Confirmed minutes of meeting 12/03 of the Academic Senate of the University of Western Sydney held on Friday 22 June 2012 at 9:30am in the Boardroom, Building AD, at Werrington North.

Present:

Associate Professor Paul Wormell (Chair)  Professor Michael Adams
Professor Ian Anderson  Associate Professor Berice Anning
Dr Susan Armstrong  Dr Catherine Attard
Ms Robyn Benjamin  Professor Andrew Cheetham
Dr Bronwyn Cole  Professor Gabriel Donleavy
Professor Kevin Dunn  Associate Professor Craig Ellis
Professor Rhonda Griffiths  Assoc Professor Cecily Hengstberger-Sims
Professor Gregory Kolt  Mr Angelo Kourtis
Mr Terry Mason  Dr Peter Mauch
Ms Shaneen McGlinchey  Associate Professor Jane Mears
Dr Terri Mylett  Dr Michael O’Connor
Dr Awais Piracha  Associate Professor Anne Power
Associate Professor Leanne Rylands  Professor Kate Stevens
Professor Jonathan Tapson  Professor Deborah Stevenson
Professor Zhong Tao  Ms Maxine Veale
Mr Greg Whatley

In Attendance:

Mr Martin Derby (Secretary)  Mr James Fitzgibbon
Professor Brett Neilson (for Prof McNeill)

Apologies:

Professor Donna Craig  Professor Annemarie Hennessy
Professor Peter Hutchings  Dr Cindy Kersaitis
Professor Kerri-Lee Krause  Professor Wayne McKenna
Professor Donald McNeill  Mr Michael Richardson
Dr Seyed Shahrrestani  Professor Lynette Sheridan Burns
Professor Clive Smallman  Professor Gary Smith
Professor Deborah Sweeney  Professor Margaret Heather Vickers
Professor Steve Wilson

Absent:

Ms Soumaya Alaouie  Mr Robert Coluccio
Dr Betty Gill  Mr Elie Hammam
Professor Jan Reid  Professor Simeon Simoff

1 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

1.1 INTRODUCTION, WELCOMES, AND APOLOGIES

Welcome

The Chair of Academic Senate Associate Professor Paul Wormell chaired the meeting of the Senate, and opened it by reading an Acknowledgment of the Traditional Owners, as follows:
“As a matter of Indigenous cultural protocol and out of recognition that its campuses occupy their traditional lands, the University of Western Sydney acknowledges the Darug, Gandangarra and Tharawal peoples and thanks them for their support of its work in Greater Western Sydney.

In particular I acknowledge the Traditional Owners of the land on which we are meeting today, and pay my respects to their Elders, past and present, and to other Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who are here today.”

He welcomed a number of new Senate members, as follows:

- Mr Michael Richardson who was elected unopposed to fill the vacancy for one of the two postgraduate student members of the Senate. His term began on 1 June 2012 and ends on 31 May 2014. Mr Richardson had tendered his apologies.
- Professor Kate Stevens, MARCS Institute, and Professor Ian Anderson, Hawkesbury Institute for the Environment, who fill the positions for: “two Directors, or their nominees, of University Research Institutes, elected by the Directors”. Their terms end on 31 May 2014.
- Professor Donald McNeill from the Institute for Culture and Society, and Associate Professor Zhong Tao from the Institute for Infrastructure Engineering who were taking two of the positions for “… appointed members of the Academic Senate …each of whom may be a student or a member of staff, whom the Vice-Chancellor may appoint, in consultation with the Chair, Academic Senate, for the purposes of achieving gender balance, consistent with the Women’s Representation on Committees Policy and an informed perspective on matters under consideration.” Their terms end on 31 May 2014. Professor McNeill had tendered his apologies.

The appointments of Professors Stevens, Anderson, and McNeill, and Associate Professor Zhong Tao provided a voice on Senate for the University’s research institutes, which were now a critical component of the University’s academic community and culture.

It was noted that Professor Jonathon Tapson was attending for Professor Simeon Simoff, and Professor Brett Neilson, Acting Director of the Institute of Culture and Society, was attending for Professor Donald McNeill.

**Apologies**

Apologies as listed were noted.

1.2 DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No members reported any conflict of interest in relation to agenda items.

1.3 STARRING OF ITEMS

It was agreed that item 3.1 Chair’s Report be starred, as well as the items already starred on the agenda, as follows:

- 3.2 TEQSA Higher Education Standards and Regulatory Risk Framework
- 3.3 AQF Compliance
• 3.7 Misconduct Rule
• 3.8 Higher Degree Policies

It was resolved (AS12:03/01):

that the documents for all unstarred agenda items be noted and, except where alternative action is noted as appropriate, all recommendations contained in those items be endorsed.

1.4 ORDER OF BUSINESS

There were no changes to the order of business.

1.5 OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

1.6 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Senate had before it the unconfirmed minutes of the Senate meeting held on 4 May 2012.

The Chair reported that a Senate member had asked for an amendment to the 5th paragraph of minute 3.12 Research Plan 2012-2014.

He said in his opinion the minute as written was accurate, referring to “...individual researchers, and researchers who were part of a small group, whose work did not necessarily relate to a field of research which was evaluated for ERA.”

However it did not refer to some further discussion about “...individual researchers, and researchers who were part of a small group...” whose research was included for ERA evaluation, even though they were not part of a larger research grouping.

He suggested that an addition to the minutes be made to cover these staff.

A further comment was made that these “...individual researchers, and researchers who were part of a small group...” might in some cases reduce ERA performance. While contributions to strengthening performance and achieving level 4 outcomes (world class) or level 5 outcomes (above world class) would be welcomed, the opposite effect – that outcomes were lowered – might sometimes eventuate.

It was agreed that the Chair would finalise a wording for the minute, to reflect the additional category of individual researchers who were mentioned in the discussion, and...

It was resolved (AS12:03/02):

To confirm the minutes of the Senate meeting held on 4 May 2012 as an accurate record.

2 BUSINESS ARISING

2 BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS
2.1 MINUTE 2.2 – STUDENT ELECTIONS

Without discussion, it was noted that student elections had concluded, with some positions on Senate, Education Committee, Academic Planning and Courses Approvals Committee, School Academic Committees, and School Research and Higher Degree Committees filled.

Many of the student positions on academic committees remained unfilled and Chairs were informed that in these circumstances, “… the Chair of the Committee may call for expressions of interest from the relevant group of students, and the Committee may fill the vacancy on the basis of the expressions that have been received.” (Clause 8, Academic Senate Standing Committees Policy).

Details of the election outcomes had been posted on the elections web page.

2.2 MINUTE 3.6 – MINOR CHANGES TO ACADEMIC POLICIES – INHERENT REQUIREMENTS

Without discussion, it was noted that the revised Academic Advising Policy had been published on the Policy DDS, and arrangements were being made for the Admissions Policy and Assessment Policy – Criteria & Standards-Based Assessment to also be published.

2.3 MINUTE 3.7 – ACADEMIC SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES POLICY

Without discussion, it was noted that the revised Academic Senate Standing Committees Policy had been published on the Policy DDS.

2.4 MINUTE 3.8 - DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY POLICY

Without discussion, it was noted that the revised Doctor of Philosophy Policy had been published on the Policy DDS.

3 GENERAL BUSINESS

3.1 CHAIR’S REPORT

Senate had before it a report from the Chair covering recent activities undertaken on behalf of the Senate since 4 May 2012.

The Chair reported on recent activities, as follows:

- He had attended the Board of Trustees Strategy Day on 7 June, when the Board had passed a number of resolutions affirming the University’s mission and strategic direction, while recognising the increasing competitive national and international environment for teaching and research. The Board’s resolutions would be published in due course.

- He had chaired the inaugural meeting of the Bachelor Honours Committee on 20 June, bringing together honours coordinators to discuss issues of principle and operational matters in relation to the various honours programs. Some very useful discussions had taken place, covering:
3.2 TEQSA HIGHER EDUCATION STANDARDS AND REGULATORY RISK FRAMEWORK

Senate had before it a report “TEQSA Higher Education Standards and Regulatory Risk Framework”, prepared by the Chair of Senate.

Speaking to the report the Chair said that Academic Senate and its Standing Committees would play a significant role in ensuring that the University complied with TEQSA’s Threshold Standards and Regulatory Risk Indicators in relation to academic quality and integrity. However, as the standards and risk indicators were addressed across the University it was apparent Senate would need to work collaboratively with the Director, Strategy and Quality; Strategy and Quality Committee; PVC (Education); PVC (Research); Deans; Deputy Deans; Office of Research Services; UWSCollege; Research Institutes; and others.

His initial assessment of the role that Senate and its committees play in addressing the Threshold Standards and Regulatory Risk Indicators had identified three areas of concern.

Firstly, TEQSA expected institutions to encourage students to have an active voice and involve them in decision making; however, despite sending a targeted invitation to the student members of Senate to today’s meeting, none were present, although one had sent his apologies.

Secondly, it was apparent that TEQSA would expect institutions to periodically review their course offerings. While some courses seemed to be constantly being reviewed, and external accreditation requirements necessitated regular scrutiny of professional courses, there were some discipline areas that were not systematically reviewed.

Thirdly, TEQSA’s Threshold Standards required higher education providers to have “a properly constituted academic board and course advisory committees”. As stated in the report:

“It is clear that many of these committees are active and effective sources of critical advice about our academic programs. In some cases this role is fulfilled by external accreditation bodies. However, this is not uniformly the case across the University: some courses do not have external advisory committees (as permitted under the External Advisory Committees Policy); others have committees but they have not met recently; while others, although helpful and supportive, do not provide sufficiently critical and independent advice and feedback.”
It was noted that the Office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education) was working with schools to identify the status of the existing external advisory committees – what they covered, who the members were, how frequently they met, where records of their meetings were kept, and so on.

In discussion, the following points were made:

- Professional courses that were accredited had to meet criteria and standards set by professional bodies, with rigorous checking of curriculum, assessment, learning outcomes and graduate attributes. In Nursing, the professional body required universities to have course advisory committees, and for the universities to supply the minutes of their meetings. For other courses that were not externally accredited, the benefits of external advice sought and obtained might vary considerably, with much depending on the individuals involved. It was apparent that achieving consistency was a significant challenge.

- Although TEQSA was promoting the importance of course advisory committees, and professional bodies could be regarded as a particular type of advisory committee, the professions’ interests might not necessarily accord with TEQSA’s aims to protect course quality and standards, and ensure good outcomes for students. They sometimes acted to restrict entry into professions, impose conditions on course providers in relation to facilities and staff-student ratios, and to stipulate the nomenclature they wanted institutions to follow.

- External Advisory Committees were often very constructive and helpful and there were potentially considerable benefits in having such committees - not necessarily limited to providing good curriculum advice. They might also help market the course, by identifying demand for it and attracting applicants, offer donations towards scholarships, and provide vocational experience for student placements.

- There were a number of models for forming external advisory committees. For example, the former College of Business and Law had established an industry advisory committee with the former schools in the College arranging more discipline-related external bodies. The School of Education had set up a large external forum and smaller program committees to reflect each teaching specialism. The Law degree had to comply with the requirements of the Council of Australian Law Deans. There were different ways to engage the performing arts community so as to use their experience and expertise to the University’s benefit. Clearly, different courses and disciplines would organise themselves differently to obtain good advice, and a course encompassing a number of discipline-based majors might need different structures from a more homogenous course.

- It was unclear whether postgraduate courses would need different arrangements to undergraduate courses in relation to external advice. In relation to research higher degrees, these could be regarded as courses, and were covered by the Code of Conduct for Responsible Research. There was considerable accountability and external oversight of research by the ARC and the NHMRC, and regulations covering research involving animals and humans, or biosafety and radiation. TEQSA, it was suggested, should only need to know that the universities complied with existing regulation and that a further level of regulatory intervention was not required.
The Chair thanked members for a very useful discussion on external course advisory committees, and reported that the Vice-Chancellor envisaged that the University's relationships with the chairs of the committees the University established would be very important.

3.3 AUSTRALIAN QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORK COMPLIANCE

At the 24 February Academic Senate meeting, it was noted...

“... TEQSA had adopted the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF), and the University would have to look at courses, learning outcomes, and assessment to ensure compliance.”

At the 4 May Academic Senate meeting...

“It was resolved (AS12:03/04):
To endorse the process and timeline for ensuring that all UWS award courses comply with the revised Australian Qualifications Framework.”

The Chair said that arrangements were being made to establish a project management position to support this work, but this was still to be confirmed. As reported at the last Senate meeting on 4 May, It was intended to start with ensuring the University’s level 7 (Bachelor) courses were compliant, as discussions were still taking place about the volume of learning for postgraduate awards, and the AQF level and nomenclature of Graduate Certificates and Graduate Diplomas, and some types of embedded Honours awards.

He and the Academic Registrar would be attending School Academic Committee meetings to report on the arrangements being made to manage the necessary work.

3.4 ACADEMIC SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES POLICY

Without discussion...

It was resolved (AS12:03/03):

To approve the proposed revisions to the Academic Senate Standing Committees Policy effective from the date of publication of the revised Policy.

3.5 ENROLMENT POLICY

Without discussion...

It was resolved (AS12:03/04):

To approve the proposed amendments to the Enrolment Policy effective from the date of publication of the revised Policy.

3.6 STUDENT FEES POLICY

Without discussion...

It was resolved (AS12:03/05):
To approve the proposed Student Fees Policy effective from the date of publication of the revised Policy.

3.7 MISCONDUCT RULE

At the 18 November 2011 Academic Senate meeting, the Senate considered a paper “Student Misconduct @UWS – Background Paper for Discussion” prepared by, Ms Helen Fleming, University Legal Counsel. At the meeting...

“Speaking to the paper, Ms Fleming said that she had begun a review of the University’s various student misconduct policies and related codes, with the aim of:

- streamlining processes, so that there were fewer steps, with more straightforward review / appeal mechanisms, and consequent speedier decision making than currently;
- clarifying roles and responsibilities for those who had to investigate and decide allegations of misconduct;
- providing greater flexibility for handling minor instances of misconduct, both academic and general (non-academic); and
- strengthening the University’s position if misconduct determinations were challenged by students and referred to the Ombudsman or external tribunals or courts.

The suggestion was for the current academic misconduct policy and the non-academic misconduct policy – which were both very procedural – to be combined into a single University rule, written in simplified, clearer language. This would in due course be accompanied by guidelines and supported by training.”

And …

“It was agreed to ask Senate Education Committee’s working party on the Misconduct: Student Academic Misconduct Policy to give advice and assistance to the University Legal Counsel during this review.”

Associate Professor Craig Ellis, the Convener of the Education Committee’s Academic Integrity Working Party (AIWP), reported on progress with work to prepare a single rule University Rule for misconduct. This entailed a completely new approach to the current arrangements for managing misconduct. He said that extensive feedback on the proposed Rule had been received from the Academic Registrar’s Office and the Secretariat, and a revised iteration was being prepared for consideration by the AIWP in July. It was anticipated the AIWP would refer the Rule to the Education Committee, which would arrange for wider feedback from the University community to be obtained via posting the Rule on the Policy DDS for comment. Though the work was taking longer than anticipated, it was critically important the Rule was not rushed through. It was hoped the Rule would be in place for 2013.

The Rule would be accompanied by procedural guidelines intended to make the process straightforward to operate for staff and students.

The AIWP included a wide range of staff from across the University with experience of operating the current misconduct policies. They were discussing a framework for
the prevention of plagiarism, including how assessment tasks might be designed to minimise the potential for misconduct, and ways in which relatively minor academic misconduct could be dealt with expeditiously. They were also looking at the interfaces of the proposed Rule with other policies, including the policy for managing research misconduct.

In discussion, the following points were made:

- The current misconduct policies stipulated a variety of timelines and deadlines expressed in “days” and “working days” by which referrals had to be processed and decisions made. These were very problematical. It was hoped that in the new Rule, there would be greater consistency and clarity about the timelines.
- The development of a common rule covering academic and non-academic misconduct was a welcome improvement.
- Misconduct allegations were especially serious for students hoping to use their degrees for admission to practice a profession like Law. The Legal Profession Admission Board of NSW required students to declare whether they had been found to have committed misconduct, and the parallel requirements in Victoria involved universities providing student records to the Council of Legal Education. Misconduct offences could prevent a law graduate being admitted to practice.

The Chair thanked Associate Professor Ellis for leading the discussion on a very significant policy development.

3.8 HIGHER DEGREE POLICIES

At the 4 May Senate meeting…

“Senate had before it a proposal to amend the Doctor of Philosophy Policy, recommended by the Research Studies Committee. This included a revised set of delegations and responsibilities, to reflect the new structure of schools and research institutes, and the addition of a further examination outcome (Option M), requiring the candidate to undertake minor rewriting of an editorial nature (not substantial changes) of the thesis.

The Chair proposed that the revisions, if approved, be incorporated into the other higher degree policies (Doctor of Philosophy by Publication, etc.) and these changes be referred to the Senate Executive Committee for approval.”

The Doctor of Philosophy Policy was approved at the 4 May Senate meeting. The following policies, revised in the same way as for the Doctor of Philosophy Policy, had been referred to the Senate Executive Committee for approval:

- Doctor of Medicine by Publication Policy
- Doctor of Cultural Research Policy
- Doctor of Creative Arts Policy
- Doctor of Education Policy
- Doctor of Philosophy by Publication Policy
- Doctor of Philosophy, Political and Social Thought Policy
- Professional Doctorate Policy
- Research Masters (Honours) Policy
• **Doctor of Medicine Policy**

Senate had before it three further higher degree student policies which had been updated to include a revised set of delegations and responsibilities, to reflect the new structure of schools and research institutes, as in the approved *Doctor of Philosophy Policy*, as follows:

- **Cotutelle Policy**
- **Research Higher Degrees Appeals Policy**
- **Supervision of Research Candidates Policy**

In relation to the **Cotutelle Policy**, it was noted that these arrangements were very important, and the Policy appeared to work well to support them. Cotutelle arrangements often entailed significant expense.

**It was resolved (AS12:03/06):**

*To approve the proposed revisions to the Cotutelle Policy effective from the date of publication of the revised Policy.*

In relation to the **Research Higher Degrees Appeals Policy**, the Chair said that he had received several comments, and he believed the Policy would benefit from some further consideration before being ready for approval. Specifically:

- A Section 1 “Purpose and Context” should be written for the Policy;
- Clause (15) covering “Appeals made where the additional information is of a highly sensitive or personal nature” should be deleted. Advice had been received from University Legal Counsel that it was inappropriate for information provided by students in relation to their appeals to be withheld from committee members, and similar clauses in other policies had been deleted.
- The proposed membership of the Academic Senate’s Appeals Policy in clause (9) was inconsistent with the membership of the Academic Senate’s Student Appeals and Integrity Committee in the **Academic Senate Standing Committee Policy**.

In relation to the **Supervision of Research Candidates Policy**, without discussion...

**It was resolved (AS12:03/07):**

*To approve the proposed revisions to the Supervision of Research Candidates Policy effective from the date of publication of the revised Policy.*

### 3.9 POSTHUMOUS AWARDS

Without discussion...

**It was resolved (AS12:03/08):**

*To note the award of the Doctor of Philosophy research higher degree posthumously to Brian Salter SID 15190215.*
To note the award of the bachelors degree 2507 Bachelor of Business (Accounting) posthumously to Paul Monteverdi SID 15736143.

To note the award of the bachelors degree 2739 Bachelor of Business and Commerce posthumously to Leslie Farah SID 16318058.

4 REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM SENATE COMMITTEES

4.1 SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Without discussion...

It was resolved (AS12:03/09):
  to note the report of the Senate Executive Committee electronic meeting conducted between 29 May and 4 June 2012.

4.2 RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Without discussion...

It was resolved (AS12:03/10):
  to note the minutes of the 3 April and 5 June 2012 Research Committee meetings.

4.3 RESEARCH STUDIES COMMITTEE

Without discussion...

It was resolved (AS12:03/11):
  to note the minutes of the 1 May and 5 June 2012 Research Studies Committee meetings.

4.4 EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Without discussion...

It was resolved (AS12:03/12):
  to note the report of the Education Committee meetings held on 7 May and 4 June 2012.

4.5 ACADEMIC PLANNING AND COURSES APPROVALS COMMITTEE

Without discussion...

It was resolved (AS12:03/13):
  to note the report of the 16 May 2012 Academic Planning and Courses Approvals Committee meeting, and ratify the recommendations contained therein, as follows:

(APCAC12: 05/04)
  to approve the major course variation to 2743 Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Laws consisting of the addition of an alternative unit in the course structure
and an administrative amendment to the professional accreditation details to commence in Autumn 2013. TRIM reference: D12/226049

(APCAC12: 05/05)

To approve the major variation to 1696 Bachelor of Communication consisting of addition of Parramatta campus offering to course and inherent majors in Advertising, Journalism and Public Relations to commence in Autumn 2013. TRIM reference: D12/220377

(APCAC12: 05/30)

To approve the pathway 12L0115 UTS INSEARCH Diploma of Business (Accelerated) to 2740 BBC/B Laws consisting of advanced standing of 60 credit points specified credit and one (1) unspecified elective totalling 70 credit points to commence in 2013.

(APCAC12: 05/31)

To approve the pathway 12L0116 UTS INSEARCH Diploma of Business (Standard) to 2740 BBC/B Laws consisting of advanced standing of 60 credit points specified credit and one (1) unspecified elective totalling 70 credit points to commence in 2013.

To approve the pathway 12L0120 Martin College Diploma of Business BSB51207 to 2740 BBC/B Laws consisting of advanced standing of 30 credit points specified credit and one (1) unspecified elective totalling 40 credit points to commence in 2013.

(APCAC12: 05/33)

To approve the pathway 12L0121 Martin College Diploma of Business BSB50207 to 2740 BBC/B Laws consisting of advanced standing of 30 credit points specified credit and one (1) unspecified elective totalling 40 credit points to commence in 2013.

To approve the pathway 12L0122 Martin College Advanced Diploma of Management BSB60407 to 2740 BBC/B Laws consisting of advanced standing of 40 credit points specified credit to commence in 2013.

(APCAC12: 05/35)

To approve the major course variation to 3623 Master of Engineering, 3624 Graduate Diploma in Engineering and 3625 Graduate Certificate in Engineering, consisting of change to course structure to commence in 2013. TRIM reference: D12/1242202

(APCAC12: 05/41)

To approve the major course variation to 7022 Associate Degree in Engineering consisting of change of course intakes to Quarters and course structure to commence in Quarter 2 2012. TRIM reference: D12/236493

(APCAC12: 05/61)

To approve the pathway proposal with TAFENSW granting students admission and 80 credit points advanced standing towards 3589 Bachelor of Science (Forensic Science), who have successfully completed one of the following:

Diploma of Laboratory Technology
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Biological and Environmental Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Chemical and Forensic Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Pathology Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Food Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Biotechnology)

(APCAC12: 05/62)
to approve the pathway proposal with TAFENSW granting students admission and 80 credit points advanced standing towards 3678 Bachelor of Science (Nutrition and Food Sciences), who have successfully completed one of the following:

Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Biotechnology)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Biological and Environmental Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Chemical and Forensic Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Pathology Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Food Testing)

(APCAC12: 05/63)
to approve the pathway proposal with TAFENSW granting students admission and 80 credit points advanced standing towards 3676 Bachelor of Science (Chemistry), who have successfully completed one of the following:

Diploma of Laboratory Technology
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Biological and Environmental Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Chemical and Forensic Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Food Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Pathology Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Biotechnology)

(APCAC12: 05/64)
to approve the pathway proposal with TAFENSW granting students admission and 80 credit points advanced standing towards 3638 Bachelor of Science (Pathway to Secondary Teaching), who have successfully completed one of the following:

Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Biological and Environmental Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Biotechnology)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Chemical and Forensic Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Food Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Pathology Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Pathway 11LO264 and 11LO259)

(APCAC12: 05/65)
to approve the pathway proposal with TAFENSW granting students admission and 80 credit points advanced standing towards 3681 Bachelor of Science (Zoology), who have successfully completed one of the following:

Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Biological and Environmental Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Biotechnology)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Chemical and Forensic Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Food Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Pathology Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Pathway 11LO263 and 11LO253)

(APCAC12: 05/66)
to approve the Pathway Proposal with TAFENSW granting students admission and 80 credit points advanced standing towards 3677 Bachelor of Science (Biological Science), who have successfully completed one of the following:

Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Biological and Environmental Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Biotechnology)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Chemical and Forensic Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Food Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Pathology Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Pathway 11LO262 and 11LO247)

(APCAC12: 05/67)
To approve the Pathway Proposal with TAFENSW granting students admission and 80 credit points advanced standing towards 3675 Bachelor of Science, who have successfully completed one of the following:

Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Biological and Environmental Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Biotechnology)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Chemical and Forensic Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Food Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Pathology Testing)
Diploma of Laboratory Technology (Pathway 11LO261 and 11LO241)

4.6 BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Board of Trustees most recent meeting was held on 7 June 2012.

The next meeting was scheduled for 5 September 2012. Summaries of Board of Trustees meetings, and minutes of Board of Trustees meetings, are available on the web-site at: http://www.uws.edu.au/boardoftrustees.

5 FOR INFORMATION

No items

6 NEXT MEETING

Senate meeting dates for 2012 are as follows:

- Friday 17 August
- Friday 26 October
- Friday 7 December (provisional meeting - to be held if necessary)

All the meetings start at 9.30 AM, and would be held in the Board Room, Building AD, at Werrington North.