



Academic Board

Meeting held on Wednesday 13 May 1998

Minutes of the meeting of the Academic Board held at 2 pm on Wednesday 13 May 1998 in the Professorial Board Room.

There were present: the Chair (Professor R Pesman) presiding, the Deputy Chairs (Professors D J H Cockayne, J R Lawrence, R McPhedran and A Sefton), the Acting Deputy Chair (Associate Professor M Painter), the Acting Vice-Chancellor (Professor K Eltis), Professors C Adam and D Anderson, Associate Professor R Arnold, Dr R Bohringer, Professors L W Burgess and B Cass, Mr T Clark, Associate Professors D Davey, D Dragovich, C J Durrant and D Farnill, Professors L D Field, D R Fraser and G J Gill, Associate Professor C B Gillies, Dr D P Godden, Professors M A Harris, R Hewitt, H Kendig and S R Leeder, Mr S Lojewski, Ms N M Maclaren, Associate Professor A F Masters, Drs P McCallum, M Peat, P Phibbs and A Reynolds, Professors W Schworm, G Sherington, V Spate and G P Steven, Associate Professor G M Stone, Professors T Walter and J Webber, Messrs T J Wilkinson, R Wilson and L Whittington and Dr G Wright.

Present as observers were: Dr W Adams (Secretary of the Academic Board), Professor L M Koder, Professor D Napper, Mr J Shipp and Professors D Siddle and D Weisbrot.

Present by invitation were: Ms N Downey, Associate Professor T Koppi and Mrs L Rose.

In attendance: Miss E R Ring.

P 46/98 Starring

Members of the Board were invited to star any unstarred item which they wished to have discussed. All other items were dealt with as recommended in the agenda.

*** The Board resolved as recommended with respect to all unstarred items.

47/98 Minutes

1. Minutes of the meeting held on 15 April 1998

*** The Board confirmed the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 15 April 1998 as a correct record.

2. Business arising out of the minutes

None.

48/98 Report of the Chair

The following reports had been circulated and tabled:

(see agenda and supplementary agenda item A4.)

Part I

1. Report on Senate Matters

*** The Board noted the report.

P 2. **University Library: Cancellation of Serials**

The Chair reported that she had asked Mr Shipp to brief the Board on the reasons for the cuts to serials and she invited an open discussion of the issue.

Mr Shipp reported in the following terms:

The cost of serials subscriptions had been rising for years due in part to cost of production increases but largely due to the increasing monopolisation of academic publishing by a small number of multinational companies. Between 1997 and 1998 alone, the average publication cost of serials increased by 11%. The situation had been worsened by a 20% devaluation of the Australian dollar since September 1997.

The Library had been able to use its financial reserves to cushion the effects of increased serials costs, but those reserves had now been depleted. Cancellation of 20% of the value of current subscriptions was unavoidable despite the Library being exempted from the 3.5% cut which was applied to almost all other University units.

As there was no immediate expectation of additional income for the Library, the situation had to be addressed by a reduction in the major expenditure areas — staffing and information resources. A comparison of Library expenditure over the past few years showed a relative decrease in salary expenditure and an increase on collections. The ratio of salary, information resources and operating expenditure was similar to that in other large Australian university libraries.

Further cancellations of about \$729,000 were anticipated for 1999. He recognised that the time available for effecting the cuts was an impediment to extensive discourse but it was dictated by circumstances. Improved procedures would be developed for the future. He also recognised that there was concern about the application of a 20% cut to all faculties. Alternate strategies, such as differential rates for the various disciplines, would be considered in the future. One of the strategies that needed to be considered was the provision of an allocation to 'academic units' which would enable them to determine their priorities in terms of what serials, monographs and other information resources should be acquired.

Long-term strategies were needed which linked University priorities and Library activities. There was also a need for increased rationalisation of library holdings in the metropolitan area and for collaborative activities. The demands upon libraries were ever-increasing with a proliferation of teaching programs across the metropolitan area and the pressure for research output. The universities in New South Wales had established a list of expensive serials of which UNSW and Sydney together held half the titles. There was an expectation by some smaller universities that Sydney should be the last bastion for serials, as indeed it was already in many cases. The universities were lobbying publishers, but consideration also needed to be given to other issues such as how the results of research were published and disseminated, as continued publication in commercial journals only exacerbated the situation, as did authors assigning their intellectual property to publishers. More consideration needed to be given to electronic publication as a means of lessening the grip of large commercial publishers on library budgets.

Mr Shipp said that in the long term the problems faced by the Library were problems for the whole University.

The Chair thanked Mr Shipp for his comments and asked that debate focus on solutions to the problems of how priorities were to be established in the event of further cuts to the Library's budget and of how further funding for the Library might be found.

During the ensuing discussion, the following points were made:

Allocation of University funding to the Library

- The University needed to work out its priorities in terms of the proportion of its funding that should go to the University Library and decide in crude terms whether it should allocate 5 to 5.5% or 7% of the budget to the Library. This issue should be addressed by Senate.
- There was a need to reconsider the basis for the allocation of funds from the University budget to the University Library and how the Library allocated purchasing power to the departments.

Collaboration with other libraries

- The costs for the retention of titles should be able to be shared with a consortium, and an ambitious collaborative approach taken to the library use of dwindling tertiary funds.
- As set out in item 1 of the Research Committee report, the cutting of serials could have a major impact on the teaching and research of the University, and more effort had to be made to collaborate with other universities to ensure that at least one subscription of each important serial was maintained.
- Where Sydney was the last holder of a title, its position should not be regarded as invidious, but should rather be looked upon with pride.

Alignment of Library with research and teaching priorities

- There was wide acceptance of the view that the University needed to articulate its strengths and priorities in research, and that this was of strategic importance over the next five years. If this were done, there was an argument that those areas designated as being of research strength and priority should be shielded from cuts.

Planning for the University Library

- It was suggested that the University Librarian be asked to look at the planning processes in other university libraries as well as their funding sources and allocations and academic priorities.

Basis of allocations to departments

- While a 20% cut across the boards appeared equitable, the historic basis for allocations to departments needed to be re-examined.
- The usage of serials needed to be determined.

Particular need of humanities and social sciences

- Libraries provided the basic infrastructure for the humanities and social sciences.
- In concentrating on the cuts to serials, the discussion was avoiding the equally important area of monograph holdings.

Need to consult students

- The primary users group, that is undergraduate students, needed to be consulted in respect of the services provided by the Library.

Mr Shipp referred to the request of the Chair of the Board to the Library and Information Technology Committee to review its role and function. A recommendation might emerge for the creation of a Library Committee.

The Chair said that it was apparent from the discussion that members were of the view that the planning process should start now for next year. She sought the Board's advice on whether it wished to ask the Library and Information Technology Committee to address the matter. Professor Cass suggested that the LITC might not be the most appropriate body; the use of new technology would not necessarily provide the best solutions to the problem. The Chair suggested that the Library Reference Group of the LITC could be asked to address the matter, to start work now and report back to the Board.

There was no dissent from this proposed course of action.

Professor McPhedran, Chair of the LITC, said that he and Professor Harris, Chair of the LITC Library Reference Group, would address the issue, in consultation with the Pro-Vice-Chancellors (College), and would strengthen the membership of the Library Reference Group.

P 3. Constitution of the Teaching Awards Committee

Mr Wilkinson expressed concern about the proposal to remove the provision for membership of the Teaching Awards Committee for an undergraduate student, and his comments were endorsed by Mr Clark. Professor Sefton reported that the Teaching and Learning Committee had discussed this issue and had agreed that provision should be made for membership for an undergraduate student.

*** The Board amended the constitution of the Teaching Awards Committee as recommended, subject to the inclusion in the constitution of an undergraduate student member nominated by the President of the SRC.

4. Conferring of Titles

*** The Board delegated authority to the Chair as requested.

P 5. Higher School Certificate Review

In reply to a request from Associate Professor Masters for further information on the equity and resource implications of providing HSC students with greater access to University units of study, the Chair referred to the issues of the fees that would be charged and the responsibility for their payment and to the fact that not all students would have access to the units of study.

*** The Board noted the report.

6. Membership of the Board: President of the SRC

*** The Board noted the report and welcomed Mr Whittington to Board membership.

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

*** The Board noted the report.

8. Questions on notice

*** The Board noted that no questions were received this month.

P Part II

At the meeting the Chair reported on the following matters:

1. Welcome to new member

The Chair welcomed Mr Luke Whittington, the new President of the SRC, to his first Board meeting.

2. Nominations for honorary awards

In accordance with the policy of the Senate Advisory Committee for the Selection of Candidates Honorary Awards, the Chair asked for nominations for honorary degrees to be forwarded to the Registrar by July 31. Those eligible to make nominations were Deputy Vice-Chancellors, Pro-Vice-Chancellors, Deputy Principals, Deans/Directors/College Principals/Chairpersons of Boards of Studies and Professors. Submissions should be made in strict confidence. Detailed procedures and guidelines were available from the Senate Office.

3. Working Parties

Flexible learning

The Chair reported that the Board's Working Party on flexible learning, which had been set up following the April meeting of the Forum, had begun meeting and expected to make a report to the Board towards the end of the year.

"For the future"

In the wake of initiatives in the Faculties of Engineering and Medicine, the Chair reported that she was setting up a small working party 'for the future'. The purpose of the working party was to tap the ideas and priorities of some of the younger members of the academic community.

4. Postgraduate Review

The Chair referred to the item in the report of the Graduate Studies Committee that the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) with the support of the Chair of the Board was instigating a review of the management of higher degree studies in the University. The members of the review committee were:

Professor David Liljgreen (Dean of Graduate Studies, University of Adelaide) (Chair);
Professor Mary Lou Maher (Architecture);
Associate Professor Stephen Garton (History); and
Professor Roger Dampney (Physiology).

5. Distinction Courses

The Chair reported that the Board of Studies had now asked Vice-Chancellors in New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory to nominate representatives for a meeting to discuss the future of Distinction Courses. She had been asked to represent this University and would report back after the meeting took place.

49/98 Statement by the Acting Vice-Chancellor and Principal

The following reports had been circulated and tabled:

(see agenda and supplementary agenda item A5.)

Part I

1. Report on Senate Matters

*** The Board noted the report.

P

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

Professor Eltis reported that the Vice-Chancellors of both this University and the University of New South Wales had each appointed three members of staff to work on the merger. The University of Sydney members were Professor Weisbrot, Mr Slater and himself. A draft Memorandum of Understanding had now been signed by both Vice-Chancellors, and a Framework Agreement was going through a drafting process. He asked Professor Weisbrot to speak to the item.

Professor Weisbrot reported on the background and proposed nature of the merger.

Associate Professor Masters referred to the aim of the joint venture to create a “world class Business School” and asked what size school this would require; if the resources, staff and students were to come from previously untapped sources, the proposal would probably be worthy of support, but if they were to be drawn from existing academic programs, then the proposal needed to be considered most carefully.

Associate Professor Masters also referred to the “Rights on dis-establishment” of the joint venture (clause 19) and suggested a change of wording under paragraph (e) from “Each University must take such steps ...” to “The universities jointly must take such steps ...”. In respect of paragraph (f) on Intellectual Property, he suggested that any intellectual property developed by the new AGSM reside with the new AGSM rather than be available to the two universities.

Professor Walter, Acting Dean of the Faculty of Economics, sought the insertion of a clause in the agreement that the new AGSM would confine its teaching to generalist management education degrees, specifically the MBA, and that the new AGSM would not develop specialised programs such as a Master of Commerce, a Master of Applied Finance, a Master of International Business, etcetera. These specialist programs were to be considered as the responsibility of the Faculty of Economics at the University of Sydney and the Faculty of Commerce and Economics at the University of New South Wales. Professor Walter understood that the UNSW Academic Board had agreed to this insertion and that Professor Peter Dodd, Director of the AGSM, supported the clause.

Professor Walter raised a number of issues:

- Most of the revenue from the AGSM and GSB was from full fees. He asked how these would be taxed, given that the UNSW and Sydney tax requirements were different, with a greater proportion being retained centrally at UNSW than at Sydney. He asked if these arrangements would be brought into line.
- In respect of the section in the preamble providing that ... “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...”, Professor Walter said that there were already strong links to the business

community in Economics and most other faculties in the University. He asked whether the Vice-Chancellor and Pro-Vice-Chancellor were convinced that the merger would be good for the University as a whole.

- Professor Walter asked how students would be counted in DEETYA submissions and how the UNSW and Sydney research quantum would be determined.
- In respect of clauses 14.2 and 14.3 of the Draft Agreement, Professor Walter queried whether there were provisions for MCom students to be able to access units taught in MBA program and the continued existence of co-operative links.
- Professor Walter referred to the provision in clauses 4.9 and 4.10 of the Draft Agreement that both Vice-Chancellors had to consent to the Chairperson elected and the Dean and Director appointed, and asked what would happen if the Vice-Chancellors did not agree.

Professor Adam agreed to the insertion of a clause providing that the new AGSM would confine its teaching to generalist management education degrees, as had been agreed by UNSW.

Professor Weisbrot pointed out that the draft agreement already covered this point very adequately, by limiting non-competition to the MBA program alone (clause 14.3), and by requiring that any new award program mounted by the joint venture would need the consent of both universities (clause 14.1). Professor Weisbrot stated that he was happy to discuss fee "taxation" issues with Professor Walter and others at another time, but that this issue was not one which Academic Board normally considered in relation to other academic programs. With respect to research quantum, Professor Weisbrot said the current thinking was that it would be divided on a 1/3-2/3 basis between the two universities, according to the general organising principle of the joint venture, which reflects the relative contributions of the two universities to the new business school. In relation to the continued access of MCom students to units in the MBA course, Professor Weisbrot noted that the draft agreement contained a specific provision (clause 14.2) which guarantees "continued flexibility and open access" across the graduate programs offered by the joint venture and the respective economics and commerce faculties at the two universities. This had always been a non-negotiable point from this University's point of view, and there had been no objection from UNSW generally, or from the AGSM. Finally, in relation to the expressed aspiration to develop a "world class business school", Professor Weisbrot agreed that the merger in and of itself would not necessarily accomplish this, given the gap in resources between Australian universities and the leading institutions in America, Europe and Asia. He referred to the central message of the Karpin Report on management education in Australia which questioned the dilution of scarce resources in Australia and called for the marshalling of these resources behind a single, powerful business school. Professor Weisbrot indicated that currently neither the AGSM nor the GSB could hope to compete in this way internationally. However, the merger of two strong and prestigious business schools at two of the pre-eminent research universities in Australia, with the undivided support of the business community, was the best hope and a most realistic way of achieving this aim.

Professor Walter said that he was reassured by the answers to his concerns.

*** As the quorum was lost at 4.15 pm, it was agreed to hold an adjourned meeting of the Board at 1.30 pm on Monday 18 May 1998, with the specific purpose of considering this item and the recommendation (*viz*, that the Board endorse (*nihil obstat*) the academic aspects of the report and forward it to Senate for approval), the Chair having reported that Senate would debate the merger at its June meeting and hence it was important that it receive Board opinion.

P Part II

At the meeting, the Acting Vice-Chancellor, Professor Eltis, reported on the following matters:

1. Report on Senate Matters

Professor Eltis spoke to the written report on Senate matters and elaborated on some of the matters.

2. Federal Budget

The Budget handed down the previous evening confirmed a 1% reduction in funding.

3. Profile

The University Profile submission, which was required by 30 June, was being prepared in consultation with the Colleges. Consideration would need to be given to the issue of Library funding. DEETYA discussions with universities on their Profiles would be held in August/September.

4. Heads of Department Forum

Information had been sent out about the forthcoming Forum for Heads of Department; the Vice-Chancellor was keen to ensure that more grass roots input was made. Discussions would be held on the content of the Forum to be held on 17 and 18 June.

5. Copyright Tribunal Proceedings

Professor Eltis reported that the University, along with others, was involved in a Copyright Tribunal case about the copying of TV and radio broadcasts. The University wanted to ensure that it paid equitable remuneration for the copying of broadcasts to Screenrights, the copyright collecting society. The Copyright Tribunal had made an order about discovery of documents, and a request for information had been sent out, with a very tight timetable. It was hoped that the utmost cooperation would be given.

6. Review of Office of Facilities Planning

A review of the Office of Facilities Planning had been conducted last year, and, following the findings of the Review, its name had been changed to Facilities Management Office and its staffing structure had been reconfigured.

During the ensuing discussion on the Budget, Professor Siddle reported that while ARC funding would be increased by \$15 million for the next year, it was projected to decrease by \$62 million during the following two years. He also reported that research infrastructure block grants were projected to decrease by 50% during 1999 and 2000. NHMRC funding would be increased by \$175 over four years, but that this only restored the situation and in a sense did not represent "new" money.

P 50/98 Sydney Summer School Pilot Program

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item A13.)

*** The item was starred for discussion, but, as the quorum was lost, consideration of the item was deferred to the June Board meeting.

51/98 Report of the Faculty of Science

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item B15.)

Amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate

- 1. Constitution of the Faculty of Science**
- 2. Boards of Examiners, Board of Postgraduate Studies, Standing Committee and Standing Committee on Courses of Study**

*** The Board recommended that Senate amend its Resolutions as recommended.

52/98 Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C1.)

Part I

1. Faculty of Health Science

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

*** The Board recommended 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 Board, acting on behalf of Senate, approved the introduction of the new subject area of Hearing and Speech in the Bachelor of Health Science degree and amended the Resolutions of the Senate to effect it.

3. Proceedings of the Committee

- (1) Membership
- (2) Expansion of the Broadway Scheme
- (3) Admissions Working Party
- (4) Reference from the Academic Board
- (5) Simplification of result grades

*** The Board noted the report.

P

Part II

The quorum was lost, and no further report was presented.

53/98 Report of the Graduate Studies Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C2.)

Part I

Proceedings of the Committee

1. Membership of the Graduate Studies Committee
2. Membership of the PhD Award Sub-Committee
3. Report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee
4. Report of the Coursework Sub-Committee
 - (1) Position papers referred to faculties for comment
 - (2) Postgraduate Course structures
 - (3) Annual faculty reports on postgraduate teaching and reviews of postgraduate coursework
 - (4) Policy work in progress
5. Terms of reference of the Committee
6. Payment of examiners of higher degree theses
7. Exit Questionnaire
8. Meeting of Deans and Directors of Graduate Studies
9. Working Party on electronic submission and examination of theses
10. Higher doctorates

Admission to candidature and appointment of examiners

Award of degree
11. Review process for research students
12. Appointment of a Working Party to consider a proposal for a new postgraduate program
13. Embargoes on higher degree theses
14. Review of the management of higher degree studies
15. Australian Postgraduate Awards (APAs)
16. "Gradfest"

*** The Board noted the report.

P Part II

The quorum was lost, and no further report was presented.

54/98 Report of the Teaching and Learning Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C3.)

Part I**Proceedings of the Committee**

1. **Composition of the Committee**
2. **PVC (Teaching) position**
3. **Report of the Learning Assistance Centre**
4. **Two-day workshop on teaching**
5. **Guidelines for Excellence in Teaching Awards**
6. **Travel grant entitlements for teaching purposes**
7. **Flexible learning: guidelines for development of flexible delivery**
8. **Assessment policy draft**
9. **Faculty annual reports**

*** The Board noted the report.

P Part II

The quorum was lost, and no further report was presented.

55/98 Report of the Research Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C4.)

Part I

1. **University Library**
2. **Policy Review**
3. **Research Misconduct Policy Document (Draft)**
4. **Report of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research)**
5. **Other Business**

*** The Board noted the report.

P Part II

The quorum was lost, and no further report was presented.

56/98 Report of the Library and Information Technology Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C5.)

Part I**P 1. Staff and Student Access to the Intranet**

*** The item was starred for discussion, but, as the quorum was lost, consideration of the item was deferred to the June Board meeting.

2. Relationship between the LITC and ITC

*** The Board noted the report.

P Part II

The quorum was lost, and no further report was presented.

57/98 Report of the Academic Staffing Committee

The following report had been circulated:

(see agenda item C6.)

Part I

- 1. Report of the Sub-committee - Research Only Staff**
- 2. Academic Appointment Policy - Clarification re Confidentiality Clause**

*** The Board noted the report.

P

Part II

The quorum was lost, and no further report was presented.

58/98 Membership of Level E Central Promotion Committee - 1998

The following reports were circulated and tabled:

(see agenda and supplementary agenda item C7.)

*** The Board appointed the Committee members as recommended.