

---

## ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICY COMMITTEE

2:00pm – 4:00pm, Tuesday 11 September 2018

Senate Room, Quadrangle (A14)

**Members of ASPC Present:** Professor Jane Hanrahan (Chair); Helen Agus (Science); Dr Vasiliki Betihavas (Nursing); Professor Alan Fekete (Academic Board representative); Associate Professor Vincent Gomes (Engineering & IT); Professor Manuel Graeber (co-opted, Medicine); Imogen Grant (President, SRC); Dr Adrienne Keane (Architecture, Design & Planning); Associate Professor Tony Masters (Chair of the Academic Board); Associate Professor Maurice Peat (co-opted, Business); Associate Professor Jennifer Rowley (Conservatorium).

**Attendees:** Dr Amanda Budde-Sung (Academic Board member); Dr Matthew Charet (EO to Academic Board); Dr Glenys Eddy (Committee Officer, University Secretariat); Professor Ofer Gal (Academic Board member); Professor Stephen Garton (Provost and DVC); Associate Professor Eric Knight (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research - Enterprise & Engagement)) (for Item 5.1); Kathy Lynch (Acting Associate Director (Operations)) (for Item 5.1); Professor Patrice Rey (Science); Associate Professor Tim Wilkinson (Chair, Admissions Sub-Committee).

**Apologies:** Professor Peter Bryant (Business); Dr Bret Church (Pharmacy); Kerrie Henderson (co-opted, Office of General Counsel); Nanda Jarosz (nominee of the President, SUPRA); Patty Kamvounias (Academic Board representative); Dr Peter Knight (Medicine); Professor Pip Pattison (Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)); Associate Professor Rita Shackel (Law).

5/2018

---

## MINUTES

### 1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**Resolution ASPC18/5-1**

*The Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolved that the*

### 2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

#### 2.1 Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 17 July 2018 were approved as a true record of that meeting

**Resolution ASPC18/5-2**

*The Academic Standards and Policy Committee resolved that the minutes of meeting 3/2018, held on 22 May 2018, be confirmed as a true record.*

#### 2.2 Business Arising

There was no business arising.

#### 2.3 2019 Meeting Dates

**Resolution ASPC18/5-3**

*The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the schedule of 2019 meeting dates.*

### 3 STANDING ITEMS

#### 3.1 Report of the Chair

The Chair advised that she had nothing to report.

**Resolution ASPC18/5-3**

*The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the report of the Chair.*

### 3.2 Report of Academic Board

The Chair of Academic Board advised that he had nothing to add to the written report.

#### **Resolution ASPC18/5-4**

*The Academic Standards & Policy Committee noted the report of the Academic Board meeting held on 12 June 2018.*

## 4 ITEMS FOR ACTION

### 4.1 Educational Services Agreements Policy 2017

The Chair opened discussion by observing that the Policy had been written to support quality assurance processes for educational services provided on the University's behalf by other parties, and in its current form does not clearly take into account situations which have arisen recently. The agreement with Taronga Zoo is an example of such teaching agreements, where it is undertaking teaching on behalf of the University and has been certified as a suitable training site for the University by TEQSA. The Committee can make recommendations about the policy to the policy owner, the DVC Education.

Professor Fekete considered the Agreement and its Principles in Section 7 to reasonably cover the situation of another party teaching into the University's programs, where the University sub-contracts its teaching, they do not cover those instances where the University provides teaching for another party or where the University is approached by another party to jointly develop units. Observing that the University will need agreements for some arrangements that have been suggested, for instance, with companies such as Microsoft or Cisco where students could do a module within a unit of study. Such teaching would need to meet the University's standards, and perhaps include academic members of staff approving assessments etc. He believed that policy needs to clearly cover instances of resources supplied by external agencies: instances of funding for something existing prior to the offer of funding, and where funding is for new teaching. It was recommended that, as a matter of integrity, the source of funding should be questioned in terms of the provider's intention.

Associate Professor Masters observed that the University has many examples of teaching which is funded externally and where the teachers are either University staff or externals. At Taronga the teachers are staff employed by the Zoo and teaching into the University's units which have been developed jointly by Taronga and our faculty staff, although they cannot be unit-of-study coordinators; the agreements are about these people who are not University staff. He also noted the association of the University with any external teaching has implications, for instance, for its reputation and for reporting matters with TEQSA. The matter of adjunct appointments that can arise from external teaching appointments, and the University's compliance obligations in these circumstances, was also noted.

Members made the following recommendations, to be forwarded to the DVC Education:

- The principles need clearer articulation in the current Educational Services Agreements Policy, possibly using the Research Agreements Policy as a guide.
- A statement of the principle of academic freedom needs to be included.
- The Gift Acceptance Policy states that the University will not accept a gift that compromises its academic freedom. This should be emphasised in the Educational Services Agreements Policy.
- Other policies relevant to the Educational Services Agreements Policy, such as the Gift Acceptance Policy, need to be referenced in the policy document.
- The Policy needs to contain a Conflict of Interest clause.
- The Policy needs to contain or reference guidelines for commercial activities.
- Members gave positive feedback on the statement that any agreement should not be more than five years old but can be renewed. This should be clearly stated.

#### **Resolution ASPC18/5-5**

*That the Academic Standards & Policy Committee reviewed the Educational Services Agreements Policy 2017 and made the recommendations as outlined above.*

## 4.2 Academic Promotions Normative Criteria

Associate Professor Knight gave a brief overview of the recent changes to the Academic Promotions Normative Criteria, including the responses it had elicited since the previous ASPC meeting. He outlined the purpose of the amendments as to recognise the value of applied or translational research, which hitherto has not had much recognition, and to effect a culture change within the University concerning this.

Prior to 3pm Professor Gal indicated that he wished to comment on the promotions document, but had to leave before 3pm due to teaching commitments.

Professor Gal considered that the main business of the University is teaching and research, reflected in the promotions criteria for each, cautioned against the allowance for promotion based solely on administration and contribution to the community. The Chair noted that the governance route is not part of the new changes being considered; the changes were additions to the Procedures, and designed to recognize research more broadly than both 'pure' research which hitherto had been seen as superior and Category 1 research grants. The changes were meant to recognise applied or translational research and the industry relationships it fosters. As a result of the decreasing supply of Category 1 grants, other research features more prominently in the research funding policy.

The Chair relayed Professor Gal's comments to Professor Knight and the Provost when they joined the meeting at 3pm for discussion of this item.

Associate Professor Masters noted the importance of the matters raised by Professor Gal, but observed 1), that academics involved in the Promotions Committee should have robust debates about these issues, and 2), due to the nuanced nature of applications often received by the Committee, its members need to understand the issues involved. The University needs to be in a position to identify its prior inability to acknowledge the academic output of academics who generate applied research including non-traditional outputs. The Provost added that most local promotion committees have tended to ignore or to minimize evidence for certain forms of engagement that directly pertain to scholarly research output, which works to disadvantage some applicants under the current research criteria. Forms of engagement that do not necessarily lead to teaching or research outcomes but are appropriate forms of engagement, for instance, a piece of policy research for an NGO, may be deemed not suitable for a refereed journal publication and therefore does not count as research output. There needs to be a way of including these outputs in promotions criteria.

It was observed that the goal of the Procedures was not to *require* academics to undertake applied research, but to allow for this to be counted in their application.

The Provost also expressed his appreciation for the quality of work being done in the education space, and wished to acknowledge this and the excellent contributions of various types that academics make to the university, as much as possible through the promotions process.

Associate Professor Peat recommended that the local promotions committees be helped to acquire the new perspective on scholarly outputs, noting that 'policy does not change the cultural application'. It was noted that the Central Promotions Committee functions to ensure equity and consistency of the promotion process. Reports of processes to be implemented within the University included:

- a twenty-minute training session on the policy and the values it embodies;
- the introduction of appropriate material into the AP & D;
- efforts by the Research Office to elevate the regard in which this type of research is seen.

Members suggested that Heads of School be trained in providing the relevant advice to academics applying for promotion, and to encourage the fulfilment of the capabilities of the complete set of selection criteria, not limited to the publication of refereed journal papers. They also noted the need to train the committee chairs.

It was acknowledged that promotions criteria are often conveyed in terms of 'minimums', for instance, the minimum for service engagement, and that problems generated by this approach needed correction. The Provost observed that a more rounded, more qualitative and mentoring-oriented framework was needed. The new Vice-Provost is to explore ways of achieving this.

**Resolution ASPC18/5-6**

*That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the changes to the normative criteria as expressed in the Academic Promotions Procedures document, including the explicit acknowledgement of the work academics undertake around research engagement.*

**5 ITEMS FOR NOTING**

**5.1 Higher Education Policy Quarterly Update, September 2018**

Associate Professor Masters raised two matters of note in the update:

- With respect to the Federal Government's review of the Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF), currently any higher education institution calling itself a University must be engaged in research, but a successful proposition for teaching-only universities will bring changes to the higher education sector.
- With respect to the AQF review, related to the different types of qualifications frameworks in different jurisdictions, Associate Professor Masters noted that in Europe, academic agencies have oversight of academic programs by external agencies.

**Resolution ASPC18/5-7**

*That the Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the Higher Education Policy Quarterly update for September 2018.*

**5.2 Educational Integrity Trend Report, Semester 1 2018**

**Resolution ASPC18/5-8**

*The Academic Standards and Policy Committee noted the Educational Integrity Trend Report for Semester 1 2018.*

**5.3 Educational Integrity Decision-Making and Penalty Guidelines 2018**

A/Prof. Masters noted that given the lack of a precedent for this to date, that this document is extremely helpful. A set of principles is necessary for imposing consistency in the enactment of the process.

The Chair requested that any feedback on the Penalty Guidelines be emailed to the Committee Officer.

**Resolution ASPC18/5-9**

*That the Academic Standards & Policy Committee noted the draft Educational Integrity Decision-Making and Penalty Guidelines 2018, as presented.*

**6 OTHER BUSINESS**

**6.1 Any Other Business**

There being no further business, the meeting ended at 3.48pm.

**Next meeting:** 2:00pm – 4:00pm, **Tuesday 6 November 2018**  
Level 5 Function Room, Administration Building F23.

A full copy of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee papers is available at:  
[sydney.edu.au/secretariat/pdfs/academic-board-committees/academic-standards/2018/20180717-ASPC-Agenda-Pack.pdf](http://sydney.edu.au/secretariat/pdfs/academic-board-committees/academic-standards/2018/20180717-ASPC-Agenda-Pack.pdf)