MINUTES

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES
Professor Houston gave the acknowledgement of country at the start of the meeting. The Chair then asked those members who have previously served on the Academic Board to introduce themselves to newer members of the Academic Board. He emphasised that the members form one Academic Board.

2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

2.1 Starring of agenda and adoption of unstarred items
The following item was starred: 8.3

AB16/1-1
The Academic Board resolved as recommended with respect to all unstarred items.

2.2 Minutes of Meeting 2015/8, 2 December 2015
Members confirmed the minutes of the last meeting held on 2 December 2015.

AB16/1-2
The Academic Board resolved that the minutes of meeting 2015/8, held on 2 December 2015, be confirmed as a true record.

2.3 Actions Arising (Response to question without notice)
Mr Greenwell noted the response received to his question regarding the University’s Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination Policy 2015, but expressed concern that there was apparently no consultation with students regarding the revised policy.
The Academic Board noted the response received to a question without notice raised at its meeting of 2 December 2015.

3 STRATEGIC ITEMS OF BUSINESS
3.1 Focus Topic: Strategic Plan 2016-2020 Culture
The Vice-Chancellor noted that this section of the Strategic Plan 2016-2020 has not previously been discussed at the Academic Board, although some members will have participated in the workshops run during 2015. While Education and Research are at the heart of the strategy, underpinned by the new organisational design, the whole plan is set within the context of the University’s culture. He pointed out that culture is an issue that has been under consideration since the previous strategic plan, with staff raising issues regarding bullying, the place of women at the University (and the perception that they are often silenced), and a lack of cultural diversity. It also covers questions such as how the community can hold robust conversations that allow everyone to participate and not be silenced.

The discussions held in 2015 developed a set of agreed values: courage and creativity (which covers, but is more than, academic freedom); respect and integrity (how members of the University community relate to each other), inclusion and diversity (a reminder of the University’s foundation as arguably the first university to admit students on academic merit), openness and engagement (how the University relates to the outside community). The Vice-Chancellor acknowledged that these values are in part aspirational, but discussion participants and those who have provided feedback agree that these values are widely shared. Building a culture based on these values starts with demonstrating leadership at all levels, empowering staff to deal with behavioural issues, and supporting discourse and dialogue. Values will be embedded by improving the University’s processes, celebrating exceptional performance and establishing a culture taskforce as a joint group of SEG and the Academic Board to oversee embedding these values across the University and measuring the effectiveness of these efforts. Lastly, there will be a focus on promoting understanding across institutional barriers. The last strategic plan included a commitment for the University to be a place where staff and students can thrive and realise their full potential, and there is research to show that organisations that address these issues seriously do see positive change. He finished by explaining that the strategy is currently aimed at staff as the culture bearers of the institution, with students as the next stage of the strategy.

Members commented on the presentation as follows:
- Professor Fekete asked if there were examples of institutions where this sort of strategy has worked well; the Vice-Chancellor advised that there are institutions that are more diverse than this one, or where the discourse between academic and professional staff is more respectful, but none is perfect; the emphasis of this part of the strategy is on the University deciding what are its values and aspiring to be true to them;
- In response to Professor Stancliffe’s question on the involvement of professional staff with the culture taskforce, the Vice-Chancellor advised they should be included;
- Professor Refshauge emphasised the importance of this part of the strategic plan, with the Vice-Chancellor agreeing there is a hunger in the University community to see change in this area;
- Associate Professor McGrath-Champ suggested documenting the types of issues outlined in the discussion paper to identify the underlying causes; the Vice-Chancellor advised that a major issue is the extent of the fragmentation of responsibility across the University, and this could be addressed by simplifying the areas of responsibility and emphasising that the University is one community;
- Ms Hartman-Warren asked whether students had been involved in the culture discussions and how they will be engaged in this discussion in the future; the Vice-Chancellor reiterated that the staff of the University need to be the culture bearers, and that the strategy will be expanded to include students once it is seen to be working with staff;
- Mr Carment referred to the discussion paper’s reference to streamlining accountabilities, querying whether this would also mean a concentration of decision-making power and effectively make it harder for students to become involved in decision-making; the Vice-Chancellor pointed out that the previous strategic plan involved the democratisation of power at the University via the Senior Executive Group, however this change was not reflected all the way down; he expressed his preference for a simpler decision-making structure that is more
open and consultative but he acknowledged student concerns.

The Chair thanked the Vice-Chancellor for his presentation.

**AB16/1-4**

The Academic Board noted the presentation by the Vice-Chancellor on the Culture discussion paper for the Strategic Plan 2016-2020.

The Chair advised members that he had asked Professor Rhodes to comment on the meeting processes at the end of the meeting. He also took the opportunity to acknowledge the previous Chair, Associate Professor Peter McCallum, and the incredible standard he set. He also thanked Professor Fekete and Associate Professor Jennifer Barrett for their participation in the election for Chair of the Academic Board, and acknowledged Professor Judyth Sachs and the late Professor Helen Bey as influences.

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR**

4.1 Decisions Matrix for Special Consideration Applications

The Chair advised that some discussions between the Student Administrative Services (SAS) project and certain faculties had already occurred. Professor Carlin advised that a number of points had been clarified in these discussions, and recommended that the word "external" be removed from page 6 of the item. Professor Refshauge seconded this motion, adding this would allow this section of the matrix to be applied to placements that occur in clinics on University campuses.

Professor Haq expressed concern that the wording of the standard response to be sent to a student once they have lodged a special consideration application could raise expectations that the student will be offered an alternative placement. Professor Carlin added that the team is aware of faculty concerns regarding the proposed template answers for correspondence with students and these are being addressed. Other members responded that faculties need more control over the decisions being made. Professor Refshauge pointed out that the review of student wellbeing at the University had indicated the urgent need to address issues with the current special consideration processes and clarified that the issue for faculties is not the decisions matrix itself but how it will be used. Professor Stancliffe added that work-integrated learning academics are concerned they have little ability to influence the decisions that will be made using the matrix, and suggested deferring implementation of the section on placements to Semester 2. Dr Bloomfield supported this, adding her faculty (Nursing and Midwifery) shared the concerns of Health Sciences, and had the added issue of placements being controlled by the Department of Health and various non-government organisations, not the faculty. Associate Professor O’Byrne added that there continues to be confusion amongst academic staff regarding the new process.

Professor Carlin responded to these concerns, pointing out that two separate issues were being raised and that the decisions matrix remains substantially the same document as the one approved by the Board at its previous meeting. The version approved by the Board was used for the work the SAS project team has completed over the past couple of months, and the amendments presented to this meeting are for clarification purposes. He advised that decisions regarding applications related to placements will be determined by the faculties, not the central team, and he agreed that the correspondence templates should be amended to ensure students are not given misleading information.

The Chair reminded members that the Board was being asked to approve the amended matrix circulated with the agenda, with the additional change to delete the word "external" on page 6, and that none of the amendments substantially alter the document approved at the Board’s last meeting. He asked members to vote on the deletion of the word "external" from page 6 of the agenda item, and a majority of members voted in favour. He then asked members to vote on approving the amendments circulated with the agenda and a majority voted in favour (41 votes for, 6 against). He noted that there still remained the issue of how the changes and the process have been communicated to faculties, and he asked members whether they preferred to wait until the Board’s next meeting on 30th March 2016 to review this issue or form a small working group to report to the Board within the next two weeks (he suggested that such a group could contain members nominated by Professors Carlin, Hambley and Refshauge and student representation). Professor Fekete suggested that members who did not support the amended matrix could be invited to this
group. Mrs Agus added that a number of other issues had not been discussed regarding the matrix, with Professor Riley agreeing and giving take-home examinations as one example. The Chair agreed these could be considered by the group.

Associate Professor McEntee suggested that the new special consideration application processes should include a requirement that any confusion or ambiguity over the category of an assessment task be referred to the unit of study co-ordinator for clarification. Professor Refshauge raised concerns that not all units of study were in the system, and the Chair suggested she and Professor Carlin continue their discussions following the meeting. Professor Fekete suggested authorising Professor Carlin and the deans to override the new system if there are any problems. Ms Specker requested that implementation not be rushed and pointed out that students in the Faculty of Science will possibly be applying for special consideration for laboratory-based assessments from Week 1. She suggested there should be some grandfathering of the previous policy or leniency, and that more should be done to communicate the changes to staff and students. Professor Carlin advised that the system will go live on Monday and has been extensively tested and he expressed confidence that it would provide a better experience for students. The Chair advised that the working group would be established as quickly as possible.

AB16/1-5
The Academic Board endorsed the amendments to the Decisions Matrix as set out in the report presented, and with the additional deletion of the word “external” from page 6, to become a schedule in the Coursework Policy 2014.

Action:
The Director, Student Administrative Services project, to note the Academic Board’s endorsement of amendments to the Decisions Matrix.

4.2 Academic Board membership by appointment or co-option
The Chair nominated two people for appointment and two people for co-option as members of the Academic Board. Members approved the nominations.

AB16/1-6
The Academic Board approved the Chair’s recommendation to appoint or co-opt additional members as follows:
- Associate Professor Kirsten McKenzie (Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences) and Associate Professor Tim Wilkinson (Faculty of Engineering and Information Technologies) be appointed to membership of the Academic Board for a term of membership expiring 31 December 2017; and
- Professor Adam Bridgeman (Director, Educational Innovation) and Associate Professor Ross Coleman (Director, Graduate Research) be co-opted to membership of the Academic Board for a term of membership expiring 31 December 2017.

Action:
Executive Officer to update membership list.

4.3 Nomination of Deputy Chair and Committee Chairs
The Chair noted that, following the approval of the proposal in item 4.2, he also wished to nominate people to chair the Board’s standing committees. Members approved the nominations.

AB16/1-7
In accordance with the University of Sydney (Academic Governance) Rule 2003 and on the nomination of the Chair of the Academic Board, the Academic Board appointed:
1. Professor Jane Hanrahan as Deputy Chair of the Academic Board and Chair of the Academic Standards and Policy Committee for a term expiring on 31 December 2017; and
2. Associate Professor Wendy Davis as Chair of the Undergraduate Studies Committee, Associate Professor Kirsten McKenzie as Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee and Associate Professor Tim Wilkinson as Chair of the Admissions Committee for a term expiring on 31 December 2017.
Action:
Executive Officer to update membership list.

4.4 Nomination of Committee members and amendment of committee terms of reference
The Chair presented the list of nominations and amendments to terms of reference for the Board’s standing committees, adding one further nomination: the co-option of Ms Kerrie Henderson (University Policy Manager) to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee. Members approved all the nominations.

AB16/1-8
That the Academic Board approve:
(1) the appointment or co-option of academic staff and student members to the Academic Standards and Policy Committee, Admissions Committee, Graduate Studies Committee and Undergraduate Studies Committee, noting that the term of membership will be until 31 December 2016 for student members and until 31 December 2017 for staff members; and
(2) the amendment of the terms of reference for the Academic Standards and Policy Committee, the Admissions Committee, the Graduate Studies Committee and the Undergraduate Studies Committee, with immediate effect.

Action:
Executive Officer to update membership lists and terms of reference.

4.5 Overview of Academic Board for 2016
The Chair took members through the items listed in this report as actions to be undertaken by the Board in 2016. He pointed out that the proposed review of the Board will need to occur in time to allow any agreed amendments to membership to be approved by Senate prior to the normal election round in late 2017. With respect to the course reviews required under the new Higher Education Threshold Standards, he advised that a national meeting of Chairs of Academic Boards and Senates to be held in March will discuss how universities could address this requirement. One suggestion is that universities conduct their normal course reviews and then refer the reports to a national committee. He also advised members that he is forming a working group to advise the Academic Board on equity and diversity issues. It will be led by Dr Jenny Saleeba and will report via his standing report on the agenda. Professor Rhodes asked for information on the kinds of instrument required to drive the changes the University wants in this area and measure their success. The Chair advised that his proposed working group will be working in conjunction with SEG and should assist in pointing out whether or not the University is achieving the changes it is aiming for. He also advised that the group would have student representation. Professor Hambley pointed out that the SAGE pilot will include data collection and analysis, and the Chair advised that he will reference this if it is not reported directly to the Board. He concluded the item by noting that the Board needs a venue that will facilitate engagement and discussion. The current venue has a great deal of historical significance, but is not suitable for presentations or small group discussions. He advised that CIS is working to find a suitable venue for the next and subsequent meetings.

AB16/1-9
The Academic Board noted the Chair’s overview of issues to be addressed in 2016.

4.6 Authority of Chair – actions taken since meeting of 2 December 2015
The Chair advised members that this item outlines the decisions made by himself and Associate Professor McCallum since the Board’s last meeting of 2015, including some decisions which would normally made by the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee.

AB16/1-10
The Academic Board noted the report on actions taken by the previous Chair and the current Chair on its behalf in respect of any urgent matters that arose between the Academic Board meeting on 2 December 2015 and the first Academic Board meeting in 2016.

4.7 Student members’ report
The Chair advised members that he has invited the student members to submit a report as part of his report.
AB16/1-11
The Academic Board noted that the student members will report regularly as part of the Chair’s report.

4.8 Watt Review
The Chair advised members that this report has been circulated in confidence for their information, adding that the University does need to look at how this review will affect research funding.

AB16/1-12
The Academic Board noted the submission as an accurate initial summary and early analysis of the Report of the Watt Review of Research Policy and Funding.

4.9 Templates for Senate, Academic Board and SEG
Members noted the report on the new templates to be used by Senate, Academic Board and SEG.

AB16/1-13
The Academic Board noted the new agenda paper and PowerPoint templates for Academic Board and Academic Board Committee meetings.

4.10 Report of the Senate meeting held on 14 December 2015
Members noted the report of the Senate meeting held on 14 December 2015.

AB16/1-14
The Academic Board noted the report from the Chair of the Academic Board on matters considered by Senate at its 14 December 2015 meeting.

4.11 Honours and Distinctions
This item was dealt with prior to item 3.

AB16/1-15
The Academic Board noted the report of the Chair of the Academic Board on the honours and distinctions and congratulate the recipients.

Action:
The Chair, Academic Board to write to recipients congratulating them on their honours and distinctions.

4.12 Correspondence Register
Members noted the report on the correspondence register.

AB16/1-16
The Academic Board noted the correspondence register.

4.13 Culture and the Strategic Plan
The Chair advised that this item relates to the Vice-Chancellor’s earlier presentation. He pointed out that the success of the Academic Board is based on the respect the Board has for the work of its standing committees, the respect Senate has for the decisions made by the Board and the respect the Board’s members have for each other. He proposed adopting respect as a core value of the Board, to be included in his email signature and formal Board documentation. Professor Fekete suggested diversity was just as important, and while the Chair agreed he advised that he had singled out respect for its importance in how the Board operates. Members endorsed the proposal.

AB16/1-17
The Academic Board affirmed respect is a core value of the Academic Board.

4.14 A new Academic Board
The Chair advised members that when the Board was last externally reviewed in 2001 two
principles were adopted regarding the size and composition of the Academic Board: that it be representative, and that it be manageable. He asked members to affirm these two principles for the next review. Professor Fekete supported the principles in general, but asked that the word “manageable” be replaced with “able to function effectively”. Members endorsed the principles as amended.

AB16/1-18
The Academic Board affirmed that the principles used in determining the membership, or composition, of the Academic Board are that the Board be representative and that the Board be able to function effectively.

REPORT OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR AND PRINCIPAL

5.1 Report of the Senate meeting held on 14 December 2015
The Vice-Chancellor advised members that the major decisions at this meeting were the endorsement of the proposed curriculum restructure, approval-in-principle of a new organisational chart for the University’s academic units (noting that further work is required with respect to the health faculties), and adoption of the Universities Governing Bodies Act (NSW State legislation) which would see alterations to Senate’s composition in terms of numbers and the replacement of elected alumni fellows with appointed alumni fellows.

AB16/1-19
The Academic Board noted the report from the Vice-Chancellor and Principal on matters considered by Senate at its 14 December 2015 meeting.

5.2 Other matters
The Vice-Chancellor noted that the Watt Review had been included in the Chair’s report. He emphasised the importance of the research strategy outlined in the new Strategic Plan in helping the University deal with these recommendations and also stressed the importance of fundamental (as opposed to applied) research at the University. He added that he and other senior staff at the University will continue to engage with government and the Australian Research Council to discuss these issues.

AB16/1-20
The Academic Board note the report presented by the Vice-Chancellor.

Professor Fekete asked the Vice-Chancellor for suggestions on how academic staff at the University could repair relationships with alumni following the decision by Senate to reduce the number of alumni members and their method of appointment. The Vice-Chancellor advised that he has received around twenty letters in total from alumni on this issue, and that currently less than 2% of all alumni vote in the Senate elections, indicating that the changes are not a major issue for the vast majority of alumni. However, he advised that he and the Chancellor are in communication with those alumni who have expressed concern. He added that the planned changes could produce a more diverse Senate membership.

Professor Tolhurst asked the Vice-Chancellor to keep the Academic Board informed of the proposed changes to SEG and its membership. He pointed out that this, coupled with the changes to Senate membership could be seen as a move to reduce the number of academic voices involved in governance roles. The Vice-Chancellor advised that SEG will be smaller but the ratio of academic to non-academic voices would be maintained, or possibly improved. He added that once the general framework for the University’s structure is approved a number of consequent issues will be presented.

Associate Professor Elias asked the Vice-Chancellor whether the future of the Sydney College of the Arts had been discussed by Senate. The Vice-Chancellor advised that there had been no real movement on this issue since staff were last updated, and that Senate had therefore not discussed it since. Professor Garton added that a heads of agreement has only recently been signed by this University, the University of New South Wales, the National Arts School and the NSW State Government to discuss the possibility of merging the Sydney College of the Arts, the College of Fine Arts (UNSW) and the National Arts School as one institution. The Vice-Chancellor stressed that the possibility was only being discussed at this stage and was not yet an agreed plan.
QUESTION TIME
Mr Hall asked the Vice-Chancellor for information on the criteria that will be used by the Senate committee considering nominations for membership of Senate. The Vice-Chancellor advised that criteria have been drafted, but that he would ask the Secretary to Senate to provide information about this for the next meeting.

AB16/1-21
The Academic Board resolved to note the response to the questions raised.

7 REPORTS FROM FACULTIEST
7.1 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: Amendment to Constitution

AB16/1-22
The Academic Board recommended that Senate approve the amendments to the Senate Resolutions relating to the Constitution of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences with immediate effect

Action:
The Chair, Academic Board to recommend that Senate approve the amendments to the Senate Resolutions relating to the Constitution of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to note the Academic Board’s endorsement of the amendments to its constitution.

8 COURSE AMENDMENT PROPOSALS WORKING GROUP
The Course Amendment Proposals Working Group met on Wednesday, 10th February 2016.

AB16/1-23
The Academic Board received and noted the report from the Course Amendment Proposals Working Group meeting held on 10 February 2016.

8.1 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: deletion of Master of Crosscultural Communication

AB16/1-24
The Academic Board:
1. approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to delete the Master of Crosscultural Communication, and approve the consequent deletion of the course resolutions with effect from 1 January 2022; and
2. recommend that Senate approve the amendment of the Resolutions of Senate related to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences with effect from 1 January 2022.

Action:
The Chair, Academic Board to recommend that Senate approve the amendments to the Senate Resolutions relating to the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to delete the Master of Crosscultural Communication and amend the resolutions in CMS.

8.2 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences: amendment of Diploma of Languages (deletion of majors)

AB16/1-25
The Academic Board approved the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to amend the Diploma of Languages to delete Yiddish as a major and Indonesian as a major for the accelerated mode, and approve the consequent amendment of the course resolutions, with effect from 1 January 2017.
Action:
The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Diploma of Languages to delete Yiddish as a major and Indonesian as a major for the accelerated mode and amend the resolutions in CMS.

8.3 Faculties of Dentistry, Medicine and Pharmacy: amendment to Master of Philosophy degrees (change to mark/grade for degree)
The Chair advised that he had starred this item because the three faculties behind this proposal had been asked to consult with other faculties, however no further advice has been received. Professor Fekete asked whether students had been consulted. Dr Saleeba and Associate Professor McKenzie each advised they would like more time to consult with their respective faculties (Science and Arts & Social Sciences). Professor Jones, representing the Acting Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, advised that she believed there had been consultation with students, but could not confirm this. A majority of members voted against the proposal.

AB16/1-26
The Academic Board resolved to not approve the proposals from the Faculties of Dentistry, Medicine and Pharmacy to amend the Philosophy offered by each faculty from an unmarked pass or fail degree to a marked degree, and refer the proposals back to the faculties for further consultation with other faculties and students.

Action:
The Deans and Faculty Managers, Faculties of Dentistry, Medicine and Pharmacy to note the Academic Board did not approve the proposals to amend each faculty’s Master of Philosophy to become a marked degree but has asked the faculties to undertake further consultation with other faculties and students.

8.4 Faculty of Science: amendment of table of units of study for Bachelor of Science/Master of Nutrition and Dietetics and Master of Nutrition and Dietetics

AB16/1-27
The Academic Board approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to introduce a mandatory unit of study for the Bachelor of Science/Master of Nutrition and Dietetics which will be a prerequisite for admission to the Master of Nutrition and Dietetics, and approve the consequent amendment of the course resolutions and table of units of study, with effect from 1 January 2018.

Action:
The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Science to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the Bachelor of Science/Master of Nutrition and Dietetics and amend the resolutions in CMS.

8.5 Faculty of Science: amendment of tables of units of study for various postgraduate degrees

AB16/1-28
The Academic Board approved the proposal from the Faculty of Science to amend the units of study offered in various postgraduate degrees, and approve the consequent amendment of the tables of units of study, with effect from 1 January 2017.

Action:
The Dean and Faculty Manager, Faculty of Science to note the Academic Board’s approval of the proposal to amend the tables of units of study for various postgraduate degrees.

9 GENERAL BUSINESS
9.1 Level D Promotions 2015

AB16/1-29
The Academic Board noted the report on the promotion of academic staff to Level D in 2015.
9.2 Level E Promotions 2015

AB16/1-30
The Academic Board noted the report on the promotion of academic staff to Level E in 2015.

9.3 Student Proctorial Panel 2015

AB16/1-31
The Academic Board approved the 2016 Student Proctorial Panel membership.

9.4 Academic Panel Membership

AB16/1-32
The Academic Board noted the membership of the Academic Panel under the University of Sydney (Student Appeals against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 (as amended) for the period January 1 2016 to 31 December 2017.

The Chair asked Professor Rhodes to comment on the meeting. Professor Rhodes noted the meeting had gone over time but had been very collegial. He agreed the venue was terrible, adding that he had been unable to hear most of the speakers. He suggested having projected times against the agenda items to help both the Chair and members. It had been wonderful to see so many members at the meeting, but he expressed disappointment that only a few had spoken, many repeatedly, and suggested thought be given to how more members could have a chance to speak. Members expressed support for the use of indicative times.

Meeting closed at 4:26 pm

Remaining Meeting Dates for 2016
2:00 pm Wednesday, 30th March 2016
2:00 pm Wednesday, 18th May 2016
2:00 pm Wednesday, 29th June 2016
2:00 pm Wednesday, 17th August 2016
2:00 pm Wednesday, 14th September 2016
2:00 pm Wednesday, 2nd November 2016
2:00 pm Wednesday, 7th December 2016

A full copy of the Academic Board Minutes is available at: http://sydney.edu.au/ab/about/agendas.shtml