998 are covered by the university.

**3) Revised CUTSD grant support process**

Based on a consideration of successful institutional practices related to the outcomes of the 1997 round of the CUTSD National Teaching Development Grants (NTDG), the CTL has established a comprehensive support process specifically targeting applicants for individual CUTSD grants in 1998. The information session for intending applicants (Wednesday 4 February) has been revised in light of the new CUTSD grant scheme. A web site (<http://www.usyd.edu.au/su/ctl/cutdsd.htm>) has been developed to disseminate information to staff and consultative writing teams will be allocated to prioritised NTDG (individual) applications.

Simon Barrie  
 Lecturer, CTL.











---

## Academic Board

Board Secretary: Miss E R Ring

Main Quadrangle, A14

Phone: 9351 3305; Fax: 9351 3572

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

---

### Membership of the Academic Board

#### The Academic Board consists of:

- (a) the Chair elected:
  - (i) from the academic staff members of the Academic Forum; and
  - (ii) by all members of the Academic Forum
- (b) five Deputy Chairs elected:
  - (i) from the academic staff members of the Academic Forum; and
  - (ii) by all members of the Academic Forum
- (c) one academic staff member from the academic staff members of each Faculty:
  - (i) who is not already a member of the Academic Board; and
  - (ii) elected by and from the academic staff members of the relevant Faculty
- (d) the Deans
- (e) five persons who are professors:
  - (i) who are not already members of the Academic Board; and
  - (ii) elected by the professors
- (f) five persons who are Heads of departments or schools:
  - (i) who are not already members of the Academic Board; and
  - (ii) elected by the Heads of departments and schools
- (g) five persons who are non-professorial members of the academic staff:
  - (i) who are not already members of the Academic Board;
  - (ii) who are members of the Academic Forum; and
  - (iii) elected by the non-professorial academic staff members of the Academic Forum
- (h) the President of the Sydney University Postgraduate Students' Association
- (i) the President of the Students' Representative Council
- (j) one person elected by and from those persons already elected to hold office as postgraduate student members of Faculties from 1 January in the year following election to the relevant Faculty;
- (k) one person elected by and from those persons already elected to hold office as undergraduate student members of Faculties from 1 January in the year following election to the relevant Faculty;
- (l) the Vice-Chancellor
- (m) the Deputy Vice-Chancellors; and
- (n) the Chair of the Academic Forum.

#### Observers

The following persons have a right to speak, but no right to vote, at Board meetings:

- (a) the Pro-Vice-Chancellors
- (b) the Assistant Vice-Chancellor
- (c) the Deputy Principals
- (d) the University Librarian (unless already elected to the Academic board under rule 5.1(g)); and
- (e) any person first approved by the Chair.

## Members of the Academic Board

as at 2 March 1998

- (a) **the Chair**  
Professor R Pesman
- (b) **five Deputy Chairs**  
Professor D J H Cockayne  
Professor J Lawler  
Professor J R Lawrence, AO  
Professor R McPhedran  
Professor A Sefton  
Associate Professor M Painter, Acting Deputy Chair (vice Professor Lawler)
- (c) **one academic staff member from the academic staff members of each Faculty**
- |                                 |                                      |               |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| Agriculture                     |                                      |               |
| Dr D P Godden                   | Agricultural Economics               | (to 31.12.99) |
| Architecture                    |                                      |               |
| Dr P Phibbs                     | Architecture, Planning & Allied Arts | (to 31.12.98) |
| Arts                            |                                      |               |
| Dr A Reynolds                   | Italian                              | (to 31.12.99) |
| Dentistry                       |                                      |               |
| Dr G Wright                     | Orthodontics                         | (to 31.12.98) |
| Economics                       |                                      |               |
| Professor W Schworm             | Economics                            | (to 31.12.98) |
| Education                       |                                      |               |
| Associate Professor P Jones     | Social & Policy Studies in Education | (to 31.12.98) |
| Engineering                     |                                      |               |
| Professor G P Steven            | Aeronautical Engineering             | (to 31.12.99) |
| Health Sciences                 |                                      |               |
| Dr R Bohring                    | Biomedical Sciences                  | (to 31.12.98) |
| Law                             |                                      |               |
| Associate Professor M Findlay   | Law                                  | (to 31.12.99) |
| Medicine                        |                                      |               |
| Associate Professor D Farnill   | Behavioural Sciences in Medicine     | (to 31.12.99) |
| Nursing                         |                                      |               |
| Ms C Hyde                       | Clinical Nursing                     | (to 31.12.98) |
| Science                         |                                      |               |
| Associate Professor D Dragovich | Geography                            | (to 31.12.99) |
| Veterinary Science              |                                      |               |
| Associate Professor G M Stone   | Animal Science                       | (to 31.12.98) |
| Graduate School of Business     |                                      |               |
| Professor C Adam                |                                      | (to 31.12.98) |
| Sydney College of the Arts      |                                      |               |
| Ms S Baker                      | Painting                             | (to 31.12.98) |
| Sydney Conservatorium of Music  |                                      |               |
| Dr P McCallum                   |                                      | (to 31.12.99) |
| Orange Agricultural College     |                                      |               |
| Mr R Wilson                     | Head of Undergraduate Studies, OAC   | (to 31.12.99) |

- (d) **the Deans**
- |   |                         |               |
|---|-------------------------|---------------|
| Agriculture                                   | Professor L W Burgess   | (to 31.12.99) |
| Architecture                                  | Professor G Moore       | (to 9.11.02)  |
| Arts  | Professor B Cass        | (to 30.06.01) |
| Dentistry                                     | Professor I J Klineberg | (to 28.2.98)  |
| Economics (Acting Dean)                       | Professor T Walter      |               |
| Education                                     | Professor G Sherington  | (to 14.2.02)  |
| Engineering                                   | Professor J Raper       | (to 30.6.02)  |
| Health Sciences                               | Professor H Kendig      | (to 1.3.03)   |
| Law   | Professor J Webber      | (to 1.3.03)   |
| Medicine                                      | Professor S R Leeder    | (to 1.6.02)   |
| Nursing                                       | Professor R L Russell   | (to 8.2.99)   |
| Science                                       | Professor R G Hewitt    | (to 28.2.99)  |
| Veterinary Science                            | Professor D R Fraser    | (to 28.2.99)  |
| Graduate School of Business (Acting Director) | Professor C Adam        | (to 3.3.98)   |
| Orange Agricultural College                   | Professor J Chudleigh   | (to 28.2.99)  |
| Sydney College of the Arts                    | Professor R Dunn        |               |
| Sydney Conservatorium of Music                | Professor S Pretty      | (to 31.5.00)  |
- (e) **five persons who are professors**
- |                          |  |               |
|--------------------------|--|---------------|
| Professor K K Campbell   |  | (to 31.12.98) |
| Professor L Field        |  | (to 31.12.99) |
| Professor M Harris       |  | (to 31.12.98) |
| Professor B D Roufogalis |  | (to 31.12.98) |
| Professor V Spate        |  | (to 31.12.99) |
- (f) **five persons who are Heads of departments or schools**
- |                                 |  |               |
|---------------------------------|--|---------------|
| Associate Professor R Arnold    |  | (to 31.12.98) |
| Professor S I Benrimoj          |  | (to 31.12.98) |
| Associate Professor D Davey     |  | (to 31.12.99) |
| Associate Professor C J Durrant |  | (to 31.12.98) |
| vacancy                         |  | (to 31.12.99) |
- (g) **five persons who are non-professorial members of the academic staff**
- |                                 |  |               |
|---------------------------------|--|---------------|
| Dr A Brew                       |  | (to 31.12.98) |
| Associate Professor C B Gillies |  | (to 31.12.98) |
| Associate Professor A F Masters |  | (to 31.12.99) |
| Dr R A Mitchell                 |  | (to 31.12.98) |
| Dr M Peat                       |  | (to 31.12.99) |
- (h) **the President of the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association**  
Mr T Clark
- (i) **the President of the Students' Representative Council**  
Mr A Durie
- (j) **one person elected by and from those persons already elected to hold office as postgraduate student members of Faculties from 1 January in the year following election to the relevant Faculty**  
Mr T Wilkinson (to 31.12.98)
- (k) **one person elected by and from those persons already elected to hold office as undergraduate student members of Faculties from 1 January in the year following election to the relevant Faculty**  
Ms NM MacLaren (to 31.12.98)
- (l) **the Vice-Chancellor**  
Professor G Brown

- (m) **the Deputy Vice-Chancellors**  
Professor D Anderson  
Professor K Eltis  
Professor J Kinnear
  - (n) **the Chair of the Academic Forum**  
Professor G Gill
- 

#### Observers

The following persons have a right to speak, but no right to vote, at Board meetings:

- (a) **the Pro-Vice-Chancellors**  
Professor R Johnstone  
Professor L M Koder, AM  
Professor D Napper  
Professor D Siddle  
Professor D Weisbrot  
Professor J A Young, AO
  - (b) **the Assistant Vice-Chancellor** -
  - (c) **the Deputy Principals**  
Ms L Phelan Deputy Principal (External Relations)  
Mr P Slater Deputy Principal (Financial Services)
  - (d) **the University Librarian**  
Mr J Shipp
- 

#### Secretary

The Registrar, or the Registrar's nominee, is to act as secretary of the Academic Board:  
Dr W Adams

Academic Positions 4/97 to 9/97  
Appointments on Nomination

Advertised(by gender)

COLLEGE	APPT TYPE	AssocLect		Lecturer		Snr Lect		AssocProf		ConjA/Prof		Professor		ConjProf		ResAssoc.		ARCResAssoc		PostdocFellow		TOTAL	TOTAL BY COLLEGE
		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F		
C (H&SS)	TENURABLE			2	1																	3	
	TENURED				1																	1	
	RENEWABLE	1	1	3	1		1		1	1												9	
	FIXED TERM	1	3	2	1		1															10	23
C (HSci)	TENURABLE																						
	TENURED	3	1		3	4	2	1	2	1	1	3		1								23	
	RENEWABLE																						
C (S&T)	FIXED TERM	2	5	1	7		3	3	3	2												23	46
	TENURABLE			1		1																2	
	TENURED	2	1	2	1		1							2					1			10	
	RENEWABLE																						
	FIXED TERM	2	2	1	1	2								5					1			15	
	RES. ONLY	1																				1	
Corporate	EXT. FUNDED				1																	1	29
	TENURABLE																						
	TENURED																						
	RENEWABLE																						
TOTAL		13	14	12	19	8	7	15	5	10	1	2	3	1	1	7	7	2	2			102	102

COLLEGE	APPOINTMENTS BY GENDER		TOTAL
	M	F	
C (H&SS)	11	12	23
C (HSci)	20	26	46
C (S&T)	22	7	29
Corporate	1	3	4
TOTAL	54	48	102

Academic Positions 4/97 to 9/97  
Appointments on Nomination

Advertised(by appt type)

COLLEGE	APPT TYPE	ASSOCIATE LECTURER	LECTURER	SENIOR LECTURER	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	CONJOINT ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	PROFESSOR	CONJOINT PROFESSOR	RESEARCH ASSOCIATE	ARC RESEARCH ASSOCIATE	POSTDOC. FELLOW	TOTAL	TOTAL BY COLLEGE
C (H&SS)	TENURABLE		3									3	
	TENURED		1									1	
	RENEWABLE	2	4	1	2							9	
	FIXED TERM	4	3	1							2	10	23
C (HSci)	TENURABLE												
	TENURED	4	3	6	3	2	3	1			1	23	
	RENEWABLE												
	FIXED TERM	7	8	3	5							23	46
C (S&T)	TENURABLE		1	1								2	
	TENURED	3	3	1					2	1		10	
	RENEWABLE												
	FIXED TERM	5	2	2					5	1	1	16	
	RES. ONLY											0	
EXT. FUNDED		1									1	29	
Corporate Gp	TENURABLE												
	TENURED												
	RENEWABLE												
	FIXED TERM	2	2									4	4
TOTAL		27	31	15	10	2	3	1	7	2	4	102	

PROFESSOR	CONJOINT PROFESSOR
J Fletcher	C Mellis
Ohlsson	
A Darendellier	

APPOINTMENTS BY TYPE

TENURABLE	TENURED	RENEWABLE	FIXED TERM	RESEARCH ONLY	EXTERNALLY FUNDED	TOTAL
5	34	9	53	0	1	102

APPOINTMENTS BY COLLEGE

C(H&SS)	C(HSci)	C(S&T)	Corporate	TOTAL
23	46	29	4	102



Academic Positions 4/97 to 9/97  
Appointments on Nomination

Nomination(appt type & gender)

COLLEGE	FUNDING SOURCE	Principle Res. Fellow		Professor		Res. Assistant		Res. Assoc.		Res. Fellow		Res. Officer		Rolf Edgar Lake Fellow		Scientific Officer		Senior Lecturer		Snr Res. Assoc.		Snr Res. Fellow		Snr Res. Officer		TOTAL	TOTAL BY COLLEGE	
		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F			?
C (H&SS)	Centrally Externally Recurrent			1						1									1							4		
	NH&MRC Grant																						1			1		
	Foundation																										39	
	Centrally Externally Recurrent									2	2						1		3	1						9		
C (HSci)	ARC																									1		
	NH&MRC Grant					5	14					2	2											1	3	27		
	Foundation					1	2	2						1												6		
	Centrally Externally Recurrent									1	1	2							1		2	2	3			2	85	
C (S&T)	ARC																									3		
	NH&MRC Grant								4	1	1	2							1		2	2	3			16		
	Foundation																										6	
	Centrally Externally Recurrent																				2	1				2	85	
Corporate	ARC																									6		
	NH&MRC Grant																									1		
	Foundation																										58	
	Centrally Externally Recurrent																											
TOTAL		2	0	1	0	6	16	7	3	5	8	4	3	1	0	1	0	1	0	5	2	3	4	1	3	4	1	184
		2	0	1	0	6	16	7	3	5	8	4	3	1	0	1	0	1	0	5	2	3	4	1	3	4	1	184
		2	0	1	0	6	16	7	3	5	8	4	3	1	0	1	0	1	0	5	2	3	4	1	3	4	1	184
		2	0	1	0	6	16	7	3	5	8	4	3	1	0	1	0	1	0	5	2	3	4	1	3	4	1	184

APPPOINTMENTS BY GENDER

COLLEGE	M	F	TOTAL
C (H&SS)	20	19	39
C (HSci)	27	58	85
C (S&T)	41	17	58
Corporate Gp	2	2	4
TOTAL	90	94	184

APPPOINTMENTS BY COLLEGE

H&SS	HSci	S&T	Corp	TOTAL
39	85	58	2	184

APPPOINTMENTS BY LENGTH

H&SS	HSci	S&T	Corp	TOTAL
39	61	44	2	146
	13	14		27
	11			11
39	85	58	2	184

less than or equal to 12mths  
greater than 12mths (grant)  
renewable (eg 1+1) (grant)