



Academic Board Agenda

Academic Board Officer: Miss E R Ring

Secretariat, Main Quadrangle, A14
Phone: 9351 3305; Fax: 9351 3572
E-mail: E.Ring@secretariat.usyd.edu.au
Web site: <http://www.usyd.edu.au/su/ab/>

NOTICE OF MEETING

A meeting of the **Academic Board** will be held at 2 pm on **Wednesday 14 March 2001** in the Professorial Board Room.

Members who are unable to attend are asked to notify Erica Ring at the above address. Enquiries concerning this meeting may also be directed to Miss Ring.

Erica Ring
for
Dr W Adams
Registrar

7 March 2001

AGENDA

Pages

☆ **1. Apologies**

The following apology has been received:
Professor S R Leeder

2. Arrangement of agenda

☆ **2.1 Starring of items**

2.2 Adoption of unstarred items

Recommendation

That the Academic Board resolve as recommended with respect to all unstarred items.

3. Minutes of previous meeting

Yellow enclosure

Recommendation

That the Academic Board adopt the minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday, 14 February 2001 as a true record.

-
- 4. Business arising from Minutes** (not dealt with elsewhere in the Agenda)
- ☆ **5. Report of the Chair**
- 5.1 Report on Senate matters**
- 5.1.1 Report of the Senate meeting held on 5 March 2001**
- Recommendation*
That the Academic Board note the report of the Deputy Chair of the Academic Board, Professor Field, on academic matters considered by Senate at its meeting held on 5 March 2001.
- 5.2 General report**
- 5.2.1 Report of the Working Party on Elections** 11
- Recommendation*
That the Academic Board request the Working Party on Elections to review its draft report in the light of comments received from members and the Academic Forum, with a view to referring its final report and recommendations to the Board at its May meeting.
- 5.2.2 The Management and Evaluation of Teaching** 11
- Recommendation*
That the Academic Board agree that the draft Board Resolutions relating to the Management and Evaluation of Teaching be left to lie on the table until the May Board meeting when comments from the Graduate Studies Committee, Teaching and Learning Committee and other comments received will be presented to the Board for its consideration.
- 5.2.3 Action taken under delegated authority: Bachelor of Dentistry course** 11-12, and separate enclosure
- Recommendation*
That the Academic Board note the Chair's report on action taken by the former Chair of the Board, Professor Cram, under delegated authority.
- ☆ **6. Report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal**
- 6.1 Report on Senate matters**
- 6.1.1 Report of the Senate meeting held on 5 March 2001**
- Recommendation*
That the Academic Board note the report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal on matters considered by Senate at its meeting held on 5 March 2001.
- 6.2 General report**

7. Report of the Academic Forum

(Associate Professor Tony Masters)

7.1 Report of the meeting held on 26 February 2001 13-22

7.1.1 Receipt of report

Recommendation

That the Academic Board receive and note the report of the Academic Forum meeting held on 26 February 2001.

7.1.2 Forum Focus: Student Involvement 13-15, 17-22

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the Forum Focus of the Academic Forum meeting held on 26 February 2001.

7.1.3 Proceedings of the Forum 15-16

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Academic Forum meeting held on 26 February 2001 relating to the following matters:

- (1) *Report from the Chair of the Academic Forum*
 - (a) *Honours and distinctions*
 - (b) *Alternative Chair of the Academic Forum*
 - (c) *Casual vacancies*
- (2) *Reports from Senate*
- (3) *Report from the Vice-Chancellor and Principal*
- (4) *Report from the Academic Board*
- (5) *Notice of Appointment of Student Members to the Student Proctorial Panel*

8. Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee



8.1 Oral report of the Chair

The Chair of the Board has invited Associate Professor Chris Gillies to present the report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee meeting of 13 February 2001 on behalf of the Committee.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee.

8.2 Report of the meeting held on 13 February 2001 23-31

8.2.1 Receipt of report

Recommendation

That the Academic Board receive and note the report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee meeting held on 13 February 2001.

-
- 8.2.2 Flexible Entry Scheme** 23-24, 26
- Recommendation**
That the Academic Board approve the proposed policy relating to the Flexible Entry Scheme, made pursuant to Part 9 (41)(3) of the University of Sydney (Amendment Act) Rule 1999, as set out in the report presented.
- 8.2.3 Recognising Qualifications** 24
- 8.2.3.1 Minimum AQF levels**
- Recommendation**
That the Academic Board resolve that for international applicants, AQF IV or higher be the normal minimum required level of qualification for eligibility for consideration for admission.
- 8.2.3.2 Vocational A Levels**
- Recommendation**
That the Academic Board resolve that up to one Vocational A-level may be counted by students presenting A-levels as qualifications for consideration for admission.
- 8.2.4 Monitoring Student Admission and Progression** 24
- Recommendation**
That the Academic Board resolve that the University keep appropriate records of the basis for admission of all students so that the effectiveness of admission criteria can be evaluated.
- 8.2.5 Special Admission Programs** 24-25, 27-30
- Recommendation**
That the Academic Board, noting that the Vice-Chancellor has been requested to consider the proposal:
- (1) *abolish the Educational Disadvantage Admission Scheme; and*
 - (2) *expand the Broadway Scheme to cover prospective undergraduate students, except those who have a tertiary record, who have suffered educational disadvantage, as set out in the report presented.*
- 8.2.6 Proceedings of the Committee** 25, 31
- Recommendation**
That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Undergraduate Studies Committee meeting held on 13 February 2001 relating to the following matters:
- (1) *Report of the faculties*
 - (2) *Recognising Qualifications*
 - (a) *Foundation Studies Programs*
 - (b) *A-levels and Marketing*
 - (3) *Admission Policies and the Academic Board*
 - (4) *UAC Dates 2001*
 - (5) *Cadigal Scheme*

8.3 Report of the meeting held by circulation in February 2001 32-33, and
separate enclosure

8.3.1 Receipt of report

Recommendation

That the Academic Board receive and note the report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee meeting held by circulation in February 2001.

8.3.2 New courses/major changes to existing courses

8.3.2.1 Faculty of Dentistry: Bachelor of Dentistry 32-33, and
separate enclosure

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note that the Chair of the Board, acting under delegated authority on behalf of the Board, has:

- (1) recommended that Senate approve:
 - (a) the proposal from the Faculty of Dentistry for the introduction in 2001 of the new course, the Bachelor of Dentistry,*
 - (b) the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to Degrees and Diplomas in the Faculty of Dentistry, with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented, and*
 - (c) the adoption of new Resolutions of the Senate relating to this course, made pursuant to the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2000, with effect immediate effect, as set out in the report presented;**
- (2) noted the Resolutions of the Faculty relating to this course, made pursuant to the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2000; and*
- (3) approved the Faculty requirements relating to units of study, the pass degree and award of the degree, as set out in the report presented.*

9. Report of the Graduate Studies Committee

(Associate Professor Russell Ross)



9.1 Oral report of the Chair

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee.

9.2 Report of the meeting held on 19 February 2001 34-46

9.2.1 Receipt of report

Recommendation

That the Academic Board receive and note the report of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held on 19 February 2001.

9.2.2 Proposals for new and amended postgraduate courses

9.2.2.1 Faculty of Science

34-35, 40-46

- (1) Graduate Certificate in Applied Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Applied Information Technology and Master of Applied Information Technology
- (2) Graduate Certificate in Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Information Technology and Master of Information Technology

Recommendation

That the Academic Board:

- (1) *recommend that Senate approve*
 - (a) *the proposals from the Faculty of Science for the introduction in Second Semester 2001 of*
 - (i) *the new Graduate Certificate in Applied Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Applied Information Technology and Master of Applied Information Technology courses, and*
 - (ii) *major changes to the existing Graduate Certificate in Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Information Technology and Master of Information Technology courses;*
 - (b) *the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to Degrees, Graduate Diplomas and Graduate Certificates in the Faculty of Science, with effect from 1 July 2001, as set out in the report presented;*
 - (c) *the adoption of new Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Graduate Certificate in Applied Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Applied Information Technology and Master of Applied Information Technology courses, with effect from 1 July 2001, as set out in the report presented, and*
 - (ii) *the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Graduate Certificate in Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Information Technology and Master of Information Technology courses with effect from 1 July 2001, as set out in the report presented; and*
- (2) *note the Resolutions of the Faculty relating to the above courses.*

9.2.3 Proceedings of the Committee

35-39

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held on 19 February 2001 relating to the following matters:

- (1) *Membership of the Committee*
- (2) *Report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee*
 - (a) *Issues relating to the examination of PhD theses*

- (i) Length of examination time
- (ii) Candidature responses
- (iii) Appointment of Examiners form
- (b) Definition of PhD
- (c) Reports for the fourth quarter 2000 on PhDs awarded and examination times
 - (i) Awards at faculty level, fourth quarter 2000
 - (ii) Awards by the PhD Award Sub-Committee, fourth quarter 2000
 - (iii) Summary of examination times, fourth quarter 2000
- (d) Membership of the Sub-Committee
- (3) Report of the Coursework Sub-Committee
- (4) References from the Academic Board
 - (a) The Management and Evaluation of Teaching
 - (b) Review of Indigenous Education
- (5) Proposal for Research Policy Sub-Committee
- (6) APA, UPA and IPR scholarships, 2001 round
- (7) Higher doctorates: award of degree of Doctor of Medicine
- (8) Work in progress

10. Report of the Teaching and Learning Committee

(Professor Judyth Sachs)



10.1 Oral report of the Chair

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Teaching and Learning Committee.

10.2 Report of the meeting held on 22 February 2001

47-48

10.2.1 Receipt of report

Recommendation

That the Academic Board receive and note the report of the Teaching and Learning Committee meeting held on 22 February 2001.

10.2.2 The Management and Evaluation of Teaching

47

Recommendation

That, as set out in item 5.2.2, the Academic Board agree that the draft Board Resolutions relating to the Management and Evaluation of Teaching be left to lie on the table until the May Board meeting when comments from the Graduate Studies Committee, Teaching and Learning Committee and other comments received will be presented to the Board for its consideration.

10.2.3 Proceedings of the Committee

47-48

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Teaching and Learning Committee meeting held on 22 February 2001 relating to the following matters:

- (1) Report of the Chair
 - (a) Membership of the Committee

- (2) *Report of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning)*
- (3) *Review of Indigenous Education*
- (4) *Learning to Learn*
- (5) *General Business*

11. Report of the Research Committee

(Professor Les Field)



11.1 Oral report of the Chair

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Research Committee.

11.2 Report of the meeting held on 6 February 2001

49-51, and
separate enclosure

11.2.1 Receipt of report

Recommendation

That the Academic Board receive and note the report of the Research Committee meeting held on 6 February 2001.

11.2.2 Code of Conduct for Responsible Research Practice and Guidelines for Dealing with Allegations of Research Misconduct

49, and separate enclosure

Recommendation

That the Academic Board endorse the Code of Conduct for Responsible Research Practice, as amended, and the new Guidelines for Dealing with Allegations of Research Misconduct and

- (1) *commend the Code of Conduct for Responsible Research Practice to Senate for approval; and*
- (2) *commend the Guidelines for Dealing with Allegations of Research Misconduct to the Vice-Chancellor for approval.*

11.2.3 Proceedings of the Committee

49-51, and
separate enclosure

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Research Committee meeting held on 6 February 2001 relating to the following matters:

- (1) *Items carried over*
 - (a) *Academic Honesty*
- (2) *Correspondence*
- (3) *Membership of the Research Committee:*
- (4) *Report on CRC round*
- (5) *Report on Internal Funding Schemes*
- (6) *The Innovation Statement*
- (7) *Reports*
 - (a) *Professor David Siddle, Pro Vice Chancellor (Research)*
 - (b) *Mr Warwick Dawson, Director, Research and Scholarships Office*
 - (c) *Dr Claire Baxter, Director, Business Liaison Office*
- (8) *Other Business*

12. Report of the Library Committee

(Professor Sue Armitage)



12.1 Oral report of the Chair

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Library Committee.

12.2 Receipt of report

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note that the Library Committee has not met since its last report to the Board.

13. Report of the Academic Staffing Committee

(Associate Professor Ros Arnold)



13.1 Oral report of the Chair

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Staffing Committee.

13.2 Receipt of report

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note that the Academic Staffing Committee has not met since its last report to the Board.

14. General Business

14.1 Election of Chair of the Academic Board to fill a casual vacancy

52

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note that Professor Judyth Sachs was declared elected unopposed as Chair of the Academic Board, to fill a casual vacancy for a term of office to 31 December 2002.

14.2 Cancellation of the April Board meeting

52

Recommendation

That the Academic Board:

- *cancel the meeting of the Board scheduled to be held on 11 April 2001; and*
- *authorise the Chair of the Board to act on its behalf in any urgent matter which may arise following the March Board meeting and which cannot await the May meeting of the Board.*

14.3 Membership of the Central Promotion Committees: 2001

52-53

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the changes made to the membership of the 2001 Central Promotions Committees and appoint the Committees as amended.

14.4 Report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal on proctorial matters

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the tabled report on proctorial matters.

AGENDA ITEM 5. Report of the Chair

5.2 General report

1. Report of the Working Party on Elections

At its meeting on 14 February 2001, the Board:

- (1) noted the report of the Working Party on Elections (which was enclosed separately with the agenda for the February 2001 Board meeting); and
- (2) invited members to submit comments on the report to the Chair by no later than 1 March, for consideration by the March meeting of the Board.

Comments have been received from Associate Professor R Drynan, Professor S R Leeder, the SRC and the Academic Forum. The Working Party is being re-convened to consider these comments, together with a proposal to recommend an amendment to the Academic Governance Rules relating to the Board in respect of filling casual vacancies, to make it explicit that the gender balance requirement would over-ride other provisions.

I therefore propose that the Board request the Working Party on Elections to review its draft report in the light of comments received from members and the Academic Forum, with a view to referring its final report and recommendations to the Board at its May meeting.

2. The Management and Evaluation of Teaching

At its meeting on 14 February 2001, the Board:

- (1) noted the report on the Management and Evaluation of Teaching (which was set out on pages 10-11 of the main agenda for the February 2001 Board meeting and in a separate enclosure); and
- (2) invited members to submit comments on the report to the Chair by no later than 1 March, for consideration by the March meeting of the Board.

The Graduate Studies Committee and the Teaching and Learning Committee have asked that consideration of the draft Board Resolutions relating to the Management and Evaluation of Teaching be deferred to allow them more time for consideration and comment.

I therefore propose that the Board agree that the draft Board Resolutions relating to the Management and Evaluation of Teaching be left to lie on the table until the May Board meeting when comments from the Graduate Studies Committee, Teaching and Learning Committee and other comments received will be presented to the Board for its consideration.

3. Action taken under delegated authority: Bachelor of Dentistry course

The Board, at its February 2001 meeting, authorised the Chair of the Board to act on its behalf in respect of approving or endorsing Faculty and Senate Resolutions relating to the new Bachelor of Dentistry course.

The former Chair of the Board, Professor Cram, reports that, acting on behalf of the Board, he has:

- (1) recommended that Senate approve:
 - (a) the proposal from the Faculty of Dentistry for the introduction in 2001 of the new Bachelor of Dentistry (BDent) course;
 - (b) the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to Degrees and Diplomas in the Faculty of Dentistry, with immediate effect, as set out in the shaded box on in the separate enclosure;
 - (c) the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to Bachelor's degrees in the Faculty of Dentistry, made pursuant to the University of

- Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2000, with immediate effect, as set out in the shaded box in the separate enclosure; and
- (2) approved the Faculty requirements relating to units of study, the pass degree and award of the degree, as set out in the separate enclosure.

Details of the proposal are set out in the Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee meeting held by circulation in February 2001 (Item 8.3.2.1 refers).

AGENDA ITEM 7. Report of the Academic Forum

7.1 Report of the Academic Forum meeting held on 26 February 2001

1. Receipt of report

The Forum **recommends** that the Board receive and note the following report of the meeting held on 26 February 2001.

2. Forum Focus: Student Involvement

Mr J Taylor (President, SUPRA), Ms M Watts (President, SRC) and Dr L Carson (Government & International Relations) were invited to present the Forum Focus on student involvement in the University's structures. A copy of papers tabled at the meeting is attached to this report. *(pages 17-22)*

Mr Taylor opened the Forum with the following points:

- There had been a steady decline of student involvement in the Academic Forum and Faculties;
- Postgraduate students in particular had been subject to changes in degree structures and all students were subject to various external pressures meaning students were less aware of issues that affected them and had less time to commit to the University's decision-making structures;
- Staff were also faced with increased pressures, resulting in increased vacancies on various committees and boards;
- Student organisations encouraged student involvement and assisted the University by advertising such things as Faculty elections;
- The University needed to increase advertising regarding elections, especially at the level of the Academic Board;
- Increased liaison with Faculties and Deans and increased use of electronic mechanisms may increase awareness of elections as students were often unaware of the representative positions available;
- The University needed to communicate more with students and it was the University's responsibility to consult with students and foster improved relationships;
- Faculties and Deans needed to acknowledge and encourage student participation and involvement;
- Students needed to be educated about on-going issues to encourage them to actively participate;
- Students needed to see the results of their participations as often they got involved to have an impact on the University;
- Students often did not see the results of discussion of the Academic Forum as it did not appear to have any influence in the wider University decision-making structures;
- Recommendations from the Academic Forum did not appear to be referred to Sub-Committees of the Academic Board for further discussion;
- Minute taking could be improved as Committee Secretaries were not required to record exact details of discussions and often particular issues raised by students were not minuted;
- The scheduling of meetings needed to be considered to take into account students' time commitments;
- The Academic Forum needed to consider a mechanism for compensating members for the time spent on the Forum as there was more involved in being a member than simply attending meetings.

Dr Carson spoke to a paper prepared for the meeting and highlighted the following points:

-
- There was a need address broader issues of participation, not just the narrower issue of representation;
 - Students, and all new members, could find the Academic Forum intimidating as the atmosphere was not conducive to informal discussion;
 - There was a need to consider alternative methods to elections in an effort to facilitate participation and the effectiveness of the Academic Forum, especially as currently membership was not seen as a positive experience;
 - The Academic Forum needed to be more interactive and participants needed to be highly informed and to know what influence their discussions would have;
 - There was a need to examine existing processes as current reporting back mechanisms did not appear to be the most appropriate.

Ms Watts spoke to a paper prepared for the meeting and highlighted the following points:

- University governance appeared to operate on either a representative or participatory basis and the representative basis did not guarantee participation of students;
- The University could not have effective governance without student involvement;
- If the University was serious about effective student involvement, it needed to examine the accessibility of current decision-making structures such as the Academic Forum and the Academic Board;
- Students were often unaware of their role within the University structures, often due to a lack of publicity;
- There needed to be improvement in the conduct of elections, especially as students were not encouraged to participate at Faculty level, and the voting processes did not recognise the limitations faced by many students;
- Student participation in meetings was often influenced by feelings of intimidation due to lack of context and awareness of on-going issues and the fact that agendas and minutes did not give the full background to issues;
- Meetings were often held at times that many students were unable to attend and there was a general lack of openness in meeting procedures;
- Students outside the Academic Forum often had no access to their representatives;
- An induction program for new students, and staff, including meeting key staff could assist in raising the awareness of new members;
- The discussions of the Forum needed to be more appropriate and the results of those discussions needed to be clarified as there appeared to be no clear lines of referral to other decision-making bodies;
- Current Academic Forum recommendations were non-binding on the Academic Board which could lead to feelings of disempowerment in the Academic Forum which had no formal relationship to other bodies such as the Senate or Faculty boards;
- Students were not being set an example by the lack of attendance by Professors and heads of departments/schools, therefore democracy did not appear to be working;
- The Academic Forum was a collegial body which needed more clear-cut processes for addressing grievances;
- The Academic Forum needed to be a more effective structure to ensure that members were achieving results and that representation was functional not token.

The following issues were raised during general discussion:

- There was a need to define the role of the Academic Forum, to involve a diverse group of people and increase participation;
- The Academic Forum's role in relation to other decision-making bodies also needed to be addressed, especially given that the Academic Forum was more participatory than any other body;
- The appearance of lack of power for the Academic Forum had led to lack of participation and members not making the Academic Forum a priority;

-
- The University needed to address feelings of powerlessness and lack of collegiality for the long term benefit of staff and students;
 - It was suggested that the Academic Forum should set the broad policy framework in which more detailed decisions were made by the Academic Board as, currently, Academic Forum recommendations were too easily dismissed;
 - Student participation at department/school level was often high because of the relevance of the issues discussed, therefore Academic Forum issues also need to be made relevant;
 - Improvements needed to be made to existing processes, especially follow-up and reporting back mechanisms;
 - There was a need to balance community interests and consensus decision-making with avenues for representation from specific groups or on specific issues;
 - There was a need to recognise that the interests of the institution and interest groups did not, and would not, always converge and that different groups did not always have the same idea of what would be best for the institution;
 - Processes for maintaining student representation needed to be preserved and students needed to be able to express their interests collectively;
 - In answer to a question, the Vice-Chancellor replied that he felt it would be inappropriate to comment on the structure of a collegial body such as the Academic Forum as it was independent of management;
 - The Academic Forum needed to make use of various mechanisms to make more opportunities for people to participate.

The Chair summarised the Forum Focus:

- The Chair had been concerned about participation in the Academic Forum and felt that the review of the Academic Board had not given much direction to the Academic Forum;
- The Academic Forum was to advise the Academic Board of matters of policy but there appeared to be a lack of closure on discussions which took place;
- The Deputy Chairs of the Academic Board had agreed to a strategy for furthering debate by taking responsibility for referring items issues raised at the Academic Forum to standing committees of the Academic Board;
- It would be inappropriate for the Academic Forum to become a mirror of the Academic Board with its own committees;
- The Academic Forum itself needed to define its role within the University's structures.

The Chair thanked all the speakers and contributors to the discussion for their comments and suggestions and suggested the following actions:

- That, where appropriate, the deputy chairs of the Academic Board provide an impartial summary of discussions, on matters relevant to particular standing committees, to the Academic Board and become responsible for reporting back to the Academic Forum on developments in those areas;
- That Forum members contact the Chair with suggestions for improving the effectiveness of the Forum;
- That the Chair develop a strategy for introducing further discussion on Forum Focus topics through electronic fora.

3. Proceedings of the Academic Forum

The Forum considered the following items:

(1) Report from the Chair of the Academic Forum

The Forum noted the report of the Chair in the following items:

(a) Honours and distinctions

The Forum congratulated staff and students who had received honours and distinctions.

(b) **Alternative Chair of the Academic Forum**

The Forum noted that an Alternative Chair would be recommended at the next meeting.

(c) **Casual vacancies**

The Forum appointed non-professorial staff to fill casual vacancies and noted the appointment of student members to Faculties.

(2) **Reports from Senate**

The Forum noted the reports from Senate tabled at the Academic Board meetings of 11 October 2000, 15 November 2000, 13 December 2000 and 14 February 2001 in the report of the Chair of the Academic Board and in the report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal.

(3) **Report from the Vice-Chancellor and Principal**

The Forum noted the report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal, in particular it noted the University's performance in attracting students with a UAI above 95, and that the University was leading the way in receipt of research grants.

(4) **Report from the Academic Board**

The Forum noted the concern of a member regarding recommendations contained in the report of the Working Party on Elections especially in regard to attendance requirements and gender balance.

The Acting Chair of the Academic Board invited the member to forward comments to the Academic Board for consideration with the report of the Working Party and the Chair of the Forum agreed to raise the issues at the Academic Board.

(5) **Notice of Appointment of Student Members to the Student Proctorial Panel**

The Forum appointed Mr G Caluya, Mr L Corbett, Ms M Watts and Mr J Taylor as student members of the Student Proctorial Panel and invited expressions of interest from other students members of the Forum to fill the remaining two positions.

**Academic Forum report, Item 7.1.2
Forum Focus: Student Involvement**

**Student Involvement in Academic Forum: Discussion Paper
Dr L Carson, Government and International Relations, School of Economics and Business**

Background

The Academic Forum has governance rules that regulate its function, membership and procedures. Election of the Forum's member is clearly prescribed and electoral procedures are meant, presumably, to deliver a representative group that can attend to the Academic Forum's prescribed functions. The functions of the Academic Forum are to:

- (a) act as an electoral college for the Academic Board;
- (b) provide a forum representative of the University's academic community to debate academic policy;
- (c) advise Academic Board on matters of academic policy...;
- (d) serve...as a body where concerns and grievances...can be aired and brought to the attention of the Vice-Chancellor.

The second function (b) specifically states that the function of the Academic Forum is to *provide a forum representative of the University's academic community*. Membership of the Academic Forum (according to the list dated 16 February 2001) indicates a very unrepresentative sample of the academic community. Perhaps that's the subject of *another* discussion paper.

This paper addresses the issue of *student* involvement and how it might be improved. It assumes that the method of selecting academic and student representatives for the Forum will remain unchanged. Random selection could certainly be considered as an alternative selection process but that is not the purpose of this paper.

The Problem

Student membership on standing committees is inevitably problematic. Students are preoccupied with their studies and organisational issues would seem to interest very few of them. Why have student representatives at all? The Academic Forum is not a decision-making body so interest in its operations is further diminished. The Forum is not meant to mirror the Board's operations, rather to stimulate debate and provide a more accessible venue for lively discussions. This is reason enough to involve more students—to incorporate the voices of those directly affected. In the past, issues have been aired in the Forum but, in the absence of decisions, its participants see little 'closure' of these issues. They are left wondering if it was all a waste of time. There are probably additional difficulties with the Forum that relate to the physical space: it's an awkward lay-out where less-powerful voices would find it hard to be heard. The formality of the space is intimidating and is not conducive to open or consensual discussions.

The problems experienced by the Forum are not dissimilar to those experienced in representative government. Those in the forum (or parliament) are unrepresentative of the wider population and formal proceedings are not conducive to useful discussion. Without genuine opportunities to participate (beyond the ballot box), the electorate grows cynical, sceptical and weary. How then to encourage meaningful participation that can occur in tandem with the prescribed governance rules? How to ensure representativeness? How to create an environment that is conducive to deliberation? How to establish opportunities to influence outcomes? The following possibilities could lead to greater student *and* academic involvement in the Forum.

Some Possibilities

1. Representativeness

Random selection is the most obvious way of improving representativeness. Intuitively we consider that those who are interested in participating *will* participate by putting themselves forward. Instead self-selection (under the guise of election) leads to a situation in which the same group of people offer to serve. The remainder is not necessarily apathetic. When randomly selected, citizens show a surprising willingness to participate in the political process. This has been demonstrated recently when innovative methods of consultation have occurred. These methods include citizens' juries, deliberative polls, people's panels, consensus conferences and more familiar focus groups.

As is the case in the wider political context, these consultation methods could be used by those charged with a decision-making role to inform their decisions. The Academic Forum could promote its activities and encourage further involvement by convening a jury, panel or interactive poll on an issue of interest. Participants could be randomly selected from the student (and academic) body and invited to participate. The event can be open to observers and this will encourage further involvement from the wider University community.

2. Deliberative capacity

These processes are highly interactive. A skilled, independent facilitator is appointed. Expert witnesses are called. The participants question the panel of experts and engage in discussion among themselves. The organisers make it clear how the recommendations will be used so that there are no false expectations. Participants inevitably are changed by the process: they learn a lot, they develop confidence in their personal views and they move beyond their own individual interests towards a consensus that is more mindful of the common good. Participants also develop greater respect for the organising body because of its willingness to consult and to be influenced by the outcomes. The reverse is also true: participants are angered by time ill-spent.

3. Influence

The Chair of Academic Forum has indicated that he would like to see more follow up from Forum proceedings. When matters are discussed there is currently insufficient closure on the issues. Action plans would help to establish this need for closure, as would some ongoing reporting about the outcomes of any deliberations. Nothing makes a group more weary than the sense of futility that arises from talking, talking, talking—with no reported outcomes. Discussions are most energetic when linked to decisions.

In this vein, if innovative consultation methods were to be employed, it would be essential that they lead to specific outcomes. This should be an explicit, contractual arrangement between participants and organisers: a statement of intent about the way in which any recommendations will be used. The reputation of such methods is dependent upon the willingness of Academic Board to act on recommendations that emerge from a robust process that is genuinely reflective of the views of the wider University community.

Recommendation

That Academic Forum considers the next issue of interest that comes before it as an opportunity to convene a jury, panel or interactive poll of the kind outlined here. Consideration should be given to ensuring representativeness, deliberative capacity and transparency of outcomes. Within the University context, with the rich diversity of talent available it is likely that skills and time would be available and may willingly be offered at no cost. Appropriate space and other facilities would need to be provided.

Further Information

References

- Carson, L. and B. Martin (1999). Random Selection in Politics. Westport, CT, Praeger Publishers.
- Fishkin, J. S. (1995). The Voice of the People: Public Opinion and Democracy. New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Renn, O., T. Webler, et al., Eds. (1995). Fairness and Competence in Citizen Participation. Evaluating Models for Environmental Discourse. Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Renouf, C. (1999). "Rebirthing Democracy: The Experience of the First Australian Consensus Conference." Consuming Interest(79, August): 16-19.

Websites

- Australia's first consensus conference: <http://www.consensusconference.chirp.com.au/>
- Australia's first deliberative poll: <http://i-d-a.com.au/>
- Citizens' juries in US: <http://www.jefferson-center.org/>
- People's panel in UK: <http://www.cabinet-office.gov.uk/servicefirst/index/pphome.htm>
- Teledemocracy Action News + Network: <http://www.auburn.edu/tann/>

Role of Students in University Governance

Moksha Watts, President, 73rd Student Representative Council

Representation

Through enrollment, students acquire a *formal* character and can be said to have commonly ascribable characteristics and interests due to fact that they now belong to a higher education institution. Common concerns include access to education facilities and teaching programmes, which are of a high standard, a liberal student financing policy, absence of fees and access to facilities such as childcare, security etc.

These are controlled by university therefore it is important that general student membership is represented in decision-making bodies that affect student lives.

Such representation is representation of students as *stakeholders*.

Participation

This is not guaranteed by representation. It is important to have more than just a student “voice” on university bodies. Students are not simply stakeholders whose interests need to be looked after but must be included as part of governance – effective and equitable governance is not possible without students. They need to make decisions and have ownership over their university. Participation is also necessary because more than having the *formal* character of being students, students have an *objective* character as people in society, University decisions affect students not just as students but as single parents, women, from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, queer, mature age, part-time etc. Therefore, it is important to have students in university governance in order for the university to be more attuned to the demands that arise in a heterogeneous student body.

Extent and nature of involvement of students

In order to have effective student involvement, and if we are serious about involvement of students into the university (i.e. more than just token numbers on Academic Board or University Senate) certain conditions need to be fulfilled:

- (1) Accessibility of university structures, like the Forum, to students
- (2) Democracy of university structures

It is through understanding the status of these conditions that we can understand why the Forum has so many student (and staff) vacancies.

- (1) Accessibility of Forum and other university structures

It is possible that students are apathetic about being involved in university governance. However, given the incredible popularity of Union and SRC elections, in terms of nominations and voting rates (~20% of student population vote), and given the resurgence in Senate nominations (1 in 1998 to over 15 last year), it is a very unlikely scenario. The problem is that the Forum is inaccessible to students (and staff), and furthermore, other governance structures within the university are inaccessible to it. This problem can be understood in 3 ways:

- (a) Accessibility to students before election to Forum (through election to Faculty Boards)
 - Students do not know what Forum is – no effort is made to let them know and recognise it as an open Forum for discussion of pertinent issues.
 - Students are unaware of nomination procedures for Faculty Boards
 - Nominations take place very close to mid-semester break in Semester 2
 - Students are not encouraged to participate at a departmental level either through Staff Student Liaison Committees or by lecturers urging students to participate

- Students do not know what these positions entail
- Votes need to be posted at own expense, rather than postage paid or open ballots

Solution

These can be remedied through sufficient advertisement of nominations in full-page ads in Daily Bull, Honi Soit, and Union Recorder, mailouts to faculty and departmental societies and to departments themselves. Circulation of minutes to faculty societies and departments may increase awareness of Forum. Appropriate timing of elections will maximise awareness of elections to Faculty Boards. Lecturers may be encouraged to mention nominations in their classes.

(b) Accessibility of Forum to elected students

Once students are elected to Faculty Boards and the Forum, their participation is still not guaranteed and definitely not encouraged. If students have gone to effort of nominating, surely they are willing participants to some degree. However peak participation does not materialise for several reasons:

- Very few students speak at meetings as meetings are intimidating, discussion is confusing and they generally have no context or background in which to put the debate.
- Agenda and minutes are by no means extensive and do not allow students to follow debate – student comments or sensitive comments are often not minuted at all
- Meetings are held at times that are hard for students (and staff) to attend, i.e. during class time (2p.m.) and on the first day of Semester 1 (ie. today)
- No standard meeting procedure followed or meeting procedure followed is unclear
- General membership cannot access student members as they do not know who their representatives are

Solution

- A training program should be run for all student members of Faculties, Academic Forum and Academic Board. Ideas include a seminar on how the university works; introductions to important people such as Faculty Deans, Chair of Forum, secretary to Forum, VC etc; a seminar on the relationship between Faculty Board and Academic Forum, Forum and Board, Forum and Senate, the University and Government; a seminar on meeting procedure; holding a mock meeting etc.
- Meetings should be scheduled in consultation with students and other members; Renton's Guide to meeting procedure or something similar should be followed as formal meeting structure encourages participation.
- Student members' (and other members') names should be published in Honi Soit and Union Recorder.
- It would be valuable to have a Student Liaison Officer of the Forum, whose responsibility is to liaise with students, keep them in the loop and make Forum a more comfortable place.
- There is no reason to believe that unless a meeting is regal, majestic and intimidating, it is not a valid meeting.

(c) Accessibility of other university structures to Forum, or Functionality of Forum: 'What happens after a Forum meeting?'

This has to do with what the intention of the Forum is. University By-law (1996) states that the functions of the Forum are to:

- provide a forum broadly representative of the University's academic community to debate academic policy;
- advise the Board of matters of academic policy, including teaching and learning, research, student matters and academic staffing; and

-
- Serve the university's academic community as a body where concerns and grievances affecting the academic community can be aired and brought to the attention of the Vice-Chancellor.

However, debate does not happen effectively as no motions are debated anymore, no recommendations are made anymore. The relationship of the Board and Senate is mostly clear but the Forum sits uneasily amongst these. It offers non-binding advice to the Board – this advice is not discussed or dealt with in any systematic way. Although the functions of the Forum involve the Board, the *Terms of Reference* of the Academic Board do not mention the Forum, let alone any obligation to at least receive advice from the Forum. The functions of the Forum do not mention any relationship to the Senate even though one might imagine that the most representative and participatory of university structures might have some role to play in the Senate. The Forum also plays no role in advising Faculty Boards on and of academic policy even though they are probably one of the most appropriate places for such advice. The other governance structures in the university are, by and large, inaccessible to the Forum. Members feel disempowered – why should they waste time in their overworked academic lives to attend meetings that no one pays attention to any more? This explains why there are not only student vacancies but also several staff vacancies, including Heads of department vacancies. If Heads of departments do not feel the urge to attend, why should students?

Democracy

University structures are not democratic – under a newfound faith in managerialism at this university, we are seeing a reduction in representation in the name of efficiency – more and more executive decisions, less and less democratic ones. Governance bodies are getting smaller in size as well as number. Examples include the Academic Board restructure that reduced the numbers of the Academic Board; students on Senate have been halved; Faculty Boards do not meet as often anymore, leaving more and more decisions to Deans; Boards of Examiners have ceased to exist as heads of department now have final say in marking. This reduces accountability as stakeholders are no longer privy to management decisions or have say in making those decisions. It also reduces participation as staff and students do not feel they can have any governing power anymore. Management is very differentiated to general staff (academics and non-academics); therefore staff become simply employees who collect pay cheques rather than contributors to this institution. Students and staff are less and involved and no longer have a defined role they can play. Therefore, it is no wonder there are so many vacancies on the Forum.

AGENDA ITEM 8.

Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee

8.2 Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee meeting held on 13 February 2001

The Committee met on 13 February 2001 when there were present: The Chair (Professor L Cram) presiding, Professor M Jackson, Associate Professor C Gillies, Drs D Feil, L Harris, P Hopwood, G Ryan and P Whiting, Ms L Friedman, Mr C Morgan, Ms E Sainsbury, Mr M Skellern. Professor J Raper, Associate Professor R Waterhouse, Drs W Adams and R Caldwell, Mr A Ali, Mr A Bennett, Mr D Bowan, Ms J Clark, Mr T Evans, Ms C Wilkinson and Miss K Neveltsen were in attendance.

1. Receipt of Report

The Committee **recommends** that the Academic Board receive and note the following report of the meeting held on 13 February 2001.

2. Flexible Entry Scheme

The Committee recommends that the Academic Board approve the policy relating to the Flexible Entry Scheme as set out in the report presented. *(page 26)*

In August 2000, the Academic Board approved a pilot program designed to test the benefits of allowing faculties greater flexibility in the use of UAI for determining admission.

The pilot program encountered no difficulties for 2001 admissions. In view of the potential benefits of greater flexibility, the Undergraduate Studies Committee was invited to consider a policy regarding flexible entry into all appropriate courses and a subsequent recommendation to the Academic Board.

The Committee heard from representatives of the three Faculties involved in the pilot program, Architecture, Engineering and Science, and recognised that there could be resourcing issues associated with a broad Flexible Entry Scheme. However, it was noted that, overall, the Faculties were supportive of the Scheme and felt that the students admitted were of a high calibre and demonstrated significant aptitude for their chosen disciplines.

The Committee noted a range of issues during discussion:

- The Flexible Entry Scheme was designed to apply to the first round of admission applications, however in the future this may be reconsidered if the University develops admissions based on early offers;
- The Faculties involved in the pilot Scheme all indicated that many of the admission decisions were based on the specific subjects applicants undertook for the HSC;
- Architecture also required applicants to submit a folio of work;
- Science had undertaken a process of automatic consideration of all applicants whereas Architecture and Engineering had used an application process;
- There was discussion regarding the application of lowered cut-off levels and the subsequent impact on quotas for courses;
- The need to retain flexibility for individual faculties would also impact on any proposed maximum variation against the UAI;
- The Flexible Entry Scheme could result in an average increase in UAI scores, therefore improving the overall academic standards of the institution.

The Chair of the Committee undertook to liaise with Archives and Record Management Services regarding record keeping and data collection requirements and incorporate suggestions into the draft policy.

The Committee noted that several points in the draft policy required revision before being referred to the Academic Board: the revised version of the policy is attached.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board approve the proposed policy relating to the Flexible Entry Scheme, made pursuant to Part 9 (41)(3) of the University of Sydney (Amendment Act) Rule 1999, as set out in the report presented.

3. Recognising Qualifications

(1) Minimum AQF levels

The Committee noted that there appeared to be inconsistencies in the University's recognition of vocational qualifications over time: there had been attempts to use AQF V as the minimum entry criterion, and on some occasions the Academic Board had approved AQF III (e.g. TAFE Tertiary Preparation).

In the past the University had tried to establish vocational AQF V (corresponding to TAFE Certificate IV – one or two years of post-secondary Vocational Study) for mature-age admission to courses, however members of the Committee were concerned that this was too high.

It was suggested that it may be more appropriate to re-affirm that AQF IV be the minimum entry criterion for all programs, and then look at individual variation at a later date. This could include establishing mechanisms for equating overseas programs as a need for wider discussion on the recognition of qualifications other than HSC was required.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board resolve that for international applicants, AQF IV or higher be the normal minimum required level of qualification for eligibility for consideration for admission.

(2) Vocational A Levels

The Committee noted that it appeared that vocational A levels (VCE) had been introduced into the UK National Curriculum. Students normally studied three A levels and under the new system one could be vocational. VCE A levels were treated as normal A levels by the UK University system.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board resolve that up to one Vocational A-level may be counted by students presenting A-levels as qualifications for consideration for admission.

4. Monitoring Student Admission and Progression

The Committee had been invited to discuss the need for a record of the basis for admission, which would assist in monitoring progression of students admitted through various methods.

It was noted that Faculties would wish to keep appropriately complete records of the basis of admission of students, in order to evaluate the effectiveness of their admission policies and practices. The Committee acknowledged the need to record this information.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board resolve that the University keep appropriate records of the basis for admission of all students so that the effectiveness of admission criteria can be evaluated.

5. Special Admission Programs

The Committee noted that the Chair had provided academic decisions in respect of the University's Educational Disadvantage Admission Scheme, and had subsequently recommended to the Committee that the Scheme be abolished. (pages 27-29)

The Committee noted that the Academic Board was responsible for approval of such schemes (*University of Sydney (Amendment Act) Rule 1999, Part 45*). The implications of any move to change the schemes potentially impacted on resource, operational and academic matters and would therefore require additional consideration by the Registrar, Vice-Chancellor and the Academic Board. A copy of correspondence to the Vice-Chancellor is attached for information. (page 30)

The Committee noted that there appeared to be no equity merit in continuing the current variety of programs and agreed with the proposals outlined.

Recommendation

That, noting that the Vice-Chancellor has been requested to consider the proposal, the Academic Board:

- (a) *abolish the Educational Disadvantage Admission Scheme; and*
- (b) *expand the Broadway Scheme to cover prospective undergraduate students, except those who have a tertiary record, who have suffered educational disadvantage, as set out in the report presented.*

6. Proceedings of the Committee

The Committee gave consideration to the following items:

(1) Report of the faculties

The Committee noted the reports of the faculties on the following matters:

- (a) Multiple paths of entry
- (b) Admissions Grey Book
- (c) Elite Performers
- (d) UAC Reports

(2) Recognising Qualifications

(a) Foundation Studies Programs

The Committee intends to review Foundation Studies Programs with a view to making appropriate recommendations to the Academic Board in due course.

(b) A-levels and Marketing

The Committee noted that the Faculty of Science had expressed concern regarding the published standard of A-levels for admission and agreed that the Faculty publish high A-levels for guaranteed entry and current A-levels as a minimum requirement.

(3) Admission Policies and the Academic Board

The Committee noted the existence of several potential problems in the management of admissions policy and recognised that some of these matters fall outside the normal work of the Academic Board. The Committee therefore requested the Chair to contact the Vice-Chancellor regarding them. A copy of correspondence to the Vice-Chancellor is attached for information. (page 31)

(4) UAC Dates 2001

(5) Cadigal Scheme

The Committee noted that the Chair will invite Professor Ramsden (Pro Vice-Chancellor (*Teaching and Learning*)) to review the Cadigal Scheme and provide a report and recommendation to the Committee.

Undergraduate Studies Committee report, Item 8.2.2 Flexible Entry Scheme

Flexible Entry Scheme

1. Faculties may approve flexible entry schemes for specified courses.
2. Pursuant to Part 9(38) and Part 9(41) of the University of Sydney (Amendment Act) Rule 1999, the University establishes for most undergraduate award courses a UAI cut-off. Eligible applicants for such courses with a UAI, or UAI equivalent, equal to, or great than, the UAI cut-off will be admitted on the basis of their UAI.
3. Flexible entry schemes for specified courses apply to eligible applicants with UAI or UAI equivalents lying below the UAI cut-off for that course. Flexible entry schemes will comprise two components:
 - (1) A flexible entry UAI band, lying between the UAI cut-off and the lower limit to the band. This lower limit will not normally lie more than 5 UAI points below the UAI cut-off;
 - (2) A flexible entry criterion or criteria, additional to the UAI, which allows admission of eligible applicants whose UAI lies within the flexible entry band. In order to monitor equity for applicants, flexible entry criteria must be selected from a list approved by the Academic Board.
4. Approved flexible entry criteria are:
 - (1) Performance in the HSC, or HSC equivalent, in subjects relevant to the course;
 - (2) Performance in extra-curricular academic activities relevant to the course (e.g. Science Olympiads);
 - (3) Aptitude for the course, evidence by relevant work and/or other experience, submission of a portfolio, and/or submission of a statement of interest in the course. Faculties may use written submissions, interviews, or other methods to obtain information about aptitude.
5. Applicants may be considered using criteria under flexible entry schemes and under educational disadvantage access schemes (e.g. Broadway), provided that their UAI lies within the approved band for both schemes. Admission bands are not normally widened for applicants who apply for more than one special admission program.
6. The University will maintain records of the basis of admission of all students, including those admitted under the flexible entry scheme, in accordance with approved procedures. These records will be required to evaluate the outcomes of admission policies and practices.

Undergraduate Studies Committee report, Item 8.2.5 Special Admission Programs

The Chair of the Board was recently called on to take some academic decisions in respect of the University's Educational Disadvantage Admission Scheme. As a result he had received advice about a number of possible improvements to special admissions programs arising in the main from changes in the way that UAC is pre-processing applications for special consideration for all NSW universities, under its Educational Access Scheme (EAS).

As the Academic Board is responsible for approval of such schemes, the Chair prepared a summary of relevant processes and issues. The implications of any move to change the schemes potentially involves resource and operational matters, as well as academic consideration. Accordingly, the Chair proposed to refer the matter to the Registrar and the Undergraduate Studies Committee for advice.

The Committee gave consideration to the following:

1. That the Educational Disadvantage Admission Scheme be abolished.
2. That eligibility for the Broadway Scheme should be widened to capture all applicants for both schemes.
3. That the UAC-EAS program deal with all applicants under an enlarged Broadway Scheme. This Program essentially provided a professional assessment of claims for special consideration, ranking the outcome of the claim by the nature of severity of the disadvantage. The UAC severity index as a criterion would become a fair means of determining eligibility for special entry. The Special Admissions Officer could consult the Chair of the Academic Board if any issues arose in UAC regarding the severity index used to determine the cut-off for eligibility for the expanded Broadway Scheme.
4. That UAC should be instructed to provide the University, in particular the Manager, Welfare and Disability Services, with the information provided by all University of Sydney applicants regarding their special needs. This should be provided as soon as this information was available, to assist the University in preparations to properly manage students with special needs.
5. That the student record systems record the basis for student's admission with sufficient details to allow statistical reviews of the progression rate of students admitted through special admissions programs (including Educational Disadvantage, Flexible Entry and deeming programs).
6. That consideration be given to ensuring that the requirements of international students with special needs are notified to the Manager, Welfare and Disability Services.
7. That the Cadigal Program, approved by the Academic Board, was last considered in 1992 and while the policy itself appeared be well conceived and may not require revision, Professor Ramsden be requested to report on the policy so that the review date can be updated.

Background Information

1. Selecting Students for Offers

- (1) The University of Sydney has two UAC-listed programs for applicants who have experienced educational disadvantage – the Broadway Scheme and the Educational Disadvantage Admission Scheme (EDAS). The Broadway Scheme is for recent

school-leavers, EDAS for students not eligible for Broadway. All other NSW universities have only one scheme listed in the UAC guide.

- (2) Applications for consideration of educational disadvantage for students applying for admission through UAC are processed by UAC under its Educational Access Scheme (UAC-EAS). All applicants complete a single form, coding the universities to which they are applying. The University of Sydney has two codes reflecting its two programs, but applicants complete a single form.
- (3) The information requested on the UAC-EAS form concentrates on the nature and severity of disadvantage as it may have affected the UAI. There is limited space for advice from teachers and/or other professionals to comment on the probable effect on future university studies.
- (4) Approximately 4000 applications are received in the UAC-EAS program. Each application is reviewed by a UAS assessment team which assigns it a severity ranking under several categories of disadvantage. The Special Admissions Officer of this University is on the team, but not all universities are involved. The severity ranking is determined independently of the program to which the student has applied, so that applicants for either or both University of Sydney programs are rated uniformly.
- (5) Approximately 2500 UAC-EAS applications involve the University of Sydney. Of these, approximately 2000 have a severity ranking which establishes that they are eligible for the Broadway Scheme (the severity level for acceptance is determined by the Special Admissions Officer on the basis of past practice).
- (6) Applicants admitted into the Broadway Scheme are flagged at UAC. Offers to these students are generated on the basis of their UAI (highest first, not more than 5 points below the normal cut-off) and the Broadway Scheme quota for the course in question. This quota is determined by the Dean. Approximately 230 Broadway Scheme admissions are made.
- (7) The Special Admissions Officer selects from the UAC-EAS applicants a sub-group who have high severity ratings for consideration in the Educational Disadvantage Admission Scheme. These applications are considered by an academic who takes account of the nature and severity of the disadvantage, the UAI, and the UAI cut-off for the desired courses. The determination by the academic automatically generates an offer, rather than mere eligibility, independently of the Broadway Scheme process. Approximately 10 students are ultimately admitted by this route. The decision to admit by this route involves more than an academic decision, and if this pathway remains open, the determination should be made by a panel.
- (8) The educational disadvantage is not considered for international students, whose admission is determined by meeting academic requirements alone. International students do have the opportunity to list special requirements on their application forms.

2. Preparing to support students

- (1) All UAC applicants are invited to provide information about disabilities that might imply the need for special assistance (Question 17). Students are assured that the information will be treated in confidence and will not influence selection. At present, this information is made available to universities only after an offer is made.

University officers concerned with assisting students with a disability would prefer to have this information as soon as it is available to UAC, since some students' needs cannot be satisfied without adequate notice.

- (2) Students applying to UAC-EAS could be considered to have a large probability of requiring some form of special assistance, even if they have not completed question 17. University officers responsible for assisting their students would appreciate

receiving information about their needs as soon as possible. One way to do this would be provision of the EAS application for to the relevant officio.

- (3) International students are invited to advise the University of any special needs when they apply for admission. I have been advised that few students do this, and that any requirements would normally be notified to the International Student Service Unit. It may be desirable for the Manager, Welfare and Disability Services to be informed as well.

3. Educational disadvantage and the HSC

- (1) The Board of Studies has been contacted regarding the consideration of educational disadvantage in the determination of HSC marks. For students who can demonstrate acute illness or misadventure at the time of the HSC, the Board uses the School HSC mark rather than the examination mark, if the later is not available or lower than the school mark. Schools will deal with acute illness or misadventure relating to school HSC assessments by providing alternative assessment.
- (2) Students with chronic disadvantage receive no compensation in respect of adjustment of HSC marks. Depending on their school, they may receive special assistance with their studies.
- (3) Since chronic educational disadvantage is likely to depress a student's HSC marks, the University should maintain its policy of admitting educationally disadvantaged students with lower UAIs. There is no evidence to suggest that the current policy of normally allowing a UAI difference or up to 5 points is not acceptable.

Memorandum to: Professor G Brown
Vice-Chancellor and Principal

Re: Rationalizing Special Admissions

Date: 14 February 2001

At present the University has two major special admissions programs listed in the UAC Guide, the Broadway Scheme and the Educational Disadvantage Admission Scheme (EDAS). Historically, the former was for recent school leavers, and the latter for mature-age applicants (arising, I think, from a program called The Vice-Chancellor's Special Six which may still exist).

UAC processes applicants under both schemes identically. No other NSW university maintains separate schemes. I have been unable to find any reason to maintain separate schemes, with the exception that Broadway defines eligibility by means of a UAI band, while EDAS does not. This exception allows students with reversible medical problems to be considered, despite having very low UAIs as a result of acute illness.

I recommend that you consider abolishing the EDAS, and vary slightly the eligibility of the Broadway Scheme to allow consideration of students with serious disabilities whose UAIs lie below the Broadway cut-off. This recommendation is supported by the Undergraduate Studies Committee of the Academic Board. The Board would be pleased to participate in any policy revisions of the Broadway Scheme, if this advice is accepted.

Lawrence Cram.

**Undergraduate Studies Committee report, Item 8.2.6(3)
Admission Policies and the Academic Board**

Memorandum to: Professor G Brown
Vice-Chancellor and Principal

Re: Admissions to undergraduate courses

Date: 13 February 2001

During my term as Chair of the Board, I have seen a gradual build up of issues regarding admissions to undergraduate courses. Responding to this, I set "admission issues" as the agenda for the February meeting of the Undergraduate Studies Committee. Additional participants were invited from faculties, the International Office, and the Registrar's Division. This letter has been prompted by my consideration of the discussion at that meeting.

While the admissions system serves the University acceptably well at present, there are concerns about problems emerging in the following areas:

- (a) The need for accurate and complete information about admission policies and procedures to be provided to people dealing with prospective students. Without such information, the University risks giving inaccurate advice, which may damage its reputation and disadvantage potential students. There is also considerable expense involved in the uncoordinated provision of information to staff. It has been suggested that an "admissions manual" could be a cost-effective way to respond to this need.
- (b) Non-uniform practices, especially for admissions not based solely on UAI, risk exposing the University's academic integrity and marketing profile to damage.
- (c) Gaps between admissions standards and practices for local and international students lead potentially to questions about academic standards, to administrative inefficiencies, and to anomalies for specific students (for example, those who become permanent residents during the admissions period).

At first sight, these problems might be best addressed by reconstituting the Admissions Sub-committee of the Academic Board. However, the University's academic administration has benefited in many ways by restricting the role of the Board to policy development and quality oversight.

Most of the admissions issues that have come to me are not about policy as such, but rather involve administrative decisions that require an element of academic judgment. Rather than establishing a Board structure to deal with matters like this, I would suggest that establishing an Admissions Working Party of VCAC might be a better way to proceed. Such a working party could have the Chair of the Board and Registrar among its members so that any academic policy issues could be taken back to the Board.

Lawrence Cram.

8.3 Report of the Undergraduate Studies Committee meeting held by circulation in February 2001

The Committee met by circulation in February 2001.

1. Receipt of Report

The Committee **recommends** that the Academic Board receive and note the following report of the meeting held by circulation in February 2001.

2. New courses/major changes to existing courses

(1) Faculty of Dentistry: Bachelor of Dentistry *(separate enclosure)*

The Committee recommends that the Academic Board recommend to the Senate the approval of the proposal to introduce a new Bachelor of Dentistry.

Senate had approved a preliminary proposal for the Bachelor of Dentistry (BDent) course at its meeting of 6 December 1999.

The full proposal had now been received and the Chair of the Academic Board had been delegated the authority of the Academic Board to recommend the proposal to the Senate, based on the recommendation of the Undergraduate Studies Committee.

The new course was designed to meet the educational needs of dentists, whose roles have been substantially changing over recent years. Particular influences had included: the ageing of the population with an increase in chronic and multi-system illness associated with increasingly complex pharmacological management; effective oral health preventive measures; recognition of the importance of sensitive communication; rapid advancement in biomedical and genetic research; new dental technologies and materials; and the increasing applications of information technology to interpersonal communication, the recording and management of data, access to information, and to evidence-based practice.

At the end of the Bachelor of Dentistry course, graduates would demonstrate:

- an understanding of normal, and abnormal human structure, function and behaviour, with a particular emphasis on oral health and disease;
- rigorous clinical reasoning and the application of evidence to the recognition, diagnosis and management of oral disease and disability or dysfunction;
- the ability to relate clinical and scientific data to dental and related medical conditions;
- in consultation with other relevant health professionals, the capacity to relate aspects of the general health of individual patients to their oral health, disease and management;
- a respect for ethical values, confidentiality, patients' autonomy and the need for effective communication so that appropriate education is offered and informed decisions are made;
- skilled and sensitive interviewing of patients, families and carers so as to elicit a dental and relevant medical history; and
- effective clinical examination and use of diagnostic strategies, accurate interpretation of findings and the provision of explanations appropriate for patients and for fellow professionals.

Recommendation

That the Committee recommend that the Academic Board:

- (1) *recommend that Senate approve:*
 - (a) *the proposal from the Faculty of Dentistry for the introduction in 2001 of the new course, the Bachelor of Dentistry,*

- (b) *the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to Degrees and Diplomas in the Faculty of Dentistry, with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented, and*
 - (c) *the adoption of new Resolutions of the Senate relating to this course, made pursuant to the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2000, with effect immediate effect, as set out in the report presented;*
- (2) *note the Resolutions of the Faculty relating to this course, made pursuant to the University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2000; and*
- (3) *approve the Faculty requirements relating to units of study, the pass degree and award of the degree, as set out in the report presented.*

AGENDA ITEM 9.
Report of the Graduate Studies Committee

9.2 Report of the Graduate Studies Committee meeting held on 19 February 2001

The Committee met on 19 February 2001 when there were present: the Chair, Associate Professor R T Ross, presiding, Dr B Adamson, Professor A Brewer, Associate Professor J Christodoulou, Dr J Finkelstein, Professor J Gero, Associate Professors P McCallum, F Nicholas and M Prosser, Mr J A Taylor and Associate Professor L Unsworth. In attendance: Miss E R Ring.

1. Receipt of report

The Committee **recommends** that the Board receive and note the following report of its meeting held on 19 February 2001.

2. Proposals for new and amended postgraduate courses

Faculty of Science

- (1) Graduate Certificate in Applied Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Applied Information Technology and Master of Applied Information Technology**
- (2) Graduate Certificate in Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Information Technology and Master of Information Technology**

On the recommendation of the Coursework Sub-Committee, the Committee recommends approval of the proposals from the Faculty of Science for the following new and amended postgraduate courses from Second Semester 2001:

- (1) the new Graduate Certificate in Applied Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Applied Information Technology and Master of Applied Information Technology courses; and
- (2) major changes to the existing Graduate Certificate in Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Information Technology and Master of Information Technology courses.

Graduate Certificate in Applied Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Applied Information Technology and Master of Applied Information Technology

With the development of the IT industry, there is great demand for the University to offer planned, targeted postgraduate programs in IT to graduates in fields other than computer science who wish to enter the IT industry. This articulated program in Information Technology is designed to provide a core of knowledge in information technology, supplemented by a broad range of options within areas of the Internet, E-commerce, multimedia, software engineering, information systems, databases and computer networks.

Students will embrace recent technology and develop practical skills in information technology. On completion, students would be prepared for typical entry-level positions as analyst/programmers, developers, support staff, sales or training staff, etc.

The program is designed for:

- graduates with tertiary degrees in any discipline who wish to obtain postgraduate qualifications in the IT area;
- graduates with expertise in a field other than IT who wish to enhance the effective use of IT within the field of their previous training;
- non-graduates with extensive IT industry experience (Graduate Certificate entry only); and

- IT professionals taking professional upgrade training under sponsorship by their employer.

Graduate Certificate in Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Information Technology and Master of Information Technology

The Faculty of Science proposes major changes to the existing Graduate Certificate in Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Information Technology and Master of Information Technology courses by reducing the study load from 24, 36 and 72 credit points to 24, 36 and 48 credit points, respectively, and by reordering the units of study accordingly; to include six majors.

The purpose for this change is to meet increasing demand from the rapidly evolving IT industry; to increase the competitiveness of current IT programs in the University; to improve the quality of the graduates; and to reduce the administrative load of the program.

The Committee **recommends** that the Board:

- (1) recommend that Senate approve
 - (a) the proposals from the Faculty of Science for the introduction in Second Semester 2001 of
 - (i) the new Graduate Certificate in Applied Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Applied Information Technology and Master of Applied Information Technology courses, and
 - (ii) major changes to the existing Graduate Certificate in Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Information Technology and Master of Information Technology courses;
 - (b) the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to Degrees, Graduate Diplomas and Graduate Certificates in the Faculty of Science, with effect from 1 July 2001, as set out in the report presented; *(page 40)*
 - (c)
 - (i) the adoption of new Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Graduate Certificate in Applied Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Applied Information Technology and Master of Applied Information Technology courses, with effect from 1 July 2001, as set out in the report presented, and *(pages 40-42)*
 - (ii) the amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Graduate Certificate in Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Information Technology and Master of Information Technology courses with effect from 1 July 2001, as set out in the report presented; and *(pages 43-45)*
- (2) note the new and revised Resolutions of the Faculty relating to the above courses. *(pages 42-43, 45-46)*

3. Proceedings of the Committee

(1) Membership of the Committee

The Committee welcomed Professor Ann Brewer to membership of the Committee as the member from the Faculty of Economics and Business (in place of Associate Professor Ross who is now the Chair of the Committee).

(2) Report of the PhD Award Sub-Committee

The Committee received the reports of the PhD Award Sub-Committee meetings of 12 December 2000 and 6 February 2001 relating to the following matters:

(a) Issues relating to the examination of PhD theses

The Committee adopted the Sub-Committee's recommendations in respect of the following aspects of the PhD examination process, noting that the Chair would progress these matters:

(i) Length of examination time

- A meeting of Postgraduate Co-ordinators will be held before the end of March, to discuss possible improvements to the examination process; and
- it will be suggested to faculties that they ask examiners to indicate if they will be on leave for any period of time following the proposed date of submission and that if a lengthy delay might be occasioned by such leave, an alternative examiner be appointed.

(ii) Candidature responses

Faculties will be reminded that, in requesting comments from a candidate relating to a proposed recommendation of revision and re-examination, the faculty should specify to whom the comments, if any, should be sent.

(iii) Appointment of Examiners form

Faculties will be reminded of the need to fully complete Appointment of Examiners forms.

(b) Definition of PhD

The Committee noted the Sub-Committee's report that few responses had been received to a request to deans regarding the definition of a PhD. The Sub-Committee had agreed that if no other responses were forthcoming the Sub-Committee's Chair would draft a discussion paper to be sent to faculties and SUPRA for comment.

(c) Reports for the fourth quarter 2000 on PhDs awarded and examination times

(i) Awards at faculty level, fourth quarter 2000

The Committee noted a report on PhDs awarded at faculty-level for the period October to December 2000, as tabulated below. No PhDs were awarded at faculty-level for the period October to December 2000 by the Faculties of Architecture, Nursing or Pharmacy or the Sydney Conservatorium of Music. No response was received from the Faculty of Education or Sydney College of the Arts.

Faculty	Award	Award subject to		Percentages		
		Typo-graphical corrections	Emendations	Award	Typo-graphical corrections	Emendations
Agriculture			3	-	100	-
AGSM						
Architecture	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arts	3	2	2	42.8	28.5	28.5
College of the Arts						
Conservatorium of Music	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dentistry	-	1	2	-	33.3	66.6
Economics	2	1	7	20	10	70
Education						
Engineering	2	2	4	25	25	50
Health Sciences	-	-	2	-	-	100
Law	-	-	1	-	-	100
Medicine	1	2	12	6.6	13.3	80
Nursing	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pharmacy	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rural Management	1	-	-	100	-	-
Science	-	4	21	-	16	84

Veterinary Science	-	-	5	-	-	100
TOTAL	9	12	59	11.3%	15%	73.7%

(ii) Awards by the PhD Award Sub-Committee, fourth quarter 2000

The Committee noted the report on PhDs considered by the Sub-Committee, indicating the recommendation of the Sub-Committee forwarded to the faculty concerned for the period October to December 2000, as tabulated below:

Faculty	Award	Typo-graphical corrections	Emendations	Revise and resubmit	Non-award
Agriculture					
AGSM		1			
Architecture					
Arts		3	5	1	
College of the Arts					
Conservatorium of Music					
Dentistry			1		
Economics					
Education				3	
Engineering					
Health Sciences					
Law			1	2	
Medicine			2		
Nursing			1		
Pharmacy					
Rural Management					
Science			1		
Veterinary Science			1		
TOTAL	-	4	12	6	-

(iii) Summary of examination times, fourth quarter 2000

The Committee noted the summary below of PhDs awarded directly at faculty-level without further qualification, subject to typographical corrections or emendations. The time of examination was calculated as the number of days between the date that the thesis was submitted and the date that the candidate was informed of the result (that is, the date of the letter informing of award or award subject to qualification).

Averaged over all faculties 31.3% of degrees were awarded in three months or less, 20% in four months, 11.3% in five months, 15% in six months and 22.4% took longer than six months.

Faculty	Number awarded within specified months from submission									Total
	=2 mths	3 mths	4 mths	5 mths	6 mths	7 mths	8 mths	9 mths	>9 mths	
Agriculture			2						1	3
AGSM										
Architecture										
Arts		2	2	1		1	1			7
College of the Arts										
Conserv of Music										
Dentistry			1		1	1				3
Economics		1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	10
Engineering	1	4	2	1						8
Health Sciences		1	1							2

Law						1				1
Medicine		3	1	2	5	2	1	1		15
Nursing										
Pharmacy										
Rural Management		1								1
Science		11	6	3	3	1		1		25
Veterinary Science		1		1	2				1	5
TOTAL	1	24	16	9	12	9	3	3	3	80

(d) Membership of the Sub-Committee

The Committee noted that the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee had appointed Associate Professor P Jones to fill a casual vacancy on the Sub-Committee following Associate Professor R Arnold's resignation from membership.

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

Chair

Associate Professor A F Masters (to February 2002)

College of Humanities and Social Sciences

Professor H Price (to February 2002)

Associate Professor P Jones (to February 2004)

College of Health Sciences

Associate Professor S West (to February 2002)

Associate Professor J Christodoulou (to February 2004)

College of Sciences and Technology

Associate Professor F Nicholas (to February 2002)

Associate Professor J Small (to February 2004)

(3) Report of the Coursework Sub-Committee

The Committee received the report of the Coursework Sub-Committee meeting of 11 December 2000 relating to matters detailed in item 2 above (Proposals for new and amended postgraduate courses).

(4) References from the Academic Board

(a) The Management and Evaluation of Teaching

The Committee received the draft Academic Board Resolution "Management and Evaluation of Teaching" which was lying on the table at the Board and upon which the Chair of the Board had sought comments by 1 March 2001.

The Committee agreed that it would not be able to give serious consideration and provide comment within the proposed time-frame and agreed to ask the Chair to request the Chair of the Board to delay consideration of the document by the Board to allow members to consider the document and discuss it at the March Graduate Studies Committee meeting.

(b) Review of Indigenous Education

The Committee noted the report by the Chair of the Board on Indigenous Education.

(5) Proposal for Research Policy Sub-Committee

The Chair reported that he intended to bring a proposal to the Committee's March meeting for the establishment of a Research Policy Sub-Committee that would

parallel the work of the Coursework Sub-Committee and consider research policy matters relating to all degrees. The Chair invited members' views on the membership and terms of reference for the proposed Sub-Committee.

(6) APA, UPA and IPR scholarships, 2001 round

The Committee noted the following brief, preliminary report from the Chair on the 2001 APA, UPA and IPR scholarships round, noting also that a more detailed report would be provided later in the year.

A total of 191 APAs and UPAs were available for award. The number of scholarships available for each College was determined using the formula that combines research higher degree load (50%) and weighted completions (50%). Details of where we are in the selection round are as follows:

	Quota	Acceptances
CHASS	61	61
CHS	53	53
CST	77	79

Although we have currently over-offered by 2 scholarships in CST, our experience is that at least two of the recipients in CST will be awarded Travelling Scholarships. If not, the additional financial commitments will be absorbed in the scholarships budget.

In addition, 24 UPAs were awarded to international students who were successful in obtaining International Postgraduate Research Scholarships; 6 in CHASS, 5 in CHS and 13 in CST.

(7) Higher doctorates: award of degree of Doctor of Medicine

The Committee confirmed the Chair's action in approving the award of the degree of Doctor of Medicine to Robert Geoffrey Moses and Valerie Beral.

(8) Work in progress

The Committee noted the status of the following work in progress:

- (a) Examination of AGSM PhD theses
- (b) Initial Year of the PhD
- (c) Accreditation of Supervisors

Amendment of Senate and Faculty Resolutions and adoption of new Resolutions

Faculty of Science

Graduate Certificate in Applied Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Applied Information Technology and Master of Applied Information Technology

Degrees, Graduate Diplomas and Graduate Certificates in the Faculty of Science

The Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Degrees, Graduate Diplomas and Graduate Certificates in the Faculty of Science (p 507, *Calendar 1999, Volume 1: Statutes and Regulations*, as amended) are further amended from 1 July 2001 to the following effect.

- Section 1 relating to the degrees in the Faculty of Science is amended by adding the following new entry:
Master of Applied Information Technology (MAppIIT)
- Section 2 relating to the diplomas in the Faculty of Science is amended by adding the following new entry:
Graduate Diploma in Applied Information Technology (GradDipAppIIT)
- Section 3 relating to the certificates in the Faculty of Science is amended by adding the following new entry:
Graduate Certificate in Information Technology (GradCertAppIIT)

Graduate Certificate in Applied Information Technology

The following new Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Graduate Certificate in Applied Information Technology are adopted from 1 July 2001.

GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN APPLIED INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Eligibility for admission

1. The Dean of the Faculty of Science may admit to candidature:
 - (1) graduates who have completed a three-year degree in any discipline; or
 - (2) persons who have worked in the area of Information Technology for more than eight years and can offer evidence of recognized prior learning which is considered to demonstrate the knowledge and aptitude required to undertake the units of study.

Availability

2.
 - (1) Admission to the Graduate Certificate in Applied Information Technology may be limited by a quota.
 - (2) In determining the quota, the University will take into account:
 - (a) availability of resources including space, laboratory and computing facilities; and
 - (b) availability of adequate and appropriate supervision.
 - (3) In considering an application for admission to candidature, the Head of the Basser Department of Computer Science and the Dean shall select, in preference, applicants who are most meritorious in terms of section 1 above.

Time limits

3. A candidate may proceed on either a full-time or a part-time basis.
 - (1) A full-time candidate shall complete the requirements for the award not earlier than the end of the second semester of candidature, and not later than the end of the third semester of candidature, unless otherwise determined by the Dean.
 - (2) A part-time candidate shall complete the requirements of the award not earlier than the end of the third semester of candidature, and not later than the end of the sixth semester of candidature, unless otherwise determined by the Dean.

Graduate Diploma in Applied Information Technology

The following new Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Graduate Diploma in Applied Information Technology are adopted from 1 July 2001.

GRADUATE DIPLOMA IN APPLIED INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Eligibility for admission

1. The Dean of the Faculty of Science may admit to candidature:
 - (1) graduates who have completed a three-year degree in any discipline; or
 - (2) persons who have completed the GradCertApplIT at the University of Sydney, with an average result of Credit or better.

Availability

2.
 - (1) Admission to the Graduate Diploma in Applied Information Technology may be limited by a quota.
 - (2) In determining the quota, the University will take into account:
 - (a) availability of resources including space, laboratory and computing facilities; and
 - (b) availability of adequate and appropriate supervision.
 - (3) In considering an application for admission to candidature, the Head of the Basser Department of Computer Science and the Dean shall select, in preference, applicants who are most meritorious in terms of section 1 above.

Time limits

3. A candidate may proceed on either a full-time or a part-time basis. In determining the length of candidacy below, the Dean shall include time previously spent as a candidate for the GradCertApplIT course.
 - (1) A full-time candidate shall complete the requirements for the award not earlier than the end of the second semester of candidature, and not later than the end of the fourth semester of candidature, unless otherwise determined by the Dean.
 - (2) A part-time candidate shall complete the requirements of the award not earlier than the end of the fourth semester of candidature, and not later than the end of the eighth semester of candidature, unless otherwise determined by the Dean.

Master of Applied Information Technology

The following new Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Master of Applied Information Technology are adopted from 1 July 2001.

MASTER OF APPLIED INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Eligibility for admission

1. The Dean of the Faculty of Science may admit to candidature:
 - (1) graduates who have completed a three-year degree in any discipline; or
 - (2) persons who have completed the GradDipApplIT at the University of Sydney, with an average result of Credit or better.

Availability

2.
 - (1) Admission to the Master of Applied Information Technology may be limited by a quota.
 - (2) In determining the quota, the University will take into account:
 - (a) availability of resources including space, laboratory and computing facilities; and
 - (b) availability of adequate and appropriate supervision.
 - (3) In considering an application for admission to candidature, the Head of the Basser Department of Computer Science and the Dean shall select, in preference, applicants who are most meritorious in terms of section 1 above.

Time limits

3. A candidate may proceed on either a full-time or a part-time basis. In determining the length of candidacy below, the Dean shall include time previously spent as a candidate for the GradCertApplIT or the GradDipApplIT course.

- (1) A full-time candidate shall complete the requirements for the award not earlier than the end of the third semester of candidature, and not later than the end of the sixth semester of candidature, unless otherwise determined by the Dean.
- (2) A part-time candidate shall complete the requirements of the award not earlier than the end of the sixth semester of candidature, and not later than the end of the tenth semester of candidature, unless otherwise determined by the Dean.

Resolutions of the Faculty

Graduate Certificate in Applied Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Applied Information Technology, Master of Applied Information Technology

The following new Faculty Resolutions are adopted:

Requirements for the courses (GradCertApplIT, GradDipApplIT and MApplIT)

1.
 - (1) Candidates for the Graduate Certificate in Applied Information Technology are required to complete satisfactorily units of study granting a minimum of 36 credit points selected from units of study approved for the Master of Applied Information Technology. Of the 36 credit points, a maximum of 24 credit points can be selected from Elementary units of study; and at least 12 credit points should come from Foundational and Elective units of study, excluding IT project units of study.
 - (2) Candidates for the Graduate Diploma in Applied Information Technology are required to complete satisfactorily units of study granting a minimum of 48 credit points selected from units of study approved for the Master of Applied Information Technology. Of the 48 credit points, a maximum of 24 credit points can be selected from Elementary units of study and at least 24 credit points can be selected from Foundational and Elective units of study excluding IT project units of study.
 - (3) Candidates for the Master of Applied Information Technology are required to complete satisfactorily units of study granting a minimum of 72 credit points selected from the units of study approved for the Master of Applied Information Technology. Of the 72 credit points, a maximum of 24 credit points can be selected from Elementary units of study; a maximum of 24 credit points can be selected from Foundational units of study; and at least 24 credit points should come from Elective or IT project units of study.
2.
 - (1) To qualify for the award of Master of Applied Information Technology students must complete one of the defined majors.
 - (2) The defined majors for the Master of Applied Information Technology are Software Engineering, Multimedia Technology, E-Commerce Technology, Database Systems, Computer Science and Computer Networks.
3. The testamur for the Master of Applied Information Technology shall specify the major(s) completed in order to qualify for the award.

Examination

2. On completion of the requirements for the course, the Faculty shall determine the results of the candidature.

Progress

3. The Dean may –
 - (1) call upon any candidate to show cause why that candidature should not be terminated by reason of unsatisfactory progress towards the completion of the requirements for the Master of Applied Information Technology and
 - (2) where the candidate does not show good cause, terminate the candidature.

Credit

4. A candidate who, before admission to candidature, has spent time in graduate study and, within the previous three years, has completed coursework considered by the Faculty to be equivalent to units of study prescribed for the course, may receive credit of up to 24 credit points towards the

requirements for the Graduate Diploma in Applied Information Technology or Master of Applied Information Technology.

Graduate Certificate in Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Information Technology and Master of Information Technology

Degrees, Graduate Diplomas and Graduate Certificates in the Faculty of Science

The Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Degrees, Graduate Diplomas and Graduate Certificates in the Faculty of Science (p 507, *Calendar 1999, Volume 1: Statutes and Regulations*, as amended) are further amended from 1 July 2001 to the following effect. (Text to be deleted is indicated by strike-through, and text to be added is indicated by underlining.)

- Section 2 relating to the diplomas in the Faculty of Science is amended as indicated below:
 - (f) Graduate Diploma in Information Technology (~~GradDipInfTech~~) (GradDipIT)
- Section 3 relating to the certificates in the Faculty of Science is amended as indicated below:
 - (c) Graduate Certificate in Information Technology (~~GradCertInfTech~~) (GradCertIT)

Graduate Certificate in Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Information Technology and Master of Information Technology

Preamble:

The following proposed amendments have been drafted on the assumption that the proposed new Graduate Certificate in Applied Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Applied Information Technology and Master of Applied Information Technology will be offered in Semester 2, 2001.

Graduate Certificate in Information Technology

The Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Graduate Certificate in Information Technology (as adopted by Senate on 1 November 1999 and amended by Senate on 6 November 2000) are further amended to the following effect from 1 July 2001. (Text to be deleted is indicated by strike-through and text to be added is indicated by underlining.)

GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Eligibility for admission

1. The Dean of the Faculty of Science may admit to candidature:
 - (1) ~~graduates who have completed a three-year degree, with a substantial study of a relevant field in any aspect of Information Technology; or~~
 - (2) ~~persons who offer evidence of recognised prior learning which is considered to demonstrate the knowledge and aptitude required to undertake the units of study.~~

Availability

2. (1) Admission to the Graduate Certificate in Information Technology may be limited by a quota.
 - (2) In determining the quota the University will take into account:
 - (a) availability of resources including space, laboratory and computing facilities; and
 - (b) availability of adequate and appropriate supervision.
 - (3) In considering an application for admission to candidature, the Head of the Basser Department of Computer Science and the Dean shall select in preference applicants who are most meritorious in terms of section 1 above.

Time limits

3. A candidate may proceed on either a full-time or a part-time basis.
 - (1) A full-time candidate shall complete the requirements for the award not earlier than the end of the first semester of candidature, and not later than the end of the second semester of candidature, unless otherwise determined by the Dean.

- (2) A part-time candidate shall complete the requirements of the award not earlier than the end of the second semester of candidature, and not later than the end of the ~~fifth~~ fourth semester of candidature, unless otherwise determined by the Dean.

Progress

~~4. The Dean may —~~

- (a) ~~call upon any candidate to show cause why that candidature should not be terminated by reason of unsatisfactory progress towards the completion of the requirements for the Graduate Certificate, and~~
- (b) ~~where the candidate does not show good cause, terminate the candidature.~~

Graduate Diploma in Information Technology

The Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Graduate Diploma in Information Technology (as adopted by Senate on 1 November 1999 and amended by Senate on 6 November 2000) are further amended to the following effect from 1 July 2001. (Text to be deleted is indicated by strike-through and text to be added is indicated by underlining.)

GRADUATE DIPLOMA IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Eligibility for admission

1. The Dean of the Faculty of Science may admit to candidature,
- (1) graduates who have completed a three-year degree, ~~with a major study of a relevant field in any aspect of~~ information Technology; or
- (2) persons who have completed the ~~GradCertInfTech~~ GradCertIT at the University of Sydney, with an average result of Credit or better.

Availability

2. (1) Admission to the Graduate Diploma in Information Technology may be limited by a quota.
- (2) In determining the quota the University will take into account:
- (a) availability of resources including space, laboratory and computing facilities; and
- (b) availability of adequate and appropriate supervision.
- (3) In considering an application for admission to candidature, the Head of the Basser Department of Computer Science and the Dean shall select in preference applicants who are most meritorious in terms of section 1 above.

Time limits

3. A candidate may proceed on either a full-time or a part-time basis. In determining the ~~time~~ length of candidacy below, the ~~faculty~~ Dean shall include time previously spent as a candidate for the ~~GradCertInfTech GradCertIT or the MInfTech course.~~
- (1) A full-time candidate shall complete the requirements for the award not earlier than the end of the ~~first~~ second semester of candidature, and not later than the end of the ~~second~~ third semester of candidature, unless otherwise determined by the Dean.
- (2) A part-time candidate shall complete the requirements of the award not earlier than the end of the ~~second~~ third semester of candidature, and not later than the end of the ~~eight~~ sixth semester of candidature, unless otherwise determined by the Dean.

Progress

~~4. The Dean may —~~

- (a) ~~call upon any candidate to show cause why that candidature should not be terminated by reason of unsatisfactory progress towards the completion of the requirements for the Graduate Diploma, and~~
- (b) ~~where the candidate does not show good cause, terminate the candidature.~~

Master of Information Technology

The Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Master of Information Technology (pp 568-9, *Calendar 1999, Volume 1: Statutes and Regulations*, as amended by Senate on 6 November 2000) are further

amended to the following effect from 1 July 2001. (Text to be deleted is indicated by strike-through and text to be added is indicated by underlining.)

MASTER OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Eligibility for admission

1. The Dean of the Faculty of Science may admit to candidature,
 - (1) graduates who have completed a three-year degree, with results equivalent to Credit level in ~~a major study of a relevant field~~ any aspect of Information Technology; or
 - ~~(2) persons who have completed a three year degree, with a major study of a relevant field of Information Technology and two years relevant professional experience; or~~
 - ~~(3) persons who have completed the GradDipInfTech GradDipIT at the University of Sydney, with an average result of Credit or better.~~

Availability

2.
 - (1) Admission to the Master of Information Technology may be limited by a quota.
 - (2) In determining the quota the University will take into account:
 - (a) availability of resources including space, laboratory and computing facilities; and
 - (b) availability of adequate and appropriate supervision.
 - (3) In considering an application for admission to candidature, the Head of the Basser Department of Computer Science and the Dean shall select in preference applicants who are most meritorious in terms of section 1 above.

Time limits

3. A candidate may proceed on either a full-time or a part-time basis. In determining the ~~time~~ length of candidacy below, the Dean shall include time previously spent as a candidate for the ~~GradCertInfTech GradCertIT~~ or the ~~GradDipInfTech GradDipIT~~ course.
 - (1) A full-time candidate shall complete the requirements for the award not earlier than the end of the ~~third~~ second semester of candidature, and not later than the end of the ~~sixth~~ fourth semester of candidature, unless otherwise determined by the Dean.
 - (2) A part-time candidate shall complete the requirements of the award not earlier than the end of the ~~sixth~~ fourth semester of candidature, and not later than the end of the ~~tenth~~ eighth semester of candidature, unless otherwise determined by the Dean.

Progress

4. ~~The Dean may~~
 - ~~(a) call upon any candidate to show cause why that candidature should not be terminated by reason of unsatisfactory progress towards the completion of the requirements for the Master of Information Technology, and~~
 - ~~(b) where the candidate does not show good cause, terminate the candidature.~~

Resolutions of the Faculty

Graduate Certificate in Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Information Technology, Master of Information Technology

The Faculty Resolutions are amended to read as follows, with text to be deleted indicated by strike-through and new text indicated by underlining.

Requirements for the courses

1.
 - (1) Candidates for the Graduate Certificate in Information Technology are required to complete satisfactorily units of study granting a minimum of 24 credit points selected from units of study, excluding IT project units of study, approved for the Master of Information Technology.
 - (2) Candidates for the Graduate Diploma in Information Technology are required to complete satisfactorily units of study granting a minimum of 36 credit points selected from

units of study approved for the Master of Information Technology. Of the 36 credit points, a maximum of 24 credit points can be selected from Foundational units of study; and at least 12 credit points should come from Elective units of study, excluding IT project units of study.

(3) Candidates for the Master of Information Technology are required to complete satisfactorily units of study granting a minimum of ~~72~~ 48 credit points selected from the units of study approved for the Master of Information Technology, satisfying the conditions approved from time to time by the Faculty. Of the 48 credit points, a maximum of 24 credit points can be selected from Foundational units; and at least 24 credit points should come from Elective units or IT projects.

2. (1) To qualify for the award of Master of Information Technology students must complete one of the defined majors.

(2) The defined majors for the Master of Information Technology are Software Engineering, Multimedia Technology, E-Commerce Technology, Database Systems, Computer Science and Computer Networks.

3. The testamur for the Master of Information Technology shall specify the major(s) completed in order to qualify for the award.

Examination

2. On completion of the requirements for the course, the Faculty shall determine the results of the candidature.

Progress

3. The Dean may –

(1) call upon any candidate to show cause why that candidature should not be terminated by reason of unsatisfactory progress towards the completion of the requirements for the Graduate Certificate in Information Technology, the Graduate Diploma in Information Technology or the Master of Information Technology, and

(2) where the candidate does not show good cause, terminate the candidature.

Credit

4. A candidate who, before admission to candidature, has spent time in graduate study and, within the previous three years, has completed coursework considered by the Faculty to be equivalent to units of study prescribed for the course, may receive credit of up to ~~24~~ 12 credit points towards the requirements for the Graduate Diploma in Information Technology or Master of Information Technology.

AGENDA ITEM 10.
Report of the Teaching and Learning Committee

10.2 Report of the Teaching and Learning Committee meeting held on 22 February 2001

The Committee met on 22 February 2001 when there were present: The Alternative Chair of the Teaching and Learning Committee (Dr C Mitchell) presiding, Professors A Brewer and P Parkinson, Associate Professors J Kay, L McCrimmon, M Prosser and R Ross and Ms J Jones. Dr P Hopwood and Miss K Neveltsen were in attendance.

1. Receipt of Report

The Committee **recommends** that the Academic Board receive and note the following report of the meeting held on 22 February 2001.

2. The Management and Evaluation of Teaching

Recommendation

That the Academic Board extend the deadline for receipt of feedback on the draft Academic Board resolutions, The Management and Evaluation of Teaching, to allow the Committee to more fully consider the document at its March meeting.

3. Proceedings of the Committee

(1) Report of the Chair

(a) Membership of the Committee

The Chair wished to record the Committee's appreciation for the service of Dr James Dalziel, particularly in the areas of IT and pedagogy, to the Committee and to the wider University.

The Chair also extended appreciation to Professor Lawrence Cram, who had resigned as Chair of the Academic Board. The Chair wished him well for the future and thanked him for his leadership in teaching and learning issues on the Academic Board.

(2) Report of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning)

The Committee noted the report of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) on the following matters:

- (a) Management and Evaluation of Teaching
- (b) Generic Attributes of Graduates
- (c) Guidelines for Good Practice
- (d) Overview of Teaching and Learning Matters

(3) Review of Indigenous Education

The Committee agreed to defer consideration of this item until the following meeting when the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) could be present.

(4) Learning to Learn

The Committee considered a booklet circulated for information of members and noted that the Learning Centre produced a similar series of interactive modules covering a broad range of study skills.

(5) General Business

(a) Topics for consideration in 2001

Based on a list of topics for possible consideration in 2001, circulated to members at the meeting, the Committee agreed on items and priorities for the year.

AGENDA ITEM 11.
Report of the Research Committee

11.2 Report of the Research Committee meeting held on 6 February 2001

The Research Committee met on 6 February 2001 when there were present: Professor L Field, *Chair Research Committee (Presiding Member)*, Professor D Siddle, *Pro-Vice Chancellor (Research)*, Professor D Melrose, Professor M L Maher, Professor J Carter, Professor R Christopherson, Dr J Lingard, Professor S Garton, Associate Professor P McCallum, Professor C Pollock, Mr J Taylor, Professor G Gill, Associate Professor R Ross, Associate Professor A Reynolds, Dr L Poladian, Dr C Baxter, Mr W Dawson, Mr Ed Micallef (Committee Secretary).

1. Receipt of Report

The Committee recommends that the Board receive and note the following report of its meeting held on 6 February 2001.

2. Code of Conduct for Responsible Research Practice and Guidelines for Dealing with Allegations of Research Misconduct

Professor Field distributed a draft Code of Conduct for Responsible Research Practice and Guidelines for Dealing with Allegations of Research Misconduct (*see separate enclosure*). He noted that the Code of Conduct had been endorsed by the Board at its meeting on 15 December 1999, subject to review by the University Solicitor, prior to referral to Senate for approval. Following discussions with Deans, Industrial Relations, the University Solicitor, and Professor Koder, minor amendments have been made to the Code of Conduct and new Guidelines for dealing with Allegations of Research Conducted have been drafted.

The Research Committee **recommends** that the Academic Board endorse the Code of Conduct for Responsible Research Practice, as amended, and the new Guidelines for Dealing with Allegations of Research Misconduct and commend them to Senate for approval.

3 Proceedings of the Committee

(1) Items carried over

(a) Academic Honesty

Professor Field noted that the policy is still with the Teaching and Learning Committee.

(2) Correspondence

There was no correspondence received during the period.

(3) Membership of the Research Committee

Professor Field outlined the requirements of the membership of the Research Committee as determined by Section 17.(2) of the Academic Governance Rules of the Senate relating to the Academic Board. Consideration should be given to representation from members of College Research Committees and Chairs of the various Internal Funding Scheme Committees.

(4) Report on CRC round

Professor Siddle noted that 19 CRCs were announced in January, 12 of which are completely new and 7 of which arose from existing CRCs. The University of Sydney was successful in four new CRCs and one renewal. The new CRCs were Smart Internet, Technology Enabled Capital Markets, Construction Innovation and

Australian Sheep Industry. The renewed Centre was Value Added Wheat. The University of Sydney is now a core participant in 13 CRCs.

(5) Report on Internal Funding Schemes

Professor Siddle distributed a report showing internal R & D support for 2001 (*see separate enclosure*). The report showed, by College, funds available for Major Equipment, New Staff Support Scheme, Sesqui R & D Scheme and Postdoctoral Fellowships. For 2001, funds for R & D support were allocated to Colleges according to ARC Large Grant income and in part according to the new Institutional Grants Scheme formula. Only the Institutional Grants Scheme formula will be used in future years.

Professor Siddle noted that the Committee should look at the guidelines for the Internal Funding Schemes and review their aims to ensure that funding is appropriately targeted.

(6) The Innovation Statement

Professor Field handed out a summary of the major changes announced by the Prime Minister and copies of commentaries on the Innovation Statement from various peak bodies. Professor Siddle distributed a briefing paper that he had prepared for the Vice-Chancellor (*see separate enclosure*).

(7) Reports

(a) Professor David Siddle, Pro Vice Chancellor (Research)

Professor Siddle reported on the following:

- There were 24 University of Sydney Completion Scholarships awarded to commence this year, of which 20 were accepted. A second round of offers will be made in the second half of this year;
- The Linkage – Infrastructure (RIEF) timetable has been negotiated. The internal closing date for draft applications is 6 April with applications being dispatched to College Research Committees on 20 April. There will be a meeting of NSW PVC/DVC (R) on 23 May to discuss strategies;
- Postgraduate Scholarships: 150 APAs and 41 UPAs were awarded, with the number of scholarships available for each College determined by using the formula that combines research higher degree load and weighted completions. A further 25 international UPAs were also awarded;
- Research Quantum and RIBG for 2001: in terms of Research Quantum the University of Sydney has increased its share progressively over the previous 4 years, from \$20.91M in 1998 to \$23.69M in 2001. Other major universities have not increased their share in the same period;
- University infrastructure: a new scheme would be introduced as part of the innovation statement to provide \$246M over 5 years for university infrastructure;
- PVCs/DVCs (R) Committee: he will chair this committee, which will have its first meeting for 2001 in March;
- Australian Synchrotron: that Queensland and Victoria have been bidding for such infrastructure. NSW has now decided to bid for this infrastructure with general University support for the facility to be based at ANSTO.

(b) Mr Warwick Dawson, Director, Research and Scholarships Office

Mr Dawson reported on the following:

- There were a dozen applications for NHMRC Program Grants, which have an external closing date of 9 February;
- NHMRC Project Grants have an internal closing date of 9 February and an external closing date of 2 March;
- ARC – Discovery Projects close internally on 23 February. At this stage about 60 have been logged on the GAMS System. He and Ms Robb have been speaking at seminars with the CST and other parts of the University and are encouraging electronic submission of applications;
- International Fellowship Scheme – Linkage: the University was not successful at receiving any of these last year and is encouraging, through his seminars, applications for 2002. Applications close with the ARC on 30 March;
- Preparation for the Publications and Finance returns has started. A user manual for publications is being produced and training sessions will be arranged shortly;
- Celera Genomics Database: only one University from the GO8 has signed up, the main stumbling block being the confidentiality agreement.

(c) Dr Claire Baxter, Director, Business Liaison Office

Dr Baxter noted that she had stated at an earlier meeting that she was meeting with the NHMRC to look at their Intellectual Property guidelines. Dr Baxter now advises that representatives for the ARC and the AVCC were also at that meeting and guidelines are being prepared for a whole of government approach.

(8) Other Business

There was no other business.

AGENDA ITEM 14. General Business

14.1 Election of Chair of the Academic Board to fill a casual vacancy

At the close of nominations at 4 pm on Monday, 5 March 2001, one nomination was received for the election of the Chair of the Academic Board, to fill a casual vacancy from the date of election to 31 December 2002. In accordance with the Academic Governance Rules relating to the Board, the following candidate was declared elected:

Professor Judyth Sachs

14.2 Cancellation of the April Board meeting

As there does not appear to be any urgent business for the April Board, it is **recommended** that the April Board meeting be cancelled in accordance with the provision in the 2001 schedule of Board meetings.

In the event that any urgent business may arise, which cannot await the May Board meeting, the Board is asked to authorise its Chair to act on its behalf in any such matter.

14.3 Membership of the Central Promotion Committees: 2001

The former Chair of the Board, Professor Cram, has recommended that the Academic Board approve the following changes to the membership of the Central Promotion Committees for 2001 that it appointed in December 2000:

Senior Lecturer

Associate Professor Susan Quine to replace Associate Professor Sybille Lechner and Associate Professor Penny Gay to replace Associate Professor Geraldine Barnes

Associate Professor

Professor Basil Roufogalis to replace Professor Cristobal dos Remedios and Professor Sue Armitage to replace Associate Professor Jill Gordon

Professor

Professor Ann Brewer to replace Professor Margaret Harris

The amended membership of the Committees is set out below:

Senior Lecturer

Professor Ken Eltis (Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Planning and Resources) (Chair)

Professor Judyth Sachs (Chair, Academic Board)

Professor Alan Johnson (external - University of Technology Sydney)

Dr Jim Kitay (nominee, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, CHASS)

Associate Professor John Small (nominee, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, CST)

Associate Professor Susan Quine (nominee, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, CHS)

Associate Professor Jack Crosbie (Physiotherapy)

Associate Professor Jock Keene (Geology and Geophysics)

Associate Professor Penny Gay (English)

Meeting: 14 September 2001

Associate Professor

Professor Ken Eltis (Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Planning and Resources) (Chair)

Professor Judyth Sachs (Chair, Academic Board)

Professor Kevin McConkey (external - University of New South Wales)

Associate Professor Julie Stubbs (nominee, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, CHASS)
Professor Alex McBratney (nominee, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, CST)
Professor Basil Roufogalis (nominee, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, CHS)
Professor Anne Brewer (Institute of Transport Studies)
Professor Sue Armitage (Clinical Nursing)
Professor Norm Dancer (Mathematics and Statistics)

Meeting: 26 October 2001

Professor

Professor Gavin Brown, Vice-Chancellor (Chair)
Professor Ken Eltis (Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Planning and Resources)
Professor Judyth Sachs (Chair, Academic Board)
Professor Kevin McConkey (external - University of New South Wales)
Professor Don Napper (Pro-Vice-Chancellor, CST)
Professor Ros Pesman (Pro-Vice-Chancellor, CHASS)
Professor J A Young (Pro-Vice-Chancellor, CHS)
Professor Anne Brewer (Institute of Transport Studies)
Professor Alex McBratney (Agricultural Chemistry and Soil Science)
Professor Vicki Reed (Communication Sciences)

Meeting: 16 November 2001