ACADEMIC SENATE

The next meeting (Meeting 12/05) of the Academic Senate of the University of Western Sydney will be held on Friday 26 October 2012 at 9:30am in the Board Room, Building AD, Werrington North Campus.

For apologies and enquiries, telephone (02) 9678 7827, fax (02) 9678 7831 or email Gillian.brown@uws.edu.au.

AGENDA

1 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

1.1 INTRODUCTION, WELCOME, AND APOLOGIES

The Chair of Academic Senate, Associate Professor Paul Wormell, will chair the meeting.

At the time of writing, apologies had been received from Professor Peter Hutchings, Professor Steve Wilson, Professor Ian Anderson (Professor Jann Conroy attending), Dr Awais Piracha, Dr Catherine Attard, Dr Michael O’Connor, Associate Professor Anne Power and Professor Kate Stevens. Any further apologies will be reported.

1.2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members are requested to declare any interests, in terms of the Conflict of Interest Guidelines, they may have in relation to the items on this agenda. The attached paper is provided for members’ information and the Conflict of Interest Guidelines are available on the Policy DDS at:

Members are reminded that they should also declare any interests that become apparent during a meeting of Academic Senate or one of its committees.

1.3 STARRING OF ITEMS

Senate members will be asked which items they wish starred for discussion.

Apart from procedural items, items already starred on the agenda are:

- 3.1 Chair’s Report
- 3.2 Higher Education Standards And TEQSA Regulatory Risk Framework
- 3.3 Australian Qualifications Framework Compliance
- 3.4 Academic Governance Matters
- 3.7 Blended Learning Strategy
- 4.4 Education And Assessment Committees (incorporating Student Experience and Engagement Committee)
- 4.6 Bachelor (Honours) Committee

It is recommended:

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
If a re-arrangement of the order of business is required.

1.5 OTHER BUSINESS
Members are invited to nominate other relevant matters, noting that such items will normally be included on the agenda for a future meeting.

1.6 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the Academic Senate meeting held on 17 August 2012 are appended.

It is recommended:
That Academic Senate confirm the minutes of the Senate meeting held on 17 August 2012 as an accurate record.

2 BUSINESS ARISING

2.1 MINUTE 2 – REVISED WORDING OF 4 MAY 2012 MINUTES

The wording of the 4 May minutes, under item 1.6, in relation to the 5th paragraph of minute 3.12 Research Plan 2012-2014 has been revised, as discussed and resolved at the 22 June and 17 August meetings.

2.2 MINUTE 2.4 – RESEARCH HIGHER DEGREES APPEALS POLICY

At the 17 August 2012 meeting...

Without discussion...

It was resolved (AS12:04/03):

That Academic Senate approve the proposed revisions to the Research Higher Degrees Appeals Policy effective from the date of publication of the revised Policy.

The revised Research Higher Degrees Appeals Policy has now been published on the Policy DDS.

2.3 MINUTE 3.4 – RESEARCH HIGHER DEGREE CANDIDATE ESSENTIAL RESOURCES POLICY

The comments from the Academic Senate meeting held 17 August regarding the Research Higher Degree Candidate Essential Resources Policy changes have been incorporated into further suggested changes, and circulated to Research Studies Committee members for comment/endorsement.

Comments from the Research Studies Committee meeting held 4 September were:

“Given the level of unspent RTS in Schools/Institutes, it was agreed that the RSC will request, from each School and Institute, guidelines as to how they plan to expend their
RTS funds. These guidelines will be received by the RSC and endorsed annually. Schools/institutes should be encouraged to see this funding as a collective resource for students – not necessarily an allocated amount of money to each student. It is an allocation across the whole of the candidature that is represented by a nominal amount in the policy."

A revised version of the policy is now submitted to the Academic Senate for comment. The Vice-Chancellor is the approving authority for this policy.

**It is recommended:**

"That the Academic Senate note the proposed amendments to the Higher Degree Candidate Essential Resources Policy."

### 2.4 MINUTE 3.5 - RESEARCH HIGHER DEGREE SCHOLARSHIPS POLICY – AUSTRALIAN CITIZENS AND PERMANENT RESIDENTS

At the 17 August 2012 meeting...

**It was resolved (AS12:04/05):**

"That the Academic Senate approve the proposed revisions to the Research Higher Degree Scholarships Policy – Australian Citizens and Permanent Residents, effective from the date of publication of the revised policy."

The revised *Research Higher Degree Scholarships Policy – Australian Citizens and Permanent Residents Policy* has now been published on the Policy DDS.

### 3 GENERAL BUSINESS

#### 3.1 CHAIR’S REPORT

A written report from the Chair covering recent activities undertaken on behalf of the Senate since 17 August 2012 is appended.

The Chair will answer any questions in relation to the report, if requested.

#### 3.2 HIGHER EDUCATION STANDARDS AND TEQSA REGULATORY RISK FRAMEWORK

The Chair of Academic Senate will present a brief update about recent developments concerning the Higher Education Standards Framework and TEQSA Regulatory Risk Framework, including comments from UWS Staff members who attended the TEQSA briefing on 17 August 2012.

Regarding the overall plan to review the Threshold Standards, and the collegial benchmarking of Learning and Teaching Standards, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education) Professor Krause advised the Education Committee on 4 September 2012 that no progress has been made with the Teaching and Learning Standards, as priority is being given to implementing the Threshold Standards. The proposal is to have a separation between the learning standards (outcomes) and the teaching standards (inputs). The UWS Academic Standards and Assessment Framework places the University in a good position, but we will need to be able to demonstrate how we are monitoring outcomes (for example through peer review and moderation, benchmarking, and accreditation).

Members of Academic Senate are invited to comment briefly on any TEQSA-related matters that have arisen in their professional or disciplinary communities.
3.3 AUSTRALIAN QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORK COMPLIANCE
In late August 2012, following responses to the Graduate and Vocational Graduate Certificates and Diplomas in the Australian Qualifications Framework – June 2012 consultation paper, the AQF Council determined:

- the Vocational Graduate Certificate and Vocational Graduate Diploma qualification types will be removed from the AQF; and

- the Graduate Certificate and Graduate Diploma qualification types will be retained in the AQF at level 8 and will be available for accreditation, regulation and issuance in both the higher education and vocational education and training sectors.

In addition, it has been noted that the scope and volume of curriculum renewal will increase significantly in the remaining months of 2012 and 2013, owing to university and sector-level priorities. It has been reported that the School Academic Committees are using the latest course templates which assist in assessment of AQF compliance.

Future AQF news will be uploaded to the ARO webpage.

Members of Academic Senate are invited to comment briefly on any AQF-related matters that have arisen in their professional or disciplinary communities.

3.4 ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE MATTERS
The University’s Office of Governance Services has prepared a further paper for Senate’s consideration, following the deferral of proposed revisions to the Academic Governance Policy in relation to the conduct of Senate elections and some other matters, and the procedures for amending the memberships and terms of reference of Senate Standing Committees. This paper is appended for Senate’s consideration.

At the 17 August meeting it was resolved:

That the Academic Senate make the following recommendations to the Board of Trustees regarding the proposed Academic Governance changes –

1. That the limitation on the terms of office for elected (and appointed) members be increased to four consecutive two-year terms, subject to continued eligibility for election or appointment.

2. That the requirement that the procedures for Senate elections be the same as those provided for in the UWS By-law be removed from the Academic Governance Policy, and be replaced by a reference to the University Elections Policy.

3. That the existing arrangements for elected academic staff members be confirmed, but the relevant sub-clauses be combined in the Academic Governance Policy to clarify the role of these members as having been elected by the school.
4. That the terms of office of the elected members of Senate and the chair and deputy chair be brought into alignment so that they serve concurrent two year terms and that this be brought into effect for 2014-15.

5. That as a transitional measure the current terms of the chair and deputy chair be extended by the Board of Trustees so as to expire on 31 December 2013, as opposed to the current end date of 31 May 2013.

6. That the proposed amendments to the Academic Governance Policy be endorsed and recommended to the Board of Trustees for approval.

7. That, subject to the Board’s approval of the changes to the Academic Governance Policy, the Academic Senate Standing Committees Policy be repealed and that Senate approve the role, terms of reference and membership of its committees as need be for publication on the Senate website.

8. That the committees specified in the current Standing Committees of Academic Senate Policy remain in place to satisfy the requirements of clause 11 of the revised Academic Governance Policy.

This subsequent paper now proposes the following additional items for Senate’s consideration:

1. That to implement the proposed changes to the number of consecutive terms of office served, the previous terms of current elected and appointed members of Academic Senate be counted for the purposes of determining the number of consecutive terms that each member has served. The exception will be where the previous terms were for truncated periods of less than twelve months.

2. That the arrangements for the two elected postgraduate student Academic Senate members be adjusted to provide for one postgraduate student to be elected by and from the postgraduate students and one postgraduate student to be elected by and from the higher degree by research students of the University. The Chair has been consulting with the Student Representative Council on this matter however discussions are not yet finalised.

3. Issues related to delegated authorities were raised in the 17 August meeting, especially with regard to the practicality of delegations that cannot be further delegated, and the approval of Awards. Following discussions with the Academic Registrar, it is proposed that the Delegations clause of the Academic Governance Policy be extended to include the Executive Committees of the School Academic Committees.

4. It is proposed to modify the membership of Academic Senate to include one elected staff member from a Research Institute, given the Research Institutes have a significant number of academic staff, comparable to a small School.

5. That the Senate consider the proposed amendments to the Academic Governance Policy, and if endorsed, recommend them to the Board of Trustees.

3.5 DRAFT GUIDELINES FOR AN INSTITUTIONAL CODE OF ETHICS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

At the 17 August 2012 meeting the Chair invited discussion and comment on the draft guidelines for an Institutional Code of Ethics in Higher Education by members, as this relates to Senate’s roles in the UWS Act as ‘the peak forum of the University for
academic debate and discourse’ and ‘the primary custodian of academic values and standards for the University’ and specifically in the context of what advice can be provided to the Vice-Chancellor about whether the Senate agrees with the Draft Guidelines. During discussion the ethos of the guidelines was widely appreciated and supported.

It was resolved (AS12:04/08):

That the Academic Senate provide the following comments to the Vice-Chancellor on the Draft Guidelines for an Institutional Code of Ethics in Higher Education:

- This document is seen as a useful tool to recommend to UWS staff as a timely reminder regarding Ethics in Higher Education, which brings together elements contained in Codes of Conduct and Practice and other legal documents.

- There were some concerns about the use of the term “sanctioning” and its ambiguous nature in an Australian context in clause 3.2 a (iv), in relation to “Sanctioning academic misconduct.” It was noted that the term is used in the proposed UWS Misconduct Rule as a penalty rather than permission.

- The listing in clause 3.2 f (i) (Avoidance of all abuse of power) should be expanded to include reference to ethnicity and disability.

- Our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander colleagues should be regarded as more than just another stakeholder. Clause 3.2 j (i) (Fair management of intellectual property) is seen as being stronger than our current Policy, with specific relevance to Aboriginal Intellectual Property as belonging to the relevant community and not an individual or the University.

- Academic Senate supports the adoption of these Guidelines, which could be used to develop an Institutional Code of Ethics that strengthens and aligns our existing codes and statements, for dissemination to UWS staff and students.

Feedback from the Office of University Legal Counsel and the above comments, were provided to the Vice-Chancellor.

3.6 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.

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.”

At the 22 June 2012 meeting 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 University Rule for misconduct. This entailed a completely new approach to the current arrangements for managing misconduct. Extensive feedback on the proposed Rule was received from the Academic Registrar’s Office and the Secretariat, and a revised iteration was prepared for consideration by the AIWP in July, and then forwarded to the 4 September 2012 Academic Senate Education
Committee meeting. At this meeting Associate Professor Craig Ellis introduced the proposal and his covering paper which reported the issues discussed and further work identified by the AIWP.

Most notably the new Rule:

- provides for Authorised Delegates, including Directors of Academic Program and Academic Course Advisors, but not Unit Coordinators, to investigate and decide allegations of misconduct, and
- limits the appeals process by not allowing appeals against decisions and outcomes for minor academic misconduct.

The Academic Senate Education Committee discussed the draft Rule and expressed support for the proposal that Directors of Academic Program (DAPs) rather than Unit Coordinators should deal with most cases. The DAPs were considered to be the most appropriate people to deal with cases, although if a case is sufficiently serious, it would be appropriate to involve the Dean or Deputy Dean. It was noted that for students in professional courses, substantiated misconduct allegations have implications for their future careers, and therefore care should be taken over who makes the decision.

It was resolved (EC12:06/03):
That Education Committee endorses the draft UWS Student Misconduct Rule and invites feedback from the community via the Policy DDS Bulletin Board.

Further discussions are being held and arrangements are being made for the draft UWS Student Misconduct Rule to be available for general comment on the Policy DDS Bulletin Board.

3.7 BLENDED LEARNING STRATEGY

At its meeting on 4 May 2012 Academic Senate considered the draft UWS Learning and Teaching Plan 2012 – 2014, which includes the following strategy:

"Develop a UWS Blended Learning Strategy to enable a blend of face-to-face and online delivery, along with innovative ICT-enabled learning."

The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education), Professor Kerri-Lee Krause, will give a presentation and lead a discussion about the UWS Blended Learning Strategy, including the UWS approach to blended learning, discussions with the Schools, an example of a blended learning framework for a course, and timelines for implementing the strategy. This has important implications for coursework curricula at UWS, and Academic Senate’s processes and schedules for amending courses and units expeditiously and with proper collegial scrutiny (see also agenda item 4.5 Academic Planning and Courses Approvals Committee).

3.8 AEGROTAT GRADE AWARD

Mr Christopher Zotos SID 16103636

At the 18 July 2012 School Academic Committee (SAC) meeting, the School of Humanities and Communication Arts approved that Christopher Zotos (SID 16103636) be allowed to graduate from course 1604.7 Bachelor of Arts with a Major in Psychological Studies under the UWS Aegrotat Grades Policy.

The Policy requires that "The Senate must be notified of the award decision and the rationale for it." This student has completed 220 credit points, including 140 credit points
in Psychology. Due to deterioration in his health it is unlikely he will be able to complete the remaining 20 credit points.

In accordance with the Posthumous Awards and Aegrotat Grades Policy …

**It is recommended:**

That Senate note the award of the Bachelor of Arts with a major in Psychological Studies degree to Christopher Zotos SID 16103636 under the UWS Posthumous Awards and Aegrotat Grades Policy.

### 3.9 AWARDS OF THE UNIVERSITY MEDAL

The following students were awarded the University Medal at the September 2012 Graduation ceremonies, as approved by the Chair of Academic Senate, on behalf of the Senate.

- Kylie BRICE (SID 16343447) Bachelor of Sciences (Honours)
- Luke STREHER (SID 16496284) Bachelor of Business and Commerce (Honours)
- Benjamin John SOUTHWELL (SID 16632817) Bachelor of Engineering

**It is recommended:**

That Academic Senate note the awards of the University Medal, approved by the Chair of Academic Senate, on behalf of the Senate.

### 3.10 APPROVAL OF SCHOLARSHIPS  AS12/05-3.10

Appended are proposals for five new University Scholarships, prepared by the Office of Development, as follows:

**Roy Medich Bachelor of Medical Research Scholarship** – This is intended for students enrolled in the Bachelor of Medical Research and accepted to study through the Ingham Institute for Applied Medical Research at Liverpool, with a research area focus on cancer.

**The Hill Trust Scholarship** – This is intended for students who have received an offer to study a full-time undergraduate program at UWS and demonstrate financial or other hardship, based on the UWS Opportunity and Equity criteria and who are the first in their family to attend university.

**Wu Opportunity Scholarship** – This is intended for students who have received an offer to study the Bachelor of Social Science (with preference for students undertaking the pathway to Master of Urban Management and Planning) full-time at UWS and demonstrate financial or other hardship, based on the UWS Opportunity and Equity criteria and who are the first in their family to attend university.

**Rooty Hill RSL Club Medical Scholarship** – This is intended for students who have received an offer to study the Bachelor of Medicine/Bachelor of Surgery at UWS with preference given to applicants who have been residents of the Blacktown local government area for at least 12 months prior to applying for the scholarship and continue to reside within the area for the duration of the degree. Applicants from other parts of Greater Western Sydney may be considered. Applicants must be enthusiastic ambassadors for health in the Blacktown area and Greater Western Sydney and assessment will be based on their personal statement and academic results.
The Mary Gilmore Bursary – This is intended for students who have received an offer to study a full-time undergraduate program at UWS and demonstrates financial or other hardship, based on the UWS Opportunity and Equity criteria and who are the first in their family to attend university.

It is recommended:

That Academic Senate approve the proposed Roy Medich Bachelor of Medical Research Scholarship.

That Academic Senate approve the proposed Hill Trust Scholarship.

That Academic Senate approve the proposed Wu Opportunity Scholarship.

That Academic Senate approve the proposed Rooty Hill RSL Club Medical Scholarship.

That Academic Senate approve the proposed Mary Gilmore Bursary.

4 REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM SENATE COMMITTEES

4.1 SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AS12/05-4.1

The Senate Executive Committee held an electronic meeting between 6 and 11 September 2012 and between 25 September and 2 October 2012. Reports of these meetings are appended.

It is recommended:

That Academic Senate note the reports of the Senate Executive Committee electronic meetings conducted between 6 and 11 September 2012 and between 25 September and 2 October 2012.

4.2 RESEARCH COMMITTEE AS12/05-4.2

The Research Committee met 2 October 2012. The minutes of this meeting are appended.

The draft Research Institute Policy was discussed including recommendations for changes.

The Research Committee noted that it will shortly convene its Scholarship Ranking Panel to determine the ranking of applicants for stipend scholarships recommended by the School Research and Higher Degrees Committees. Each School (and Institute for APA scholarships) has carried out its own ranking using a revised set of Higher Degree Research Scholarships Guidelines, and will make an academic case for the highest-ranked students to the Scholarship Ranking Panel.

The Research Committee agreed that it would comprise the Scholarship Ranking Panel, subject to members’ availability, using its delegation under subclause 49i of the Academic Senate Standing Committees Policy.

The IPRS Scholarship Ranking Panel met on Friday 5 October 2012 and the APA Scholarship Ranking Panel is scheduled for Tuesday 4 December.
4.3 RESEARCH STUDIES COMMITTEE

The Research Studies Committee met 7 August, 4 September and 2 October 2012. The minutes of these meetings are appended.

The Research Studies Committee has recommended that the standard clause about English Language Requirements in the UWS Higher Degree Research Policies be amended by adding some additional text, as shown in bold text below. This reflects the admission criteria that are being used by UWS International, and ensures an appropriate level of English proficiency across the subtests for reading, speaking, listening and writing. The required score for writing is higher, to reflect the importance of this skill in an HDR degree.

The standards are:

a. IELTS – 6.5 overall score with a minimum 6.0 in each subtest;

b. TOEFL – 575 (minimum 4.5 in TWE);

c. TOEFL computer based test – 232 (minimum 4.5 in Essay Writing);

d. TOEFL Internet based test – 89 (writing = 21 and all subtests = 18);

e. Cambridge Certificate in Advanced English – (CEA) – A grade of B or above; or

f. Cambridge Certificate of Proficiency in English – A grade of B or above.

It is recommended

That the Academic Senate approve the proposed revisions to the Doctor of Philosophy Policy and Research Masters (Honours) Policy, effective from the date of publication of the revised Policies.

It is recommended:

That Academic Senate note the minutes of the 7 August, 4 September and 2 October 2012 Research Studies Committee meetings.

4.4 EDUCATION and ASSESSMENT COMMITTEES (incorporating Student Experience and Engagement Committee)

The Education Committee met on 4 September, the Assessment Committee on 8 October and the Student Experience and Engagement Committee on 30 August 2012. A combined report is appended.

The Education Committee has proposed minor changes to the Referencing Styles Policy and seeks the Senate’s endorsement of these minor changes. The Policy was reviewed in consultation with the Library with a view to greater standardisation, to move towards greater consistency and clarity for students.

The current Policy was placed on the Policy DDS Bulletin Board and a number of comments were received along with responses from the Library and Secretariat, including an issue raised by academic staff regarding the limited referencing styles available, and suggesting that styles more suitable to their disciplines should be allowed.

The Committee decided that the current policy wording allowed sufficient flexibility to satisfy the needs of large multidisciplinary schools, and did not wish to place a further burden on students by removing the current restrictions. There was no support for
restricting Schools to a single style, even for first year students, and the view was that large multidisciplinary Schools should be able to manage with the several University-supported styles available. It was agreed that Deputy Deans should initiate discussions within the SACs, and ensure that first year transition issues are taken account of when approving referencing styles.

Minor amendments, in consultation with the Library, and in response to feedback, are proposed as shown in the attached version of the Policy.

It was resolved (EC12:06/05):

That Education Committee endorses the proposed amendments to the Referencing Styles Policy and recommends the proposal to Academic Senate.

It is recommended:

That Academic Senate approve the proposed amendments to the Referencing Styles Policy, effective from the date of publication of the revised Policy.

The Assessment Committee discussed the proposal that all Deputy Deans and the Dean, Indigenous Education, should be members. Members supported the proposal, noting the importance of the Committee’s work, especially the quality aspects, and of the Deputy Deans hearing the discussions first-hand.

It was resolved (AC12:03/03):

That the Assessment Committee endorses the proposal that all Deputy Deans and the Dean, Indigenous Education should be added to the membership of the Committee, and recommends it to Academic Senate.

It is recommended:

That Academic Senate approve the proposed amendments, regarding the membership of the Assessment Committee, to the Academic Senate Standing Committees Policy, effective from the date of publication of the revised Policy.

It is recommended:

That Academic Senate note the combined report of the Education and Assessment Committees meetings (held on 4 September and 8 October respectively) also incorporating the report for the Student Experience and Engagement Committee held on 30 August 2012.

4.5 ACADEMIC PLANNING AND COURSES APPROVALS COMMITTEE AS12/05-4.5

The Academic Planning and Courses Approvals Committee (APCAC) met on 12 September 2012. A report is appended.

The Committee considered a paper entitled Potential changes to timelines and processes for considering course and unit proposals, to reflect the university’s blended-learning strategy, AQF compliance and other factors affecting coursework curricula, and noted the following:

- The purpose of the paper was to seek advice from APCAC about potential changes to timelines and processes for considering course and unit proposals, to reflect the university’s blended-learning strategy, AQF compliance and other factors affecting coursework curricula. Also, it encompassed recent suggestions that the
delegations of the Curriculum Quality Committees might be extended to expedite the approval of unit variations.

- The scope and volume of curriculum renewal will increase significantly in the remaining months of 2012 and 2013, owing to university and sector-level priorities.

- The TEQSA Regulatory Risk Indicators will need to be monitored and managed (the University is currently well placed but will need to manage risks appropriately).

The key operational issues were detailed, including:

- Maintenance of close liaison between stakeholders to identify proposed new courses, and to prioritise existing courses for revision.
- Development of an integrated timeline for assessing the impacts of various factors on each course, developing modified curricula, and submitting Course Proposals to UWS Executive and the relevant academic governance committees, including deadlines for submission of Course Proposals to UWS Executive, to ensure compliance with timelines.
- Revisions to the Course Concept Proposal form to include information that will allow the UWS Executive to assess the resourcing impacts, including information about unit enrolments and standard documentation for a business case.
- Revisions to the Award Courses and Units Approvals Policy to (a) clarify the process for UWS Executive consideration of Course Concept Proposals; (b) streamline the process for considering major course changes; and (c) identify the course changes that require consideration by UWS Executive.
- Clarification of the definitions of a "new unit" and "major course change".
- Potential amendments to the delegations of the Curriculum Quality Committees, to expedite the approval of unit variations (i.e., changes).

The Committee supported the initiatives suggested in the paper, including the proposed changes to the Award Courses and Units Approvals Policy as presented.

The proposed changes, with updates based on further feedback, will be considered by Senate Education Committee at its meeting on 5 November 2012, for recommendation to Academic Senate.

It is recommended:

That Academic Senate note the report of the 12 September 2012 Academic Planning and Courses Approvals Committee meeting and ratify the recommendations contained therein.

4.6 BACHELOR (HONOURS) COMMITTEE

The next meeting of the Bachelor (Honours) Committee is scheduled for 29 October 2012.

At the Academic Senate meeting held 17 August 2012 it was resolved to include the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education) and Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) in the membership of this committee (AS12:04/12). Arrangements are being made to update the Academic Senate Standing Committees Policy.

Changes to the Bachelor (Honours) Policy, with regard to the role of the third examiner, have been proposed and are being reviewed by a working party. The outcome and recommended changes are to be reported from the next Bachelor (Honours) Committee meeting.
In the 20 June 2012 meeting, the Committee also recommended that reference to the UWS Research Supervisor Register be removed from clause 27 of the Honours in Bachelor Awards Policy. The UWS Research Supervisor Register is maintained for Higher Degree Research (HDR) supervisors, and the professional development associated with it is specific to HDR supervision. However, the Committee’s view was that there should be some form of register for Honours supervisors, covering the specific requirements of a Bachelor (Honours) candidature, and this will be investigated further in consultation with the Schools.

The proposed change is shown below.

(27) The primary supervisor will be a member of the UWS Research Supervisor Register and will hold qualifications at or above Honours and/or have a record of research or scholarly attainment in a relevant field.

It is recommended:
That Academic Senate approve the proposed amendment to the Honours in Bachelor Awards Policy, effective from the date of publication of the revised Policy

4.7 BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Board of Trustees met on 5 September 2012.

The next meeting is scheduled for 21 November 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 7 December (provisional meeting – to be held if necessary)

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

Senate meeting dates for 2013 are as follows:
- Friday 22 February
- Friday 3 May
- Friday 21 June
- Friday 16 August
- Friday 25 October
- Friday 6 December (provisional meeting – to be held if necessary)