



Academic Board Agenda

Academic Board Officer: Keri Neveldsen

Secretariat, Quadrangle, A14

Phone: 9351 3305; Fax: 9351 3572

E-mail: K.Neveldsen@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 12 February 2003** in the Professorial Board Room.

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

Keri Neveldsen
for
Dr W Adams
Registrar

5 February 2003

AGENDA

Pages

- ★ 1. **Apologies**
The following apologies have been received:
Professor C Benrimoj

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 11 December 2002 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 3 February 2003 [5-7](#),
Supplementary agenda (tabled)

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Board on academic matters considered by Senate at its meeting held on 3 February 2003.

5.2 General report

5.2.1 Summary of Academic Board activities 2002 [8, 9-11](#)

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Board on Academic Board activities 2002, as set out in the report presented.

5.2.2 Academic Board Faculty Review Visits: Phase One [8, 14-15](#)

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Board relating to Academic Board Faculty Review Visits: Phase One, as set out in the report presented.

5.2.3 Academic Board Faculty Review Visits: Phase Two [8, 16-40](#)

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Board relating to Academic Board Faculty Review Visits: Phase Two, as set out in the report presented.

5.2.4 Self-audit of the Academic Board [8, 41-42](#)

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Board relating to Self-audit of the Academic Board, as set out in the report presented.

5.2.5 Actions taken under delegated authority [8](#)

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the report of the Chair of the Academic Board on actions taken under delegated authority since the December 2002 meeting of the Academic Board, as set out in the report presented.

★ 6. **Report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal**

6.1 **Report on Senate matters**

6.1.1 **Report of the Senate meeting held on 3 February 2003**

*Supplementary
agenda (tabled)*

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal on matters considered by Senate at its meeting held on 3 February 2003.

6.2 **General report**

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the general report of the Vice-Chancellor and Principal.

★ 7. **Question time**

Questions to the Vice-Chancellor and Chair of the Academic Board

(Time limit 15 minutes)

8. **Reports of Faculties and Boards**

8.1 **Report of the Faculty of Medicine**

[43-46](#)

8.1.1 **Receipt of report**

Recommendation

That the Academic Board receive and note the report of the Faculty of Medicine meeting held on 21 November 2002.

8.1.2 **Amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate: Constitution of the Faculty of Medicine**

[43, 44-46](#)

Recommendation

That the Academic Board recommend that Senate amend the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Constitution of the Faculty of Medicine, with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.

9. Report of the Research Committee

(Professor John Carter)



9.1 Oral report of the Chair

Recommendation

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

9.2 Report of the meeting held on 22 October 2002 [47-50](#)

9.2.1 Receipt of report

Recommendation

That the Academic Board receive and note the report of the Research Committee meeting held on 22 October 2002.

9.2.2 Proceedings of the Committee [47-50](#)

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Research Committee meeting held on 22 October 2002, as set out in the report presented.

9.2 Report of the meeting held on 19 November 2002 [51-53](#)

9.2.1 Receipt of report

Recommendation

That the Academic Board receive and note the report of the Research Committee meeting held on 19 November 2002.

9.2.2 Proceedings of the Committee [51-53](#)

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the proceedings of the Research Committee meeting held on 19 November 2002, as set out in the report presented.

10. General Business

10.1 Membership of Central Promotions Committees: 2003 [54](#)

Recommendation

That the Academic Board appoint members to the Central Promotions Committees for 2003, as set out in the report presented.

10.2 Conferring of All Academic Titles [55-60](#)

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the report relating to the Conferring of All Academic Titles by Colleges and Faculties, as set out in the report presented.

AGENDA ITEM 5

Report of the Chair

5.1 Report on Senate matters

5.1.1 Report of the Senate meeting held on 3 February 2003

For the information of the Board, the paper I presented and discussed at the recent Senate retreat follows:

Challenges Facing the Academic Board

Judyth Sachs

Presentation to Senate: February 2003

Responding to environmental pressures

(1) Managing and responding to the external environment

- Government, Nelson Inquiry and AUQA
- Professional pressure – especially as this relates to accreditation and certification of courses (Psychology, nursing, engineering computing, accounting, dentistry, medicine and others have to have their degree courses accredited before graduates can practise)
- Student and community expectations – high quality, rigorous and relevant curriculum and learning environment
- Pressure to pass students – as the quality of in take increases, the University is open to criticism of ‘ruining’ successful school leavers if they do not pass examinations. Academic Board has a role to play in the quality of assessment – control assessment and control the quality of the courses
 - Find ways to value add to students – Advanced science and arts degrees and extending high achieving students
- Engaging with the community – part of the frame of reference in which we operate. Strategic goal relates to community engagement. Outreach of the University and how the University is positioned. How do we do this? (Shopfront – brand – other universities have campuses and offices in major capital cities) How can we resource it?
- Image of the university – need to protect the ‘brand’
 - Responsive and service oriented – quick turn around
- Nature of the student body
 - High UAI scores – issues of social diversity and equity
 - Priorities – full time study and full time work eg. “the working student”
- Retention and recruitment of staff – growing the next generation of academics and researchers. Strategies for mentoring and support
- De-regulated fees. Impact on quality (of courses and of students). Problem of responding only to market pressures
 - Impact on student demographics in certain courses (Law, Vet Science, BA (Communications), Business and Economics – how does this fit with University goals?
- Review of performance of Academic Board, its committees and Chair and Deputy chairs

(2) Managing and responding to the internal environment

- Articulation of undergraduate degrees and post graduate degrees
- Quality of delivery – standards in course content delivery (nature and mode), quality of back up services (staff training in IT, back up services for IT)
- Supporting flexibility of student choice – seamless transitions – increase in double degrees demands this
- Challenge of diversity of course offerings versus flexibility. Issue of 6 credit points across all courses
- Flexibility of pathways through degrees
- Compliance to AB policies – AB visits have focussed on some of these policies but not all. Brings into question how exposed are faculties if they do not comply with policy
- More efficient and effective ways of collecting and reporting information for QA purposes
- Post graduate degrees – many professional courses now have postgraduate entry. (Law, Dentistry, Medicine, Education)
- General studies/core curriculum in degree courses

Identification and acknowledgement of the work of the Academic Board

(1) Committees and working parties

- Committees
 - Research Committee
 - Graduate Studies Committee
 - Postgraduate Research Training Sub-Committee
 - Postgraduate Coursework Sub-Committee
 - PhD Award Sub-Committee
 - Undergraduate Studies Committee
 - Admissions Sub-Committee
 - Teaching and Learning Committee
 - Library Sub-Committee
 - Academic Staff Committee
- Working parties
 - Working Party on Communication, Implementation and Monitoring of Academic Board Policies
 - Show Cause Working Party
 - Special Consideration Working Party
 - ICT and Pedagogy in Teaching and Learning Reference Group

(2) Academic Board Faculty Review Visits

- Academic Board Review visits to faculties to review teaching and learning and research training in 2002. In 2003 the visits will focus on other university goals
- Common themes emerging from the visits
 - Strong student loyalty and identification with the “brand” and profession
 - Compliance with Board policies – esp. Academic Honesty quite good
 - Quality assurance processes in place
 - Culture of QI across university
 - Variation of support to international students

-
- (3) **Policy development, monitoring and review**
- Policy development
 - Rural and Regional Entry Scheme: pilot program
 - Admission to Undergraduate Courses
 - Admission to Undergraduate Courses: Elite athletes and performers
 - Submission of treatises containing published work
 - Submission of PhD theses containing published work
 - APA and University scholarships: Method of award and transfer guidelines
 - Amended policy on PhD examinations
 - Amended the promotions documents for academic staff to levels B-E
 - Monitoring and review of policies
 - Assessment and examination of coursework
 - Management and evaluation of teaching
 - Implementation of Academic Honesty
 - Graduate attributes and performance standards
 - Honours
 - Establishing the monitoring and review cycle of Academic Board policies
- (4) **Academic Board initiatives: 2002**
- Academic Board web site development
 - Communication of Academic Board policy
 - Academic Board Reviews of teaching and learning and research training
 - Development of guidelines for Phase 2 AB reviews – dealing with the other strategic goals
 - Discussion paper: Quality Assurance and the Influence of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) on Teaching and Learning
 - New Academic Board
 - Templates for course proposals
- (5) **Academic Board initiatives: 2003**
- Appeals
 - Student code of conduct
 - Course standardisation
 - English language requirements
 - Implementation of new Academic Board

5.2 General report

5.2.1 Summary of Academic Board activities 2002

[9-11](#)

For the information of the Board, a summary of Academic Board activities during 2002 is set out in the report presented on pages 9-11.

5.2.2 Academic Board Faculty Review Visits: Phase One

[14-15](#)

In 2002 the Academic Board completed the process of Faculty Review Visits to all faculties, building on initial work undertaken in 2001. The 17 visits in 14 months were undertaken by review panels including the Chair of the Academic Board, faculty representatives, the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) and the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research). They comprised a series of structured interviews between the review panel and groups of students, staff and senior officers of the faculty.

The review visits followed the submission by faculties of self-evaluation reports on faculty academic quality assurance systems to the Academic Board. These reports were required to address the management of quality in teaching and learning, including systems for ensuring the integration of research with undergraduate teaching, processes for assuring the quality of student assessment and standards, quality assurance for research training, and methods for monitoring student progress and recognising excellence in teaching.

The 2002 visits focussed on teaching and learning and a brief summary of common themes emerging from the reviews is outlined in the report enclosed on pages 14-15. A full report will be presented to the Board in the near future.

5.2.3 Academic Board Faculty Review Visits: Phase Two

[16-40](#)

The second round of Faculty Review Visits begins in 2003 and will:

- include a review of faculty progress where possible improvement was identified in phase one; and
- address strategic goals of the University not included in the first round of reviews.

The draft Guidelines for phase two are enclosed on pages 16-40. Members are asked to direct feedback to Elizabeth Hanna, Executive Officer (Quality Assurance) by Friday 21 February.

5.2.4 Self-audit of the Academic Board

[41-42](#)

The Academic Board continues to undergo change as a result of the Review of the Academic Board and the Academic Forum. The proposed By-law which will amend the Academic Board and disestablish the Academic Forum is now with the Minister for Education for referral to the Governor.

The changes that have been ongoing will continue during 2003 as part of the implementation of the new Board. In the context there will be additional challenges for the Academic Board in undertaking a self-audit.

The enclosed document, pages 41-42, is designed to generate discussion by members of the Board to enable the development of a full process for self-audit.

5.2.5 Actions taken under delegated authority

The Board, at its December 2002 meeting, authorised the Chair of the Board to act on its behalf on any urgent matter which arose following the December 2002 Board meeting and which could not await the first meeting of the Academic Board in 2003.

I have not acted on behalf of the Board in any matters.

Summary of Academic Board activities 2002

The Academic Board, and its Committees, considered a variety of issues throughout 2002. Summarised below are some of the activities of the Board and its Committees (this includes actions taken by the Chair of the Board under delegated authority):

The Academic Board recommended the introduction of new courses, or amendment of existing courses as follows:

Faculty of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources	Bachelor of Land and Water Science; and Bachelor of Resource Economics	Amended
Faculty of Architecture	Energy Conservation to Sustainable Design in the Master of Design Science, Graduate Diploma in Design Science and Graduate Certificate in Design Science	Renamed stream
Faculty of Arts	Bachelor of Arts (Advanced)	New
	Master of Media Practice, Graduate Diploma in Media Practice and Graduate Certificate in Media Practice	New
	Master of Medical Humanities, Graduate Diploma in Medical Humanities and Graduate Certificate in Medical Humanities	New
	Doctor of Arts	New
	Doctor of Social Sciences	New
Faculty of Dentistry	Master of Dental Science	Amended
Faculty of Economics and Business	Bachelor of Economics (Social Sciences) to the Bachelor of Economic and Social Sciences	Renamed
	Bachelor of Commerce, Bachelor of Economics and Bachelor of Economic and Social Sciences	Amended
	Master of International Business and Law (with the Faculty of Law)	New
	Master of Business, Graduate Diploma in Business and Graduate Certificate in Business	New
Faculty of Education	Bachelor of Education (Primary); Bachelor of Education (Secondary Education: Human Movement and Health Education); Bachelor of Education (Secondary Education: Humanities and Social Sciences) / Bachelor of Arts; Bachelor of Education (Secondary Education: Science) / Bachelor of Science; Bachelor of Education (Secondary Education: Mathematics) / Bachelor of Science; Bachelor of Education (Secondary Education) / Bachelor of Arts (Psychology); Bachelor of Education (Secondary Education) / Bachelor of Science (Psychology); Bachelor of Education (Secondary Education: Design and Technology)	Amended
	Graduate Diploma in Educational Studies (Coach Education) and Graduate Certificate in Educational Studies (Coach Education)	New
	Master of Education (Higher Education)	New

Faculty of Engineering	Bachelor of Engineering	Amended
	Graduate Certificate in Automation in Field Robotics	New
	Doctor of Engineering Practice	New
Faculty of Health Sciences	Master of Health Science	Additional delivery mode
Faculty of Law	Bachelor of Laws	Amended
	Master's degrees and Graduate Diplomas	Amended
Faculty of Medicine	Advanced Diploma in Indigenous Primary Health Care and Diploma in Indigenous Primary Health Care	New and amended
	Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery	Amended
	Master of Science in Medicine (Psychotherapy)	New
Faculty of Nursing	Bachelor of Nursing and Bachelor of Nursing (Honours)	New revised courses
	Bachelor of Nursing (Indigenous Australian Health)	New
	Mental Health in the Master Nursing	New subject area
	Aged Care in the Master Nursing	New subject area
Faculty of Pharmacy	Bachelor of Pharmacy (Rural)	New
	Master of Pharmaceutical Industry, Graduate Diploma in Pharmaceutical Industry and Graduate Certificate in Pharmaceutical Industry	New
	Master of Herbal Medicines, Graduate Diploma in Herbal Medicines and Graduate Certificate in Herbal Medicines	Additional delivery mode
	Master of Pharmacy (Clinical) and Graduate Diploma in Clinical Pharmacy	Additional delivery mode
Faculty of Rural Management	Bachelor of Business (Agricultural Commerce) and Advanced Diploma of Business (Agricultural Commerce)	Amended
	Undergraduate Courses	Amended
	Master of Sustainable Management, Graduate Diploma in Sustainable Management and Graduate Certificate in Sustainable Management	New
Faculty of Science	Bioinformatics in the Master of Applied Science, Graduate Diploma in Applied Science and Graduate Certificate in Applied Science	New subject area
	Microscopy and Microanalysis in the Master of Applied Science, Graduate Diploma in Applied Science and Graduate Certificate in Applied Science	New subject area
	Coastal Management in the Master of Applied Science, Graduate Diploma in Applied Science and Graduate Certificate in Applied Science	New subject area
	Master of Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Information Technology, Graduate Certificate in Information Technology, Master of	Amended

	Applied Information Technology, Graduate Diploma in Applied Information Technology and Graduate Certificate in Applied Information Technology	
	Master of Applied Science, Graduate Diploma in Applied Science and Graduate Certificate in Applied Science	Amended
	Master of Quantitative Marine Ecology, Graduate Diploma in Quantitative Marine Ecology and Graduate Certificate in Quantitative Marine Ecology	Amended
Faculty of Veterinary Science	Bachelor of Veterinary Science	Amended
	Master of Veterinary Public Health Management, Graduate Diploma in Veterinary Public Health Management and Graduate Certificate in Veterinary Public Health Management	New
Sydney College of the Arts	Bachelor of Visual Arts	Amended
Sydney Conservatorium of Music	Bachelor of Music Studies	Amended

Review of the Academic Board and the Academic Forum

Early 2002 saw the final approval by the Academic Board and Senate of recommendations arising from the Review of the Academic Board and the Academic Forum undertaken in 2001. Throughout the remainder of the year, implementation issues were addressed. This included the approval of the Guidelines for Faculties to Elect Academic Staff Members of the Academic Board and approval of the provisions submitted by the faculties. Faculties also addressed issues relating to student membership of faculties to reflect the changes to the categories of membership of the Academic Board.

On the recommendation of the Academic Board, Senate adopted the *University of Sydney (Academic Board Membership) Rule 2002* to extend the terms of office of members to 31 December 2003 to provide a transitional period. Senate also adopted the *University of Sydney (Academic Forum Membership) Rule 2002* to extend the terms of membership of the Academic Forum until the proposed By-law is adopted and the Forum subsequently disestablished. An increase to the total membership of the Student Proctorial Panel was also approved with the adoption of the *University of Sydney (Student Proctorial Panel) Rule 2002*.

In preparing for the implementation of the revised committee structure, the Academic Board approved the terms of reference and constitutions of the Undergraduate Studies Committee, Admissions Sub-Committee, Graduate Studies Committee, Postgraduate Coursework Sub-Committee, Postgraduate Research Training Sub-Committee, PhD Award Sub-Committee, Postgraduate Awards Sub-Committee, Appeals Committee of the Graduate Studies Committee, Research Committee, Academic Staffing Committee, Teaching and Learning Committee, and Library Sub-Committee; and amended the Resolutions of the Academic Board relating to Student appeals against academic decisions to provide for the Dean of Graduate Studies to be a member of the Appeals Committee of the Graduate Studies Committee.

Faculty Review Visits

The Academic Board completed the process of Faculty Review Visits to all faculties, building on initial work undertaken in 2001. The visits by a review panel including the Chair of the Academic Board, faculty representatives, the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) and the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) comprise a series of structured interviews between the review panel and groups of students, staff and senior officers of the faculty.

The review visits follow the submission by faculties of self-evaluation reports on faculty academic quality assurance systems to the Academic Board. These reports address the management of quality in teaching and learning, including systems for ensuring the integration of research with undergraduate teaching, processes for assuring the quality of student assessment and standards, quality assurance for research training, and methods for monitoring student progress and recognising excellence in teaching.

The 2002 visits focussed on teaching and learning, and research training and how faculties were implementing the goals of the University's strategic plan. In the year ahead, the Academic Board will conduct a second round of visits reviewing faculty progress where possible improvement was identified and addressing those strategic goals not included in the first visits.

Resolutions, Policies and Procedures

The Academic Board:

- approved the Rural and Regional Entry Scheme: Pilot Program;
- approved the Elite Athletes and Performers Scheme;
- approved the Academic Board Resolutions: *Admission to Undergraduate Courses*;
- approved the policy *Submission of treatises containing published work*;
- approved the revised policy *Australian Postgraduate Awards and University Scholarships: Method of Award*;
- approved the *Australian Postgraduate Awards: Transfer Guidelines*;
- approved the policy *Appointment of Additional Examiner as Assessor*;
- amended the Resolutions of the Academic Board relating to the Examination Process of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in relation to the appointment of additional examiner as assessor;
- approved the policy *Submission of Doctor of Philosophy Theses Containing Published Work*;
- amended the Resolutions of the Academic Board relating to the Use of the University of Sydney Library; and
- endorsed the resolution of the Library Committee relating to the disposal of print copies of publications where the University also possessed electronic versions.

The Board also:

- recommended that Senate approve the *University of Sydney (Intellectual Property) Rule 2002* and noted the Intellectual Property Rule: A Guide;
- recommended that Senate amend the *University of Sydney (Amendment Act) Rule 1999* (as amended) relating to the Doctor of Philosophy and the requirement to complete candidature within the University;
- recommended that Senate amend the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Use of the University of Sydney Library;
- recommended that the Vice-Chancellor amend the *Guidelines for Dealing With Allegations of Research Misconduct*, associated with the Code of Conduct for Responsible Research Practice;
- received reports of titles conferred by the Colleges, in accordance with the policy, *Conferring of All Academic Titles*;
- approved the minimum English language requirements for admission to the Faculty of Nursing; the Doctor of Health Sciences in the Faculty of Health Sciences; and the Bachelor of Laws in the Faculty of Law, in accordance with its authority under the *Delegations of Authority: Academic Functions*;

- appointed members to the 2002 Student Proctorial Panel, in accordance with the requirements of the *University of Sydney (Amendment Act) Rule 1999*;
- appointed members to the Australian Graduate School of Management (AGSM) Academic Board;
- noted the definition of “Non-English Speaking Background” in relation to the Academic Board Resolutions: *Admission to Undergraduate Courses*;
- noted that the Graduate Studies Committee had approved the *Guidelines for Examiners of Doctor of Philosophy Theses*; and
- noted that the Graduate Studies Committee had developed an application form for applications for deferment of public availability of theses.

In addition, the Board:

- endorsed the *Response to the Nelson Review of Higher Education: Striving for Quality: Learning, Teaching and Scholarship*;
- developed the discussion paper: *Quality Assurance and the Influence of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) on Teaching and Learning at the University of Sydney*;
- received reports, via the Committee process, of academic activities of faculties and organisational units;
- received reports relating to the Summer School;
- received reports of the Academic Board meetings of the Australian Graduate School of Management (AGSM);
- received a report from the Chair on attendance at the bi-annual national chairs of academic boards conference;
- received reports from the Chair relating to the New South Wales Committee of Chairs of Academic Boards/Senates meetings;
- received a report relating to Discipline of Students 2001;
- received information from its Undergraduate Studies Committee concerning the International English Language Testing System (IELTS);
- appointed members to the Advisory Committee for the Centre for Continuing Education;
- noted and congratulated the recipients of the Vice-Chancellor’s Awards for Outstanding Teaching and the Vice-Chancellor’s Awards for Excellence in Research Higher Degree Supervision;
- appointed members to fill casual vacancies; and
- began considering strategies to review its own performance.

In relation to Academic Staffing matters, the Board appointed members to Central Promotion Committees, and acting on behalf of the Academic Board, the Chair appointed nominees for selection committees. The Board also receive reports on the promotion of academic staff from Level A to Level B, Level B to Level C, Level C to Level D, and to Level E (Professor) in 2002.

The Board considered and recommended that Senate approve the amendment of the constitutions of the Faculty of Architecture; Faculty of Education and Social Work; Faculty of Health Sciences; Faculty of Science; Sydney College of the Arts; and the Board of Studies of Indigenous Studies

The Board also considered and approved variation to semester and vacations dates for the Faculty of Architecture 2002; Faculty of Dentistry 2003; Faculty of Education 2003; Faculty of Health Sciences 2003-2006; Faculty of Medicine 2002 and 2003; Faculty of Nursing 2003; Faculty of Veterinary Science 2003; and the Sydney Conservatorium of Music 2003.

Academic Board Faculty Review Visits: Phase One

Summary of key issues arising from the Academic Board Faculty Review Visits on teaching, learning, and research training

- 1. Reaction to Review process**
On the whole, Faculties gave positive feedback on the usefulness of the Review process and its positive impact on Teaching and Learning. A sense of improvement culture seems to exist throughout the University.
- 2. Commitment**
In many areas, there is a strong sense of commitment from both staff and students to programs, Faculties and the University.
- 3. Collegiality**
Positively commented on in many Faculties
- 4. Leadership**
Strong leadership of the Dean commended in a few cases.
- 5. Restructuring**
On the whole, the many instances of recent restructuring have been effective and well received by staff.
- 6. Generic attributes**
Several examples of good practice. Varying awareness among students regarding their Faculty's approach to generic attributes. Generic attributes are 'on the agenda' in Faculties.
- 7. Research-led teaching**
Highlighted as working well in many areas.
- 8. Research in scholarship of teaching**
Starting to be recognised as a valid research area.
- 9. Research training**
Variable. Both good practice and room for improvement. Implementation of Code of Supervision patchy. Is on Faculty agendas, with lots of encouragement or requirement in Faculties for staff to complete ITL Postgraduate Supervision Development Program.
- 10. Teaching and Learning**
 - Dedication of staff commended in many areas
 - Increasing development of an excellence in teaching culture
 - Several Faculties appointing Associate Deans with T&L titles
 - Considerable variety in student views of quality of teaching
 - Teaching and Learning Committees working well in general
 - Much positive feedback on support provided by ITL
 - New staff undertaking ITL teaching courses
 - Variation in tutoring standards raised by students in a number of areas
 - Concern in many areas at the reduction in the number of tutorials and the increase in tutorial sizes
 - Economics and Business starting its own Centre for T & L
 - Some good examples of innovation, such as: BDent (1st graduate program); PBL in Medicine and Dentistry; Nursing – first BN (Indigenous Health)

11. **Assessment**
 - Some Faculties developing policies, handbooks, monitoring arrangements etc
 - Variation in student views on speed and effectiveness of feedback on assessment
 - Group work and its assessment is area for further improvement in some areas
12. **Transition programs**

Quite a few examples of good practice
13. **Students at risk**

Variation in practices across Faculties. Some Faculties had examples of good practice while others seemed to have little in the way of structured strategies in place to identify students at risk.
14. **Mentoring schemes**

Some Faculties had these in place, although some seemed not to be running effectively.
15. **International students**

Recognising the specific needs of international students is on many Faculties' agendas, with some having appointed Associate Deans with specific international student responsibilities. At least one Faculty has established an international student working party.
16. **Student Evaluation**

Working very well in some areas, but some instances where students seemed to be unaware of how the Faculty had responded to their feedback. Some Faculties have a dedicated Evaluation Officer
17. **Benchmarking**

This issue is on the agenda in Faculties. Many have formal benchmarking arrangements in place.
18. **Academic Board policies**

Most Faculties have effective processes in place to disseminate and implement Academic Board policy.
19. **Combined degrees**

Student concern in some areas about the practicalities of undertaking combined degrees, relating to matters such as support, administrative arrangements and lack of identity with either Faculty. A number of Faculties have examples of good practice with special arrangements in place.
20. **On-line learning/WebCT**

Working very effectively in some areas.
21. **Isolation**

Some areas based off the main Darlington campus feel a sense of isolation from the main campus.

Academic Board Faculty Review Visits: Phase Two

GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY REVIEWS (PHASE 2)

Draft for discussion

1. Purpose of Academic Board review

- 1.1 The central purpose of Academic Board Review is to assist the University in safeguarding and enhancing the quality of its core activities ie, teaching, learning and research. Review is intended:
- to support Faculties in ensuring the effectiveness and sustainability of their quality assurance arrangements, through peer review of processes, outcomes and the evidence that demonstrates their effectiveness;
 - to assist Faculties in identifying and evaluating strengths and weaknesses;
 - to support Faculties in maintaining a systematic and continuous cycle of planning, monitoring and improvement;
 - to promote good practice throughout the University;
 - to assist Faculties in evaluating achievements in relation to the University's Goals;
 - to promote ownership of quality assurance activities throughout the University;
 - to fulfil the University's requirements for both internal and external accountability (e.g. audit by the Australian Universities Quality Agency).

2. The two phases of Academic Board review

- 2.1 Reviews of Faculties commenced in late 2001 with the Academic Board Reviews of Faculty Teaching, Learning and Research Training. For ease of reference, these reviews are here referred to as the 'Phase 1' Reviews. All Faculties have now completed Phase 1 Review. This Phase 2 Review process is designed to complete the review process of Faculty activities in a manner complementary to the Phase 1 Review process. Whereas the Phase 1 process focused primarily on teaching, learning and research training, the Phase 2 process is designed to review the entirety of Faculty activity. Phase 2 will not duplicate Phase 1 Review. Teaching, Learning and Research Training will be addressed within the Phase 2 process by asking Faculties to provide an update on how they have responded to the Recommendations of the Phase 1 process. The rest of the Phase 2 Review process will consider the scope of Faculty activity with particular reference to the Faculty's contribution to the achievement of the University's seven Goals.
- 2.2 The Phase 2 Review process builds on the experiences of the Phase 1 reviews, taking account of feedback from Faculties on the process of Phase 1 review.
- 2.3 These Guidelines cover the Academic Board Review Phase 2 process. Separate guidelines exist for the Academic Board Reviews of Teaching, Learning and Research Training (Phase 1) process. It may be that, for the next round of Academic Board Reviews (not due to start until 2005), the Phase 1 and Phase 2 processes will be amalgamated into a single process. This matter will be considered in the light of experience of the Phase 2 Reviews.

3. Cycle of review

- 3.1 Each Faculty will normally undergo Academic Board Phase 2 Review every **five years**, although a shorter cycle is discretionary. The Chair of the Academic Board has responsibility for scheduling the Reviews. Phase 2 Reviews will commence in 2003 and all Faculties will have undergone Phase 2 Review by the end of 2004.

4. Scope of review

- 4.1 The Phase 2 Faculty Reviews cover the full range of Faculty activities, with particular reference to their contribution to the University's seven Goals as described in its Strategic Plan 1999-2004. They cover the following:

Goal One	Quality Teaching and Learning
Goal Two	Diversity, Access and Equity
Goal Three	Excellence in Research
Goal Four	Internationalisation
Goal Five	Engagement with Industry and the Professions
Goal Six	Effective Management
Goal Seven	Service to the Community

- 4.2 Review evaluates both processes and outcomes:

- It evaluates the Faculty's internal quality assurance processes: the processes that the Faculty uses to assure itself of the quality of its academic activities in relation to teaching, learning, research and research training; and
- It evaluates the outcomes that reflect the success of the quality assurance processes.

The Academic Board's five-yearly Review process complements the Faculty's internal quality assurance processes. Academic Board Review processes seek to ensure the sustainability of the Faculty's own quality assurance processes and that they are robust and provide the necessary continuity in the cycle of planning, monitoring and improvement.

5. Principles of Review

Review adheres to the University's Principles for Quality Assurance and Improvement, provided in Appendix 1.

6. Stages of review

More detailed summaries of the review process, indicating the responsibilities of position holders, are provided in Appendix 3 (overview) and Appendix 4 (Faculty responsibilities). The key stages can be summarised as follows:

- 6.1 **Submission of the Self-evaluation Report** Faculty submits Self-evaluation Report (SER) to the Review Team four weeks in advance of the meeting date.
- 6.2 **Review Meeting** Review Team visits Faculty and meets with the Dean, Senior staff, other staff, and students. The duration of the meeting is likely to be a day or a day-and-a-half. The visit will conclude with the Chair providing an oral summary of the main findings of the Review Team to the Dean. (see Appendix 6)
- 6.3 **Report of Review Meeting** forwarded to Faculty, normally within four to six weeks of the visit.
- 6.4 **Faculty submits response to Recommendations contained in the Review Meeting Report** outlining how it will build the Recommendations into Faculty planning processes. (within two months of receiving the Report)

- 6.5 **Faculty submits progress report** on responding to the Recommendations. A meeting may be arranged between representatives of the Faculty and the Review Team, if appropriate. (within one year of receiving the Report)
7. **Membership and Terms of Reference of review teams**
See Appendix 2.
8. **Summary of documentation for review**
- 8.1 The following documents should be provided:
- Self-Evaluation Report (SER)
 - Faculty Plans/Management Plans/Strategic Plans
 - Faculty Teaching and Learning Plans (updated since the last Review)
 - Faculty Research Plan
 - Any other relevant Faculty plans relating to matters such as research and scholarship, international reputation, diversity and equity, effective management, and links with the professions and the community
- 8.2 The key document in the Review process is the Self-Evaluation Report (SER). Please see separate *Guidelines on preparing Self-Evaluation Reports for Phase 2 academic Board Review*. Please note that statistical information to support Faculties in preparing their SER will be provided to Faculties in advance of the Review (see Appendices 1 – 3 of SER guidelines).
- 8.3 Faculties are asked to produce a single, bound document containing all relevant material for the Review. This document should contain the SER plus all relevant appendices and attachments. The document should have a list of contents, section numbers throughout, page numbers throughout, and be cross-referenced as appropriate. As far as possible, documents should be in the program Microsoft Word. Please provide **six** (hard) copies to the Review Team Secretary **four weeks** in advance of the Review meeting. An electronic copy should also be sent to the Review Team Secretary (but to supplement, not replace, the hard copies).
9. **Report of the review meeting**
- 9.1 The Review Report shall be prepared by the Review Team Secretary in consultation with the Review Team Chair and shall be agreed with members of the Review Team before being forwarded to the Faculty (to the Dean and the Faculty Review Co-ordinator). The draft Review Report will normally be forwarded to the Faculty within **four to six weeks** of the Review meeting, with an invitation to comment upon points of factual accuracy. If the full report cannot be produced within four weeks, the Faculty shall receive a brief report within the four week deadline, in advance of receipt of the full report.
- 9.2 The Review Report shall normally include points of Commendation, Recommendations for Improvement and examples of good practice of relevance to other areas of the University. The Report shall normally be structured under headings in accordance with the Terms of Reference as outlined in s. 7 above. A template for the Report is provided in Appendix 5.
- 9.3 Once the Chair has considered comments from the Faculty on the Report and amended as deemed appropriate (in consultation with the full Review Team if there are significant or contentious comments) the report is forwarded by the Review Team Secretary for approval to the University Teaching and Learning Committee and subsequently to the University's Academic Board for ratification. Once ratified by the Academic Board the Report is posted on the Academic Board website, and at this point becomes accessible by students.

10. Faculty response to recommendations

10.1 Within **two months** of receiving the Review Report, the Faculty should submit an outline of how it will build the Recommendations into Faculty planning processes.

11. Faculty update on recommendations

11.1 **One year** after receiving the Review Report, the Faculty provides the Review Team Chair with an update on the Faculty's progress in responding to the Review Team's Recommendations. Further updates may be agreed as necessary depending on the level of closure on the recommendations.

Appendix 1: University of Sydney Principles for Quality Assurance and Improvement

1. The aim of the University's quality assurance strategy is to enhance the effectiveness of its core activities of teaching and research.
2. The quality assurance strategy addresses all areas of University activity (academic, administrative and support services) and focuses on their contribution to the achievement of the University's Goals.
3. The University's quality assurance processes are driven by academic considerations. They are intrinsic to the work of staff who are undertaking or supporting teaching, the promotion of learning and research.
4. The University judges its achievements against appropriate national and international benchmarks. Comparison with other internationally competitive research universities is a key aspect of the University's commitment to improving its effectiveness.
5. Collegiality is an important aspect of quality assurance and the procedures used will reflect the principles of rigorous peer review. They will aim to identify areas where progress can be made, to foster collaboration and exchange of good practice, and to encourage an ethos of critical self-evaluation.
6. The University's quality assurance activities are part of normal and continuous cycle of planning, monitoring and improvement. Although the results from them will be useful for purposes of external review, they are not created with the prime purpose of meeting external requirements.
7. The University's quality assurance methods are evidence-based. Evidence of outcomes and feedback from stakeholders (including students, staff, employers and the community) will provide the basis for analyses and conclusions on which improvements are planned.
8. The University's quality assurance processes are designed to be streamlined, efficient and work within the principles of equity and natural justice.
9. The University's quality assurance activities will themselves be the subject of continuous review and improvement.

Appendix 2: Membership and Terms of Reference of review teams

Membership:

A typical Review Teams will include the following members:

(Note: all members shall be from outside the Faculty undergoing Review)

- Chair: Chair of the Academic Board or nominee;
- One member from a panel established by the Academic Board;
- The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) or nominee;
- The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) or nominee.

Terms of Reference:

Phase 2 Review Teams will consider the scope of Faculty activity with particular reference to the Faculty's contribution to the achievement of the University's seven Goals. The Terms of Reference described below (which directly correlate with the Goals) will be considered in the light of:

- Faculty objectives and processes;
 - evidence of outcomes (and how these fit with targets and goals);
 - evidence of feedback from stakeholders (including students, staff, employers and the community);
 - the quality assurance processes by which the Faculty evaluates outcomes and feedback and plans improvement.
1. The Faculty's response to the Recommendations resulting from its Academic Board Review of Teaching, Learning and Research Training (Phase 1 Review);
 2. The Faculty's effectiveness in supporting diversity, access and equity for its students and staff in relation to, for example: gender balance; participation of indigenous Australians; successful participation of people from non-English speaking backgrounds, people with disabilities and people from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds;
 3. The Faculty's research performance and the policies, processes and practices that promote and support excellence (in terms of internationally recognised standards);
 4. The success of the Faculty's strategies to enhance the University's position as a university of high standing in the international community of scholars, for example in relation to: links in research and consulting activities and staff and student exchange and collaboration; mechanisms to identify, encourage and reward contributions to international activities by students and staff; establishment of international benchmarks within disciplines.
 5. The effectiveness of the Faculty's engagement with industry and the professions in relation to, for example: arrangements for developing and maintaining professional links; relevance of curricula and graduate skills; provision of expectation and opportunity for ongoing graduate education; involvement of staff in professional associations, government agencies and professional regulatory bodies;
 6. The effectiveness of the Faculty's management structures and practices (for both human and physical resources) in relation to, for example: strategic planning that makes effective use of management information as part of goal-setting; strategies to promote equity, diversity, and environmental awareness in the staff and student environment.
 7. The Faculty's contribution to the communities it serves locally, nationally and internationally in relation to, for example: contribution to local, national and international debate; provision of expert services; preparation of graduates for leadership roles.

Appendix 3: Summary of review process

Action	Person in Faculty with responsibility	Person on Review Team with responsibility	Timescale
1. Identify dates of Review and advise Faculty		Review Team Secretary in consultation with Chair of Ac Board	ideally 12 months before the Review
2. Appoint Review Team Chair and members		Review Team Secretary in consultation with Chair of Ac Board	ideally 6 months before the Review
3. Prepare SER and supporting documentation	Faculty Review Co-ordinator		ideally to commence 6 months before the Review
4. Submit electronic copies of SER and supporting documentation to the Review Team Secretary	Faculty Review Co-ordinator		4 weeks before the date of the Review meeting
5. Circulate electronic copies of document to the Review Team		Review Team Secretary	3 weeks before the date of the Review meeting
6. Collate initial feedback from the Review Team on the documentation and circulate to Review Team		Review Team Secretary	10 days before the Review meeting
7. Faculty to advise Review Team Secretary of names of all students and staff attending the meeting and room location for meetings	Faculty Review Co-ordinator		10 days before Review meeting
8. Pre-Review Meeting of all members of the Review Team		Review Team Secretary	1 week before Review
9. Review Meeting	Faculty Manager or nominee to arrange rooms, catering and parking if necessary	Review Team Secretary liaise with Review Team and Faculty	Meeting date
10. Prepare and circulate initial draft report, first to Review Team Chair and then to other members of Review Team		Review Team Secretary draft and circulate. Review Team Chair and members read and provide feedback	ideally within 2 weeks of the Review date
11. Report to Faculty		Review Team Secretary	within 4-6 weeks of Review
12. Faculty comments on Report to Review Team Secretary	Dean/Faculty Review Co-ordinator		within 2 weeks of Faculty receiving Report
13. Report to University Teaching and Learning Committee		Review Team Secretary	within 2 months of Review
14. Faculty outline of how it will build Recommendations into Faculty planning	Dean/Faculty Review Co-ordinator		within 2 months of receiving Review report
15. Faculty update on response to Recommendations	Dean/Faculty Review Co-ordinator		within 1 year of receiving Review Report

Note: For the first few Reviews to be held in 2003, it will not be practicable to adhere to the timelines above for items 1., 2. and 3.

Appendix 4: Faculty check-list for review process

	Action	Person in Faculty with responsibility	Timescale
1.	Dean to nominate senior member of staff from within the Faculty to act as the Faculty Review Co-ordinator (likely to be a senior member of staff such as the Chair of the Teaching and Learning Committee or an Associate Dean)	Dean	ideally 6 months before the Review
2.	Prepare SER and supporting documentation	Faculty Review Co-ordinator	ideally to commence 6 months before the Review
3.	Submit electronic copies of SER and supporting documentation to the Review Team Secretary	Faculty Review Co-ordinator	4 weeks before the date of the Review meeting
4.	Faculty to advise Review Team Secretary of names of all students and staff attending the meeting and room location for meetings	Faculty Review Co-ordinator	10 days before Review meeting
5.	Review Meeting	Faculty Review Co-ordinator or nominee to arrange rooms, catering and parking, if necessary	Meeting date
6.	Report received by Faculty (sent to the Dean, the Faculty Review Co-ordinator and the Faculty Manager/Executive Officer)		within 4-6 weeks of Review
7.	Faculty comments on Report to Review Team Secretary	Dean and Faculty Review Co-ordinator	within 2 weeks of Faculty receiving Report
8.	Faculty outline of how it will build Recommendations into Faculty planning	Dean and Faculty Review Co-ordinator	within 2 months of receiving Review report
9.	Faculty update on response to Recommendations	Dean and Faculty Review Co-ordinator	within 1 year of receiving Review Report

Note: For the first few Reviews to be held in 2003, it will not be practicable to adhere to the timelines above for items 1. and 2.

Appendix 5: Template for review report

This template should be used as a rough guide only. It is not intended to be prescriptive. Different report structures may be more appropriate according to the discussions at the meetings.

Front page:	Name of Faculty Review date Table of contents
Introduction:	Review Team membership Faculty staff participating in discussions (only senior staff named) (??) Student groups participating in the discussions (no names) Documentation considered (cross reference to Appendix)
Background:	This section is optional. If included it would cover matters such as Faculty context, achievements, hallmarks, recent changes
Quality Assurance:	Summary of the Faculty's quality assurance structures and processes, identifying any perceived strengths and weaknesses
Quality Teaching and Learning:	Main findings cross-referenced to Conclusions
Diversity, Access and Equity:	Main findings cross-referenced to Conclusions
Excellence in Research:	Main findings cross-referenced to Conclusions
Internationalisation:	Main findings cross-referenced to Conclusions
Engagement with Industry and the Professions:	Main findings cross-referenced to Conclusions
Effective Management:	Main findings cross-referenced to Conclusions
Service to the Community:	Main findings cross-referenced to Conclusions
Conclusions:	Commendations – under relevant sub-heads and cross-referenced to Report Recommendations under relevant sub-heads and cross-referenced to Report
Appendices:	Program for the visit List of documentation considered by the Review Team Faculty's Self-Evaluation Report

The report should be an analytical account of the findings of the Review Team. It should be as brief as possible and not go into unnecessary detail. The Report should elucidate how the Conclusions have been arrived at. This might cover, for example, the issues investigated, the Faculty's objectives, how these relate to outcomes and feedback, how quality assurance mechanisms monitor the achievement of the objectives, and the Team's analysis and conclusions (which will identify strengths and weaknesses). The Report is not a record of meeting and is not intended to necessarily cover all matters discussed. Review Teams are not empowered to make recommendations for additional resources.

The Report will normally be drafted on behalf of the Review Team by the Review Team Secretary in consultation with the Review Team Chair. It will be circulated to the Review Team for agreement before being forwarded to the Faculty for comment on factual accuracy. Faculties will be provided with a format for comments eliciting: the precise reference within the report; an explanation of the point at issue; the reasoning or evidence to support the comment; and (if appropriate) a suggested re-wording.

Appendix 6: Indicative timetable for review visit (one day visits)

Item	Content	Minutes	Time
Coffee for the Review Team		15	8.45 – 9.00am
Private meeting of Review Team to finalise agenda		30	9.00 – 9.30am
Interview One (a)	Dean	15	9.30 – 9.45am
Interview One	Dean and Senior Faculty Staff	75	9.45–11.00am
Morning Tea and discussion time for Review Team		15	11.00 – 11.15am
Interview Two	Undergraduate students	50	11.15 – 12.05
Interview Three	Postgraduate coursework students	50	12.05 – 12.55pm
Lunch and discussion time for Review Team		45	12.55 – 1.40pm
Interview Four	Postgraduate research students	50	1.40 – 2.30pm
Review Team discussion time to determine agenda for Interview Five over afternoon tea		30	2.30 – 3.00pm
Interview Five	Other academic and general staff (including key research staff if not included in Interview One)	60	3.00 – 4.00pm
Interview Six	Open interview – staff and students can book time within this slot to raise issues of concern with the Review Team	20	4.00 – 4.20pm
Review Team discussion time		30	4.20 – 4.50pm
Interview Seven	Dean and Senior staff (meeting to follow-up any issues that have arisen during the day)	20	4.50 – 5.10pm
Review Team discussion time to finalise Conclusions		30	5.10 – 5.40pm
Report back	Dean	15	5.40 – 5.55pm

Note: If there are no requests from the Faculty for individuals to meet with the Review Team (Interview Six), then Interview Seven may be moved forward by 20 minutes to 4.30pm.

Appendix 7: Indicative timetable for review visit (one and a half day visits)

Item	Content	Minutes	Time
Day One			
Coffee for the Review Team		15	8.45 – 9.00am
Private meeting of Review Team to finalise agenda		30	9.00 – 9.30am
Interview One (a)	Dean	25	9.30 – 9.55am
Interview One	Dean and Senior Faculty Staff (morning tea at 10.30)	105	9.55–11.40am
Discussion time for Review Team		30	11.40 – 12.10pm
Interview Two	Undergraduate students	50	12.10 – 1.00pm
Lunch and discussion time for Review Team		50	1.00 – 1.50pm
Interview Three	Postgraduate coursework students	50	1.50 – 2.40pm
Interview Four	Postgraduate research students	50	2.40 – 3.30pm
Interview Five	Open interview – staff and students can book time within this slot to raise issues of concern with the Review Team (over afternoon tea)	30	3.30 – 4.00pm
Review Team discussion time to determine agenda for Interviews Six and Seven		60	4.00 – 5.00pm
Day Two			
Coffee for the Review Team		15	8.45 – 9.00am
Interview Six	Other academic and general staff (including key research staff if not included in Interview One)	90	9.00-10.30am
Review Team discussion time over morning tea		30	10.30 – 11.00am
Interview Seven*	Dean and Senior staff (meeting to follow-up any issues that have arisen during meetings)	60	11.00 – 12.00am
Review Team discussion time to finalise Conclusions		30	12.00 – 12.30pm
Report back	Dean	15	12.30-12.45pm

Academic Board Faculty Review Visits: Phase Two

***GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING THE SELF-EVALUATION
REPORT (SER) FOR ACADEMIC BOARD REVIEW PHASE 2***

Draft for discussion

1. General

- 1.1 The Self-Evaluation Report (SER) is the principal reference document considered by the Review Team and forms the basis of the review. It should be a self-critical, analytic and evidence-based document which addresses areas for improvement as well as strengths. It should focus on processes and evidence, ie the processes and structures in place to monitor standards, identify problems, address those problems, and monitor the results, and the evidence that demonstrates that the processes are working and have been effective.
- 1.2 Faculties may find it helpful to keep in mind the following series of simple questions when preparing their SER:
- what are we doing?
 - how are we doing it?
 - how do we know we are doing it?
 - how do we measure progress?
 - what are our strengths and weaknesses?
 - how well are we doing it and how can we improve?
 - do we have good systems in place to ensure that the outcomes of self-evaluation are acted upon in a continual cycle of improvement?
- 1.3 In the sections that follow relating to each of the seven Goals, examples are provided under various headings, but please note that these are **examples only – they are not intended to be prescriptive or exclusive**. They are only there to give some kind of guide should it be needed. It is up to Faculties to decide what is most relevant in relation to each Goal in the context of the Faculty profile. Please note, however, that all Goals must be addressed.
- 1.4 The section on each Goal suggests addressing it in relation to: Objectives; Policies, processes and practices; Outcomes; Stakeholder feedback; Quality assurance processes; and Evaluation. In case it is helpful, here are some examples illustrating the way each of these headings might be applied to an aspect of one of the Goals (Indigenous education under Goal 2 has been selected as a random example).
- Objectives might include issues such as the Faculty's targets and goals in relation to Aboriginal students.
 - Policies, processes and practices would refer to, for example, the following in relation to Aboriginal students: Faculty recruitment policies; Faculty support mechanisms; practices to monitor progress; induction activities.
 - Outcomes might refer to statistics on Aboriginal student entry, progression and completion rates, graduate destinations.
 - Stakeholder feedback might cover feedback from Aboriginal students on their educational experience at the University; feedback from outside bodies/employers.
 - Quality Assurance processes might include arrangements for collecting and monitoring Aboriginal student feedback; Faculty committees; Faculty structures to monitor progress; arrangements for collecting employer feedback.
 - Evaluation – this might include the Faculty's analysis of the effectiveness of all of the above, an identification of strengths and weaknesses, and plans for improvement in relation to the latter.

- 1.5 As the Goals overlap and intertwine across the range of activities, Faculties are encouraged to address the Goals in an integrated way, cross-referencing where appropriate.

The balance between processes, outcomes and evaluation

- 1.6 The importance of a constructively self-critical and evaluative approach in the SER cannot be over-emphasised. As described in s. 1.4 above and the sections that follow, Faculties are asked to address each Goal in terms of objectives, policies, outcomes stakeholder feedback and QA processes. However, it is stressed that the most important aspect of the SER is its evaluativeness – how the Faculty analyses this information to plan for improvements. The SER should assist the Faculty in identifying problems and ways to resolve them, as well as identifying areas of good practice and ways to maintain and expand them. The Faculty is asked to bear this in mind when addressing each of the Goals and seek to avoid producing a document that merely lists objectives, policies, outcomes etc, without providing the interpretative analysis that gives them meaning.

Benchmarking – definition of

- 1.7 The term ‘benchmarking’ is broadly understood in two ways: (i) comparing outcomes, criteria and standards, and (ii) analysing what it is that makes a competitor excel in a particular area and how their experience can be built upon to effect improvement here. The term is used within these guidelines to encompass both meanings.

Data

- 1.8 In advance of the Review, the Review Team Secretary will provide to the Faculty some key data relating to Goal Two (Diversity, Access and Equity), Goal Three (Excellence in Research), and Goal Four (Internationalisation) (please see Appendices 1 – 3). This information is intended to support the Faculty in preparing its SER. Please note, however, that there is no expectation that Faculties would provide a thorough analysis of all of these data. The Faculty is invited to draw upon the data as it sees fit, although it would likely wish to comment on any unusual trends that emerge. If there are other data that the Faculty would like to use but cannot find, the Review Team Secretary may be able to provide assistance in sourcing them.

Supplementary material

- 1.9 The Faculty may wish to attach (existing) documents that exemplify the effectiveness of operation of its quality assurance and improvement systems.

Presentation

- 1.10 Faculties are asked to produce a single, collated and/or bound document containing all relevant material for the Review. This would include:
- the SER
 - all relevant appendices and attachments
 - list of contents
 - section and page numbers throughout

As far as possible, Faculties are asked to supply documents in the program Microsoft Word. Please provide **six** (hard) copies to the Review Team Secretary **four weeks** in advance of the Review meeting. An electronic copy should also be sent to the Review Team Secretary (but to supplement, not replace, the hard copies).

Overview of the SER structure

Introduction and Faculty context

- Section 1: Follow-up to Phase 1 Review
- Section 2: Goal 2: Diversity, Access and Equity
- Section 3: Goal 3: Excellence in Research
- Section 4: Goal 4: Internationalisation
- Section 5: Goal 5: Engagement with Industry and the Professions
- Section 6: Goal 6: Effective Management
- Section 7: Goal 7: Service to the Community
- Section 8: Evaluative summary of the Faculty's effectiveness in contributing to the University's seven Goals

Notes on each section follow.

SER Introduction and Faculty Context

This section should provide a **summary** of the Faculty's:

- (i) structure (eg organisational structure or chart)
- (ii) programs
- (iii) student profile
- (iv) staff profile
- (v) research activities (the Faculty's 2001 report to the PVC Research can be used here)
- (vi) the Faculty's quality assurance activities and structures (including arrangements for off-shore activities, if any)
- (vii) benchmarking activities, including how the Faculty compares its academic standards with other research intensive universities, both in Australia and internationally
- (viii) analysis of the outcome of any recent reviews, for example by professional accrediting bodies (reports should be appended)
- (ix) committee structure

Note: The introductory section of the Self-evaluation Report for the Faculty's Academic Board Review of Teaching, Learning and Research Training (Phase 1 Review) may be used as the basis for the introductory section for the Phase 2 SER.

SER Section 1: Follow-up to Phase 1 review

This section covers:

GOAL 1: QUALITY TEACHING AND LEARNING: *The University of Sydney will maintain and enhance its position as an outstanding provider of high quality undergraduate and postgraduate teaching, both in Australia and internationally.*

and aspects of **GOAL 3: EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH**

A template will be provided for each Faculty, providing the Recommendations from its Phase 1 Review. The Faculty will need to indicate how each Recommendation has been acted upon. The following format will be used for each Recommendation:

Recommendation 1	eg It is recommended that the Faculty consider ways to provide and improve training for sessional and part-time tutors and to monitor consistency of compliance across the Faculty. The Faculty should aim to achieve greater consistency and monitoring of the standards of tutor performance.
Action taken by the Faculty	
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	
Review Team's comments (to be completed after the Review)	
Review Team's conclusion (to be completed after the Review)	<i>Either:</i> "No further action recommended. Item closed." <i>or</i> stipulate further action.

(NB Faculties that had any Recommendations relating to Research are asked to analyse and comment upon the results of the 2002 Student Research Experience Questionnaire (SREQ)).

SER Section 1: Diversity, Access and Equity

GOAL 2: DIVERSITY, ACCESS AND EQUITY: *The University of Sydney will continue to provide access to tertiary study and appropriate support for students from a diversity of backgrounds.*

The following should be addressed in relation to Goal 2:

- 2.1 **Objectives:** The Faculty's key objectives in relation to Diversity, Access and Equity (for example, Equity targets) (*ie 'what are you doing' or aiming to do*)
- 2.2 **Policies, processes and practices:** Brief description of the Faculty's policies, processes and practices that support Diversity, Access and Equity (*ie 'how are you doing it?'*) (for example, student admissions and staff recruitment policies, processes for tracking student progress, student support arrangements)
- 2.3 **Outcomes:** Evidence of outcomes, for example:
 - staff and student numbers in relation to: gender balance; indigenous Australians; people from non-English speaking backgrounds, people with disabilities; people from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds
 - student progression, retention and completion rates in relation to these groups (*ie 'how do you know you are doing it?'*)
- 2.4 **Stakeholder feedback:** Evidence of feedback from stakeholders (for example from students, staff, employers and the community). Analysis of the extent to which feedback suggests that the Faculty's constituencies are satisfied. (*ie 'how do you know you are doing it?'*)
- 2.5 **Quality assurance processes:** How the Faculty's quality assurance processes evaluate processes, outcomes and stakeholder feedback and use this information to plan improvement. (*ie how do you monitor outcomes, measure progress and identify strengths and weaknesses*)
- 2.6 **Evaluation:** The Faculty's analysis of how effectively it supports and promotes diversity, access and equity. The Faculty should identify weaknesses as well as strengths and plans for improvement. ***Please note: this is the most important section and it should be given the most emphasis and word-space.*** (*ie 'how well are you doing it and what are you doing to improve?'*)

Please refer to:

- Appendix 1 for the data which will be provided to the Faculty to support its response to this section;
- The University's Strategic Plan 1999 – 2004, pages 14 – 15 for further details on the University's Objectives in relation to this Goal.

Some points to remember

- There is no need to cover everything. The Review Team seeks an overview, not an inventory.
- The section should be kept as brief as possible – a maximum of 3 pages is recommended (excluding attachments). Bullet point presentation is fine, if preferred.
- It is not necessary to address items 2.1 – 2.5 separately – they can be merged as considered appropriate. Cross-referencing between the Goals is also encouraged.

SER Section 3: Excellence in Research

GOAL 3: EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH: *The University of Sydney will develop its reputation as an institution where pure and applied research and research training are conducted at nationally and internationally recognised standards, including research relevant to the economic, social and cultural well-being of Australia and the region.*

The following should be addressed in relation to Goal 3:

- 3.1 **Objectives:** The Faculty's objectives in relation to research. (*ie 'what are you doing' or aiming to do?*)
- 3.2 **Policies, processes and practices:** (*ie 'how are you doing it?'*) The Faculty's policies, processes and practices that support excellence in research relating to, for example:
 - benchmarking of research outputs
 - collaboration - with other research areas within the University and externally, with other universities and non-HE organisations (eg industry/business/government)
 - the range and scope of research activity
 - visiting scholars
 - research funding (such as for conferences and travel)
 - alignment of research with Faculty and University plans
 - arrangements to support junior staff in developing a strong research profile
 - induction and support for staff new to research
- 3.3 **Outcomes:** Evidence of outcomes (*ie 'how do you know you are doing it?'*), for example:
 - research inputs compared with research outputs
 - research record in comparison with national and international norms
 - trends in quality of research outcomes
- 3.4 **Stakeholder feedback:** Evidence of feedback from stakeholders (for example from students, staff, employers and the community) (*ie how do you know you are doing it?*)
- 3.5 **Quality assurance processes:** How the Faculty's quality assurance processes evaluate processes, outcomes and stakeholder feedback in relation to research and use this information to plan improvement.
(*ie how do you monitor outcomes, measure progress and identify strengths and weaknesses*)
- 3.6 **Evaluation:** The Faculty's analysis of how effectively it supports and promotes excellence in research. The Faculty should identify strengths and weaknesses and plans for improvement.
Please note: this is the most important section and it should be given the most emphasis and word-space.
(*ie 'how well are you doing it and what are you doing to improve?'*)

Please refer to:

- Appendix 2 for the data which will be provided to the Faculty to support its response to this section;
- The University's Strategic Plan 1999 – 2004, pages 17 – 18 for further details on the University's Objectives in relation to this Goal;

Some points to remember

- There is no need to cover everything. The Review Team seeks an overview, not an inventory.
- The section should be kept as brief as possible – a maximum of 3 pages is recommended (excluding attachments). Bullet point presentation is fine, if preferred.
- It is not necessary to address items 3.1 – 3.5 separately – they can be merged as considered appropriate

SER Section 4: Internationalisation

GOAL 4: INTERNATIONALISATION *The University of Sydney will enhance its position as a university of high standing in the international community of scholars.*

The following should be addressed in relation to Goal 4:

- 4.1 **Objectives:** The Faculty's key objectives in relation to Internationalisation
(ie 'what are you doing' or aiming to do?)
- 4.2 **Policies, processes and practices:** Brief description of the Faculty's policies, processes and practices that support Internationalisation (ie 'how are you doing it?')
Examples might relate to marketing and recruitment, curriculum design, international student support, mechanisms to support various types of international links.
- 4.3 **Outcomes:** Evidence of outcomes, for example:
 - international research projects
 - international projects (such as World Bank and Asian Development Bank projects)
 - activity relating to agreements with institutions overseas
 - student exchange programs
 - international student numbers
 - international student progress rates
 - student numbers on special programs, study abroad and exchange schemes
 - programs/majors/units of study with an international focus
 - international links (research, consulting, student exchange, collaboration)(ie 'how do you know you are doing it?')
- 4.4 **Stakeholder feedback:** Evidence of feedback from stakeholders (for example from students, staff, employers and the community). Analysis of the extent to which feedback suggests that the Faculty's constituencies are satisfied?
(part of 'how do you know you are doing it?')
- 4.5 **Quality assurance processes:** How the Faculty's quality assurance processes evaluate processes, outcomes and stakeholder feedback and use this information to plan improvement. This should include international benchmarking practices within disciplines.
(ie how do you monitor outcomes, measure progress and identify strengths and weaknesses)
- 4.6 **Evaluation:** The Faculty's analysis of how effectively it supports and promotes internationalisation. The Faculty should identify weaknesses as well as strengths and plans for improvement. **Please note: this is the most important section and it should be given the most emphasis and word-space.**
(ie 'how well are you doing it and what are you doing to improve?')

Please refer to:

- Appendix 3 for the data which will be provided to the Faculty to support its response to this section;
- The University's Strategic Plan 1999 – 2004, pages 20 - 21 for further details on the University's Objectives in relation to this Goal.

Some points to remember

- There is no need to cover everything. The Review Team seeks an overview, not an inventory.
- The section should be kept as brief as possible – a maximum of 3 pages is recommended (excluding attachments). Bullet point presentation is fine, if preferred.
- It is not necessary to address items 4.1 – 4.5 separately – they can be merged as considered appropriate

SER Section 5: Engagement with industry and the professions

GOAL 5: ENGAGEMENT WITH INDUSTRY AND THE PROFESSIONS *The University of Sydney will continue to make a significant contribution to the well-being and enhancement of the wide range of professions with which it engages.*

The following should be addressed in relation to Goal 5:

- 5.1 **Objectives:** The Faculty's key objectives in relation to Engagement with Industry and the Professions
(ie 'what are you doing' or aiming to do)
- 5.2 **Policies, processes and practices:** Brief description of the Faculty's policies, processes and practices that support such engagement. For example mechanisms to: obtain feedback on curricula and graduate skills; encourage and support joint research activities; promote life-long learning. (ie 'how are you doing it?')
- 5.3 **Outcomes:** Evidence of outcomes, for example:
 - joint research projects
 - student placements in industry/professions
 - graduate destination statistics
 - links with industry/professions/professional associations/government agencies and professional regulatory bodies
 - ventures involving the commercialisation of intellectual property(ie 'how do you know you are doing it?')
- 5.4 **Stakeholder feedback:** Evidence of feedback from stakeholders (for example from students, staff, employers, the community and professional bodies (reports from professional body accreditation visits can be appended)). Analysis of the extent to which feedback suggests that the Faculty's constituencies are satisfied?
(ie 'how do you know you are doing it?')
- 5.5 **Quality assurance processes:** How the Faculty's quality assurance processes evaluate processes, outcomes and stakeholder feedback and use this information to plan improvement.
(ie how do you monitor outcomes, measure progress and identify strengths and weaknesses)
- 5.6 **Evaluation:** The Faculty's analysis of how effectively it supports and promotes engagement with industry and the professions. The Faculty should identify weaknesses as well as strengths and plans for improvement. **Please note: this is the most important section and it should be given the most emphasis and word-space.**
(ie 'how well are you doing it and what are you doing to improve?')

Please refer to:

- The University's Strategic Plan 1999 – 2004, pages 23 - 24 for further details on the University's Objectives in relation to this Goal.

Some points to remember

- There is no need to cover everything. The Review Team seeks an overview, not an inventory.
- The section should be kept as brief as possible – a maximum of 3 pages is recommended (excluding attachments). Bullet point presentation is fine, if preferred.
- It is not necessary to address items 5.1 – 5.5 separately – they can be merged as considered appropriate

SER Section 6: Effective Management

GOAL 6: EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT *The University of Sydney will improve its position as an efficient, effective and responsible institution, striving to meet the needs of students and staff, and committed to quality in all aspects of its operations.*

The following should be addressed in relation to Goal 6:

- 6.1 **Objectives:** The Faculty's key objectives in relation to Effective Management
(ie 'what are you doing' or aiming to do)
- 6.2 **Policies, processes and practices:** Brief description of the Faculty's policies, processes and practices that support effective management of both human and physical resources. These might relate to, for example: strategic planning; diversification and strengthening of funding bases; strategies to promote equity, diversity, and environmental awareness in the staff and student environment; staff planning, appointment, mentoring, appraisal and development; management of physical facilities, IT and laboratory provision.
(ie 'how are you doing it?')
- 6.3 **Outcomes:** Evidence of the outcomes of 6.2. Others might include:
- percentage of Faculty budget spent on staff training and development
 - numbers of staff undertaking ITL and leadership programs
 - staff turnover
 - staff promotions
 - Faculty office costs per FTE student enrolment
 - the time taken to process student applications
- (ie 'how do you know you are doing it?')
- 6.4 **Stakeholder feedback:** Evidence of feedback from stakeholders (for example from students, staff, employers and the community). Analysis of the extent to which feedback suggests that the Faculty's constituencies are satisfied?
(part of 'how do you know you are doing it?')
- 6.5 **Quality assurance processes:** How the Faculty's quality assurance processes evaluate processes, outcomes and stakeholder feedback and use this information to plan improvement.
(ie how do you monitor outcomes, measure progress and identify strengths and weaknesses)
- 6.6 **Evaluation:** The Faculty's analysis of how effectively it supports and promotes effective management. The Faculty should identify weaknesses as well as strengths and plans for improvement. **Please note: this is the most important section and it should be given the most emphasis and word-space.**
(ie 'how well are you doing it and what are you doing to improve?')

Please refer to:

- The University's Strategic Plan 1999 – 2004, pages 26 - 27 for further details on the University's Objectives in relation to this Goal.

Some points to remember

- There is no need to cover everything. The Review Team seeks an overview, not an inventory.
- The section should be kept as brief as possible – a maximum of 3 pages is recommended (excluding attachments). Bullet point presentation is fine, if preferred.
- It is not necessary to address items 6.1 – 6.5 separately – they can be merged as considered appropriate

SER Section 7: Service to the community

GOAL 7: SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY *By providing knowledge, opportunity and encouragement, the University of Sydney will maintain and enhance its position as a leading contributor to the opinions and ideas, cultures and lifestyles of the many communities it serves locally, nationally and internationally*

The following should be addressed in relation to Goal 7:

- 7.1 **Objectives:** The Faculty's key objectives in relation to Service to the Community
(ie 'what are you doing' or aiming to do)
- 7.2 **Policies, processes and practices:** Brief description of the Faculty's policies, processes and practices that support effective service to the community. These might relate to: contribution to local, national and international debate; provision of expert services; preparation of graduates for leadership roles; non-award HSC school programs.
(ie 'how are you doing it?')
- 7.3 **Outcomes:** Evidence of outcomes of the policies, processes and practices outlined in s. 7.2.
(ie 'how do you know you are doing it?')
- 7.4 **Stakeholder feedback:** Evidence of feedback from stakeholders (for example from students, staff, employers and the community). Analysis of the extent to which feedback suggests that the Faculty's constituencies are satisfied?
(ie 'how do you know you are doing it?')
- 7.5 **Quality assurance processes:** How the Faculty's quality assurance processes evaluate processes, outcomes and stakeholder feedback and use this information to plan improvement.
(ie how do you monitor outcomes, measure progress and identify strengths and weaknesses)
- 7.6 **Evaluation:** The Faculty's analysis of how effectively it supports and promotes service to the community. The Faculty should identify weaknesses as well as strengths and plans for improvement. ***Please note: this is the most important section and it should be given the most emphasis and word-space.***
(ie 'how well are you doing it and what are you doing to improve?')

Please refer to:

- The University's Strategic Plan 1999 – 2004, pages 29 - 30 for further details on the University's Objectives in relation to this Goal.

Some points to remember

- There is no need to cover everything. The Review Team seeks an overview, not an inventory.
- The section should be kept as brief as possible – a maximum of 3 pages is recommended (excluding attachments). Bullet point presentation is fine, if preferred.
- It is not necessary to address items 7.1 – 7.5 separately – they can be merged as considered appropriate

SER Section 8: Evaluative summary of the faculty's effectiveness in contributing to the University's seven goals

In this concluding section, which should be no more than one page in length, the Faculty is invited to provide a critical overview of its activities in relation to the University's seven Goals. This might identify major strengths and weaknesses across the seven Goals and describe key areas for improvement.

Appendix 1: Data to support Goal 2: Diversity, Access and Equity

A completed, Faculty specific table will be provided to Faculties in advance of the Review

Category	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002	
	Faculty	USyd	Faculty	USyd	Faculty	USyd	Faculty	USyd	Faculty	USyd
Total Ug enrolments										
SPR for total Ug enrolments										
Number of Ug students with a disability + (as a % of total enrolment)										
SPR for Ug students with a disability										
Number of Ug Aboriginal/Torres Strait Islander students + (as a % of total Ug enrolments)										
SPR for Ug Aboriginal/Torres Strait Islander students										
Number of Ug NESB students, + (as a percentage of total Ug enrolments)										
SPR for Ug NESB students										
Number of low socio-economic background Ug students, + (as a percentage of total enrolments)										
SPR for Ug students from a low socio-economic background										
Student gender mix M/F as %										

SPR = Student Progress Rate (on load basis)
NESB = Non-English Speaking Background

Appendix 2: Benchmark research data (based on averages for 2000 and 2001) in equivalent Go8 faculties, 2002 (except ANU)

A completed, Faculty specific table will be provided to Faculties in advance of the Review

	USyd	Go6 - 1	Go6 - 2	Go6 - 3	Go6 - 4	Go6 - 5	Go6 - 6	Go6 average
Teaching and Research Academic Staff (FTE)								
Research Only Academic Staff (FTE)								
Total Academic Staff, (FTE)								
Masters (Research), EFTSU								
PhD, EFTSU								
Total Higher Degree Research, EFTSU								
Masters (Research), Completions								
PhD, Completions								
Total Higher Degree Research Completions								
Books								
Chapters								
Articles								
Proceedings								
Total Publications								
Weighted Pubs (WPUBS)								
National Competitive Research (Cat 1)								
Public Sector Funding (Cat 2)								
Industry and other Funding (Cat 3)								
Total Research Income								
RHD Load (per FTE)								
RHD Completions (per FTE)								
PUBS (per FTE)								
WPUBS (per FTE)								
Cat 1 grants (per FTE)								
Research Income per FTE								

Notes:

- This benchmarking data is collected through The University of Melbourne, and is the same data that each institution supplied to DEST as part of the Higher Education Research Data Collection and other statistical collections (staff and students). The data is aggregated at the Faculty level to allow comparisons of similar Faculties.
- Owing to confidentiality agreements, it is not possible to identify the other institutions.
- This information has been compiled by The University of Sydney Research Office

Appendix 3: Data to support Goal 4: Internationalisation

A completed, Faculty specific table will be provided to Faculties in advance of the Review

Category	1998			1999			2000			2001			2002		
	Fac	USyd	Go8	Fac	USyd	Go8	Fac	USyd	Go8	Fac	USyd	Go8	Fac	USyd	Go8
Undergraduate International students, + (as % of total Ug)															
Pg Cw International students, + (as % of total Pg Cw)															
Research International students, + (as % of total Research students)															
SPR for International Undergrads															
SPR for non-International Undergrads															
	Faculty		USyd	Faculty		USyd	Faculty		USyd	Faculty		USyd	Faculty		USyd
Average completion time for Int. Research students															
Average completion time for non-Int. Research students															
Number of Ug students participating in Exchange schemes, + (as % of student numbers)															
Number of Pg Cw students participating in Exchange schemes, + (as % of student numbers)															
Number of Ug students participating in Study Abroad schemes, (+ as % of student numbers)															
Number of Pg Cw students participating in Study Abroad schemes, (+ as % of student numbers)															

PR = Student Progress Rate (on load basis)

Self-audit of the Academic Board

Following the Review of the Academic Board and the Academic Forum, the Academic Board at the University of Sydney is supported by five principles identified as integral to the operations of the Board. The Academic Board is:

- the principal academic decision-making body within the University of Sydney;
- an independent body that represents various elected and appointed constituencies of the University;
- concerned with the academic integrity of the University and responsible for maintaining the highest standards in teaching, scholarship and research;
- an inclusive collegial entity with processes that encourage participation; and
- operates with transparent processes and outcomes.

These principles are underpinned by a model of distributed participation where all members of the University have an opportunity to participate in the work of the Board. This highlights the distinction made between the Board as an entity (eg. at its meetings) and the activities undertaken by the Board.

The functions and authority of the Academic Board are prescribed by the Senate, the governing body and grouped in three categories – general, advisory, and specific. Fundamentally, the Academic Board has principal responsibility, subject to the Senate:

- to maintain the highest standards in teaching, scholarship and research and, in that process, to safeguard the academic freedom of the University;
- to oversee and monitor the development of all academic activities of the University; and
- to communicate with the academic community through the Faculties, colleges and boards of studies and similar organisational units.

The Academic Board also provides advice to the Senate and the Vice-Chancellor and is charged with specific responsibilities including: recommending new academic courses and changes to existing courses to the Senate; determining issues relating to programs of study; overseeing regular reviews of academic activities; and formulating policy.

Even without the AUQA audits, these functions place the Academic Board in a pivotal position within the institution and a process to assure the quality of the Board itself and its activities must be adopted.

Quality assurance at the University may be described as “academic led”. The University promotes a view of quality assurance as an integral part of the academic enterprise, driven by staff who are active in teaching and research, rather than an additional activity.

The Academic Board also needs to build quality assurance into all its activities and has begun this by integrating quality assurance matters into the terms of reference of each of its committees.

The Board however, also needs to conduct a self-audit, examining issues about the function of the Board, the Board operations and relationship to the University’s strategic plan and its interactions with members of the University community, including members of the Board.

It may be useful to consider the following document from Southern Cross University as a starting point for Academic Board discussions:

Southern Cross University: Auditing the Academic Board

The purpose of this appendix is to raise an initial list of questions that might be helpful in a self-audit of the Academic Board. The section draws upon personal reflections about a possible approach to auditing the activities and impact of the Academic Board.

These reflections are informed by ongoing discussions at meetings of the NSW Chairs of Academic Boards concerning implications of the AUQA audit process for Academic Boards.

The questions listed below might also be a useful starting point for a self-audit of the University Council, and of other committees at the University.

Approach

- how does the Academic Board characterise itself? what is its mission? how does its mission relate to its historical development, context and capabilities? what are its major strengths and areas of emphasis?
- what are its strategic objectives? how well disseminated are these objectives? how widely supported are they?
- how well do the Board's strategic objectives relate to the mission, vision, values and goals of the University? are these objectives adequately informed by benchmarking?

Deployment

- does the Academic Board work well in terms of its mission and strategic objectives? what are the mechanisms for monitoring its performance? are the responsibilities of the Chair effectively discharged? what are the mechanisms for monitoring the performance of the Chair?
- what are the mechanisms for monitoring the implementation of Academic Board policies and procedures? what are the relevant accountabilities at different levels of the organisation? are these well understood by academic staff and students?
- what are the procedures for managing input by members (including student members) and committees to policy development by the Academic Board, and to the review of its policies and procedures?
- how well are members of the Academic Board inducted to their role and responsibilities as members?

Results

- what does the Academic Board know about the quality of the University's academic programs? how does it know?
- against what benchmarks does the Academic Board appraise its performance?
- do key stakeholders play any role in appraising the Academic Board's performance?

Improvement

- what is the process whereby the Academic Board identifies the need for improvements? how well understood by staff and students is this process? how effective is the process?
- what are the follow-up mechanisms whereby the impact of significant policies and procedures approved by the Academic Board is evaluated?

AGENDA ITEM 8

Reports of Faculties and Boards

8.1 Report of the Faculty of Medicine

8.1.1 Receipt of Report

The Faculty **recommends** that the Academic Board receive and note the following report of the Faculty of Medicine meeting held on 21 November 2002.

8.1.2 Amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate: Constitution of the Faculty of Medicine

[44-46](#)

The Faculty of Medicine recommends through the Academic Board that Senate approve the proposed amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Constitution of the Faculty of Medicine, as set out in the report presented.

The amendments:

- (1) reflect the new structure of the Faculty, in particular the establishment of the School of Rural Health;
- (2) make provision for membership of the Faculty by the Director of Research and Development of the College of Health Sciences; and
- (3) make provision for membership of the Faculty by medically qualified Fellows of Senate.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board recommend that Senate amend the Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Constitution of the Faculty of Medicine, with immediate effect, as set out in the report presented.

Amendment of the Resolutions of the Senate and adoption of new Resolutions

Resolutions of the Senate

Constitution of the Faculty of Medicine

The Resolutions of the Senate relating to the Faculty of Medicine (p 303, *Calendar 2002*) are amended to the following effect, with immediate effect (additions indicated by underline, deletions indicated by strikethrough and subsequent re-numbering):

1. The Faculty of Medicine shall comprise the following persons:
 - (a) the professors, readers, associate professors, senior lecturers, lecturers and associate lecturers, being full-time members of the teaching staff in the following schools and departments:
 - ~~Anaesthesia~~
 - ~~Anatomy and Histology~~
 - ~~Biochemistry~~
 - Canberra Clinical School
 - Central Clinical School
 - Children's Hospital at Westmead
 - ~~Clinical Ophthalmology and Eye Health~~
 - ~~General Practisee~~
 - ~~Infectious Diseases~~
 - Department of Medical Education
 - Medicine
 - ~~Obstetrics and Gynaecology~~
 - ~~Paediatrics and Child Health~~
 - Pathology
 - Pharmacology
 - Physiology
 - ~~Psychological Medicine~~
 - ~~Public Health and Community Medicine~~
 - Radiology
 - Rural Health
 - Surgery;
 - Northern Clinical School
 - School of Biomedical Sciences
 - School of Public Health
 - Western Clinical School
 - (b) the professors, readers, associate professors, senior lecturers, lecturers, and associate lecturers, being fractional members of the teaching staff of half-time or greater of the schools and departments included in subsection (a);
 - (c) persons upon whom the University has conferred the title of professor, reader, associate professor, senior lecturer, lecturer or associate lecturer and who are members of the ~~research units formally recognised by the University as associated with the Faculty~~ schools and departments included in subsection (a);
 - (d) persons upon whom the University has conferred the title of Visiting Professor and who are members of the schools and departments included in subsection (a);
 - (e) persons upon whom the University has conferred the title of adjunct associate lecturer, adjunct lecturer, adjunct senior lecturer, adjunct associate professor and adjunct professor ~~in accordance with the resolutions of the Academic Board~~ and who are members of the schools and departments included in subsection (a);
 - (f) persons upon whom the University has conferred the title of clinical professor, clinical associate professor, clinical senior lecturer, clinical lecturer or clinical associate lecturer ~~in accordance with the resolutions of the Academic Board~~ and who are members of the schools and departments included in subsection (a);
 - (g) the Director of Research and Development of the College of Health Sciences;
 - (h) the Director of the Electron Microscope Unit;

- (i) full-time members of the research staff of the schools and departments included in subsection (a) and of the research units formally recognised by the University as associated with the Faculty holding University appointments of research fellow and above;
- (j) persons upon whom the University has conferred the title of research fellow, senior research fellow, principal research fellow and senior principal research fellow and who are members of the schools and departments included in subsection (a);
- (k) the Deans of the Faculties of Arts, Dentistry, Health Sciences, Nursing, Pharmacy, Science and Veterinary Science and the Professors in the Faculties of Dentistry, Health Sciences, Nursing and Pharmacy;
- (l) the Director-General of the NSW Health Department and the Chief Health Officer of New South Wales;
- (m) the Chairman of the Board and the Chief Executive Officer or nominee of the following Area Health Services:
Central Sydney Health Service
Far West Area Health Service
Macquarie Area Health Service
Mid Western Area Health Service
Northern Rivers Area Health Service
Northern Sydney Area Health Service
South Eastern Sydney Area Health Service
Wentworth Area Health Service
Western Sydney Area Health Service
and the Chair of the ACT Health and Community Care Services Board;
- (n) the Chair of the ACT Health Board and the Chief Executive Officer or nominee of
The Canberra Hospital;
- (o) the Chairman of the Board and the Chief Executive or nominee of the Children's Hospital of at Westmead;
- ~~(m) the Chief Executive Officer or nominee of the following teaching hospitals:
Children's Hospital of Westmead
Concord Repatriation General Hospital
Nepean Hospital
Royal North Shore Hospital
Royal Prince Alfred Hospital
Sydney Hospital (including Sydney Eye Hospital)
Westmead Hospital
The Canberra Hospital;~~
- ~~(n) one nominee of each of the associated teaching hospitals of the Faculty as determined by the Faculty on the recommendation of the Dean;~~
- ~~(o) those professors emeriti who have been professors in departments with full membership of the Faculty of Medicine;~~
- (p) former members of the Faculty upon whom the University has conferred the title of emeritus professor;
- (q) persons upon whom the University has conferred honorary degrees in the Faculty;
- (r) the President of the Medical Graduates' Association and the President of the Medical Foundation;
- (s) medically qualified Fellows of Senate;
- ~~(r) the Senior Graduate President of the University of Sydney Medical Society, provided that person is a candidate for the degrees of Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery in the Faculty;~~
- ~~(s) the President of the Faculty of Medicine Postgraduate Society, provided that person is a candidate for a postgraduate degree in the Faculty;~~
- ~~(t) not more than four additional students elected in the manner prescribed by the resolution of the Senate;~~
- (t) not more than six students elected in the manner prescribed by resolution of the Senate;

- (u) such other persons as may be appointed by the Faculty on the nomination of the Dean.
2. A person appointed pursuant to section 1(e) ~~(u)~~ shall be appointed for a period of 3 years and shall be eligible for reappointment. A person appointed pursuant to sections 1(m), 1(q), 1(r), 1(s) or 1(t) shall be appointed for a period of 2 years and shall be eligible for reappointment.
 3. The Faculty may elect persons to honorary membership of the Faculty in accordance with resolutions adopted by the Faculty at its meeting on 21 May 1992.

AGENDA ITEM 9.2 **Report of the Research Committee**

9.2 Report of the Research Committee meeting held on 22 October 2002

The Committee met on 22 October 2002 when there were present: Professor G Gill, Chair, Professor M Christie, Professor D Melrose, Dr J Lingard, Professor J Carter, Associate Professor P McCallum, Professor C Pollock, Professor M Harris, Professor L Field, Professor R Ross and Mr R. Martinez. A/Prof N O'Dwyer, A/Professor G Gurr, Professor H Raadsma, Dr L Poladian, Dr C Baxter, Mr W Dawson, Ms M Robb and Mr E Micallef were in attendance.

9.2.1 Receipt of report

The Committee **recommends** that the Academic Board receive and note the following report of its meeting held on 22 October 2002.

9.2.2 Proceedings of the Committee

(1) Items carried over

(a) Working Party for Vislab and HPC

The working party comprised of Professor Ross McPhedran (Physics), Professor Peter Eades (ITC), Dr Lars Jermin (Biological Science) with expertise in Bioinformatics and Associate Professor Simon Carlile (Assistant Pro Vice-Chancellor (Information Technology)). The Committee is chaired by the Acting Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research). Dr Chris Walsh has been appointed as a consultant who is currently drawing together information from all sources and conducting interviews with all interested parties. All Deans and HoD's have been contacted and asked to identify staff who should have input. The terms of reference for the Steering Committee were tabled at the meeting. It is proposed that an interim report be available in November and a final report towards the end of November/Early December.

(b) Working Party on Research Only Staff

A call for submissions closed on 18 October 2002. The working party is now collating responses. The Working Party will meet within the next month to consider the consolidated list of issues that have emerged.

(c) Draft Terms of Reference and Constitution of the Research Committee

The Chair advised that the suggested amendments made to the draft terms of reference have been agreed to at the last meeting of the Academic Board.

(2) Discussions with Faculty Research Committees

Associate Professor Geoff Gurr, Chair, Faculty of Rural Management Research Committee: Professor Gurr noted that while the overall level of research has not been strong (the CAE background is a contributing factor) the publication rate has increased 5-fold between 1997 and 2001, the first PhD student graduated in 2000 and research student load has increased from 1 in 1993 to 22 in 2002. Professor Gurr noted that the Faculty recognises research development as a key challenge and a number of events are indicators of this including: increase in research post graduate enrolments; appointing research active staff; the construction of research glasshouses and laboratories; the establishment of the Centre for Regional Education Orange and the association with a number of CRCs, regional, state, federal and local organizations including international collaboration in research. New initiatives aim to build on recent progress and exploit strong researchers in order to mentor and motivate other staff.

Professor Herman Raadsma, Chair, Faculty of Veterinary Science Research Committee: Professor Raadsma noted that research income in the faculty now exceeds \$4m pa with the major areas of strength being epidemiology, genetics, reproduction, immunology, nutrition and physiology. The bulk of the income comes from research in pigs and sheep with most coming from the Sydney and Camden locations. It was noted that whilst the value of grants and postgraduate students are increasing, the rate of publications is falling. The staffing profile shows that 70% of the income comes from 30% of the staff, 50% of the staff are not research active, 35% of income is externally funded and 75% of the grants are earned by 6 areas of research strength. The faculty is now aligning resource allocation according to the funding drivers, building strategic area of core strength, building a strong and responsive research culture, building a strong external profile and capturing new opportunities in genomics and biotechnology. New opportunities exist in biotechnology, research partnerships, commercial partnerships, bio-informatics, national animal health programme and clinical trials centre's.

Associate Professor Peter McCallum, Chair, Conservatorium of Music Research Committee: Professor McCallum defined research as that which expands the discipline in which it participates, is publicly reported and peer reviewed. The Conservatorium has been involved in traditional research (musicology, music education) since 1975, and is now involved in applied research in music performance, composition and technology and creative work. Issues include the treatment of creative work within the University sector, staff development (particularly providing grants for performance work and composition), the integration of the National Voice Centre and the use of composition technology. The goals for the committee include the revision of the research management plan, review of postgraduate supervision, increase the number of grants by targeting Discovery, Linkage and the Australia Council.

(3) Draft timetable for 2003 meetings

The Chair circulated the proposed University Research Committee timetable for 2003. The Acting Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) noted that the senior executive meetings were held on Tuesdays, and now that the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research) will be part of the executive, there may be a clash with meeting dates. As there will be a number of new senior executives at the University in 2003, this committee will await the decision of the Executive Committee regarding its meeting dates before finalising 2003 dates.

(4) Reports

(a) Professor Les Field, Acting Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research)

Professor Field reported on the following:

- *ARC Outcomes:* Overall an excellent result for the University. Professor Field wished to congratulate all of the successful applicants and also to thank all of those who have contributed to this successful outcome – including the HoDs/Deans and PVC's who have provided the good research environment and also to the Research Office and the Research Development Office for the work they put in ensuring the quality, professional polish and competitiveness of the applications from here. The University leads with the largest amount of Discovery Project support both initial support as well as initial plus continuing. We are also leading Linkage this year (for the first time ever).
- *Sesqui Near Miss Scheme.* The first round of "near misses" have now been awarded – these were those based on ARC outcomes – still awaiting outcomes from NHMRC. Awarded 14 near misses to ARC - each of these was awarded \$40K for one year – they carry the caveat that the grants be returned should applicant be awarded a grant on a reserve list.

- *Profiles visit.* DEST was visited on 23 September by the Vice-Chancellor, Professor Ken Eltis (Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor), Professor Les Field (Acting Pro Vice-Chancellor, Research) and Mr Charles Davidson, Director, Planning Support Office. A number of issues were discussed but of importance was the issue of being under target with our Postgraduate load. It was proposed that we accommodate the shortfall over the space of 3-5 years and re-balance our load. We are awaiting a response.
- *House of Representatives Standing Committee on Science and Innovation – Inquiry into Business Commitment to R&D.* The Acting Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) noted that he was in Canberra on 21 October appearing before the committee to make a presentation on behalf of the Go8. Professor Field advised the Standing Committee that most of the R&D is done by the Go8, and that most commercialisation, patents, spin-offs also go to the Go8 which are well structured to handle R&D. It was pointed out that the tax structure provided disincentive to some commercialisation (Capital Gains Tax and FBT liability should commercialisation proceed, and the 125/175% tax incentive to industry). The commission is clearly looking for ideas to move forward and encourage more business investment in R&D.
- *Centres of Excellence.* There were 56 full applications submitted nation wide. The applicants now have some referees comments and have had the opportunity to provide brief rejoinders. The Selection Committee will consider the applications, assessments and rejoinders. It will short-list approximately 16 applications for interview. The Selection Committee will prepare its recommendations for consideration by the ARC Board on 11 December.
- *Sesqui R&D Scheme.* Applications have now been reviewed and assessed and the draft recommendations are with PVC(R). On track to maintain the timeline where all applicants will be notified within the first week in November. Still awaiting the outcomes of the NHMRC.
- *Sesqui Fellowships.* Applications closed 20th September. As a result of poor take up last year and the very late withdrawal of some of the people who were offered them, we will offer more fellowships this year – probably 15 rather than 12.
- *Postgraduate Coordinator's meeting.* It was noted that the Acting Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) had addressed a meeting of Postgraduate Coordinators from around the University with Associate Professor Russell Ross, Chair, Graduate Studies Committee and Associate Professor Tony Masters, Chair, PhD Award Sub-Committee. The meeting was very much a two-way exchange of information about Postgraduate issues, and worked well.

(b) Mr Warwick Dawson, Director, Research Office

Mr Dawson reported on the following

- There is a list of successful grants for 2003 funding on the Research Office web site;
- There will be an information feedback session run by the ARC for researchers and research administrators on 20 November starting at 9:30 am at the UNSW;
- NHMRC results are expected at the end of the month. We still have over 50% of our applications in the running;
- Management of data: Calista Research will be implemented within the next 6 – 12 months. It will be web based and should allow the apportionment of credit for grants between departments for RIBG purposes.

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

Dr Baxter advised that the University is participating in an on-going national survey of research commercialisation, which will allow us to compare results with other Australian and American Universities. Measures include patents, licenses, income, start-up companies. The Go8 fared well and the next survey will be out next month.

(d) **Ms Merrilee Robb, Director, Research Development**

Ms Robb noted the following:

- ARC results were pleasing;
- ANU excelled in its performance in DP's and came close to us in LPs;
- Percentage wise we did better 2 years ago;
- Unsuccessful letters from the ARC were poorly worded, particularly with reference to percentile bands;
- We did worst in postdoctoral fellowships. We need to prioritise this for next year, particularly the need to take up the four-year option;
- We did well in Linkage because of Physics. This needs to be sustained next year.

AGENDA ITEM 9.3 **Report of the Research Committee**

9.3 Report of the Research Committee meeting held on 19 November 2002

The Committee met on 19 November 2002 when there were present: Professor G Gill, Chair, Professor D Melrose, Dr J Lingard, Professor J Carter, Associate Professor P McCallum, Professor L Field, and Professor R Ross. Professor D Burke, Ms M Robb, Ms G Briody and Mr E Micallef were in attendance.

9.3.1 Receipt of report

The Committee **recommends** that the Academic Board receive and note the following report of its meeting held on 19 November 2002.

9.3.2 Proceedings of the Committee

(1) Items carried over

(a) Research Only Working Party

The Acting Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) noted that he had received 35 submissions, which he has now summarised into key points. A number of issues need to be directed to other university committees (URC, Staffing Committee of Academic Board, College PVC's and the PVC(ER)). It is expected that proposals will be actioned after Christmas.

(2) Chairs Report from the Academic Board

The Chair circulated a paper, which summarised the main subjects discussed by the University Research Committee in 2002. A number of issues were identified for discussion in 2003 including: review of policies relating to research fellows; review of policies relating to agreements with industry; and the issue of creative arts and patents and their use as research performance indicators within the University.

(3) Discussion with representatives of Faculty Research Committees

Mr Geoff Weary, Chair, Sydney College of the Arts Research Committee: Mr Weary noted that there is an increased demand in research degrees accompanied by a high level of completion rates. In 2003 there were 19 PhD applications for 8 places and 50 Masters applications for 29 places. These degrees require technical support and studio space and should be considered as 'high cost' degrees. An associated problem with increased postgraduate enrolments is staff capacity to supervise the numbers and the faculty's ability to provide space and technical support. With respect to academic research there has been a significant increase in solo exhibitions, group exhibitions, public commissions and representative contemporary art presentations. There is a commitment to attracting external funding from the Australia Council and the ARC. Disappointment was expressed in the success rate of Sesqui funding by SCA. Perhaps there have to be separate Sesqui grants for creative works?

Associate Professor Nicholas O'Dwyer, Chair, Faculty of Health Sciences Research Committee: Professor O'Dwyer noted that the faculty comprises 10% of the University, with 33% of its academic staff being identified as research active. Several areas of research strength have been identified, including: Ageing, Disability, Movement, Public Health, Stuttering and Anxiety. There has been a steady growth of publications in the DEST formula over recent years. Enrolment in Higher Degrees continues to increase, however, there is concern with research training performance as indexed by the HDR student load completion ratio. In 2003 and beyond the faculty priority is to maximise research income, with a five-year goal to bring all research performance indicators in line with the rest of the University.

There was a general discussion about the value of Faculty Research Committee (FRC) chairs presenting to the URC. A number of points were made about the involvement of FRC chairs in the URC in 2002. It was decided that we would continue as we have this year, i.e., invite 2 FRC's to each of our meetings, but also to explore the idea of a forum between the URC and members of the FRC at least once a year.

(4) ARC Fellowships and the 4-year option

The Director, Research Development spoke about the poor relative performance of ARC Postdoctoral Fellowships against other ARC performers. There are a number of issues with postdocs including: transition of postdocs to a higher level; the restricted time to publish; and our ability to attract quality applicants. These problems can be partly overcome with the 4-year option (i.e., a 3 year fellowship going over 4 years with the university paying 25% of the salary each year). This 4-year option requires the College to find 12 months salary to fund these postdocs. There is a benefit to the College, where these postdocs spend 25% of their time teaching; this could be used to relieve other stressed T and R staff. It was noted, however, that currently 3-year postdocs are able to take a year off to enhance their teaching profile, so effectively the four-year option can be accommodated retrospectively. The real benefit in the 4-year option, then, is to allow an extra year for publications, and as a promotions vehicle to bring in higher quality applicants. Professor Field noted that he would raise this with College PVC's.

(5) Reports

(a) Professor Les Field, Acting Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research)

Professor Field reported on the following:

- NHMRC Outcomes: NHMRC outcomes. Announced within the last few weeks. Tabled. The University has done extremely well. Including 1 SPRF (to Professor Christie) and 3 SRF's. Amongst the Universities, Sydney has done the best on projects plus fellowships. If we include other institutions then the WEHI is just ahead;
- Centres of Excellence: There were some 56 full applications submitted nation wide. Approximately 20 applications were short listed for interview. Short listed applicants were announced yesterday. Of the 5 applications submitted by the University of Sydney, 2 have been short listed for interview: Professor Hugh Durrant-Whyte (Engineering) - Centre for Autonomous Systems; and Professor Ben Eggleton/Matijn DeSterke (Physics) - Centre for Ultrahigh-bandwidth Devices for Optical Systems Interviews will be held in Old Parliament House, Canberra, in the period 25-28 November. Outcomes will be known by the end of the year. We are looking at options for the other Centres which failed to get to interview – there has been considerable effort to get to this stage and we would like to capitalise on the momentum that has been generated in getting this far.
- Sesqui R&D Scheme. All applicants have been notified of the outcomes. A final summary and report of the outcomes will be circulated when available. With the announcement of the NHMRC results, near-miss grants from NHMRC have also been finalised.
- Sesqui Fellowships: Applications closed 20th September, and have been ranked by Faculties and the Central Committee. 15 offers have been made with a reserve list of 8.

- Major Equipment: The Major Equipment Committee met on 18 November and successfully allocated the Major Equipment budget (> \$3M). Allocation was on a College-by-College basis with each College having its own budget. 55 applications were ranked from faculties of which 38 were funded. The general principle was to fully fund all legitimate budget items after budget scrutiny. Successful applicants are on the web.
- Federation Fellowships: Round 2 applications have closed. There were 10 applications from CST 1 from CHS and 1 from CHASS. All applications are very strong.

(6) **Other Business**

The Chair noted that he would be on study leave for the first half of next year and that the Alternate Chair, Professor Carter, will chair the meetings.

AGENDA ITEM 10.1 General Business

10.1 Membership of Central Promotions Committees: 2003

It is recommended that the Academic Board approve the following appointments to membership of the Central Promotions Committees for 2003:

Senior Lecturer

Professor Ken Eltis (Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor) (Chair)
Professor Judyth Sachs (Chair, Academic Board)
Professor David Griffiths (Chair, Academic Board, University of Wollongong)
Associate Professor Louise Baur (nominee, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, CHS)
Associate Professor Shane White (nominee, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, CHASS)
Professor WMC Maxwell (nominee, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, CST)
Associate Professor Ross Menzies (Behavioural & Community Health Sciences)
Associate Professor Scott Kable (Chemistry)
Associate Professor Penny Gay (English)

Meeting: 25 September 2003

Associate Professor

Professor Ken Eltis (Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor) (Chair)
Professor Judyth Sachs (Chair, Academic Board)
Professor Kevin McConkey (President, Academic Board, University of New South Wales)
Professor Basil Roufogalis (nominee, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, CHS)
Associate Professor Jennifer Hill (nominee, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, CHASS)
Professor Brian Haynes (nominee, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, CST)
Professor Richard Waterhouse (History)
Professor Marcela Bilek (Physics)
Associate Professor Sandra West (Clinical Nursing)

Meeting: 30 October 2003

Professor

Professor Gavin Brown, Vice-Chancellor (Chair)
Professor Ken Eltis (Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor)
Professor Judyth Sachs (Chair, Academic Board)
Professor Kevin McConkey (President, Academic Board, University of New South Wales)
Pro-Vice-Chancellor, CHASS
Professor David Handelsman (nominee, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, CHS)
Professor Frank Nicholas (nominee, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, CST)
Professor Anne Brewer (Assistant Pro-Vice-Chancellor)
Professor Jo-anne Brien (Pharmacy)
Professor Bruce Armstrong (Public Health)

Meeting: 13 November 2003

AGENDA ITEM 10.2 General Business

10.2 Conferring of All Academic Titles

Every six months the Pro Vice-Chancellor (College) are required to report to the Academic Board on the conferral of all titles within their Colleges.

The Colleges and Faculties have provided information on titles conferred from 1 July 2002 to 31 December 2002.

College of Health Sciences

Title	Name	Faculty/Department	Duration
Associate Lecturer	McCahon, E	Paediatrics & Child Health, The Children's Hospital	Duration of substantive appointment
Clinical Associate Lecturer	Gavaghan, C	Medicine, Northern Clinical School	3 years
Clinical Associate Lecturer	Guenther, S	General Practice, Northern Clinical School	3 years
Clinical Associate Lecturer	Jacobe, S	Paediatrics & Child Health	3 years
Clinical Associate Lecturer	Millwood, M	Medicine, Central Clinical School	3 years
Clinical Lecturer	Alexander, S	Paediatrics & Child Health	3 years
Clinical Lecturer	Hardwick, R	Paediatrics & Child Health	3 years
Clinical Lecturer	Hart, D	General Practice, Northern Clinical School	3 years
Clinical Lecturer	Persson, J	Obstetrics & Gynaecology, Central Clinical School	3 years
Clinical Lecturer	Sheil, M	Paediatrics & Child Health	3 years
Clinical Senior Lecturer	Walker, S	Anaesthesia, Northern Clinical School	3 years
Clinical Senior Lecturer	Waite, L	Medicine, Central Clinical School	3 years
Clinical Senior Lecturer	Woodhouse, A	Anaesthesia, Northern Clinical School	3 years
Clinical Associate Professor	Benness, C	Obstetrics & Gynaecology, Central Clinical School	3 Years
Clinical Associate Professor	Cohen, R	Paediatrics & Child Health, The Children's Hospital	3 years
Clinical Associate Professor	Commens, C	Medicine, Western Clinical School	3 years
Clinical Associate Professor	Corbett, A	Medicine, Central Clinical School	3 years
Clinical Associate Professor	Catalaris, C	Medicine, Western Clinical School	3 years
Clinical Associate Professor	Nanan, R	Paediatrics & Child Health, The Children's Hospital	3 years

Clinical Associate Professor	Shaw, P	Paediatrics & Child Health, The Children's Hospital	3 years
Research Fellow	Bertilino, P	Centenary Institute of Cancer Medicine & Cell Biology, Central Clinical School	Duration of substantive appointment
Research Fellow	O'Neill, G	Paediatrics & Child Health	Duration of substantive appointment
Research Fellow	Schevzov, G	Paediatrics & Child Health	Duration of substantive appointment
Senior Research Fellow	Jones, M	Medicine, Western Clinical School	Duration of substantive appointment
Senior Research Fellow	Reddell, J	Institute of Respiratory Medicine, Central Clinical School	Duration of substantive appointment
Conjoint Associate Lecturer	Magoffin, A	Paediatrics & Child Health	Duration of substantive appointment
Conjoint Associate Lecturer	Ramakrishnan, N	Medicine, Canberra Clinical School	Duration of substantive appointment
Conjoint Lecturer	Dalby-Payne, J	Paediatrics & Child Health, The Children's Hospital	Duration of substantive appointment
Conjoint Lecturer	Hollis, G	Medicine, Canberra Clinical School	Duration of substantive appointment
Conjoint Lecturer	Jyoti, R	Radiology, Canberra Clinical School	Duration of substantive appointment
Conjoint Lecturer	Mohamed, A	Medicine, Central Clinical School	Duration of substantive appointment
Conjoint Lecturer	Nicholl, M	Obstetrics & Gynaecology, Northern Clinical School	Duration of substantive appointment
Conjoint Lecturer	Stormon, M	Gastroenterology, Western Clinical School	Duration of substantive appointment
Conjoint Senior Lecturer	Carey, V	Public Health, Northern Clinical School	Duration of substantive appointment
Conjoint Senior Lecturer	Huxley, R	Institute for International Health, Central Clinical School	Duration of substantive appointment
Conjoint Senior Lecturer	Jones, B	Gastroenterology, Northern Clinical School	Duration of substantive appointment
Conjoint Senior Lecturer	King, G	Medicine, Northern Clinical School	Duration of substantive appointment
Conjoint Senior Lecturer	Lowe, H	Medicine, Central Clinical School	Duration of substantive appointment
Conjoint Senior Lecturer	Young, J	Public Health, Central Clinical School	Duration of substantive appointment
Conjoint Associate Professor	Lo, S-K	Institute for International Health, Central Clinical School	Duration of substantive appointment
Conjoint Associate Professor	Neal, B	Institute for International Health, Central Clinical School	Duration of substantive appointment

Conjoint Associate Professor	Sue, C	Neurology, Northern Clinical School	Duration of substantive appointment
Adjunct Senior Lecturer	Curtin, A	Medicine, Northern Clinical School	3 years
Adjunct Associate Professor	Martin, F	Paediatrics & Child Health	3 years
Adjunct Professor	Reid, M	Institute for International Health, Central Clinical School	3 Years
Visiting Professor	James, B	School of Public Health	3 Years
Clinical Associate Lecturer	Bassi, S	Dentistry	3 years
Clinical Associate Lecturer	Cho, Yuen-Teng	Dentistry	3 years
Clinical Associate Lecturer	Mruk, D	Dentistry	3 years
Clinical Associate Lecturer	Rudrakumar, B	Dentistry	3 years
Clinical Associate Lecturer	Geddes, C	Dentistry	3 years
Clinical Associate Lecturer	Baxter, D	Dentistry	3 years
Clinical Lecturer	Reid, A	Dentistry	3 years
Clinical Lecturer	Kenny, J	Dentistry	3 years
Clinical Lecturer	Lain, R	Dentistry	3 years
Clinical Lecturer	Pearlman, B	Dentistry	3 years
Clinical Lecturer	King, P	Dentistry	3 years
Clinical Senior Lecturer	Buchanan, S	Dentistry	3 years
Clinical Associate Professor	Walton, T	Dentistry	3 years
Adjunct Senior Lecturer	Stanley, C	Health Sciences	1 year

College of Humanities and Social Sciences (This report also includes titles conferred from 1 January 2002 to 30 June 2002.)

Title	Name	Faculty/Department	Duration
Adjunct Senior Lecturer	Sue Gordon	Education	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Monica Azzolini	SEAMELS	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Bruce Mansfield	SPGHAWS	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Colette Rayment	SEAHFM	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Helen Groth	SEAHFM	30/1/02 - 29/1/03
Honorary Associate	Judith Barbour	SEAHFM	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Jennifer Lindsay	SSCP	01/2/02 - 31/12/05
Honorary Associate	Graham Hardie	SSCP	01/1/02 - 31/12/03
Honorary Associate	Michele Morgan	SSCP	01/1/02 - 31/12/03
Honorary Associate	Gary Simes	SEAHFM	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Chris Given-Wilson	SEAHFM	10/2/02 - 30/4/02
Honorary Associate	Helen Hewson	SEAHFM	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Beverley Sherry	SEAHFM	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Sang Soo Jeon	SEAMELS	01/1/02 - 31/12/04

Honorary Associate	Avrum Ehrlich	SEAMELS	01/1/02 - 31/12/04
Honorary Associate	Lena Cansdale	SEAMELS	01/1/02 - 31/12/04
Honorary Associate	Tom Kramer	SEAMELS	01/1/02 - 31/12/04
Honorary Associate	Eric Gross	SSCP	01/1/02 - 31/12/03
Honorary Associate	Jeremy Beckett	SSCP	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Lucy Davey	SEAMELS	01/1/02 - 31/12/04
Honorary Associate	Lloyd Dawe	Development & Learning	01/2/02 - 31/1/03
Honorary Associate	Samantha Eames	SOPHI	01/3/02 - 28/2/03
Honorary Associate	David Biernoff	SOPHI	01/3/02 - 28/2/03
Honorary Associate	Anne Bickford	SOPHI	01/3/02 - 28/2/03
Honorary Associate	Blanche Menadier	SOPHI	01/3/02 - 28/2/03
Honorary Associate	Jennifer Blain	SEAHFM	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Christopher Allen	SOPHI	01/1/02 - 31/12/04
Honorary Associate	Peter Hinton	SSCP	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	William Eddleston	SOPHI	01/3/02 - 31/12/04
Honorary Associate	Bernadette Brennan	SEAHFM	04/3/02 - 28/2/03
Honorary Associate	Michael Allen	SSCP	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	William Newell	SSCP	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Gretchen Poiner	SSCP	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Frederick Sandall	SSCP	01/1/02 - 28/2/02
Honorary Associate	Margaret Kerans	SSCP	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Roger Pitcher	SOPHI	01/3/02 - 31/12/04
Honorary Associate	Graham White	SOPHI	01/1/02 - 31/1/02
Honorary Associate	Barbara Horvath	SSCP	01/1/02 - 31/12/03
Honorary Associate	Marie de Lepervanche	SSCP	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Michael John Noone	SSCP	01/1/02 - 31/12/03
Honorary Associate	Penelope Allison	SOPHI	01/3/02 - 28/2/05
Honorary Associate	Vivienne Kendos	SSCP	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Kate Grenville	SEAHFM	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Goeffrey Little	SEAHFM	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Cathy Runcie	SEAHFM	01/1/02 - 31/12/04
Honorary Associate	Brian Kiernan	SEAHFM	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Mary Lane	SSCP	01/2/02 - 01/2/05
Honorary Associate	Henry Chan	SEAMELS	01/4/02 - 31/3/05
Honorary Associate	Leith Morton	SEAMELS	15/4/02 - 14/4/05
Honorary Associate	David Miller	SOPHI	01/5/02 - 31/12/03
Honorary Associate	Gillian Cowlshaw	SSCP	01/5/02 - 01/2/03
Honorary Associate	Andrew Lattas	SSCP	01/5/02 - 31/1/03
Honorary Associate	Hu Jin Kok	SSCP	01/5/02 - 01/2/03
Honorary Associate	Xiyan Bi	SEAMELS	01/6/02 - 30/5/05
Honorary Associate	Ian R. Jack	SPGHAWS	01/1/02 - 31/12/04
Honorary Associate	Jo-Anne Duggan	SEAMELS	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Trevor Evans	SPGHAWS	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Brian Fletcher	SPGHAWS	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Sybil Jack	SPGHAWS	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Nicholas Hardwick	SPGHAWS	01/1/02 - 31/12/04
Honorary Associate	Grahame Harrison	SPGHAWS	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Jeanette Lingard	SEAMELS	01/2/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Kenneth Macnab	SPGHAWS	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	A. Syrokomla-Stefanowska	SEAMELS	01/1/02 - 31/12/04

Honorary Associate	Carolyn Van Langenberg	SEAHFM	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Robin Torrence	SPGHAWS	02/1/02 - 01/01/04
Honorary Associate	Michael Van Langenberg	SEAMELS	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Ilaria Vanni	SEAMELS	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Diana Wyndham	SPGHAWS	01/1/02 - 31/12/02
Honorary Associate	Michael Young	SPGHAWS	01/1/02 - 31/12/04
Honorary Associate	Axel Kruse	SEAHFM	1/2/02 - 31/1/05
Honorary Associate Professor	Gay MacAuley	SSCP	01/2/02 - 31/12/05
Honorary Professor	Leonie Kramer	SEAHFM	01/1/02 - ongoing
Visiting Professor	Rosemary Pringle	SSCP	01/2/02 - 30/2/02
Visiting Professor	Malcolm Gammie	Law	18/5/02 - 31/5/02
Visiting Scholar	Esther Simons	SEAMELS	03/3/02 - 14/6/02
Visiting Scholar	Seung-Woo Whargh	SEAHFM	14/2/02 - 20/12/02
Visiting Scholar	Huiting Gan	SEAHFM	01/3/02 - 31/8/02
Visiting Scholar	Hieng Hiong Lau	SSCP	1/2/02 - 31/7/02
Visiting Scholar	Jiazhen Cai	SEAHFM	1/3/02 - 28/2/03
Visiting Scholar	Li Song	SSCP	01/2/02 - 01/2/03
Visiting Scholar	Zhanzi Li	SSCP	01/6/02 - 01/6/03
Visiting Scholar	Toshihiko Narita	SEAMELS	01/3/02 - 29/2/03
Visiting Scholar	Jung Pyo Lee	Policy & Practice	29/3/02 - 31/12/02
Visiting Scholar	Andriy Andreev	Business	01/5/02 - 30/6/02
Visiting Scholar	Henk Berkman	Business	21/4/02 - 04/5/02
Visiting Scholar	Michael Bradbury	Business	16/4/02 - 31/5/02
Visiting Scholar	Hui Guo	Development & Learning	01/1/02 - 31/3/02
Visiting Scholar	Lai Sing Lam	SEPS	15/4/02 - 28/6/02
Visiting Scholar	Mark Lincicome	Policy & Practice	01/3/02 - 30/4/02
Visiting Scholar	Robert Mackie	Policy & Practice	02/1/02 - 30/6/02
Visiting Scholar	Maurice Peat	Business	12/2/02 - 06/7/02
Visiting Scholar	Maxwell Stevenson	Business	12/2/02 - 06/7/02
Visiting Scholar	Hualu Wang	Policy & Practice	01/4/02 - 31/3/03
Visiting Scholar	Jianhui Zhang	Development & Learning	25/4/02 - 24/4/03
Adjunct Lecturer	Michael Di Francesco	SEPS	15/07/02 - 14/07/03
Honorary Associate	Xiyan Bi	SEAMELS	01/07/02 - 30/06/03
Honorary Associate	Svend Helms	SOPHI	01/07/02 - 30/06/03
Honorary Associate	Abdulzahir Youssofzay	SOPHI	01/07/02 - 30/07/03
Honorary Associate	Timothy Gregory	SOPHI	01/07/02 - 30/06/03
Honorary Associate	Anne Brewer	Business	01/07/02 - 30/06/05
Honorary Associate	Douglas Kahn	SEAHFM	01/07/02 - 31/12/03
Honorary Associate	Kim McShane	Policy & Practice	17/09/02 - 16/09/04
Honorary Associate	Victor Hansen	SEAHFM	1/8/02 - 31/7/03
Honorary Associate	Robert White	SEAMELS	10/7/02 - 9/7/05
Honorary Associate	John Williams	SEAMELS	8/7/02 - 8/7/05
Honorary Associate	Fiona Giles	SEAHFM	1/9/02 - 31/8/03
Honorary Associate	Paul Knobel	SEAMELS	25/7/02 - 24/7/05
Honorary Associate	Kathleen O'Brien	SEAMELS	1/7/02 - 30/6/05
Honorary Associate	Kobayashi Hiroko	SEAMELS	25/09/02 - 25/09/05

Honorary Associate	Kenneth MacNab	SOPHI	1/1/02 □– 30/12/05
Honorary Associate	William Atkins	SEPS	1/07/02 – 30/06/05
Honorary Associate	Ken Turner	SEPS	1/09/02 – 31/08/05
Honorary Associate	Ute Eickelkamp	SSCP	01/10/02 – 31/12/03
Honorary Associate	Ursula Potter	SEAHFM	1/11/02 -31/10/03
Honorary Associate	Richard Corry	SOPHI	20/10/02 – 31/12/03
Honorary Associate	Adam Cobb	SEPS	01/10/02 – 30/09/04
Honorary Associate	William Sidney Atkins	SEPS	01/07/02 – 30/06/05
Honorary Associate	Richard Johnson	SOPHI	20/11/02 – 07/03/03
Visiting Professor	Andrew Treymane	SEPS	08/07/02 - 31/12/02
Visiting Professor	David Atkinson	SOPHI	10/10/02 - 20/11/02
Visiting Scholar	Ana Ortigosa	SCCP	29/7/02-7/12/02
Visiting Scholar	Kayoko Takagi	SEAMELS	01/07/02 - 30/06/03
Visiting Scholar	Aukje van Hoek	Law	10/08/02 - 30/08/02
Visiting Scholar	Amnon Lazar	SSCP	01/07/02 - 30/09/02
Visiting Scholar	Jon Patrick	SSCP	02/09/02 –31/12/02
Visiting Scholar	Maki Yamada	SSCP	08/08/02 - 04/09/02
Visiting Scholar	Bansari Mitra	SEAHFM	01/09/02 –28/02/03
Visiting Scholar	Byung-Woo	SEAHFM	01/09/02 –31/08/03
Visiting Scholar	Huiting Gan	SEAHFM	31/08/02 - 28/03/03
Visiting Scholar	Huizhen Hao	Development & Learning	01/07/02 - 01/07/03
Visiting Scholar	Ana Ortigosa	SSCP	29/07/02 - 07/12/02
Visiting Scholar	Victor Portougal	SEPS	29/07/02 - 31/01/03
Visiting Scholar	Barbara Stiebels	SSCP	12/08/02 - 12/10/02
Visiting Scholar	Anchalee Wannaruk	SEAHFM	August '02 - October' 02
Visiting Scholar	Simone Fullagar	Policy & Practice	29/07/02 - 22/11/02
Visiting Scholar	Luca Girelli	Development & Learning	01/03/02 - 01/04/02
Visiting Scholar	John McCormick	Development & Learning	09/09/02 - 20/12/02
Visiting Scholar	Kwang Sik Kim	Business	15/07/02 – 15/02/03
Visiting Scholar	Barbara Steibels	SSCP	12/8/02-12/10/02
Visiting Scholar	Atsushi Maki	SEPS	31/0702 – 14/08/02
Visiting Scholar	Robert Walker	SEPS	25/07/02 – 7/01/03
Visiting Scholar	Daniel Heard	SOPHI	01/10/02 - 15/01/03
Visiting Scholar	Judith Quinn	SEAHFM	09/11/02 – 07/01/03
Visiting Scholar	Bon-Jung Koo	SCCP	29/11/02 - 28/11/03
Visiting Scholar	Mathias Frisch	SOPHI	27/10/02 - 03/11/02
Visiting Scholar	Nicholas Smith	SOPHI	01/12/02 – 31/01/03

College of Sciences and Technology

Title	Name	Faculty/Department	Duration
Adjunct Professor	Robert Baxter	Molecular & Microbial Biosciences	09/08/02 – 31/12/04
Adjunct Professor	Michael Dureau	Engineering	01/01/03 – 31/12/05
Adjunct Professor	Tetsuo Oikawa	Electron Microscope Unit	01/01/03 – 31/12/04