



Academic Board

Board Secretary: Miss E R Ring

Main Quadrangle, A14

Phone: 9351 3305; Fax: 9351 3572

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

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

MEMORANDUM TO: Members of the Academic Board

A meeting of the Academic Board will be held at 2 pm on Wednesday, 13 May 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
6 May 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	4
A13. Sydney Summer School Pilot Program	6
B15. Report of the Faculty of Science	6
C1. Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee	7
C2. Report of the Graduate Studies Committee	9
C3. Report of the Teaching and Learning Committee	14
C4. Report of the Research Committee	16
C5. Report of the Library and Information Technology Committee	18
C6. Report of the Academic Staffing Committee	19
C7. Membership of the Level E Central Promotions Committee - 1998	19

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 15 April 1998

The minutes of the meeting of the Academic Board held on Wednesday, 15 April 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, 12 May 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 15 April 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.

P 2. University Library: Cancellation of Serials

The University Librarian, Mr Shipp, will report at the meeting. See also item 1 in C4. Report of the Research Committee.

.....

3. Constitution of the Teaching Awards Committee

In February 1997, the Committee to Consider Awards for Excellence in Teaching was established as a sub-committee of the Teaching and Learning Committee and it was renamed the "Teaching Awards Committee". Its constitution is set out below:

- (a) Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (Convenor);
- (b) Chair of the Academic Board or nominee;
- (c) a Professor of Education;
- (d) the Director of the Centre for Teaching and Learning;
- (e) an undergraduate student member of the Academic Forum, nominated by the President of the SRC;
- (f) a postgraduate student member of the Academic Forum, nominated by the President of SUPRA; and
- (g) three other members of the academic staff nominated by the Teaching and Learning Committee.

It is **recommended** that the Committee's constitution be amended to the following:

- (a) Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic Support) (Convenor);
- (b) Chair of the Teaching and Learning Committee;
- (c) a Professor from the Faculty of Education nominated by the Chair of the Board;
- (d) the Director of the Centre for Teaching and Learning;
- (e) a postgraduate student member of the Academic Forum, nominated by the President of SUPRA; and

- (f) one member of the academic staff from each of the Colleges nominated by the Chair of the Board.

The purpose of the proposed amendments is to

- reflect the allocation of the responsibility for teaching and learning to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor;
- provide for membership by the Chair of the Teaching and Learning Committee rather than the Chair of the Board or nominee;
- remove the provision for membership by an undergraduate student as there could be conflict of interest where the undergraduate student might be being taught by an applicant for an Award; and
- specify that the three additional committee members should be drawn from the three Colleges.

that the Board amend the constitution of the Teaching Awards Committee as recommended.

4. **Conferring of Titles**

Under the 1996 Appointments Policy, academic appointments other than to Chairs are approved by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (College). At the moment, the setting up of committees for the conferring of titles operates under the previous cumbersome procedures. The Academic Staffing Committee of the Board expects to present a new set of policies and procedures for the conferring of titles later this year. In the meantime, I request that the Board delegate to the Chair the authority previously held by the old Standing Committee of the Board to approve where necessary the composition of committees and the conferring of titles. Personnel Services teams will make six monthly reports to the Board on titles in the same way that appointments are currently reported.

that the Board delegate authority to the Chair as requested.

5. **Higher School Certificate Review**

Review

In the next stage in the review of the Higher School Certificate following the White Paper, the Board of Studies has appointed evaluation teams (comprising a Board Officer, two practising teachers and an academic) for each subject available for the Higher School Certificate. The teams are to recommend on the appropriateness for each subject of:

- a SINGLE 2-UNIT course
- a DIFFERENTIAL course (2-Unit standard and advanced with an overlapping curriculum)
- EXTENDED STUDY (analogous to the current 3-unit).

The Board of Studies has asked the Committee of Chairs of Academic Boards to nominate members of academic staffs of Universities for each subject for consultation with the Board of Studies' evaluation team over the next six weeks. A number of academics from this University have been asked to participate in the evaluation process and I am grateful for their co-operation.

Higher School Certificate Distinction Courses

A request has been made to the Committee of Chairs of Academic Boards by the Board of Studies to set up a working party to look at a proposal to abandon Distinction Courses. Under the proposal the Distinction Courses would be replaced by providing high school students with greater access to first year university courses. The Committee declined to establish such a working party. Replacing Distinction Courses with greater access to University courses had serious implications for both equity and resources.

that the Board note the report.

6. **Membership of the Board: President of the SRC**

Mr Luke Whittington has been elected President of the SRC.

that the Board note the report and welcome Mr Whittington to Board membership.

7. **Action under delegated authority and reports from the Academic Colleges**

Under delegated authority, I have considered the recommendations of the Academic 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. Reports on the appointment of a selection committee to consider the appointment of a Visiting Professor and on the appointment of a Visiting Professor are attached. (Page 20)

that the Board note the report.

8. **Questions on notice**

that the Board note that no questions were 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.

2. **Academic policy matters arising out of the proposed merger (joint venture) of the operations of the Graduate School of Business (GSB) and the Australian Graduate School of Management (AGSM) at UNSW**

Introduction

The University of Sydney and the University of New South Wales ("UNSW") are currently considering the amalgamation of our Graduate School of Business ("GSB") and the Australian Graduate School of Management ("AGSM") at UNSW, to form a new joint venture business school.

The discussions have now reached the point where the University of Sydney Senate and the Council of UNSW have requested the respective Vice-Chancellors to prepare a formal detailed proposal for consideration at their respective June meetings. This paper presents for information and discussion the issues of academic policy arising out of the proposed joint venture. Extracts of the most recent version of the *draft* working agreement (Draft No 6, 27 April 1998) are included as Attachment "A", below. The text of a memorandum of understanding signed by the two Vice-Chancellors is included as Attachment "B".

(Pages 21-28 and 29-30)

Background

The previous Labor Federal Government established an Industry Taskforce on Leadership and Management Skills, chaired by David Karpin. After three years of research, community consultation, and review of submissions, the Taskforce released its three volume Report, entitled *Enterprising Nation: Renewing Australia's Managers to Meet the Challenges of the Asia Pacific Century* (1996) (also known as "the Karpin Report"). Among the five major "challenges" identified in the Report was the need to reform management education. In particular, the Karpin Report decried the proliferation of more than 30 business schools in Australia, with the consequent dilution of scarce resources and the failure to develop and support a single business school which legitimately could be described as "world class".

While the GSB and the AGSM have been relatively successful in local terms, they are both small and under-resourced by international standards. In 1997, the GSB and the AGSM had approximately 120 and 240 full-time MBA students, and 18 and 41 PhD candidates, respectively, which was well below the top 25 international schools. The academic staffs - at 14 (only 6 full-time) and 45 FTE respectively - also were considerably smaller than the leading schools, and have not yet developed sufficient depth within disciplines nor the

breadth of teaching programs, research agendas, program innovations and cross-disciplinary initiatives found in the larger international schools.

Although the GSB and the AGSM enjoy a solid market position in Australia and parts of Asia, there is strong competition nationally and increasing competition from leading American and European schools in the Asia-Pacific region. It is likely that this external competition will focus on Australia as Commonwealth Government funding of postgraduate courses is reduced and fees are increased.

The Joint Venture is aimed squarely at harnessing the talents and energies of both Universities to produce a powerful new centre of excellence for teaching and research in business and management, which will have the undivided support of the business community, and the consequent critical mass, resources, prestige and expertise to operate on the regional and international stages as a truly world class Business School. Not surprisingly, the recent *Australian Financial Review* Special Report on Management & Business Education (13 March 1998, p 64), described the proposed joint venture as “the major event in the offing” with respect to management education in this country.

The Council of the GSB, and the AGSM Board of Management and Advisory Council have very strongly endorsed the proposed move to a Joint Venture.

As the establishment of the proposed Joint Venture obviously amounts to significant workplace change as contemplated by the "managing change" provisions of the Enterprise Agreement, the University has commenced the joint consultation process with the staff unions. It is essential to note that the underlying ethos of the Joint Venture is not premised upon the need for rationalisation of staffing or other resources. On the contrary, the clear intention of the proposed merger is to enhance the viability of existing programs, and promote further innovation, growth and globalisation.

A Joint Venture which amalgamates the GSB and AGSM programs will significantly increase the number of full-time and part-time students and provide a scale of students and fees that will position the combined school closer to the scale of the leading international schools. The combined school is expected to attract increased support from the business community that will assist in the funding of facilities incorporating advanced education and communication technology, as well as in attracting outstanding scholars.

The Nature of the Proposed Structural Changes

It is proposed that the current activities of the GSB and the AGSM would be merged into a new Joint Venture business school, owned and operated by the University of Sydney and UNSW. The Joint Venture will be incorporated (as a non-profit company), in order to enable the employment of staff and effectively carry out other necessary functions.

Reflecting the relative size of the existing schools and the relative contributions of the two universities to the Joint Venture, a one-third/two-thirds principle will operate in the management of the enterprise. Thus, in addition to the Vice-Chancellors of Sydney and UNSW, the Dean/Director of the merged business school, and elected student and staff, Sydney will appoint four of the outside Directors of the Joint Venture company and UNSW will appoint eight. (This Board will replace the existing Council of the GSB and the AGSM Board of Management).

The Dean/Director will be the head of the new Joint Venture business school and will report to the Board, except that for staffing purposes and for student matters, the Dean/Director will report to the Vice-Chancellor with jurisdiction on these matters (to begin with, UNSW and Sydney, respectively). As a general matter, the Dean/Director will enjoy normal advisory relationships with both Vice-Chancellors.

In terms of academic governance, a special 25 member “spectrum” Academic Board of the joint venture will be established, with ex officio, elected and appointed members from both universities (see section 14, below, for the details of the proposed membership).

It is proposed that both Universities will agree to an initial five year term after which either party can give two years notice of intention to unwind the Joint Venture (ie. the first date of possible unwinding would be seven years from commencement). The rights of staff will be protected in the event that the joint venture is dissolved. Staff will have the right of return to the “home” University without loss of pay or conditions. (It may be recalled that similar arrangements were made when the CULAS company was terminated.)

The Joint Venture business school will continue to operate at each of the three locations currently used - the GSB's Newtown campus (Burren Street), and the AGSM's facilities at UNSW (Kensington) and Little Bay (the Institute of Administration).

Staff and Student Protocols

In order to ensure a common set of rules and procedures governing all staff at the new joint venture business school, and so those rules reflect university standards and values, the new Board will from time to time adopt the protocols from one or other of the universities. In the first instance, it has been agreed that the protocol governing staff will be that of UNSW.

Similarly, a common protocol will be adopted in respect of all students, and in the first instance that will be the protocol governing students at the University of Sydney. (In the event of cases in which the interests of staff and students may be inextricably intertwined, such as certain matters affecting postgraduate supervision, allegations of harassment, misconduct or plagiarism, disputes over intellectual property, or cases in which a person is both a student and an employee of the school, the protocol governing staff will be the controlling protocol for identifying which University should have carriage of the matter.)

Timetable

Documentation that establishes the legal basis for the joint venture is currently being prepared, as noted above, for consideration at the June meeting of Senate (following consideration by Academic Board). If Senate and the UNSW Council approve the proposal in June, it is anticipated that the joint venture will commence operations at the start of the 1999 academic year.

*David Weisbrot
PVC (CHASS)
4.5.98*

that the Board endorse (nihil obstat) the academic aspects of the report and forward it to Senate for approval.

P Part II

To be presented at the meeting by the Acting Vice-Chancellor, Professor Eltis.

A13. Sydney Summer School Pilot Program

Attached for the information of the Board is a report on the operation of the Sydney Summer School Pilot Program and a report of the external evaluation of the program.

(Pages 31-36 and 37-47)

that the Board note the reports.

B15. Report of the Faculty of Science

The Faculty met on 7 October 1997 and 3 March 1998.

The Faculty of Science resolved that the following items be referred to the Academic Board for consideration:

Amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate

1. **Constitution of the Faculty of Science**
(pp 403-404, 1996 *Calendar, Volume 1, Statutes and Regulations*, as amended)

The Faculty **recommends** that the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Constitution of the Faculty of Science be amended as follows with immediate effect:

Section 1 (a)

Delete

or Bachelor of Medical Science

Insert instead

Bachelor of Medical Science, Bachelor of Psychology, or Bachelor of Computer Science and Technology

Section 1 (c)

Delete

Faculties of Arts,

Insert instead

Faculties of Architecture, Arts,

Section 1 (k)

Delete

or Bachelor of Medical Science

Insert instead

Bachelor of Medical Science, Bachelor of Psychology, or Bachelor of Computer Science and Technology

The purpose of the amendments is to update the Constitution to reflect changes in membership and the addition of new degrees in the Faculty.

2. Boards of Examiners, Board of Postgraduate Studies, Standing Committee and Standing Committee on Courses of Study

(pp 464-465, 1996 Calendar, Volume 1, Statutes and Regulations, as amended)

The Faculty **recommends** that the Resolutions of the Senate relating to Boards of Examiners, Board of Postgraduate Studies, Standing Committee and Standing Committee on Courses of Study in the Faculty of Science be amended as follows with immediate effect:

The Undergraduate Studies Committee

Following the last sentence:

Add

The Undergraduate Studies Committee carries out all of the functions of The Standing Committee on Courses of Study referred to in the Resolutions of the Senate, pp 60-61, 1996 Calendar, Volume 1, Statutes and Regulations, as amended, other than those matters relating to postgraduate coursework degrees.

The Postgraduate Studies Committee

Following the last sentence:

Add

The Postgraduate Studies Committee carries out all functions required of the Board of Postgraduate Studies referred to in the Resolutions of the Senate, pp 59-60, 1996 Calendar, Volume 1, Statutes and Regulations as amended, and those responsibilities relating to postgraduate coursework degrees of The Standing Committee on Courses of Study, pp 60-61, 1996 Calendar, Volume 1, Statutes and Regulations, as amended.

The purpose of the amendments is to provide for changes of nomenclature relating to the Board of Postgraduate Studies and The Standing Committee on Courses of Study.

that the Board recommend that Senate amend its Resolutions as recommended.

C1. Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee

Part I

The Committee met on 21 April 1998. There were present: Associate Professor Martin Painter (Chair), Ms Su Baker, Ms Louise Buchanan, Dr David Evans, Associate Professor Christopher Gillies, Associate Professor Jill Gordon, Dr Jim Kitay, Dr Edith Lees, Mr Michael Villis and Dr Michael Walsh. Professor Ros Pesman (Chair, Academic Board) and Associate Professor John Mack were present by invitation. Professor John Chudleigh, Mr Bruno Gelonesi, Dr Lynne Harris and Ms E Bergmann were in attendance.

1. Faculty of Health Science

Initial proposal for a new award program, the Bachelor of Behavioural Health Science

The Committee **recommends** that the Academic Board approve in principle the proposal for the introduction in 1999 of the new award program entitled the Bachelor of Behavioural Health Science.

The purpose of the proposal is to equip graduates with significant studies in sociology and psychology applied to health, high level skills in research and evaluation methodology, skills in negotiation and dispute resolution, and high level understanding of the ethical and legal obligations of people working in the health system.

that the Board recommend that Senate approve in principle the introduction of the new Bachelor of Behavioural Health Science course.

2. Amendment of Resolutions of the Senate

Faculty of Health Science

Bachelor of Health Science (Hearing and Speech)

The Committee **recommends**

- (i) that the Academic Board approve the proposal of the Faculty of Health Sciences to introduce a new subject area, Hearing and Speech, in the degree of Bachelor of Health Science for introduction in 1999; and
- (ii) that new Resolutions of the Senate be adopted, with effect from 1 January 1999.

Senate approved the proposal in principle at its meeting on 2 March 1998.

The purpose of the proposal is to prepare students to undertake further study for a career in audiology, a rapidly growing health profession; enter the health care workforce in a capacity such as health promotion consultants, health education officers, women's health workers and residential care workers; enter the private commercial workforce with businesses such as Cochlea or Optus; and undertake further study for a career in related fields such as health administration, medicine and rehabilitation counselling.

Draft amendments to the Resolutions of the Senate are attached. (Pages 48-49)

that the Board, acting on behalf of Senate, approve the introduction of the new subject area of Hearing and Speech in the Bachelor of Health Science degree and amend the Resolutions of the Senate to effect it.

3. Proceedings of the Committee

(1) Membership

The Committee noted that Professor Richard Johnstone, who attended Committee meetings as Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning), had resigned from the Committee; Miss Carole Price had replaced Associate Professor Ewan Mylecharane as the representative of the Faculty of Dentistry on the Committee; Professor Ben Boer had replaced Professor Hilary Astor as the representative of the Faculty of Law from July, with Ms Shelley Wright representing the Faculty until then; Dr David Evans had replaced Professor Brian Farrow as the representative of the Faculty of Veterinary Science; Mr Michael Villis was the nominee of the undergraduate student members of the Academic Forum; and Ms Louise Buchanan was the nominee of the Students' Representative Council.

(2) Expansion of the Broadway Scheme

In accordance with section 8 of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to Admission to Undergraduate Degrees (p88, *Calendar, Vol I*), the Committee approved the expansion of the Broadway Scheme to accept applicants from outside NSW and the ACT.

(3) Admissions Working Party

The Committee established an Admissions Working Party to deal with admissions matters and to report to the Committee.

(4) Reference from the Academic Board

The Committee referred a report of the Faculty of Agriculture, referred to the Committee by the Board at its April meeting, to its Admissions Working Party for consideration and advice.

(5) Simplification of result grades

The Committee considered a proposal from Associate Professor J Mack and Ms C Crittenden that a simplified system of result grades be introduced in March Semester 1999. Associate Professor Mack undertook to revise the document in light of comments and decisions made at the meeting, for circulation to the Committee and submission of the final document to the June Academic Board.

that the Board note the report.

P Part II

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

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

The Committee met on 27 April 1998 when there were present: the Chair, Professor J R Lawrence, presiding, Mr B Buckley, Associate Professors S Crump and S Ellis, Professor G MacAulay, Dr M J Mahony, Associate Professor A F Masters, Dr P McCallum, Associate Professor A Mitchell, Dr R Mitchell, Professor R Rose, Associate Professors R Ross and C D Shorey, Professor D Siddle, Miss C Tabrett, Dr S West and Associate Professor A Ziegert. Professor R Pesman was present by invitation, Ms O Cornelius and Mrs L Rose were present as observers and Miss E R Ring was in attendance.

Proceedings of the Committee**1. Membership of the Graduate Studies Committee**

The Committee noted that Associate Professor Stephen Crump had replaced Dr Mike King (Faculty of Education) until the end of First Semester, and that Miss Catherine Tabrett was the new postgraduate student member nominated by and from the postgraduate student members of the Academic Forum. The Committee welcomed the new members.

2. Membership of the PhD Award Sub-Committee

The Committee adopted the recommendations of the relevant Pro-Vice-Chancellors (College) and appointed Dr R Mitchell and Professor J Gero to fill the vacancies for membership of the PhD Award Sub-Committee by a member of staff in each of the Colleges of Health Sciences and Science and Technology.

The Sub-Committee's membership is set out below for information:

Associate Professor A F Masters (Chair)

Professor G Gill	Economics	Humanities & Social Sciences
Dr M King	Education	Humanities & Social Sciences
Associate Professor C D Shorey	Medicine	Health Sciences
Dr R Mitchell	Health Sciences	Health Sciences
Associate Professor G M Stone	Veterinary Science	Sciences and Technology
Professor J Gero	Architecture	Sciences and Technology

The Committee noted that all nominees were male and decided that at least two female members should be appointed to the Sub-Committee in consultation with Associate Professor Masters.

3. Report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee

On the report of the meeting of the PhD Award Sub-Committee held on 17 March 1998, 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 thesis which are to remain available within the University, to three candidates;
- the degree had not been awarded to one candidate in the Faculty of Agriculture, and the candidate had been permitted to revise and re-submit;
- one candidature had been referred back to the Faculty of Arts for the appointment of a fourth examiner to act as an assessor; and
- examiners had been appointed for 33 candidates (including one who had revised and resubmitted).

4. Report of the Coursework Sub-Committee

The Committee noted a report from the Coursework Sub-Committee on the following matters:

(1) Position papers referred to faculties for comment

Most faculties had now submitted responses to the following three position papers referred to them for comment by the end of February:

- Parallel Teaching in Undergraduate and Postgraduate Coursework Programs;
- Distance, Alternative and Flexible Modes of Delivery in Postgraduate Coursework Programs; and
- Semesterisation and nomenclature issues for postgraduate programs from SIS.

The faculty responses were, for the most part, positive and supportive of the Sub-Committee's position papers.

Most of the recommendations in the Parallel Teaching paper that faculties had identified as causing them difficulties could be accommodated within the existing draft policy framework. The practice in some faculties of prescribing undergraduate work for students with overseas qualifications who were deficient in certain areas could be overcome by the students being admitted in the first instance to a lower level course with the advice that they would be permitted to upgrade on the successful completion of prescribed units of study. Alternatively, they could be admitted as Master's Preliminary students.

The "Flexible Delivery" Paper had been well received. There was a consensus that a University policy along the lines outlined in the Position Paper was needed. Many faculties had some involvement already in flexible delivery.

The difficulties identified by faculties in respect of the "Semesterisation Paper" were discussed more fully as part of the broader issue of postgraduate course structures (see item (2) below).

It was agreed that the Chair would make some minor amendments to the position papers in the light of the responses received and that the revised position papers would be presented to the May meetings of the Sub-Committee and the Graduate Studies Committee.

(2) Postgraduate Course structures

Professor Lawrence, Dr Mack and Professor Pesman attended the meeting for discussion of the item on the conversion of all postgraduate courses to the new Student Information System, especially in respect of the adoption of the 24 credit points per full-time semester standard.

Following the last meeting of the Graduate Studies Committee, Professor Lawrence and Associate Professor Ross had met with Dr Mack, and it had been agreed that implementation of the new postgraduate structures could be achieved in time for First Semester 1999, but would not be feasible in all faculties by July 1998. To achieve this, sufficient extra resources would be required to ensure timely flow of information between Faculties, the Graduate Studies Committee and the SIS Implementation team. These resources had been committed and work had already begun on the process.

A letter was to be sent to Deans from the University's Senior Management, advising them about the necessity for and urgency of the conversion. A copy of the letter would also be sent to those members of academic staff who had been identified as being responsible for postgraduate coursework programs in the respective faculties. They would be asked for advice about which programs in their faculties had already been converted to the new course structure, which programs could easily be converted, and which ones would present difficulties for conversion. Assistance would be offered in re-drafting Senate Resolutions where required. Dr Mack and Associate Professor Ross would visit faculties where conversion difficulties were perceived.

Several faculties had observed difficulties in the semesterisation of year-long units of study such as treatises. Dr Mack confirmed that it had never been intended that there be a mandatory semesterisation of units of study such as treatises, with two separate semester enrolments and results; such units of study could be recorded as being year-long. The negative aspect of so doing would be that if a student failed to complete the unit and needed to repeat it, he/she would have to re-enrol in the whole year-long unit, with the faculty having the provision to grant partial exemptions within it, but no credit.

Faculties would also need to address what constituted a full-time versus part-time postgraduate enrolment for their courses.

It was suggested that a template be prepared for use by faculties in the preparation of the Resolutions relating to postgraduate courses. However, it was also recognised that the various faculties prescribed different amounts of course requirements in Senate Resolutions as opposed to faculty resolutions; a template might be seen by some faculties as being too prescriptive and restrictive of individual differences.

The Sub-Committee noted that it would play a pivotal role in the restructuring process and its task would be to oversee the conversion of all postgraduate coursework programs to the 24 credit point system in time for the August meeting of the Graduate Studies Committee.

(3) Annual faculty reports on postgraduate teaching and reviews of postgraduate coursework

The Sub-Committee noted that most faculties had now submitted their annual reports on postgraduate teaching and on reviews of postgraduate coursework that had been due by 2 March. The Chair undertook to draft a report incorporating the faculty responses for consideration by the Sub-Committee at its May meeting.

(4) Policy work in progress

The Sub-Committee was in the process of addressing the following policy matters:

- credit for units of study at postgraduate level;
- conjoint ventures in postgraduate coursework; and
- implications of a Summer Session for postgraduate coursework programs.

5. Terms of reference of the Committee

The Committee noted a report from its Chair that the Chair of the Board had asked the Deputy Chairs to ask their committees to review their terms of reference.

It was agreed that members give consideration to the Committee's terms of reference, especially in respect of the following issues:

- its constitution; and
- advising the Board on the criteria for determining selection for postgraduate awards, in determining the successful applicants, and the reporting mechanism of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee.

The Committee agreed to discuss the integration of the work of the Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee and possible recommendations for amendments at the next meeting.

6. Payment of examiners of higher degree theses

The PhD Award Sub-Committee has asked the Committee to consider the system of paying examiners of PhD theses that elicited several complaints from prospective examiners. The

system entails examiners being asked to complete a form giving details of their bank accounts.

The Committee noted advice to the Chair from the Manager of Remuneration Services, that stated, *inter alia*, as follows:

- The payment for thesis marking as an honorarium does not preclude the University from having to deduct pay as you earn tax from the amount prior to payment if the marking takes place in Australia and this requires a group certificate to be raised; the payment therefore cannot be made through the general ledger system.
- Application had been made to the Australian Tax Office (ATO) on behalf of the University to have this payment exempt under section 221D of the Taxation regulations. The ATO had advised that the University was required to deduct pay as you earn tax from the payment unless the recipient of the payment had a tax exempt certificate from the ATO and that only individuals could apply for a tax exempt certificate.
- In 1995/96 the University made a decision to stop making salary payments by cheque for the Casual (non-regular) Payroll. [Cheque payments for the regular payroll ceased when PPB came live.] This was extensively communicated throughout the University and inserts were put in all casual staff payslips requesting them to supply bank account details. The cut-off for producing cheques from the Casual Payroll was March 1996 but was eventually extended to January 1997. The University does not produce payroll cheques even for payments outside the system; these are all processed using the direct entry banking system.
- If a marking service is carried out overseas, no tax needs to be taken out of the monies and they can be paid through the General ledger system and a cheque sent.

The Committee agreed that this was a significant issue. It agreed that the Chair and Professor MacAulay meet with Mr Vanaglia to ascertain if there were any other ways that examiners could be paid. It was agreed that overseas examiners should be paid by cheque, as had been the practice in the past, and that if the direct banking system had to be used, the advice to examiners be amended to explain the reasons for this method of payment and the requirements of the ATO.

The Committee noted the suggestion that the issue could be referred to the Council of Directors and Deans of Graduate Studies for consideration on a broader, national base, noting also, however, that taxation matters varied at the state level and that it would be preferable to have a clear picture first distinguishing constraints imposed by the University's accounting system from those imposed by the State taxation system.

7. Exit Questionnaire

Professor Siddle had asked that the Committee consider the desirability of introducing an Exit Questionnaire for PhD and research master's candidates, with a view to establishing a small working party to develop the questionnaire and the procedures, for recommendation to the Committee.

The West Review argued that there were too many research students and it provided for the establishment of a Research Training Index which would form the basis for the number of research student positions allocated to the universities. Irrespective of the introduction of a national research student Exit Questionnaire it was important that the University introduce its own questionnaire in order to determine students' perceptions of its strengths and weaknesses.

The Committee agreed to establish the following working party to formulate recommendations on the design, distribution and data analysis of the questionnaire. The Working Party would report back to the Committee's June meeting.

Professor J R Lawrence
 Associate Professor A F Masters
 Professor D Siddle
 Associate Professor S Crump
 Miss C Tabrett

8. Meeting of Deans and Directors of Graduate Studies

The Committee noted that Associate Professor Ross had represented the Chair at a meeting of Deans and Directors of Graduate Studies on Wednesday 22 April.

Associate Professor Ross reported on issues discussed at the meeting, such as:

- the extent that Australian universities use oral examinations for PhDs;
- the amount of research content in professional doctorates, with a recommendation being made that they have a minimum one-third research content;
- how universities interpret the DEETYA guidelines for extending Australian Postgraduate Awards (APAs); and
- the West Review.

Associate Professor Ross reported that it had been agreed that the next meeting of Deans and Directors of Graduate Studies would be held in October at this University.

The Committee briefly discussed the issue of introducing oral examinations as part of the normal examining procedure for PhDs. It was agreed that an options paper could be prepared by the Working Party on the Exit Questionnaire.

9. Working Party on electronic submission and examination of theses

The Committee noted that as a number of the original members of the Working Party on electronic submission and examination of theses are no longer available, the Chair had appointed the following Working Party to address ongoing issues:

Professor J R Lawrence (Chair)
 Associate Professor R Ross
 Associate Professor A F Masters
 Professor J Gero
 Associate Professor T Koppi
 Mr T Clark

10. Higher doctorates

Admission to candidature and appointment of examiners

The Committee confirmed the Chair's action in approving a recommendation for the appointment of examiners for a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Engineering.

Award of degree

The Committee confirmed the Chair's action in approving a recommendation for the award of the degree to the following candidates:

Degree of Doctor of Engineering
 Dr K K Watson

Degree of Doctor of Music
 Roger Woodward

11. Review process for research students

The Committee noted that when the requirement had been introduced for the departmental review of the progress of research students at the end of their first year of candidature, it had been agreed to ask for triennial reports on the review process. The Committee noted that the review process appeared to be working extremely well in some departments but not so well in others. It agreed that faculties be asked for these reports.

12. Appointment of a Working Party to consider a proposal for a new postgraduate program

The Committee noted that the Chair had appointed the following Working Party to consider a proposal from Sydney College of the Arts for the introduction of a PhD program at the College:

Professor J R Lawrence (Chair)
 Associate Professor A F Masters
 Associate Professor A Mitchell
 Mr B Buckley
 Dr A Cholodenko
 Dr P McCallum
 President of SUPRA or nominee

13. Embargoes on higher degree theses

The Chair reported that an application for a thesis embargo had been referred to him for approval, where the Faculty had already approved an embargo for two years. He reminded the Committee that it is University policy that theses which result from programs of advanced study and research should become available immediately for consultation, and that it is only in certain circumstances, as outlined in the *Postgraduate Studies Handbook*, that embargoes can and may be granted. The first six months may be granted by the relevant dean, but any period beyond that can only be granted by the Committee.

14. Review of the management of higher degree studies

Professor Siddle reported that he was in the process of writing a paper on higher degree research load and that he would circulate it to the Committee when it was completed. The tertiary research environment was becoming more and more competitive and the University had to ensure that it was able to strengthen its postgraduate research cohort. Following discussions, he and the Chair of the Board were instigating a review of the management of higher degree studies that would consider areas such as research content, the structures for monitoring student progress and provisions for complaint. The Review Chair would be external to the University and it was envisaged that the Review Committee would have three members. Submissions would be sought.

The Chair said that many of the issues to be addressed by the Review fell within the terms of reference of the Graduate Studies Committee. The Graduate Studies Committee should make submissions both individually and as a Committee.

15. Australian Postgraduate Awards (APAs)

Associate Professor Masters drew attention to the loss of an APA to the University for three years if a student gave it up after July during the first year of candidature. He suggested that if students were known to be about to renounce their APAs, they be encouraged to do so before July with the provision of alternative means of support for the interim period. It was agreed to ask Professor Siddle to give consideration to this issue.

16. "Gradfest"

The Committee noted that the Learning Assistance Centre will be conducting its bi-annual "Gradfest" for postgraduate research students from June 15 - 26. Details are available from the Centre. Registration for Gradfest will be on Tuesday June 9th.

that the Board note the report.

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 March 1998 when there were present: Professor Ann Sefton (Chair), Ms Louise Buchanan, Mr Simon Barrie, Mr Tom Clark, Ms Fran Everingham, Ms Janet Jones, Associate Professor Tony Koppi, Professor Ross McPhedran, Dr Mary Peat. Apologies: Dr Angela Brew, Associate Professor Lloyd Dawe, Mr Les McCrimmon. In attendance: Ms Louise Maral.

Proceedings of the Committee**1. Composition of the Committee**

The Committee welcomed Louise Buchanan as Acting SRC President pending re-elections late April.

2. PVC (Teaching) position

The Committee expressed its concern that the position of PVC (Teaching) vacated by Professor Johnstone might not be filled. It was felt that inappropriate messages were being sent to the University community and to the public that teaching was not of high priority at the University of Sydney. It was suggested that, while it was positive to have someone at DVC level responsible for teaching, Professor Anderson's portfolio was now very large.

The Committee believed that if the University did not replace the PVC with special responsibility for teaching, it would be sending a message to the University community and beyond that teaching is not valued in the same way that research is valued.

3. Report of the Learning Assistance Centre

The Committee noted the report tabled by Ms Janet Jones which summarised the teaching and teaching related activities of the LAC from January to April 1998, included a table summarising LAC Services over the previous two years and focussed on programs conducted co-operatively with faculties this year to date. *(Pages 50-51)*

It was particularly noted that the amount of work undertaken with faculties had increased markedly over the past couple of years, reflecting heightened perception of the importance of generic skills. Discussion focussed on the need to involve teachers more in early and continual feedback to students regarding generic skills. It was suggested that a diagnostic facility needed to be built into the assessment process.

Ms Jones agreed to incorporate into future three-monthly reports, a brief report from her counterpart at the Cumberland Campus on programs undertaken at Cumberland.

4. Two-day workshop on teaching

The Chair reported that much enthusiasm had been expressed around the University for the proposed workshop and that Professor Anderson would secure funding. The Dean of the Faculty of Education had offered to co-sponsor the workshop and the CTL would undertake publicity and part of the planning.

A steering committee was established to work on the project and report monthly. It comprises: Professor Sefton, Associate Professor Koppi, Mr Barrie, Associate Professor Dawe, the Associate Dean from Education, Dr Mary Peat and Ms Everingham.

The Committee decided to hold the workshop during Study Vacation in early November. While it was regretted that this might preclude many students from participating it was thought more important to establish a time appropriate for staff and it was pointed out that postgraduate students who were part-time teachers would not be adversely affected.

The Committee welcomes ideas and suggestions.

5. Guidelines for Excellence in Teaching Awards

The Chair reported that the guidelines were being brought together with the promotion criteria for each level of appointment and would go to the CTL. Guidelines will be sent to faculty committees and deans to encourage and support appropriate applications. There would be an effort to have awards decided in late August to allow plenty of time to organise a 'show and tell' session at the workshop (see item above).

6. Travel grant entitlements for teaching purposes

The Chair reported that there were entitlements in some faculties and not in others and that departments had been saying there was no money available. She had raised the matter with Professor Anderson who was yet to report back to her.

7. Flexible learning: guidelines for development of flexible delivery

Associate Professor Koppi undertook to incorporate emendations suggested at and beyond the meeting into the paper and make it available on the CTL website. The paper would be made available to chairs of faculty teaching committees for circulation and comment prior to being finalised and forwarded to the Academic Board.

Professor Sefton reported that the working party that had been set up by the Chair of the Academic Board would look at broad issues such as to the future directions of teaching

within the University, to what extent would flexible learning remain campus based, and in what areas were policy guidelines needed.

8. Assessment policy draft

The Chair reported on comments received from faculty teaching committees and undertook to make appropriate changes and circulate the new document to committee members for comment, highlighting the changes and the new material.

9. Faculty annual reports

Responses have been received from most faculties and a summary report to Senate was being prepared.

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 16 April 1998 when there were present: Professor D Cockayne, *Deputy Chair Academic Board (Presiding Member)*; Professor D Siddle, *Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research)*; Professor G Gill; Professor R Pesman; Professor D Melrose; Professor I Hume; Dr J Lingard; Mr T Clark. In Attendance: Mr J Shipp, University Librarian; Mr A Walmsley; Associate Professor A Reynolds; Professor J Lawrence; Professor L Field; Ms M Robb; Mr C Halbert.

1. University Library

Mr J Shipp, University Librarian, spoke of the Library's position within the current environment of university budget cuts. He said that, in previous years, the Library had been reliant upon additional funds from the University, but that in recent years these had not been forthcoming. Rationalising serials was seen as one of the main methods to cut expenditure. The Research Committee recognised that while there are immediate benefits in this approach, they could be seen as short-term and cutting at the core of what Professor Siddle called "the most important piece of research infrastructure in the University". It was noted that the existence of the Fisher Library is a major factor in generating income for the University through research grants and that this needs to be recognised.

It was asked of Mr Shipp if there were any recognised methods for bringing down journal costs without cutting journal subscriptions. He advised that one method might be to have the University involved directly in the publishing process; another would be to encourage electronic publishing.

The Committee urged Mr Shipp to coordinate a strategy with UNSW and other Universities, to ensure that at least one subscription of each important journal was maintained. However Mr Shipp gave a number of reasons why he felt this could not be achieved; at the same time he queried whether this University had any responsibility for supporting the wider research community. The Research Committee argued that if this form of inter-institutional co-operation was not put in place, all institutions will be disadvantaged. In the ensuing discussion, members of the Committee voiced concerns about whether the restructuring of the library was able to support the University's research aspirations. Associate Professor Reynolds argued that if we want to be a world class university we have to maintain a world class library.

The Committee agreed that Professors Cockayne and Siddle should write to Professor Eltis setting out the Committee's concerns about the Library's funding situation. The letter will be tabled at the next Research Committee meeting

2. Policy Review

HECS Exemption Scholarships

Professor Cockayne pointed out that the policy, as shown on the University's homepage, is out of date. Professor Siddle advised that the policy has been revised and printed in the 1998 Postgraduate Handbook. The University's homepage will now be updated by the Student Centre as they have prepared the revised policy for approval by Academic Board in 1997 and 1998. Professor Siddle pointed out that the Student Centre will consult him on future revision of the policy prior to submitting it to the Academic Board.

ARC & NHMRC Fellows: Conditions

The Research Committee noted that the policy document needs to be revised to include recent additions. Professor Cockayne will review the document and table the final version at the next meeting.

3. Research Misconduct Policy Document (Draft)

Members of the Committee considered the draft document prepared by Ms Reid. It was agreed that the document be accepted as a draft, with the members of the Committee to contact Professor Cockayne with any comments. There was some urgency in this matter, as it has to be forwarded to the ORI within the next few days. Professor Cockayne asked the members to keep in mind that the document has to be consistent with the AVCC/NHMRC policy on the matter.

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

Presentation on research for new academic staff

Professor Siddle reported that he, Ms Reid, Ms Robb and Mr Peter Hartley, from the BLO, had attended the most recent induction day for new academic staff. The team fielded questions about research opportunities available to new staff, and about the process involved in applying for grants.

BEACH Program

Professor Siddle advised that the Better Evaluation and Care of Health (BEACH) program was launched, based in the Family Medicine Research Unit, Faculty of Medicine, with the aim of studying internal workings of GPs' surgeries.

Centres

Professor Siddle reported that four Key Centre proposals had been submitted to DEETYA. These were for Key Centres of Teaching and Research in Robotics, Finance, Polymers and Horticulture. It has been announced that there will be another round of the Special Research Centres Program early in 1999. Details will be made available as soon as they are received from DEETYA.

ARC Small Grants Scheme

The Chairs of the Small Grants Committee met and have agreed to some major changes to the scheme this year:

- (1) 17.5% of the available funds will be kept back to support applicants whose Large Grant applications just miss out on funding by the ARC.
- (2) Small Grants will be funded for a period of one year only.
- (3) Successful applicants will be expected to apply for external support after that one year.

BLO Biotechnology Forum

Professor Siddle reported that the Biotechnology Forum, run by the BLO, had been a great success and that he had received very positive feedback.

Working Parties of the Research Committee

Professor Siddle had requested that two working parties be created, one to look into good research management at departmental/school level, and the second to develop a policy on the future of externally funded centres at the end of the period of external funding. It was resolved that membership of the first working party be Professor Siddle, Professor Cockayne, Professor Field, Associate Professor Reynolds, Dr Lingard. Ms Robb expressed an interest in joining this group, as did Mr Clark. The decision as to whether Mr Clark should represent the Graduate Studies Committee was left to a later discussion between Professors Siddle and Lawrence. It was subsequently decided that Associate Professor Russell Ross would join the Working Party to represent the Graduate Studies Committee and that Mr

Clark would be a member representing the views of research students. The suggested members for the second working party were Professor Siddle, Professor Hume, Professor Gill and Associate Professor Garton. It was agreed that these working parties would report back to the Research Committee regularly.

KPMG Audit

Professor Siddle pointed out that the error rate in the publications reporting for this university was 37%, when the national average was 33.8%. He said that this year the RSO will be conducting an internal audit, prior to the submission of the data in an effort to reduce our error rate. The Committee expressed concern about the process used by KPMG in the latest audit and asked Professor Siddle to obtain details from KPMG of the particular grants which had errors. They also asked him to see whether the person who carried out the last internal audit could be asked to re-audit the documents shown as giving errors in the KPMG audit.

5. **Other Business**

Student Travel Grants: The management of these grants was devolved to the faculties a number of years ago from the Research and Scholarships Office. Professor Siddle had indicated that some of the faculties had not spent all of the allotted funds. He advised that this made continued support for the budget difficult. The Committee is very concerned at this situation, and discussed whether the funds should once again be handled centrally. It was decided to continue with the current arrangements in 1998, and to request that faculties advertise more extensively.

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 Tuesday 21 April. There were present: Professor R McPhedran (presiding), Professors R Pesman and M Harris, Dr M Peat, Associate Professors R Kummerfeld, and Mr J Shipp. Ms B Olde and Mr T Robinson were in attendance.

1. Staff and Student Access to the Intranet

The Committee considered the action necessary following the passing by the Academic Board of the motion contained in its last report (15 April 1998, C5 Part 1, 2). It was agreed that the Chair, Professor McPhedran, would write to the Assistant Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Information Technology), Dr S Carlile, regarding the motion and the relevance of implementation issues to the ITC.

2. Relationship between the LITC and ITC

A draft paper by Professor McPhedran, titled "Future Structures of IT and Library Issues" was considered by the Committee. The paper canvassed the future of the LITC, its Library and IT Reference Groups and the relationship with the ITC. Particular comments centred on the duplication of interests and working parties between the ITC and the LITC, and whether there were policy issues involving IT which could be considered in a meaningful way without involving decisions concerning resources. It was agreed that fundamental issues were facing the University in the areas of Library and information resources, and that the Board would continue to need advice on these from one of its Committees. The document will be re-written in the light of the discussion with a view to its being submitted to the Academic Board by the end of May.

that the Board note the report.

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 22 April 1998. There were present: Professor R Pesman (Chair), Professor M Koder, Professor L Burgess, Professor S Armitage, Professor L Field, Associate Professor R Arnold, Associate Professor D Davey and Ms S Jamieson. In attendance: Dr S Rosewarne, Ms J Deitch and Ms H Beamish.

1. Report of the Sub-committee - Research Only Staff

The draft document "Guidelines for the Appointment of Research Staff" was discussed. Draft guidelines for the Promotion of Research staff are to be prepared.

2. Academic Appointment Policy - Clarification re Confidentiality Clause

The following paragraph will be circulated to Heads of Department and is to be provided to applicants for academic positions.

Academic Appointment Policy - Confidentiality Clause

The policies and procedures of the Academic Board of the University require that the Head of Department and the members of the appointments committee consult with other relevant members of the Academic staff of the Department. The normal expectation is that shortlisted applicants will give a presentation to the Department and meet with relevant academic staff prior to the appointments committee making a selection. Thus the normal procedure is that the identity of applicants will be relatively widely known. Where applicants believe they have particular requirements to maintain the confidentiality of their application, they should approach the Head of Department, but should also appreciate the difficulty that maintaining confidentiality would present when meeting the requirements for consultation.

that the Board note the report.

P Part II

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

C7. Membership of Level E Central Promotion Committee - 1998

The Chair **recommends** the appointment of the following members to the Level E Central Promotions Committee for 1998:

Professor Gavin Brown, Vice-Chancellor (Chair)
 Professor Derek Anderson (Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Academic and Staffing)
 Professor Ros Pesman (Chair, Academic Board)
 Professor Don Napper (Pro Vice-Chancellor, CST)
 Professor David Weisbrot (Pro Vice-Chancellor, CHASS)
 Professor J Paul Seale (nominee Pro Vice-Chancellor, CHS)
 Professor Robert King (external - University of New South Wales)
 Professor Jocalyn Lawler (Clinical Nursing)
 Professor Judyth Sachs (Teaching and Curriculum Studies)
 Professor David Hill (Electrical Engineering)

Meeting Date: 20 November 1998

that the Board appoint the Committee members as recommended.

*Report of the Chair***Action by the Chair under delegated authority****College of Health Sciences****Committee appointed to consider the appointment of a Visiting Professor**

Committee to consider the appointment of a Visiting Professor in the Pain Management and Research Centre at Royal North Shore Hospital:

Ex officio:

Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Professor J A Young)

Chair of the Academic board (*Professor R Pesman)

Dean, Faculty of Medicine (Professor S R Leeder)

Up to 3 persons nominated by the Vice-Chancellor, including one external member and either departmental or cognate members:

Professor M J Cousins (Pain Management and Research Centre)

Professor R Bandler (Anatomy and Histology)

Professor M Rowe (University of New South Wales)

Up to 2 members of the academic staff of the University, professorial or non-professorial, appointed by the Standing Committee on behalf of the Academic Board:

Professor K Goulston (Associate Dean, Northern Clinical School)

Professor L Mather (Pain Management and Research Centre)

The Committee consists of 7 males and 1 female (*marked)

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 Siu Wan-chi	Computer Science	01/08/98 to 31/08/98

Statement by the Vice-Chancellor

“Attachment A”

EXTRACTS FROM DRAFT AGREEMENT (v6)

CAUTION: This is a discussion draft (No. 6) only of an agreement which may be entered into by the two Universities for the formation of a new company and a new Business School.

Legal advice on the consequences/effectiveness and necessary steps to achieve some of the objectives is not finalised.

Recitals

- A. The Universities have agreed to form a non-profit company for the joint purpose of utilising the talents, energies and resources of both Universities to produce a powerful new centre of excellence for teaching and research in business.
- B. The Universities have agreed that membership in the company and the composition of the Board of directors will comprise two-thirds nominated by UNSW and one-third nominated by Sydney.
- C. The Universities have agreed on a number of other matters particularly in relation to governance, academic board, staff, students, assets, and funding of the company.

1. Interpretation

Definitions

In this agreement:

Academic Board means the group of persons constituted in accordance with Part 13 of this agreement to be the Academic Board of the new AGSM, and having the responsibilities and powers and obligations normally associated with and exercised and undertaken by the academic board of a tertiary educational institution;

3. Members and Rights and Obligations

3.1 Membership of Company

The subscribers to the memorandum and articles for the purposes of formation of the Company will be UNSW and its Vice-Chancellor and Sydney and its Vice-Chancellor and UNSW will nominate two further persons to be members of the Company.

[note: this is designed to maintain the 2/3-1/3 ratio in the joint venture]

4. Appointment and removal of directors

4.1 Appointment of directors

UNSW will be entitled to appoint eight (8) persons (with their prior written consent in each case) as directors of the Company, of whom at least four will be from or associated with the business community.

Sydney will be entitled to appoint four (4) persons (with their prior written consent in each case) as directors of the Company, of whom at least two will be from or associated with the business community.

Each University will endeavour to include one or more alumni among its nominees from the business community.

4.2 Term of Appointed Directors

Except for the twelve directors first appointed, of whom half must retire at the end of the second year and who may then be reappointed for two further consecutive terms, each

appointed director may hold office for a three year term with a maximum of two consecutive terms.

4.3 Removal of Appointed Directors

A director appointed by a University may only be removed or replaced by the University which appointed the director.

4.4 Other directors

The other directors (subject in each case to their prior written consent) will be:

- The Vice Chancellor, The University of New South Wales
- The Vice Chancellor, The University of Sydney
- the Dean of the new AGSM and managing director of the Company
- one student elected by and from the body of students enrolled in a course at the new AGSM leading to a University award
- one staff member elected by and from the academic staff of the new AGSM.

4.5 Alternate directors for ex officio directors

Directors who are directors by reason of their office are to be entitled under the articles of the Company to appoint alternate or nominee directors to act in their place (with the written consent of the alternate or nominee in each case).

The articles must also provide that if a relevant office is vacant the individual who is for the time being acting in that office is a director (with the written consent of that person) by reason of being and for so long as the person is the individual acting in that office.

4.6 Elections and Term for elected directors

Elections by students of the new AGSM from among their members for the purposes of the Company's Board and Academic Board must be conducted in accordance with the protocols of the University of that one of the Vice Chancellors who at the relevant time has jurisdiction in respect of student matters.

Elections by staff of the new AGSM from among their members for the purposes of the Company's Board and Academic Board must be conducted in accordance with the protocols of the University of that one of the Vice Chancellors who at the relevant time has jurisdiction in respect of staff matters.

Each student director may hold office for a one year term with a maximum of one term, but shall cease to be a director upon ceasing to be enrolled in a course at the new AGSM.

Each staff director may hold office for a two year term with a maximum of two terms, but shall cease to be a director upon ceasing to be a member of the academic staff of the new AGSM.

4.7 Further directors

No other directors may be appointed without the prior written consent of the Vice Chancellor of each University.

4.8 Voting entitlements

Each director will have one vote.

Decisions of the Board will be made by a simple majority.

4.9 Chairperson

The Foundation Chairman of the Board will be Mr. David Hoare. Subsequently the chairperson must be elected by the Board from among its members, subject to the consent of the Vice Chancellor of each University. The Chairperson elected by the Board will be the acting Chairperson until the necessary consents are obtained, or until a replacement Chairperson having the necessary consents is elected by the Board from among its other members. The Chairperson may be removed as Chairperson only by the Board.

4.10 Dean and Director

The Foundation Dean of the new AGSM and managing director of the Company will be Professor Peter Dodd. Subsequently the Dean and managing director must be appointed by the Board subject to the consent of the Vice Chancellor of each University. The Dean and managing director appointed by the Board will be the acting Dean and managing director until the necessary consents are obtained, or until a replacement Dean and managing director

having the necessary consents is appointed by the Board. The Dean and managing director may be removed as Dean and as managing director only by the Board.

4.11 Other University interests

Each of the Universities will take such steps as are necessary to ensure that the Chairperson and the Dean may continue to be, or may become, members of bodies associated with or forming part of each University.

[note: bylaws or other constituent documentation of University bodies will need review and may need amendment to achieve this.]

Each of the Chairperson and the Dean must ensure that any potentially conflicting interests are declared to (for recording by) the Company and each such body.

Where the body concerned does not have its own procedures for dealing with declared conflicts of interest the Universities will notify the Chairperson and the Dean of their requirements (as to voting, or withdrawing from discussion, or any other requirements) with respect to dealing with conflicts of interest which arise in respect of any particular University body.

The Dean may by request of the Vice-Chancellor attend meetings at either University normally attended by a Dean, and may attend other meetings at either University by request of the relevant University, and must declare a conflict of interest wherever one may exist.

5. Name and Testamurs

5.1 Name of School

The name of the new AGSM will be “The Australian Graduate School of Management (at The University of New South Wales and The University of Sydney)”, also to be known as “AGSM”, and both names are to be registered as business names used by the Company.

5.2 Ownership

The names “The Australian Graduate School of Management” and “AGSM” belong to and will continue to belong to UNSW and the right to use of those names will revert to UNSW on any change of name of the new AGSM or on the new AGSM ceasing to operate or on any dissolution of the Company.

The names “The Graduate School of Business” and “GSB” belong to and will continue to belong to Sydney and the right to use of those names will revert to Sydney on the new AGSM ceasing to operate or on any dissolution of the Company.

5.3 Use of names

Each University agrees that, for so long as the new AGSM continues in operation using the names referred to in clause 5.1:

- it must not use any of the names referred to in clause 5.1 other than in reference to the new AGSM and
- it will not otherwise use any of the names referred to in clause 5.2.

5.4 Identification of Company and new AGSM

The crests of both Universities must be used with the name of the Company and/or the new AGSM on letterhead and other stationery and in promotional material. The design requirements from time to time of the particular University must be complied with in respect of use of its name and crest, and the indicia of each University must be equal in prominence and location on each medium.

5.5 Testamurs

Each University agrees that it will take such steps as are necessary to ensure that full academic credit will be granted by the University for work completed satisfactorily at the new AGSM, and graduates of the new AGSM will be awarded a testamur for their degree which bears the crest and seal of each of the Universities and the signatures of the Chancellor and of the Vice Chancellor of each of the Universities. The design requirements from time to time of the particular University must be complied with in respect of use of its name and crest and seal, and the indicia of each University must be equal in prominence and location on each testamur.

12. Management

12.1 Management of the AGSM

The Dean of the new AGSM and managing director of the Company will be responsible for the day to day management of the Company and of the new AGSM, subject to the instructions of the Board, except for staff matters and student matters.

12.2 Student matters

Any student matters arising for determination which cannot be resolved by the Dean under delegated authority from the relevant Vice Chancellor must be resolved by that one of the Vice Chancellors who is agreed between the two Vice Chancellors as having jurisdiction in respect of student matters, and at the date of this agreement this is the Vice Chancellor of Sydney, unless (either generally or in a particular case) the Vice Chancellors agree otherwise.

12.3 Staff matters

Any staff matters arising for determination which cannot be resolved by the Dean under delegated authority from the relevant Vice Chancellor must be resolved

- in accordance with protocols applying from time to time to staff at UNSW and
 - by that one of the Vice Chancellors who is agreed between the two Vice Chancellors as having jurisdiction in respect of staff matters, and at the date of this agreement this is the Vice Chancellor of UNSW, unless (either generally or in a particular case) the Vice Chancellors agree otherwise.
-

13. Academic Board

13.1 Academic Board of new AGSM

The new AGSM will be treated by each University for all possible purposes as a Faculty of the University, and the Academic Board of the new AGSM will consist of:

- the Vice-Chancellor of The University of Sydney
- the Vice-Chancellor of The University of New South Wales
- the Dean of the new AGSM and managing director of the Company
- the Presiding Member of the Board of Studies of the new AGSM
- the Registrar or another nominee from one of the Universities, selected on a two-year rotating basis by one of the Vice Chancellors, the first selection to be made by such one of the Vice Chancellors as is agreed between the Vice Chancellors
- three persons elected by and from the body of the academic staff of the new AGSM
- eight persons nominated by the President of the UNSW Academic Board drawn from the members of the UNSW Academic Board, and two Deans nominated by the Vice Chancellor of UNSW
- four persons nominated by the Chair of the Sydney Academic Board drawn from the members of the Sydney Academic Board, and one Dean nominated by the Vice Chancellor of Sydney
- two students from different programs within the new AGSM which programs lead to a University award, elected by the student body of the new AGSM from among its members.

13.2 Term of membership of Academic Board

The five members first listed above will be members by reason of their office; and at any time during which an office is vacant the person acting in such office will be a member of the Academic Board.

Each other member will hold office for a two-year term unless earlier terminated.

A member elected by students will cease to be a member on ceasing to be enrolled in a course at the new AGSM.

A member elected by staff will cease to be a member on ceasing to be a member of the academic staff of the new AGSM.

13.3 President of Academic Board

The President of the Academic Board will hold office for two years and will be elected from the members of the Academic Board by the members of the Academic Board. *[Note: to be achieved on a rotating basis between UNSW and Sydney members of the Academic Board]*

13.4 Attendees

Ex-officio members of the academic board of each University are to be invited to attend meetings of the Academic Board of the new AGSM.

14. Academic Programs**14.1 Nature of Programs**

Academic programs to be provided by the new AGSM will include programs at Masters and Doctoral levels, and a Graduate Diploma in Management, and other programs for executive and professional development, and such other programs as are agreed from time to time by the Company on the recommendation and advice of the Academic Board.

For the avoidance of doubt it is expressly agreed that:

- the final business decision on whether or not a program is provided by the new AGSM rests with the Company through its Board and the Dean, but
- the Company cannot determine to provide a program except on the recommendation of the Academic Board, and
- neither the Company nor the Academic Board can determine or recommend provision of a program leading to a University award without the prior agreement of each of the Universities.

The Universities will continue to consider and if thought fit, progress provision by the new AGSM, with involvement of the Law Schools of both Universities, of the program presently provided by UNSW and known as the MLM degree.

14.2 Continued Flexibility and Open Access Across Programs

Each University will endeavour to ensure continued flexibility and open access across the programs which they will continue to offer in their respective Commerce and Economics and other Faculties.

14.3 No Competition

Each University agrees with the other University that it will not:

- offer an MBA or any program which uses "MBA" or "Master of Business Administration" in its title
- use any name currently used by it in respect of a program offered by the AGSM (in the case of UNSW) or offered by the GSB (in the case of Sydney) in any way which would or might compete with the new AGSM.

15. Staff**15.1 Staff: general principles**

The objective of the Universities for the benefit of the new AGSM is that all staff whether originally employed by UNSW or by Sydney should have the benefit of the same rights and be subject to the same obligations and the unitary authority of the Dean (and the Board) with respect to their terms and conditions of employment. However it is recognised that certain considerations affecting staff of each University may not initially be reconcilable with this objective.

15.2 Employees to have University status

Each University will take such steps as are necessary to endeavour to ensure that staff employed in future (in addition to seconded employees) directly by the Company for the purposes of the new AGSM will have so far as possible the same entitlement to selection, nomination or election to membership or as officers of or in other positions on University committees and bodies and organisations as if they were employed by the relevant University.

[note: “the relevant University” refers to the person’s designated “home University”, with such assignments roughly maintaining the 2/3-1/3 ratio.]

15.3 New Entitlements

Procedures for promotions of staff within the new AGSM must be consistent with the procedures which apply at the relevant time in respect of the staff member at the University which originally employed the staff member, and in any event for the purposes of the new AGSM will be subject to the approval of a committee comprising the Dean of the new AGSM, the Vice-Chancellor of each of the Universities, and the President/Chair of the Academic Board of each of the Universities.

Each University acknowledges and agrees that where a secondment expires (other than by reason that the original contract of employment has expired) or is terminated, seconded staff who do not take up new employment with the Company for the new AGSM will return to their original employing University at the status achieved by any promotion within the new AGSM.

16. Students

16.1 Rules and Processes

It is intended that all students of the new AGSM will have both the benefits and the obligations of a common set of values and rules and processes, being those applying to students in the University of that one of the Vice Chancellors who is agreed between the two Vice Chancellors as having jurisdiction in respect of student matters, and at the date of this agreement this is the Vice Chancellor of Sydney unless otherwise agreed (in general or in a particular case) by each of the two Vice Chancellors.

16.2 Enrolment

Enrolment procedures must ensure that students are advised of and acknowledge at enrolment, which protocols and processes will apply in respect of student matters, and the jurisdiction of that one of the Vice Chancellors who is agreed between the two Vice Chancellors as having jurisdiction in respect of student matters.

If the procedure of enrolment direct with the new AGSM should result in any detriment to either University (including with respect to funding), or to the students by reason of rights or reasonable expectations in relation to third parties being prejudiced because students are not enrolled at one or other University, the Universities will endeavour to agree on some alternative procedure to address or remedy the detriment, which procedure must recognise the principle of two-thirds UNSW and one-third Sydney on which most of the elements of this agreement have been agreed.

16.3 Delegation of authority

Each University will take such steps as are necessary or appropriate to delegate so far as possible to the Dean the authority necessary to manage student matters, and in particular, in respect of contentious matters requiring resolution, authority to manage such matters in accordance with the procedures and processes of the relevant University and for final resolution under the jurisdiction of that one of the Vice-Chancellors who is agreed between the two Vice Chancellors as having jurisdiction in respect of student matters.

16.4 Resolution of Student matters

All student matters must be resolved in accordance with protocols and processes applying to students at the University of, and under the jurisdiction of, that one of the Vice Chancellors who is agreed between the two Vice Chancellors as having jurisdiction in respect of student matters, and at the date of this agreement this is the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Sydney.

16.5 Student/Staff matters

Where in the opinion of the Dean a student matter requiring resolution also involves a staff matter requiring resolution, the matter must be resolved as a staff matter requiring resolution under the jurisdiction of that one of the Vice-Chancellors who is agreed between the Vice-Chancellors as having jurisdiction in respect of staff matters, and at the date of this agreement this is the Vice-Chancellor of UNSW.

16.6 Administrative matters

Day to day administration of student matters should be carried out by staff of the new AGSM and should take place at a location at which the new AGSM conducts its operations.

16.7 Existing students

Each University will use its best endeavours to ensure that the interests of students presently enrolled in programs at the AGSM (in the case of UNSW) and at the GSB (in the case of Sydney) will be protected and will not be prejudiced by termination of programs in those institutions and the provision of similar programs by the new AGSM.

16.8 Award of degrees

Each University will with the other University, and having regard to the recommendations and advice of the Academic Board of the new AGSM, agree upon the programs which may be offered by the new AGSM for the awarding of particular degrees or other qualifications.

16.9 Alumni Status

Each University will take such steps as are necessary or appropriate to ensure that graduates from the new AGSM will be recognised as alumni of both Universities.

16.10 Student Association Fees

The Universities will negotiate with the student associations of their respective Universities to achieve reciprocal rights for students undertaking programs provided by the new AGSM, on the basis of two-thirds student fee payable to UNSW student association and one-third student fee payable to Sydney student association.

19. Disestablishment**19.1 Operating review**

The Universities will at or before the end of the second full academic year of the operation of the new AGSM conduct (with the Dean and the Board as considered appropriate) a detailed review of the outcomes, from the perspective of each of them and generally, which have resulted from the implementation of this agreement. The Universities will if thought necessary record any further matters then agreed between them for the further and better operation of the new AGSM resulting from the review.

19.2 Continuation review

The Universities will at or before the end of the fifth full academic year of the operation of the new AGSM conduct a further detailed review of the outcomes which have resulted from operation of the new AGSM over the five-year period.

The Universities will record any agreement reached between them resulting from the review as to the continuation, modification or proposed disestablishment of the new AGSM.

Any agreement for proposed disestablishment must provide for disestablishment at the end of the seventh full academic year, and for the rights and obligations of each University which are to result from and upon disestablishment, including any rights and obligations which are agreed to be different from those specified in this agreement.

19.3 Notice of disestablishment

Either University may give two years' written notice to the other of intent to withdraw from participation in the Company and the new AGSM under this agreement, and any such notice must not take effect until the end of the second academic year after the calendar year in which the notice is given. If such a notice is given the new AGSM is to be disestablished with effect from the end of that second academic year after the year in which the notice is given.

19.4 Rights on disestablishment***[to be further considered and finalised]***

On any disestablishment of the new AGSM pursuant to the provisions for disestablishment contained in this agreement (but without prejudice to the rights of either University against the other in respect of any breach of this agreement):

- (a) Premises and Fixtures

- (b) Little Bay Premises
- (c) Staff
- (d) Use of Names; Competition

Each University will in accordance with Part 5 of this agreement be entitled to again use the names which it used in respect of the AGSM (in the case of UNSW) and in respect of the GSB (in the case of Sydney) before it entered into this agreement, and the prohibition on competition contained in clause 14.2 will no longer apply.

- (e) Students

Each University must take such steps as are necessary or appropriate (in consultation with the other University if considered appropriate)

- to endeavour to offer programs suitable for students who at disestablishment are part-way through a program which was offered by the new AGSM, to enable them to complete a course of study and to obtain a degree or award as similar as possible to the course of study and degree or award which they could have expected to obtain had the disestablishment not occurred, and in particular
- to grant credit in their respective offered programs to such students for courses or elements of the new AGSM program which the student has already completed.

- (f) Intellectual Property

Each University will be free to use for its own purposes (and each University must take such steps as are available to it including entering into any necessary documentation with the other University and with the Company to achieve that result)

- any intellectual property which the particular University originally made available for the use of the new AGSM pursuant to clause 11.1 of this agreement, and
- any new intellectual property which has arisen out of or in connection with acts matters and things done in or about the business of the new AGSM (*including any which was developed from intellectual property originally made available to the new AGSM by the other University)

- (g) Other Assets and Liabilities

“Attachment B”

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Relating to the Framework Agreement for a Joint Venture between The University of New South Wales and The University of Sydney in respect to the Australian Graduate School of Management and the Graduate School of Business.

The following statements have the effect of clarifying the intentions of the two Vice-Chancellors and bringing the two slightly different versions of the Framework Agreement (as endorsed by the UNSW Council and the University of Sydney Senate) into harmony, which in turn will provide a basis for the preparation of the legal instrument to be considered by the governing bodies of the universities.

Recognition of awards

The Framework Agreement will include the following statement:

The Vice-Chancellors agree that both universities will grant full academic credit for work completed satisfactorily at the AGSM, and graduates of the AGSM will be awarded a testamur for their degree which bears the crest and seal of both the University of New South Wales and the University of Sydney. Such graduates will be recognised as alumni of both universities.

Relationship between the Dean and the Vice-Chancellors

The Framework Agreement will include the following statement:

The Head of the merged entity will be Dean and Director and will report to the Board of Management except that for staffing purposes and for student matters, the Dean and Director will report to the Vice-Chancellor with jurisdiction on these matters.

In addition to the above arrangement, the Dean and Director will enjoy normal advisory relationships with the Vice-Chancellors of both universities.

Student and Staff Matters

The Framework Agreement will include the following statements:

In order to ensure a common set of rules and processes governing all staff, and so those rules reflect university standards and values, the new Board of Management will agree, from time to time, on a protocol to be used for this purpose, which will be adopted from one or other of the universities. In the first instance, all staffing matters will be resolved under the jurisdiction of the Vice-Chancellor of the University of New South Wales, unless agreed otherwise between the two Vice-Chancellors.

In order to ensure a common set of rules and processes governing all students, and so those rules reflect university standards and values, the new Board of Management will agree, from time to time, on a protocol to be used for this purpose, which will be adopted from one or other of the universities. In the first instance, all student matters will be resolved under the jurisdiction of the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Sydney, unless agreed otherwise between the two Vice-Chancellors.

Both Vice-Chancellors agree that the majority of interactions between students and administration should take place at an AGSM site so that assignment of student matters to the protocol of one university or the other in most cases will not be noticeable to the student body. However, both Vice-Chancellors recognise that student matters do arise which involve both students and staff members. Therefore, in order to ensure that the assignment of university protocols allows for the pragmatic and effective administration of the AGSM and its students, the Vice-Chancellors agree at the time the Joint Venture comes into existence and for the initial period, that:

- the day to day administration of student matters will take place at a joint venture site and be carried out by staff attached to the joint venture;

- concerns or disputes sometimes will arise in which the interests of staff and students are inextricably intertwined, such as matters affecting postgraduate students and their supervisors, intellectual property, harassment, misconduct, plagiarism, and cases in which a person is both a student and employee of the AGSM. In order to avoid uncertainty or any potential conflict of protocols, it is preferable that in all such cases (as determined by the Dean/Director), the governing protocol will be that of the university whose protocol on staff matters is operative at the time. (In the first instance, as noted above, this will be the staff protocol of The University of New South Wales.)

We also agree that in adopting the protocols to govern students and staff of the AGSM, the AGSM Board can be assured that the protocols of both universities reflect high standards of good practice within the Higher Education sector, and that neither staff nor students of either university will suffer disadvantage from the adoption of one or other of the protocols. If this assurance is challenged during the term of this joint venture agreement, the matter should be the subject of resolution and report to the AGSM Board by the two Vice-Chancellors.

Professor John Niland
Vice-Chancellor
The University of New South Wales

and

Professor Gavin Brown
Vice-Chancellor
The University of Sydney

2 April 1998

REPORT ON THE OPERATION OF THE SYDNEY SUMMER SCHOOL PILOT PROGRAM

(Dr John Mack, Academic Director, The University of Sydney Pilot Summer School)

1. The 1998 Program

- The Summer School ran successfully with 372 students enrolled in 502 units of study (UoS), selected from 27 separate such units offered by the Faculties of Arts, Economics and Science. The Summer School generated \$686K of fee income, of which almost \$453K was distributed to Faculties. Section 5 of this report sets out students' results by UoS, and the report of the external evaluation of the academic program is also attached. In general the response by students and staff to the pilot program has been positive which in turn has generated a great deal of enthusiasm in the University for the second year of the Pilot Summer School.
- We were fortunate in obtaining the willing help of all general, academic and administrative staff whose expertise was needed in order to solve the various organisational problems associated with preparation and dissemination of information/enrolment material, with devising an effective enrolment and fee collection procedure and with organising space and services for classes. Without this freely given help, we could not have got the Summer School up and running in the short time available to us. Nor would it have run with so few operational problems - those that did arise were promptly addressed. In my view, the only issue that may need a formal review is that of ensuring that applications by summer school students to Faculties for credit of results, are promptly and smoothly processed (so for example, potential graduands may be placed in an appropriate graduation ceremony once results are known). The problem here is that this has to be done at a time when all involved academic-related administrative units are very busy with first semester student matters.
- The problems that were anticipated as arising from the late start to this Summer School undoubtedly did arise. These have assisted me greatly in identifying some key factors that must be addressed to ensure that the second year of the pilot program in 1999 is even more successful. My comments in the following sections are intended to facilitate achievement of this goal.

2. The Summer School Market

- I believe that there are two obvious target groups. Firstly, the students who discover they need a unit (or have failed a needed unit), for pre-requisite purposes and do not wish to delay their regular progression if at all possible. This was a significant group in the 1998 intake. Secondly, those we can identify as likely to need only 1 or 2 units to complete their course of study after semester 2 is over, and who would contemplate finishing off in the summer and graduating in that year, rather than delaying graduation by a year. (*At present it is not easy to generate lists, by course and current enrolment, of prospective near graduands who might consider completing degree requirements via a summer enrolment.*)
- There is a third group, and that is the group of international fee paying students, who would see both academic and financial benefit in completing units in 7 weeks instead of 14 or more, throughout the period of their degree (and thus reduce their overall living away from home costs). I do not know how easy it is to identify prospective FFPOS students who might consider the benefits of a summer enrolment.
- At postgraduate level there may be some merit in using the Summer School as a way of students sampling our offerings, in the sense that one could plan to admit them to a course on the basis of performance in selected Summer School units. This may be a particularly attractive prospect for some overseas students and graduates of other institutions.
- The diversity and academic quality offered at the University of Sydney also appears to be attractive to students who wish to study units which may be converted to credit elsewhere. This year despite very limited publicity, we had some 35 enrolments by students from other local or interstate universities. This is indicative of another market group, a subgroup of which might be overseas students, who may wish to study units for credit with their home institution, and/or test their ability to complete units here, without having to pay the higher visa fee.

- A further group to be considered is that of high school students who have taken accelerated HSC programs who wish to take a University unit of study for possible future credit to a degree program.

3. Factors which impact on the success of the Summer School operation

- The marketing opportunities mentioned above, and a better organisational plan for the Summer School, depend for their success upon effecting improvements to various crucial aspects of our current operations.
- There is a need to raise awareness within the University of the availability of the Summer School as early as possible, and to maintain a high level of awareness throughout the planning and operation of the second pilot summer school in 1999. Deans and the Summer School staff need to be able to identify and contact the various target groups with relevant advice about the Summer School well in advance of its start date. This could not be done in 1997 - but for 1998 I would hope that the latest date for disseminating a first reasonably informative notice about the 1999 Summer School would be via an insert in Semester 1 result notice postings. I would also recommend that suitable inserts go with the annual SIB mailout in November and with Semester 2 result notices, as was done in 1997.
- The other major problem which must be solved, is to ensure that the selection of units to be offered is more carefully tied to market research information on attractiveness and potential audience size, so that the published list of units is less likely to suffer deletions due to lack of enrolments. The 1998 experience is not a good guide here, because of the lateness of everything, but with hindsight it is clear that more careful selection together with an appropriate promotional campaign, would have generated a more effective enrolments pattern in some areas.
- A further problem concerns the timetabling and locating of the teaching times and places for the summer school program. It needs better coordination of some faculty offerings, an understanding of the likely commitments of prospective students, and probably, a decision to assign a few key building locations as designated teaching spaces for the summer program (but this latter will meet with opposition from those who want to teach in their usual locations - I have no in principle objection to this except to note that if the extra costs of servicing the teaching spaces become significant then it should be addressed).
- A more difficult problem to address is the need to complete semestrial examining and reporting in a much shorter time than at present, so that, desirably, students receive their results within two to three weeks of the completion of teaching and there is a clear week before or after the Christmas/New Year break to allow for orderly Summer School enrolment, followed by a comfortable time for completion of its program prior to the start of the following semester. This essentially asks for a review of our current academic calendar.

4. The 1999 Program

- I hope that a single physical location for a Summer School office and inquiry desk (combined), relatively easily accessible to students making personal inquiry, may be found very soon. It was costly and somewhat disruptive to have to operate from temporary sites for the 1998 program and at present staff are scattered around the campus in temporary locations. If a permanent office cannot be found near the Carslaw/Merewether area, then I would recommend relocating an inquiry desk/office setup to Carslaw from early December to end of Summer School, as was done this year, to simplify student access, but again I should point out that this level of disruption is costly. The early establishment of an informative website for the 1999 program is a 'must' in promotional terms, and this is difficult to achieve without a firm and suitable location for the operation.
- At present, I have assigned the period 4 January to 27 February for the 1999 Summer School, in order that it ends before semester 1 classes commence, but there is no leeway at the finish date and a tight gap at the beginning in relation to expected availability of 1998 semester 2 results. [At least I would expect that more departments would be releasing semester 1 results midyear in 1998 than was the case in 1997.]
- As a pre-emptive step, I have asked Room Bookings to place a 'block' on all spaces in some key buildings (Carslaw, Woolley, Merewether, Institute, Stephen Roberts) and some selected other spaces in other buildings, for the above period, as requests are already being

made by others for bookings in this period. Space will be released progressively as schedules become firmer.

- While consultations commenced with all Deans early in April regarding the planning of a program of UG/PG units of study for the next summer school, I think it would be useful, for this final pilot, to see if one or two other types of activities might also be incorporated. I am thinking of say a program in the performance/visual arts for talented school students, similar to U.S. 'pre-College' components, a high level professional development program involving some senior academics working with an expert professional group in one of the prestige professions, a program of public lectures that might be organised jointly with the Festival of Sydney, given by senior academic staff or visitors, and at least one offering of a unit of study taken overseas (such as the European art unit proposed for 1998), perhaps arranged jointly between the Summer School and Continuing Education in order to obtain a viable overall number.

5. **Summer School 1998 - Completions by result grade and unit of study**

Faculty of Arts

1st Year Units

PHIL 1003 Introduction to Metaphysics - 6 students

2 distinction

2 pass

2 AXX

Higher Year Units

ARHT 2021 Modernism - 6 students

4 distinction

1 credit

1 AXX

HSTY 2019 War and Society in the late modern world - 7 students

1 distinction

1 credit

5 pass

HSTY 2020 Australian Social History to 1914 - 13 students

2 distinction

5 credit

6 pass

Postgraduate Units

WMST 6005 Gender and Health - 8 students

1 high distinction

2 distinction

1 credit

3 pass

1 AXX

Faculty of Economics

1st Year Units

ACCT1001 Accounting 1A - 41 students

3 high distinction

13 distinction

18 credit

3 pass

3 XX

1 AXX

ACCT1002 Accounting 1B - 38 students

5 distinction

14 credit

19 pass

CLAW1001 Commercial Transactions A - 12 students
 3 distinction
 4 credit
 4 pass
 1 AXX

ECON1002 Introductory Macroeconomics - 30 students
 1 high distinction
 3 distinction
 6 credit
 13 pass
 7 XX

ECON1001 Introductory Microeconomics - 44 students
 1 high distinction
 4 distinction
 11 credit
 23 pass
 5 XX

IREL1002 Micro-Industrial Relations - 21 students
 1 distinction
 8 credit
 10 pass
 1 XX
 1 AXX

ECMT 1011 Econometrics 1A - 10 students
 1 distinction
 5 credit
 3 pass
 1 XX

ECMT 1021 Econometrics 1B - 13 students
 5 pass
 5 credit
 3 distinction

2nd Year Courses

CLAW2001 Corporations Law - 9 students
 5 credit
 3 pass
 1 AXX

ACCT2002 Management Accounting A - 13 students
 1 high distinction
 4 distinction
 4 credit
 4 pass

MKTG2001 Marketing Principles - 8 students
 1 high distinction
 4 distinction
 3 credit

ECON2001 Intermediate Microeconomics - 41 students
 2 high distinction
 4 distinction
 12 credit
 21 pass
 2 XX

ECON2002 Intermediate Macroeconomics - 43 students

3 high distinction
 5 distinction
 21 credit
 12 pass
 2 XX

FINC2001 Corporate Finance 1 - 26 students

3 distinction
 4 credit
 17 pass
 2 XX

FINC2002 Corporate Finance II - 20 students

5 credit
 12 pass
 3 XX

GOVT2401 Japanese Politics - 13 students

1 high distinction
 2 distinction
 4 credit
 3 pass
 2 XX
 1 AXX

Faculty of Science**1st Year Units****CHEM 1101 Chemistry 1A - 8 students**

1 high distinction
 1 distinction
 5 credit
 1 pass

COMP 1000 Information technology tools - 19 students

1 distinction
 5 credit
 7 pass
 5 XX
 1 AXX

MATH 1001 Differential calculus -14 students

2 credit
 6 pass
 1 conceded pass
 3 XX
 2 AXX

MATH 1002 Linear Algebra - 13 students

1 distinction
 3 credit
 4 pass
 3 XX
 2 AXX

MATH 1003 Integral Calculus and modelling - 10 students

1 credit
 3 pass
 1 conceded pass
 4 XX
 1 AXX

MATH 1005 Statistics - 16 students

1 high distinction

1 distinction

1 credit

5 pass

3 conceded pass

3 XX

2 AXX

**REPORT OF THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY PILOT
SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM HELD IN JANUARY/FEBRUARY 1998**

This report constitutes a short discussion of the issues whose importance became apparent in the process of evaluating the initial Sydney University Summer School (SS). The data on which this discussion is based are to be found in the extended reports of the results of the questionnaires to staff and students that form the basis of the evaluation, and of the interview with the Director of the SS. These are all attached as Appendices.

The major question for an external evaluator of the SS must be: how well did it do in its own terms? How successful was it in its own right? Three more specific evaluative questions were used to define and address this major question:

- A. Student learning and achievement in the SS - was this at least as satisfactory as or equivalent to that displayed by students in a normal semester?
- B. Staff and student satisfaction with the SS - was it a positive or negative experience for them?
- C. Did the SS generate appropriate/adequate revenue?

This report will deal with the first two questions. Concerning A. above, one overt measure of student achievement is the result or grade awarded at the conclusion of the unit of study. Compiled results for SS students are listed in Questionnaire 3. However, other intriguing and difficult questions concern the differences students perceive between the SS and a normal semester, and the possible differences in their motivation, behaviour and longer term learning outcomes when undertaking a unit of study in the SS in half the normal time. Long-term follow up of some of these issues is an interesting research prospect.

Concerning B. above, the feelings of achievement and satisfaction expressed by students during the SS are an important indicator of their commitment to learning in the SS, and by extension of the extent to which word of mouth endorsement or otherwise of the SS will influence its viability in the future. Similarly, the opinions of staff on these issues, and their approach to teaching in the SS form a valuable source of data in seeking to answer the question: was the SS successful in its own right?

Procedures

Three questionnaires were administered to SS students, in Week 3 (Student Questionnaire 1), Week 6 (Student Questionnaire 2), and Week 7, Assessment Week (Student Questionnaire 3). Response rates were 54.6%, 61.6% and 29.8% respectively of a total of 372 enrolled SS students. A questionnaire was sent to all staff teaching in the SS in the week after it concluded. The response rate to this was 77%. The Director of the SS was also interviewed.

Results and discussion

1. Teaching and Learning in the Summer School

The overwhelming and strongest impression from all the evaluative data is the extent to which both students and staff appreciated teaching and learning in small groups. There are continual comments from students that the small numbers meant that individual attention was possible, and both staff and students commented repeatedly that this led to interaction, improved motivation, increased focus, and better learning - and that this was enjoyable for both parties. One cannot read the responses without being struck by these expressions of satisfaction.

In spite of the short time frame of the SS, the flow-on effects of this positive response to small groups seem enormous - for example, as can be seen in the Staff Questionnaire responses, staff thought that student motivation was higher than in a normal semester, and attributed this primarily to small classes. This in turn is reflected in student results and the perception by 60% of students that they had learned course material more effectively than in a normal semester (see Student Questionnaire 3), and in most students' perceptions (89%) that the teaching was good (see Student Questionnaire 2).

It might be noted that in the week of 23/3/98 advertisements appeared in the Sydney Morning Herald for the Hawaii Pacific University. "Small classes not exceeding 20" was a prominent feature in the list of attractions for studying there. In the same way Sydney

University's Summer School could if it wished make a feature of this, as a selling point, and word of mouth would soon support this aspect of the SS - as it is, 81% of student respondents thought the SS was worthwhile and would recommend it.

2. Fees

When invited to send a message about the SS to the University, by far the largest category of response referred to the cost of the SS. What Sydney University strikes as an SS rate in the future may be a matter for discussion, but many students found it very expensive, not competitive with the SS rates at other universities, and wondered why it could not be subject to HECS. This last point may need to be explained to potential students before they enrol.

3. Workload

In spite of the halving of a normal semester's time, student comments about workload and the amount of time available for study were surprisingly positive eg 62% of students were reasonably satisfied that they did enough work (a further 19% were well satisfied). Even when the responses of job holders were isolated (see Student Questionnaire 2) 39/106 said they had been able to give enough attention to their SS work. Staff thought that workload did not seem to be an overwhelming problem for students. However, the difficulties of a short time frame should not be underestimated, as there were continual comments about this from students eg that there was not enough time to absorb ideas, and when asked what the single worst thing was about the SS the largest response was "too much to cram in/too fast/too short".

It was the issue of assessment that seemed to be the area in which time constraint was most apparent. Some students felt harried by continuous assessment ie a test every fortnight, but a few thought that this was a good way to be kept working. However, there were some comments from students that there was not enough time to prepare for the exam, and a staff member noted that the research essay was not well done because of the lack of time for reading and thinking.

It is suggested that students be made fully aware before enrolment of the workload requirements in the SS.

4. Paid work

Nearly 50% of students said they had a paid job of some sort (Student Questionnaire 2). It seems also that a few gave up their job to cope with the SS. A few others reported taking holidays to fit in with SS times. Responses seem to show that while it was often very difficult, it was not impossible to combine SS with paid work. As there would seem to be no point in trying to deter students with jobs from enrolling in the SS, staff expectations of study, attendance and assessment requirements should be made quite clear to potential students who intend to continue with paid work during the SS.

5. Accelerated degree/making good

Students' motivations for enrolling in the SS are not clear-cut - in Student Questionnaire 1, 38% said their major reason for undertaking SS was to make good a previously failed unit. However, in Student Questionnaire 2, 59% reported in another context that they were repeating a course in which they had previously failed. It seems that this category blends for students with the next largest reason for enrolment ie to accelerate their degree. The opportunity to do this was consciously appreciated by many SS students eg when asked what the best thing was about the SS the single largest category of response was "getting extra units/speeding up the course" and this factor may well be the source of a continuing supply of SS enrollees in the future.

It is interesting that almost all those students repeating a unit who chose to comment on their experience of redoing it in the SS perceived this to be a positive experience (Student Questionnaire 2).

6. Physical venue and facilities

There were enough adverse comments about the airconditioning in Merewether to encourage future organisers to arrange for a better teaching and learning environment than this year's

SS provided in that venue. As a few students said, for the money they pay they would expect something better. Library hours were extended during the SS but there were still some comments from staff and students about lack of access to Fisher.

In summary - was it worthwhile? Was it a success in its own right?

The overwhelming impression from staff and students is that the majority found it a worthwhile and sometimes pleasurable experience even if it was hard work. All staff respondents said they enjoyed it, and 81% of student respondents said they found it worthwhile and would recommend it.

While the reasons for its success have been canvassed above, one of the major reasons for this positive attitude would seem to be due to staff and students' experiences in the small classes. What seems to come across in staff responses is that with small classes there is much more interaction with students, and that staff like this, both because it is a more enjoyable approach to teaching and because it is better for student learning. The other impression, which comes through in many staff and student responses, is that in the SS the students are more receptive and more motivated and that, as a result, staff are willing to make more effort. A happy state of affairs. How can we incorporate it in to normal semesters?

Jacqueline Lublin
External Evaluator

March, 1998

Questionnaire to Summer School Teachers

This questionnaire was administered in the week following the conclusion of the Summer School ie after the week in which final assessments were carried out. There were 23 responses, which represents about 77% of all Summer School teachers. Responses are recorded in raw scores out of 23.

Most SS teachers were Sydney University employees	20
Full-time PhD students	2
Other (no further description)	1

- Overall, staff reported a very positive response to the SS, both in their own attitudes towards it and in their perceptions that students had also enjoyed it. Their positive attitudes are consistently reflected in the quantitative results of the Staff Questionnaire and in the written comments they made.
- Staff were asked about their perception of student motivation in the SS. Responses were that student motivation seemed to be

higher than in a normal semester	16
about the same	3
lower than in a normal semester	3

Reasons most often given by staff to explain a higher than usual level of motivation in students included the fact of small classes (mentioned most often) in which it was easier to question the teacher and in which bonding and rapport between teacher and student was likely to happen.. Other reasons for good motivation referred to more extrinsic factors like the fact that students were paying to attend and that “catch-ups” had to pass. Other responses referred to students choosing to do SS units rather than being required to do them, and having less opportunity to be bored. One staff member reported that students themselves rated their own motivation higher than in a normal semester. Some outcomes of improved motivation were seen to be better tutorial attendance, and prereading being done.

- Staff were asked whether students seemed to have problems with the amount of work expected of them in the SS. While there was some spread of opinion here:

about half seemed to have problems	6
fewer than half seemed to have problems	9
hardly any seemed to have problems	6

it is clear from these responses that in general staff thought that the workload did not seem to be too much of a problem for students. However, several staff commented explicitly that those students who also had a paid job, and students doing two units - and the even more unfortunate combination of the two - did find it difficult to cope with the workload. This is echoed in a comment from another section of the questionnaire concerning the amount of work expected of students, to the effect that counselling should be offered before the SS starts. Other comments made about the issue of workload are interesting and provocative in terms of student learning - that six weeks gave too little time for reinforcement of material, that there was not enough time to do the reading (one day between lecture and tute), that essays and revision were done together, and that NESB students had difficulty keeping up with the reading.

- Staff were asked how their perceptions of the depth, rigour and quality of students' learning in the SS, as seen in their assessment products, compared with that in a normal semester. Staff thought that

it was better	10
about the same	10
less	3

than in a normal semester. One staff member was “pleasantly surprised” by students' good performance, while several ascribed it to small classes and hence more individual contact and help. Students' enthusiasm was mentioned and two staff mentioned lower or no failure rate as evidence. Again there were a few thoughtful reservations expressed about the effect of the SS format on student learning - that there was little time to absorb material (a lot of it required by the professional body), and that the required research essay did not have the depth due to time constraints. This lack of time is echoed in comments elsewhere in the responses: one staff member suggested the SS should be a week longer, while another

suggested it should begin before Christmas, with the break allowing an opportunity for reading, thinking and writing.

5. Staff were asked how much face-to-face out of hours contact SS students had wanted. Interestingly, most thought that SS students, compared with students in a normal semester, wanted either

about the same	9
less	9
(more)	4)

face-to-face contact. Most staff who said students had wanted less attributed this to the small class sizes in which students got virtually individual attention. One perceptive staff response said that questions were encouraged in class because the answers would benefit all students and thus reduce the need for out-of-hours contact. On a more sober note, one staff member who thought students wanted less gave as a reason student exhaustion after two three-hour sessions per week.

6. Staff were asked what teaching methods they used in the SS and whether they had made changes to their normal ways of teaching. It is most interesting that 13 respondents explicitly referred to increased interaction and student participation through the use of group discussions, and less formal lecturing, with more use of questions and discussion. As an example, one staff member said that he/she usually taught 130 students but had 9 in the SS class, and so a round-table discussion format was adopted. Several staff mentioned the possibilities for individual attention for students in small classes, a feeling reflected in responses elsewhere in which there were several spontaneous expressions of pleasure at having been able to teach the subject to a small group rather than a large class. Other teaching changes made in the SS included field trips, more problems addressed, less volume and more conceptual depth presented, and a slower pace adopted (one staff member used the four hours for three hours of work).

7. It will be pleasing to learn that all respondents enjoyed the SS experience:

yes, very much	11
yes	12

Six comments referred to the pleasure of teaching a small group of keen students, while several staff referred to the good rapport, "bonding" and general enjoyment of both staff and students. Other comments referred to more receptive students, lighter workload for staff, that they enjoyed teaching, that it was rewarding, and that it was good to see enthusiastic administrators. However, there were also a few comments to the effect that it was very tiring, there was a big rush at the end, and that the exams were too close to teaching.

8. Suggestions to improve the SS experience in the future were in general down to earth and sensible. There were six comments about venue, most being about the lack of airconditioning but staff also referred to problems with locked doors and the need to have rooms cleaned before SS began. Three staff suggested better library hours, while one asked if Wentworth could provide for evening students, there being nothing available in Merewether. There were a few comments on time tabling problems, and two comments on problems with contractual/pay issues. Two staff members suggested that the SS be extended, while a few mentioned the 3-4 hour block as being too long.

One staff member suggested that students should be tested on Week 2 as a "warning" ie to allow them to withdraw gracefully, another asked that all teaching times be declared, as it had been difficult to arrive at a suitable tutorial time. Other suggestions were that students be counselled about the required workload, dissuaded from taking a concurrent paid job, warned that late enrolment would entail missing a significant amount of the course, and that NESB students should have essay writing classes during the SS.

In summary, from the point of view of staff it is clear that the SS was a success and that staff enjoyed the experience.

Student Questionnaire 1 (Week 3)

This questionnaire aimed to get immediate feedback in areas where changes could be made during the SS, and it was also directed at acquiring information about motivation to enrol and students' perceptions at that stage of the SS of their workload.

There were 203 responses to the first questionnaire, which represented 54% of all student enrolment in the SS. Faculties were represented in the responses in the following proportions:

Arts	18%
Economics	58%
Science	21%

1. Students were asked why they enrolled in the SS. The single largest category was previously failed subject (38%); however, a total of 27% said that they did so primarily to accelerate their degree studies, while 19% said the SS subject was a prerequisite for intended future study. It is interesting that 5 students (2.5%) said they enrolled primarily for interest /fun.
2. Students were asked whether the resources they needed on campus were available. 59% said everything was available: there were suggestions about more extended hours for Fisher from 11%, and a few other minor complaints and suggestions eg. more food outlets needed (2.5%). It is to be noted that the Director of the SS acted immediately on this feedback to have library hours extended.
3. Students were asked whether they had expected to encounter the workload that they were currently experiencing (workload was defined here as the amount of their own time required for successful study of an SS unit). It will be reassuring to learn that 55% of respondents said that it was much as they had expected; although 41% said that it was more than expected, this comprised 34% who said it was a bit more, while only 7% said it was much more.
4. Students were asked how well they thought at this stage they were coping with the workload. Again, staff will be reassured to learn that at this stage of the SS 25% said they were coping quite well, while 65% said they were managing to cope with it. Only 10% said it was a struggle.

Student Questionnaire 2 (Week 6)

This questionnaire was administered in the last teaching week of the SS, in order to canvass student opinion of the whole SS experience apart from final assessment, which was the subject of a third questionnaire. The number of responses to the second questionnaire was 229, which represented 61% of all students enrolled.

1. Students were asked their opinion of the teaching in the SS. Responses were overwhelmingly favourable, with 89% saying it was good /very good in equal proportions. This should be a source of satisfaction to teaching staff. Students reported repeatedly that the reason for this was the small class numbers, and staff in turn seem to have adapted their teaching styles to capitalise on this benefit.
2. Were class times convenient? 83% said they were quite convenient.
3. Students were asked if they were satisfied with the amount of work that they did in their own time. This question was meant to be complementary to the questions about perception of workload in the first questionnaire, and does in fact tend to reflect those responses ie. while 19% were well satisfied, 62% were reasonably satisfied that they did enough work. However, 18% were rather or quite dissatisfied with the amount they did.
4. 72% of respondents said they attended all formal contact hours. Reasons given by the other 28% who did not mainly mentioned illness as a reason. One person candidly said they had "been distracted by holiday activities".
5. Because of staff concern about the previous issues of workload, attendance and available time for study, students were asked if they were holding a job at the same time as they were attending the SS. Results here are illuminating. While 50% of respondents said they did not have a job during the SS, most of the rest had a job of some sort, with 7% (17 students) reporting a full time paid job. Three students said they had to abandon a full-time job in order to cope with the SS. Interestingly, statistical tests show that students with full-time jobs were significantly less likely to be repeating failed units in the SS.

38% of respondents reported that they had a part-time job. The range of self-definition of "part-time" was enormous:

The highest number of hours reported as a part-time job was 32! The following paragraph and Paragraph 9 are both based on the responses of the group of students who reported holding a paid job of some sort - 106 or 46% of all respondents to this Questionnaire.

Students were asked about the extent to which they were able to give adequate attention to their SS work (this question was thought to be particularly pertinent to the job holders). Rather surprisingly, the single largest response was that they had had enough time to do so - 39/106. However, 12 said it had been difficult and 9 said there had not been enough time. Several respondents commented on positive aspects which were helpful, eg reading ahead, redoing the; course, having a good tutor, the intensity and focus. One said that studying was a good break from the monotony of work.

In view of the intense nature of teaching and learning in the SS it is suggested that potential students in future might be specifically informed of the expectations staff hold about students' willingness and ability to engage with learning in the subject. These might include, for example, expectations of workload, need for attendance.

6. 59% of all respondents said they were repeating a course in which they had previously failed. On the one hand this constitutes the majority of students enrolled, but on the other hand 41% of enrolments were for reasons other than making good a failed subject eg. to accelerate the degree, to get a headstart. Both motivations would seem to bode well for the viability of the SS. Students repeating a course reported generally that their experience of redoing it in the SS was very positive: it was clearer, more intense, easier, the teaching was better, classes smaller, it was pleasanter, there was more interaction with teachers.
7. It is interesting to note that while 37% of all respondents had enrolled for 8 credit points, 30% said they had enrolled for more than 8 points. The vast majority of respondents - 86% - would recommend the number of points they enrolled in to future students.

8. It will be gratifying for SS organisers to learn that 81% of respondents found the SS worthwhile and would recommend it, while 18% would do so with reservations.
9. Messages to the university:
Students were asked what messages they would send back to the university about the SS that might improve its operation in the future. By far the largest group of messages - 25/106 - referred to the cost of the SS: it was too expensive, should be HECS, the cost is not competitive with other universities' Summer Schools. Other messages referred to the wish for a wider range of subjects to be on offer (6), problems with library hours (4) problems with the airconditioning (4). There were a few references to the lack of time to prepare for exams, to the need to provide the best teachers in the SS, and a variety of times and formats were suggested for lectures and tutes. There were individual references to the need to get more information to students, that the SS office hours must suit SS students, and that better enrolment procedures would be appreciated. There was a specific comment that library ID and Sports Union entitlements were delayed, and several general expressions of pleasure in the SS experience.

Student Questionnaire 3, Assessment Week (Week 7)

This final questionnaire was administered to students after they had undertaken all required assessment tasks for their unit(s). The hope was that they would be able to reflect on the total experience of the SS including the assessment procedures. However, because of the timing of this questionnaire the response rate was disappointingly low - 111 or 29% of the total student body. Thus one can place less confidence on the results of this questionnaire in being able to extrapolate to the total student group. Nevertheless with that caveat the results are recorded here for the sake of interest.

1. Students were asked what results they thought they would get. The following are the frequency distributions of student expectations matched against the frequency distributions of their actual results:

	Expected results	Actual results
HD	.9%	3.2%
D	8.1%	13.7%
C	41.4%	31.1%
P	43.2%	38.6%
Other*	6.5%	13.3%

* includes 5 Conceded Pass

Cumulative proportions of grades recommended by Academic Board (1996) are:

	%HD	%D+	%C+
First Year	3	14	42
Senior/upper	4	18	50

2. One of the most difficult issues in evaluating an SS is to decide how to investigate whether the depth and quality of student learning is different to the learning that occurs in a normal length semester. Student results and the quality of their assessment artefacts are one source of evidence, and they are addressed in the Staff Questionnaire. In Questionnaire No 3 to students the question was asked: "Do you consider that you have learned the material as effectively as if you had learned it over a conventional semester's length?"
The responses to this question are perhaps surprising, and reinforce the strong impression in the three student questionnaires that the SS experience was a very positive one, as 60% of respondents said that they had learned the material more effectively than in a normal semester, and a further 17% made positive comments eg that there was less pressure and that they received personal attention. It should be noted however that 22% said that there was not enough time to absorb ideas.
3. Two-thirds of respondents said that they had received enough feedback from teaching staff to know how they were going, but 5% said they did not receive sufficient for this purpose.
4. 77% of respondents thought the assessment was a fair test of the subject matter. However, there was a spread of opinion concerning the amount and timing of assessment, with 27% saying it was good but 14% indicating it was too rushed with too little time to think. As 36% did not answer this question these results are merely suggestive.

5. The best things about the SS were seen to be:
- | | |
|--|-----|
| getting extra units/speeding up the course | 33% |
| smaller classes/fewer people | 11% |
| good teaching | 10% |
| stronger focus/less distraction | 8% |
| given personal attention | 5% |
| better learning | 5% |
| passing failed subject | 4% |
| 16% did not answer this question | |
6. The worst things about the SS were seen to be:
- | | |
|--|-----|
| too much to cram in/too fast/too short | 26% |
| hot weather | 12% |
| fees/expense | 10% |
| hard to concentrate in summer | 5% |
| problems with airconditioning | 4% |
| 23% did not answer this question. | |

Interview with Dr John Mack, Director of the Summer School, held 23/3/98

Dr Mack confirmed that from his point of view the Summer School was a success. He attributed this to:

- the willingness of Sydney University staff to be involved in the Summer School;
- the positive attitudes expressed by these staff at the conclusion of the Summer School;
- the positive attitudes of students he spoke to;
- the commitment of most students to working in the Summer School, although he worried about those “made” to do it;
- the contact made between Summer School teachers and the Centre for Teaching and Learning prior to commencement.

Dr Mack commented that attention would need to be paid to:

- class scheduling;
- making available common space for use by Summer School students;
- the need for contact numbers for international students who enrol;
- earlier decision - making about the viability of individual units;
- all Summer School staff should use the CTL questionnaire to get feedback on their teaching;
- giving earlier and better advice to potential students and staff;
- producing an information sheet for enrolled students before teaching begins concerning workload, teaching and assessment requirements.

Amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate**Faculty of Health Sciences****Bachelor of Health Science**

The Resolutions of the Senate relating to the degree of Bachelor of Health Science are amended to the following effect from 1 January 1999:

- section 1 of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the degree of Bachelor of Health Science is amended by inserting new sub-section (c), Hearing and Speech; and by relettering existing subsections (c) to (f) as (d) to (g) (pp 363-366, 1996 Calendar, Vol. I)
- section 2 (1) of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the grade of Honours degree in the degree of Bachelor of Health Science is amended by inserting new sub-section (c), Hearing and Speech
- the list of tables relating to Bachelor of Health Science is amended by inserting the following new Table C:

TABLE C - Hearing and Speech**C.1 - Pass Course (3 year full-time)****Year 1**

Introductory Psychology
 Cognitive and Developmental Psychology
 Research Methods I: Design
 Disorders and their Management
 Introductory Human Biology
 Introductory Neurobiology
 Neurobiology I
 Hearing Science
 Speech Science I
 Speech Science II
 Linguistics
 Professional Development I: Introduction to Clinical Learning
 Phonetics I
 Articulation and Phonology
 Normal Communication Development

Year 2

Cognitive Neuropsychology I
 Research Methods II: Data Analysis
 Neurobiology II for Communication Disorders
 Voice Science and Disorders
 Language Impairments in Children I
 Language Impairments in Children II
 Stuttering
 Professional Development IIA: Clinical Skills
 Professional Development IIB: Clinical Skills
 Phonetics II
 Audiology I
 Audiological Management I
 Speech & Language Impairments of Neurological Origin I
 Communication Disorders Clinical I
 Communication Disorders Clinical II

Year 3

Cognitive Neuropsychology II
 Sociology I
 Sociology II
 Patient Management: Theories and Applications
 Social and Health Psychology
 Neurology for Communication Disorders

Audiological Management II
Auditory Perception and Processing
Communication Impairments in Special Populations
Language Impairments in Children III
Professional Development III: Management Skills
Audiology II
Craniofacial Anomalies
Communication Disorders Clinical III
Communication Disorders Clinical IV
C.2 - Honours Course (4 year full-time)
Year 1 - As for Pass Course
Year 2 - As for Pass Course
Year 3 - As for Pass Course
Year 4
Honours Paper I
Honours Paper II
Honours Thesis

- the list of tables relating to Bachelor of Health Science is amended by relettering existing Tables C to F as D to G.

Learning Assistance Centre
Report to the Teaching and Learning Committee
2 April 1998

This report summarises the teaching and teaching related activities of the Learning Assistance Centre (LAC) from January to April, 1998.

LAC's main teaching activities are:

- (i) a Central Workshop Program (to develop students' generic academic skills)
a Faculty-based Program (to develop students' generic academic skills within the context of their discipline)
- (ii) an Independent Learning Program (ILP).

Since 1991 the staffing level has remained about the same with the equivalent of approximately 5 full-time academic staff. While the number of student enrolments in the Central Program has remained about the same for the last three years, the number of workshops offered and the number of student registrations in the workshops has increased. Once enrolled, students tend to register in 2 or more workshops throughout the year.

Table 1 below provides a summary of teaching staff, number of workshops offered in the Central, ILP and Faculty Teaching Programs, student profile over the last 2 years.

Table 1: Summary of LAC Services, 1996 and 1997

	1996	1997
LAC teaching staff		
<i>Equivalent full-time teaching staff</i>	4.8	4.7
Central Teaching Program		
<i>Number of student enrolments</i>	1107	1095
<i>Number of workshops registrations</i>	2719	2812
<i>Number of Central workshops offered</i>	158	192
<i>Number of hours</i>	1098	902
Student Profile of Central Program		
<i>Number of Local students</i>	804 (72.6%)	794 (72.5%)
<i>Number of International students</i>	303 (27.4%)	301 (27.5%)
<i>Number of undergraduate students</i>	634 (57.3%)	654 (59.7%)
<i>Number of postgraduate students</i>	473 (42.7%)	441 (40.3%)
Faculty Teaching Program		
<i>Number of students taught</i>	682	1336
<i>Number of workshops</i>	22	31
<i>Number of hours</i>	73.5	145.5
<i>Number of faculties</i>	8	8
<i>Number of departments</i>	15	17

1998

Central Program

In 1998 the LAC has so far offered **46** workshops, representing **217** teaching hours. **408** students have enrolled in these workshops. Most students enrolled in more than 1 workshop. Attendance figures have not yet been finalised.

ILP

21 students have so far received individual assistance, mostly for study skills/time management.

Faculty Program

A large component of our current work is with Faculty and this work has grown rapidly in the last two years. From February to April this year, the LAC has been involved in teaching and teaching related activities in various departments in 11 Faculties, involving **96** teaching contact hours, for the benefit of over 1500 students (see Table 2). Some of the non-teaching activities are also shown below marked**.

The Faculty-based Program offers a range of activities , e.g. discrete ‘add-on’ workshops on generic skills offered outside the award course (using the content of the discipline); diagnostic assessment of students’ literacy skills across a whole cohort; collaborative curriculum design of a whole or part of a course, where skills are embedded into the disciplinary content; team teaching of skills-based workshops with department staff; lectures and tutorials on generic skills as part of an award course; packages of learning resources for student and staff use (some computer-based). The increase in demand for these kinds of activities may reflect the growing interest within departments across the institution in the value of integrating the development of generic skills into course curricula and the value of providing academic learning support within a disciplinary context. An evaluation strategy is being planned to measure the impact of these activities on students’ course assessment results.

Table 2: Programs conducted co-operatively with faculties and departments Feb - Apr 1998

FACULTY Dept/Student Group	Title of Workshop	Number of Students	Number of teaching Hours
AGRICULTURE			
1 st year AgEcon and AgSc u/grads	Study Skills	80	0.5
ARCHITECTURE			
Architecture + Design Science BSc(hons)	Research Methods + Writing skills	15	10
Architecture 6th Year	Literature review	50	10
Architecture 1st + 2nd year	Essay Writing	120est	2
ARTS			
**Asian Studies 1st year	Feedback on Diagnostic Writing Task Materials development on Academic Literacy	200est	N/A
CONSERVATORIUM			
Undergrads	Essay Writing	100est	2
DENTISTRY			
Dentistry 1 st year u/grad	Study Strategies for Lectures	64	1
ENGINEERING			
**Electrical Engineering 1 st year u/grads	Diagnostic Assessment of Writing CBL software on Grammar Report Writing materials	270	N/A
ACIIC (new postgrads)	Introd to Thesis Writing	15	1
GSB			
All students (Int and Local)	Academic Orientation	60	2
All students (Int and Local NESB)	Academic Skills Program	20	32
LAW			
Law (non-specific group)	Critical Reading and Analytical Writing	100est	8
MEDICINE			
Pharmacology Hons	Thesis Proposal,+ Literature Review	15	4
NURSING			
Nursing Grad Dip & Master Dr Sandra West/Helen Bonanno	Orientation for postgraduate study	50	1.5
1 st year u/grads	Essay Writing	100est	4
Diploma in Midwifery students	Assignment Writing	90	4
**Master of Nursing Clinical Care	**Research Methods Handbook Support Workshops on Handbook	11	6
Perioperative Nursing Grad Diploma	Writing a Critical Review	20est	2
SCIENCE			
**Biological Sciences 2nd year Botany	Writing a Lab Report (CBL module)	100est	N/A
Pharmacy 3rd year	Oral Communication Skills	20	6
	TOTAL	150est	95