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This meeting was the inaugural Academic Senate meeting chaired by the newly appointed Chair of Academic Senate, Professor Mariella Herberstein.

1. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY**

   A meeting of the Academic Senate commenced at 9.35am. The Chair acknowledged the traditional custodians of the land and welcomed members and attendees to the meeting.

2. **WELCOME AND APOLOGIES**

   The Chair welcomed Professor Anne Ross-Smith, in attendance as Acting Executive Dean of the Faculty of Business and Economics; Members of the Academic Freedom Working Party; and Budhaditya Majumdar, a newly elected student representative attending as an observer.

   The Chair noted apologies from Jeremey Gunter, Professor Kevin Jameson, Professor Mike Jones, Professor Barbara Messerle, Professor Martina Mollering, Professor Peter Nelson, Professor John Simons, Cheryl Ware, Professor David Wilkinson and Julia Yang.

3. **ARRANGEMENT OF AGENDA**

   3.1 Disclosure of conflicts of interest

   The Chair requested that Senate members declare any conflict of interest. No conflicts were declared.

   3.2 Adoption of unstarrred items

   The following Items were starred for discussion:
   - 10.4 Student Representatives to the Academic Senate
   - 12.1 2017 New Program: Master of Accounting (Extension)
   - 12.10 Amendment to the Grade Appeal Policy

   **Resolution 16/162**

   Academic Senate resolved that the items not starred for discussion (Items 9.3, 9.4, 12.2, 12.4, 12.5, 12.6, 12.7, 12.8, 12.9, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3, 13.4, 14.1, 14.2, 14.3, 14.4 and 15.1) be noted and, where appropriate, be adopted as recommended.

4. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

   4.1 Minutes of the meeting held 5 April 2016

   The following matters were identified as requiring amendment:
   - Item 9.7 Qualifications Issuance Policy – Update, page 8 of the Minutes

   An amendment to the resolution appearing on page 8 of the minutes (page 12 of the agenda) to reflect that the body charged with the development of a policy and procedure is a Reference Group opposed to a Working Party. The amended resolution:

   **Resolution 16/145**

   *Academic Senate resolved to:*
i. endorse a revised membership for the Reference Group to include:
   • Chair of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee
   • Pro Vice-Chancellor Learning and Teaching;
   • Head of Student Administration;
   • Manager, Policy Unit;
   • Manager, Quality Assurance and Compliance;
   • a member from the Macquarie Graduate School of Management;
   • a member from Access MQ; and
   • a member of the Academic Senate.

ii. recommend that the Chair of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee assume the role of
    Chair of the Reference Group, and

iii. endorse the following timeline:
   a. an update on the Reference Group’s deliberations to be provided to the next meeting of
      Academic Senate on 24 May 2016;
   b. the draft policy to be provided to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee meeting of
      31 May 2016 for consideration;
   c. the draft policy to be provided to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee meeting of 6
      June 2016 for consideration; and
   d. the final policy draft to be provided to Academic Senate meeting of 26 July 2016.

Attendance
Professor Enrico Coiera is recorded as being in attendance at the meeting.

Resolution 16/163
Academic Senate resolved to approve the Minutes of the meeting held 5 April 2016 as a true and correct
record subject to the amendments identified.

5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES
   (not dealt with elsewhere in the Agenda)

The Chair reported on the following matters:
   i. There are currently no items requiring action that are not encompassed by the Academic Senate
      Projects and Priorities which will be addressed under Item 9.1.
   ii. The Business Cases supporting the Academic Case for New Programs in 2017, as approved by
       Academic Senate at its meeting of 5 April 2016 (Items 13.3 – 13.10) were subsequently approved
       by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic).

6. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

As the newly appointed Chair of Academic Senate, Professor Mariella Herberstein took the opportunity
to briefly provide a retrospective report of the achievements of Academic Senate under the leadership of
the former Chair, Professor Dominic Verity. These achievements included:
   • a top-to-bottom overhaul of student discipline which resulted in the establishment of Faculty-
     based hearing committees, penalties aligned with best practice, and a more equitable way to
     investigate discipline cases;
   • a new approach to Disruption to Studies with a clear separation between wellbeing and
     academic decision making;
   • a review of assessment practice and the development of the new Assessment Policy supporting
     the Learning and Teaching Strategy;
   • the first institution-wide approach to student progression including a graduated model to
     identify and support those students at risk; and
   • a rethink in the University’s approach to academic integrity to encourage both student and staff
     understanding and ownership of academic integrity principles and good practice.

The Chair provided an overview of her initial thoughts on the direction and goals of Academic Senate in
the next 14 months of her term of office and outlined her obligations as Chair and the responsibilities of
Senate members.
A copy of the Chair’s presentation is attached to these minutes (Attachment 1).

Professor Peter Radan arrived at 9:49am.
Professor Amanda Barnier arrived at 9:50am.

The Chair reported on the activities that she has undertaken since commencing her term, including:
- chairing the Standing Committee of Academic Senate on 3 May 2016;
- meeting with Chairs of Senate Committees;
- reviewing the Senate projects and priorities; and
- participation in the meeting to finalise draft Terms of Reference for the Research and Research Training and Thesis Examination Subcommittee.

7. VICE-CHANCELLOR UPDATE

The Vice-Chancellor, Professor S. Bruce Dowton congratulated the Chair on her appointment and noted that due to the number of key discussion items on the agenda, his update would be brief. Professor Dowton reflected on the announcement of the federal budget and the upcoming election, and noted that neither of the major parties were forthcoming with significant detail on higher education. The Vice-Chancellor predicted that if the current government were to be re-elected, the proposed significant changes to funding for higher education would be replaced by a more nuanced and subtle approach, targeting a range of matters, and that potential changes to the Cabinet would also influence outcomes.

Professor Dowton advised members that Professor Charles Areni had accepted the role of Executive Dean, Faculty of Business at the University of Wollongong and that Professor Norma Harrison had accepted the role of Acting Dean of the MGSM. Professor Dowton reported that discussions continued on the alignment of the MGSM and the Faculty of Business and Economics, and that a series of town hall meetings had been conducted with staff in the two areas.

Members were advised that Professor Jim Angus had commenced the Review of the Master of Research and that arrangements for stakeholder engagement were currently being confirmed. In addition, the review of the Delegations of Authority, conducted by Emeritus Professor Richard Henry was progressing well. Professor Dowton noted that several members of Senate had met with Professor Henry, including the former Chair of the Academic Senate, Professor Dominic Verity and the current Chair. Professor Dowton indicated that the review would deliver a detailed report recommending a number of amendments of which Senate would be advised.

8. QUESTION TIME

Members were invited to raise questions with either the Vice-Chancellor or the Chair. A Faculty elected member asked how to become involved and participate in the Master of Research Review.

Professor Dowton encouraged any staff member or student with feedback to provide that feedback either directly to him or the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research). All Senators were reminded that the Terms of Reference for the review are available on the Academic Senate website.

9. ACADEMIC SENATE PROJECTS

9.1 Approach to Projects and Priorities

The Chair presented her vision for a renewed approach to Academic Senate projects and priorities, which focus on Senate becoming more effective. This approach includes:
- the need for Senate to focus upon strategic initiatives and not minutiae;
- project scoping;
- tight timelines and standardised reporting;
- empowerment of Committees and working groups;
- clear indicators of when Senate will have input through curated discussion and when approval is sought;
- clear understanding of implications for implementation; and
- post implementation review
The Chair presented a decision tree to assist Senate identify priorities for existing and future projects.

A copy of the Chair’s presentation is attached to these minutes (Attachment 2).

Members were broadly supportive of this approach and discussed the Chair’s presentation with the following themes emerging:

- a need for greater transparency on the status and progress of projects of Senate;
- the need for the Chairs of the working groups to provide respond to stakeholders, acknowledge feedback and advise why it has not been taken into account. Members noted this approach had proven effective with discussion relating to the Assessment Policy at the 5 April Academic Senate meeting where the Chair of SLTC raised feedback and explained why it was or was not taken into account;
- the change in terms of Senate of members resulting in various lags in the approval process by requiring revisiting draft versions of policies; and
- the need to move away from binary decision making and identify those projects which will make a step change and be transformative.

Members discussed the need to right-size the volume of Academic Senate projects and questioned the process of prioritisation with concerns raised about those projects which are identified as lower in priority.

The Chair responded that projects, which have been identified as being of lower priority did not mean a project would never commence but that it would be scheduled accordingly.

The Vice-Chancellor noted that the Academic Senate needed to determine how it was performing in comparison to institutions of similar age and composition, and shared his observation that Senate tended to be bogged down in detail. The equivalent body to the Academic Senate at peer institutions typically has 2 or 3 projects in train at a time. These projects are progressed and completed allowing Senate to then move on to other priorities. The Vice-Chancellor advised that the review of the delegations of authority will place a sharper focus on what Senate can delegate to the Faculty level and allow Senate to focus on not just what is urgent but what is important.

The Chair advised members on the collation and analysis of Academic Senate projects and priorities. Part of this approach is a greater level of transparency around current projects, participants and timelines. To achieve this, the current projects of Senate will be published on the website and the Chair urged members to provide feedback on priorities and to identify those projects which they wish to be involved in.

9.2 Focused Discussion: Academic Freedom

Professor Jacqueline Phillips, Chair of the Academic Freedom Working Group, provided a progress report on the revisions to the Academic Freedom statement, and the identification of general, rather than specific guiding principles, in recognition that standards may differ across disciplines. Professor Phillips outlined the international benchmarking, which resulted in the definition of Academic Freedom as:

*Academic freedom is the principle that staff and students should be free to conduct research, undertake learning and teaching, communicate, and publish, subject to the standards of scholarship, without undue interference or penalty.*

Dr Paul Formosa, a contributing member of the working group, was invited to provide an overview of case studies, which had informed drafting the revised statement. A copy of Dr Formosa’s presentation is attached to these minutes (Attachment 3).

The case studies included well-known examples, where academics had:

- commented outside their area of expertise;
- made controversial political statements; and
- made sexist or racist comments or ‘jokes’.

The case studies informed the rights of staff and students captured in the revised statement, which include the right to:

- engage in critical enquiry and scholarly endeavour without fear of intimidation, in an environment of tolerance for and engagement with divergent opinions, unconstrained by institutional censorship; and
• engage in public discourse, expressing their informed views whether within their defined areas of expertise or not. In doing so they may identify themselves as members of, but not spokespersons for, the University. This freedom of expression extends to making statements on political matters, including policies affecting higher education, and to criticism of Macquarie University and its actions.

Members noted that revised statement included responsibilities for staff and students to:
• uphold commitment to high academic standards, including academic integrity, rigour in the construction of arguments, and the appropriate use of evidence;
• foster intellectually vigorous and open discussion, adhering to the standards of scholarship, and avoid actions that may inhibit freedom of inquiry and expression; and
• exercise awareness of the parameters of academic freedom including legislative and internal policy requirements, and therefore apply a degree of self-regulation.

Professor Phillips opened discussion and invited members to provide feedback on the draft revised statement.

The Vice-Chancellor opened discussion and commended Academic Senate for prioritising revising the Academic Freedom Statement. It was noted however, that the benchmarking predominantly involved institutions based in the United States, which operate in a different context. The protections afforded by the industrial relations and institutions directly funding tenured staff positions in Australia result in fundamental differences between the nature of relationships amongst academics and the University in the two countries. Due to these differences, it was proposed that a more nuanced approach was required to balance the rights of staff together with their responsibility to the University. There was general acknowledgement of the variations in the higher education context between the United States and Australia and the statement needing to reflect the Australian experience, however members articulated need for protection of academic freedom, despite this difference in context.

Discussion focused on the right of academic staff and students to comment both within and outside of their defined areas of expertise with the following themes emerging:
• the ability for staff to comment on areas outside of their area of expertise, on the condition that this was subject to high standards of scholarship and academic rigour;
• the difference between speaking as an individual and speaking with the authority of an expert academic representative of the University;
• the need to distinguish between ‘area of expertise’ versus a substantive nominal appointment;
• how to assess realms of competence and expertise;
• areas of expertise that are regulated by external bodies;
• codes of ethics which determine boundaries of competence; and
• the need to address instances where conflicting statements are made in the public arena.

Members discussed the responsibilities of academic staff and students and raised issues relating to:
• the need to balance communitarian responsibility as well as individual responsibility;
• the need for the statement to detail the collective responsibility of staff to the university community and the role played by individual staff in fulfilling this role; and
• the responsibilities of guest researchers and lecturers.

Members commented that the introduction of a purpose or preamble would express an aspirational statement about the University and its vision, and provided positive feedback on the use of case studies as a way to explore the issues relating to Academic Freedom. There was consensus that the case studies are included as attachments to the statement as they provide an educational resource that would promote the discussion of issues of academic freedom.

Members noted the need for the Public Comment Policy to be revised urgently as it contains provisions contrary to commonly held principles of academic freedom.

Professor Phillips thanked members for their feedback and confirmed that many of the issues discussed were aligned with those identified by the working party. Professor Phillips suggested that the working party meet with the Vice-Chancellor to ensure that the rights of staff and their collective responsibility to the University were appropriately addressed.

**Resolution 16/164**

Academic Senate resolved to note the Academic Freedom discussion paper and to seek feedback from members on the content of the report provided to Academic Senate and on the matters identified by
9.3 Progress Report: Academic Progression

**Resolution 16/165**
Academic Senate noted the progress report on Academic Progression.

9.4 Progress Report: Academic Prizes and Awards

**Resolution 16/166**
Academic Senate noted the progress report on Academic Prizes and Awards including the responsibilities of the Working Party and the project timeline.

10. GENERAL BUSINESS

10.1 Research and Research Training Committee and Thesis Examination Subcommittee: Terms of Reference

The Deputy Chair of Academic Senate spoke to the report, noting that the Working Group had met on 2 May 2016 to discuss and finalise the Terms of Reference for the Research and Research Training committee and Thesis Examination Subcommittee. The meeting was both productive and collaborative, the result of which are the final drafts of the Terms of Reference presented for approval.

**Resolution 16/167**
Academic Senate resolved to approve:

i. the Research and Research Training Committee Terms of Reference; and

ii. the Thesis Examination Subcommittee Terms of Reference.

**Resolution 16/168**
Academic Senate resolved to:

i. disestablish the Higher Degrees Research Committee and the Program and Examination Subcommittee; and

ii. approve that the date of effect will be determined by the Chair of Academic Senate and the Chair of the Higher Degrees Research Committee and the Chair Research and Research Training Committee to ensure that no candidate is disadvantaged by transition arrangements.

**Resolution 16/169**
Academic Senate resolved to appoint the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) as the Chair of the Research and Research Training Committee.

10.2 Research Training Performance

Academic Senate noted a comprehensive presentation by the Dean of Higher Degree Research (HDR), Professor Nick Mansfield, on the University’s research training performance.

Academic Senate noted that Macquarie’s bold strategic HDR initiatives have positioned the University as a leading force in the sector, continuing to increase its HDR enrolments and completions, and student satisfaction rates.

A full copy of the presentation provided is attached to these minutes (Attachment 4).

Dr Kate Fullagar departed the meeting at 11.33am.

10.3 Casual Vacancies Faculty Elected Representatives to Academic Senate

The Chair reported on the processes to fill casual vacancies for the Faculty elected representative to Academic Senate from the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Science and Engineering.

**Resolution 16/170**
Academic Senate resolved to seek nominations from the elected representatives from the Faculties of Arts and Science and Engineering to fill casual vacancies to Academic Senate in those electorates.
10.4 Student Representatives to the Academic Senate

**Resolution 16/171**
Academic Senate resolved to note the update to the student representative membership to Academic Senate.

**Resolution 16/172**
Academic Senate resolved to request the Faculty of Medicine and Health Elected Representatives to nominate an eligible student representative as defined by Part 3, Rule 7(4)(b) of the Academic Senate Rules.

11. **QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Members may submit questions on notice to the Chair two days in advance of the meeting.

The Chair confirmed that no questions had been received.

12. **ITEMS FOR APPROVAL FROM ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEES**

12.1 **2017 New Program: Master of Accounting (Extension)(ASQC)**

Associate Professor Pamela Coutts, Chair of Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) advised that TEQSA would not approve the program title as endorsed by ASQC as the term ‘Extension’ did not comply with AQF nomenclature.

Professor Anne Ross-Smith, Acting Executive Dean of the Faculty of Business and Economics confirmed that following receipt of this advice, the Faculty agreed to rename the program as the Master of Accounting (Advanced).

**Resolution 16/173**
Academic Senate resolved to approve the change of name for the Master of Accounting (Extension) to the Master of Accounting (Advanced) for implementation from 2017.

12.2 **2017 New Program: Graduate Diploma and Graduate Certificate of Public Health (Exit Awards) (ASQC)**

**Resolution 16/174**
Academic Senate resolved to approve the following exit awards from the Master of Public Health for implementation from 2017:

i. Graduate Diploma of Public Health; and

ii. Graduate Certificate of Public Health.

12.3 **2017 Change to Award: Bachelor of Engineering Honours Criteria and Offerings (ASQC)**

Associate Professor Pamela Coutts, Chair of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) spoke to the item.

At its last meeting, the Academic Standards and Quality Committee endorsed a proposal that Macquarie University award a Bachelor of Engineering with Honours degree to all students who fulfil the requirements of the four-year professional engineering program.

The University currently enrols all commencing undergraduate engineering students in the Bachelor of Engineering with Honours (an AQF Level 8 Award). Students who do not maintain the required level of attainment for the Honours Award graduate with a Bachelor of Engineering (an AQF level 7 award).

ASQC noted that the proposal for changes to the Bachelor of Engineering is tightly linked to the accreditation processes, recognising that Australian Professional Engineering Programs accredited by Engineers Australia have standards, which require an AQF Level 8 Bachelor Honours degree.

The Faculty contends that all students who satisfy the requirements of either the Bachelor of Engineering or Bachelor of Engineering with Honours at Macquarie University achieve a standard consistent with AQF Level 8. ASQC noted that the proposal requires changes to the criteria for the Bachelor of Engineering Honours, introduces a Class 3 Honours grade, and impacts on the Bachelor of Engineering degree offerings.

ASQC supported the proposal, with a recommendation that the Faculty develops a communication strategy to inform current affected students of the changes, and ensures that AQF Level 7 exit awards are available. It was also noted that currently honours classifications at Macquarie are based on the calculation of a Weighted Standard Numerical Grade (WSNG) for all qualifying units. Further
clarification will be provided to ASQC on the clarification of Class 3 honours grades in the sector and be brought back to the next ASQC meeting. Following approval by Academic Senate, degrees associated with the Bachelor of Engineering will be deleted.

**Resolution 16/175**
Academic Senate resolved to approve:

i. graduating students of the four year Bachelor of Engineering program do so with the award Bachelor of Engineering with Honours from 1 January 2016;  
ii. to retain the Bachelor of Engineering with Honours, and its associated double degree programs; and
iii. the introduction of a Class 3 Honours grade (with grading awarded to each student to be determined by a Weighted Standard Numerical Grade calculation).

**Resolution 16/176**
Academic Senate resolved to approve the deletion of following programs from 31 December 2015:

i. Bachelor of Engineering;  
ii. Bachelor of Engineering with the Bachelor of Arts;  
iii. Bachelor of Engineering with the Bachelor of Commerce; and  
iv. Bachelor of Engineering with the Bachelor of Science.

**12.4 2017 Schedule: Change of Award Names (ASQC)**

**Resolution 16/177**
Academic Senate resolved to:

i. approve the renaming of the Master of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism with the Degree of Master of International Security Studies (OUA) to the Master of Cyber-Security, Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism with the Degree of Master of International Security Studies (OUA) from 1 January 2017 for inclusion on the schedule of Course Availabilities – Offerings from 2017 Awards; and
ii. approve the deletion of the former program from 31 December 2016.

**12.5 2017 Schedule: Change of Specialisation Names (ASQC)**

**Resolution 16/178**
Academic Senate resolved to:

i. approve the change of name of the following specialisations from 1 January 2017:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDL11S Educational Leadership</td>
<td>Leading Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Master of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LET31S Leading Teaching</td>
<td>Leading Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Graduate Certificate of Education Studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADP11S Advanced Practices in Learning</td>
<td>Advanced Practices in Teaching and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Teaching</td>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Master of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADP31S Advanced Practices in Learning</td>
<td>Advanced Practices in Teaching and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Teaching</td>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Graduate Certificate of Education Studies)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii. approve the deletion of the former specialisations from 31 December 2016.

**12.6 2017 Schedule of Programs: Awards for Deletion (ASQC)**

**Resolution 16/179**
Academic Senate resolved to approve the deletion of the following awards from 31 December 2016:

i. Master of Accounting (Professional);  
ii. Master of International Accounting;  
iii. Bachelor of Arts – Media;
iv. Bachelor of Arts – Media with the Bachelor of Laws;
v. Bachelor of Arts – Media with the Bachelor of Laws with Honours; and
vi. Master of Accounting (Professional) with the Master of Commerce.

12.7 Joint PhD Program with Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (HDRC)

Resolution 16/180
Academic Senate resolved to approve Katholieke Universiteit Leuven as a partner institution for the purpose of a joint PhD degree.

12.8 Combined PhD Masters of Clinical Psychology, of Clinical Neuropsychology or of Organisational Psychology (HDRC)

Resolution 16/181
Academic Senate resolved to approve a new pathway for the four (4) year combined PhD Masters of Clinical Psychology, or Clinical Neuropsychology or the Organisational Psychology.

12.9 Approval to proceed: Peer Assisted Learning Policy (SLTC)

Resolution 16/182
Academic Senate resolved to approve the review of the Peer Assisted Learning Policy.

12.10 Amendment to the Grade Appeal Policy (SLTC)

Members discussed the proposed changes to the Grade Appeal Policy and Procedure with specific reference to remove the ground of an appeal ‘the assessor’s judgement was not objectively applied’.
Dr Wylie Bradford questioned why this amendment was proposed in light of the work being undertaken on the Academic Appeals Policy. The Head of Governance Services indicated that the Academic Appeal policy presented to the 5 April meeting of Academic Senate included grounds for appeals of this nature and that as an interim, students submitting an appeal on the basis that they had been treated unfairly would have recourse to the Complaint Procedure for Students and Members of the Public.
Professor Sherman Young reflected on the discussion at SLTC where feedback from members was unanimous that the proposed change be recommended for approval.
Dr Wylie Bradford, Chair of the Working Party charged with the review of the Grade Appeal Policy recorded his opposition to the proposed resolution.

Resolution 16/183
Academic Senate resolved to approve the deletion of the ground of appeal ‘the assessor’s judgement was not objectively applied’ from the Grade Appeal Policy and Procedure effective immediately.

Professor Dowton departed the meeting at 11.57am.

13. REPORTS FROM ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEES

13.1 Academic Senate Standing Committee

Academic Senate noted the Academic Senate Standing Committee reports of the meeting held 3 May 2016, noting Resolution 16/27 of the Academic Senate Standing Committee.

13.2 Academic Standards and Quality Committee

Academic Senate noted the report of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee meeting held 26 April 2016.

13.3 Higher Degree Research Committee

Academic Senate noted the reports of the Higher Degree Research Committee meetings held 11 March, 8 and 29 April 2016.
13.4 Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

Academic Senate noted the reports of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee meetings held 18 April and 9 May 2016.

14. REPORTS FROM FACULTY BOARDS

14.1 Faculty of Business and Economics Faculty Board

Academic Senate noted the report of the Faculty of Business and Economics Faculty Board meeting of 12 April 2016.

14.2 Faculty of Human Sciences Faculty Board

Academic Senate noted the report of the Faculty of Human Sciences Faculty Board meeting of 5 April 2016.

14.3 Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences Faculty Board

Academic Senate noted the report of the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences Faculty Board meeting of 11 April 2016.

14.4 Faculty of Science and Engineering Faculty Board

Academic Senate noted the report of the Faculty of Science and Engineering Faculty Board meeting of 26 April 2016.

15. CONSIDERATION OF CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

15.1 University Hearing Committee

A confidential report of the University Hearing Committee meetings held 16 April and 4 May 2016 were tabled.

16. OTHER BUSINESS

The Chair noted that this is the final meeting of the current Academic Senate student representatives and noted that these individuals had made significant contributions to Committees of Senate, working parties and the Student Discipline Hearing Committee.

Ms Hardy spoke to her experience of sitting on Senate for the past year, noting the insight that this experience had provided her with. Ms Hardy reflected on the contributions of her peers to the University Discipline Committee, Committees of Senate and various working parties. Ms Hardy thanked the Academic Senate Project Officer, Ainslee Harvey for her support during this time.

17. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Academic Senate will be held on Tuesday 26 July 2016.

Agenda Items are due by Tuesday 12 July 2016.