ACADEMIC SENATE

A meeting of the Academic Senate will be held at 9.30 am on Tuesday 6 October 2015, in the Senate Room, Lincoln Building C8A, Level 3.

★ This symbol indicates items that have been starred for discussion at the meeting.

Members are requested to notify the Chair of Academic Senate, Professor Dominic Verity, of any additional items which they wish to have starred, and the reason for seeking discussion of those items.

Members who are unable to attend the meeting are requested to send their apologies to Ms Amanda Phelps, University Committee Secretary (phone +61 2 9850 7316 or e-mail senate@mq.edu.au).

AGENDA
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★ 4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES
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Pages 8 to 10 4.1 Academic Senate items requiring action

Pages 11 to 13 ★ 5. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

★ 6. VICE-CHANCELLOR ORAL UPDATE

★ 7. QUESTION TIME
Questions to the Chair of Academic Senate and the Vice-Chancellor

8. STRATEGY AND POLICY

Pages 14 to 35 ★ 8.1 Discussion Paper: Governance of Research and Research Training
   • Draft Terms of Reference, Research & Research Training
   • Draft Terms of Reference, Thesis Examination Subcommittee

Pages 36 to 40 ★ 8.2 Independent Review of the Master of Research Program

Pages 41 to 43 8.3 English Language Policy – Clarification of resolutions

Pages 44 to 45 ★ 8.4 Policy Development for the Macquarie University International College

9. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Members are requested to submit Questions on notice to the Chair two days in advance of the meeting.

Page 46 ★ 9.1 Question on Notice received from the Faculty of Science and Engineering

10. GENERAL BUSINESS

Pages 47 to 49 ★ 10.1 HDR Terminations and Appeals: RIE

Pages 50 to 52 ★ 10.2 TEQSA Renewal Update

Pages 53 to 54 10.3 Statement of Academic Freedom Working Group – Terms of Reference

Pages 55 to 56 10.4 University Medals Nominations Working Group - Terms of Reference

Pages 57 to 58 10.5 Revised Academic Year Plan - 2016
11. ITEMS FOR RATIFICATION

11.1 Items approved by the Chair

12. ITEMS FOR APPROVAL FROM ASQC

12.1 Ongoing Exemption from the Final Examination Policy Requirement to Publish Final Exams from BIOL345 Human Genetics Theory

12.2 Pace Unit Accreditation Criteria – Proposed Updates

12.3 Principles for Shared Teaching

13. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

13.1 Academic Senate Standing Committee

13.2 Academic Standards and Quality Committee

- Refer to items 12.1, 12.2 and 12.3.

13.3 Higher Degree Research Committee

13.4 Higher Degree Research Appeals Committee
Minutes of the meeting of 27 August 2015.

14. REPORTS FROM FACULTY BOARDS

14.1 Faculty of Arts

14.2 Faculty of Business and Economics
Minutes of the meeting 8 September 2015 can be accessed via this link.

14.3 Faculty of Human Sciences
Report of the meeting 4 August 2015.

14.4 Faculty of Medicine and Health Science
Report of the meeting 7 September 2015.

14.5 Faculty of Science & Engineering
Report of the meeting 16 September 2015.

15. OTHER BUSINESS

16. CONSIDERATION OF CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

16.1 University Discipline Committee
The minutes of the University Discipline Committees held on 9 September 2015 will be tabled.

17. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of Academic Senate will be held on 10 November 2015.

Agenda Items are due by Tuesday, 27 October 2015.
ITEM 3  MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Attached are the minutes of the meeting held on 25 August 2015.

For approval.

Recommended Resolution:
That the minutes of the meeting held on 25 August 2015 be signed as a true and correct record.
ACADEMIC SENATE – MINUTES

Minutes of a meeting of Academic Senate held on Tuesday 25 August 2015 at 9.30 am in the Senate Room, Level 3, Lincoln Building.

PRESENT

Professor Dominic Verity
Professor Amanda Barnier
Dr Ayse Bilgin
Dr Wylie Bradford
Dr Yvonne Breyer
A/Professor David Coutts
A/Professor Pamela Coutts
Professor Linda Cupples
Harry Dang
Dr Kate Fullagar
Professor Mark Gabbott
Professor Simon George
Gabrielle Hardy
Professor Mariella Herberstein
Professor Lesley Hughes
Jinji Kong
Professor Jim Lee
Professor Nick Mansfield
Nicholas McGuigan
Professor Patrick McNeil
Professor Barbara Messerle
Professor Kathryn Millard
Professor Martina Mollerling
Professor Peter Nelson
Dr Kerry-Ann O’Sullivan
Professor Jacqueline Phillips
Simon Populin
Professor Sakkie Pretorius
Cathy Rytmeister
Professor John Simons
Professor Ian Solomonides
JoAnne Sparks
Professor Lucy Taksa
A/Professor Estela Valverde
Cheryl Ware
Julia Yang
Professor Sherman Young

IN ATTENDANCE

Professor Charles Areni (attending for Professor Norma Harrison)
Hayley Harris
Kerri Mackenzie
Amanda Phelps
Shirley Sorensen
Zoe Williams
Jonathan Wylie

APOLOGIES

Deidre Anderson
Professor Bruce Dowton
Professor David Wilkinson
Professor Alex Frino
Anna Glen
Jeremey Gunter
Professor Norma Harrison
Professor Richard Henry
Professor Mike Jones
Professor Peter Radan
1. **APOLOGIES / WELCOME / ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTY**

The Chair opened the meeting and acknowledged the traditional custodians of the land.

The Chair welcomed members and attendees to the meeting, including Professor Charles Areni (attending for Professor Norma Harrison) and new student member from the Faculty of Human Sciences Julia Yang.

Academic Senate noted that apologies were received from: Deidre Anderson, Professor Bruce Dowton, Professor Alex Frino, Anna Glen, Jeremey Gunter, Professor Norma Harrison, Professor Richard Henry, Professor Mike Jones and Professor Peter Radan.

The Chair confirmed the approval of Kate Roth as the representative of Macquarie International on the Academic Standards and Quality Committee.

The Chair reported the passing of Edwards Watts in June 2015, a former Faculty of Business and Economics elected representative on Academic Senate (2012 – 2014), and extended condolences to his family and friends. The Chair also extended best wishes to long serving Academic Standards and Quality Committee member Sue Spinks who is recovering after a period of ill health.

2. **ARRANGEMENT OF AGENDA**

2.1 The Chair requested that Senate members declare any conflicts of interest.

No conflicts were recorded.

2.2 Adoption of Unstarred Items

The Chair reported that further discussions relating to implementing a Grade Point Average (GPA) of 7 are taking place and this matter will be presented to a future meeting.

**Resolution 15/72**

*That the items not starred for discussion be noted and, where appropriate, be adopted as recommended.*

3. **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

3.1 The minutes of the 2 June 2015 meeting were approved by flying resolution on 22 July 2015, with all business arising now actioned.

**Resolution 15/73**

*That the minutes of the meeting held on 2 June 2015 be ratified and signed as a true and correct record.*

Gabrielle Hardy arrived at 9:40am

4. **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

4.1 Academic Senate items requiring action

The Chair noted that a number of action items would be discussed in the course of the meeting.

5. **REPORT FROM THE CHAIR**

5.1 The Chair spoke to his report, noting the following matters:

- **Academic Integrity Project Update:** Dr Tracey Bretag (University of South Australia) and Dr Teddi Fishman (Director of the International Centre for Academic Integrity, Clemson University) will join a 2 day Academic Integrity workshop to be held at Macquarie on the 19th and 20th November 2015. SLTC will shortly form a working party to scope the details the parameters of the project.

- **Member-led business:** Following discussions with elected Faculty representatives, the Chair has approved the introduction of this permanent standing item for future meetings, allowing staff and student members to bring forward business to be included on the agenda from the floor. The Academic Governance Workshops also identified this opportunity to assist more pro-active engagement by members. Governance Services and Human Resources will consider an appropriate training package for members of Senate and its committees.

- **TEQSA Registration:** The Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic’s office has commenced preparations for TEQSA reregistration in 2016. Membership of the Steering Group includes the Chair of Academic Senate. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic noted the reregistration process is being viewed as an opportunity for the University to reflect on current practices and identify areas for improvement.
• Quality Enhancement Committee (QEC) update: The governance framework of the QEC is under development including a review of the University's quality framework and operating procedures to support academic organisational reviews and identify academic risk. This will include a consultative process to allow for feedback. Activities leading up to the 26 November 2015 QEC meeting will be actioned via flying minute and incidental working parties as appropriate. The Chair of Academic Senate will work closely with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic, noting that a proposal to appoint an external QEC Chair may bring specialised expertise to enhance the independence of this Committee's work.

• Macquarie University International College (MUIC) Subcommittee of ASQC update: Dr Catriona Lavernicocca (Faculty of Business and Economics) is appointed as the Chair of the MUIC Subcommittee of ASQC, and will work with the Director of MUIC to begin planning the subcommittee's activities.

• OLT Project: Student engagement in University decision-making and governance: The Chair of Academic Senate is a member of the project’s reference group to work across the sector to develop and enhance student engagement, and has identified the possibility of the University being involved in a pilot study.

• Learning and Teaching Week: Members were encouraged to attend and support the annual Learning and Teaching Week during 14-17 September 2015.

Academic Senate noted the report from the Chair of Academic Senate.

6. STRATEGY AND POLICY

6.1 Context for Change – Learning and Teaching Strategic Framework

The Chair introduced a background paper, included with the Agenda, addressing the implications of the external environment in the University’s Learning and Teaching Strategic Framework. Cathy Rytmeister addressed the meeting, providing a comprehensive summary of the report that articulated the external and internal factors contextualising the change in approach to learning and teaching at Macquarie. Ms Rytmeister’s presentation is available with the Agenda. Ms Rytmeister detailed the current challenges and opportunities facing the University and referred to key statistics detailed in the paper, including the University’s position nationally, performance, student cohort and staff profile.

Members thanked Ms Rytmeister for her contribution.

Resolution 15/74
Academic Senate resolved to note the report Context for Change – Learning and Teaching Strategic Framework.

6.2 Learning and Teaching Strategic Framework (White Paper)

The Pro Vice-Chancellor Learning and Teaching provided an overview of progress with the Learning and Teaching Strategy. Professor Young’s presentation is available with the Agenda. Professor Young outlined the governance and operational implications of the targets and supporting strategies described in the draft Learning and Teaching framework. Utilising an online e-poll, Professor Young demonstrated the cultural shifts that would be required to in order to successfully implement the proposed Learning and Teaching Strategy. Specific topics canvassed included the notion that students would become collaborators and co-creators of their learning, the concept of an open learning commons, and the proposed shift to a program-based approach to curriculum.

There was broad discussion of some of the challenges in implementing the Strategic Plan, including a reliance on casualization, working across discipline boundaries, the problems of implementing effective curriculum review and renewal, and a cultural reluctance to share content. It was noted that the strategy envisaged a gradual process of curriculum renewal, taking place over a regular and predictable 5-year cycle of review and re-accreditation, rather than a punctual process of wholesale revision of all programs in one go.

Members asked specific questions in regard to the provision of resources, both of time and money, to implement this strategy, and the key question of the workload balance between teaching and research. It was recognised that these bigger questions were a substantial challenge and that answers to those questions were still subject of significant uncertainty and discussion. The DVC-A, Professor John Simons, explained that the strategy had been designed to alleviate workload stress in certain areas, such as in assessment practice, and that the time saved would be re-directed to implementation of the learning and teaching, and research strategies.

Resolution 15/75
Academic Senate resolved to note the report on the Learning and Teaching Strategic Framework (White Paper).

Professor Kathryn Millard departed the meeting at 11.10am

6.3 The University of Sydney’s Taskforce on Academic Misconduct

The Chair provided a brief overview of the first report of the University of Sydney’s Taskforce on Academic Misconduct, “An Approach to Minimising Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism at the University of Sydney”. The report may assist Academic Senate in developing the direction of how it will face this challenge. The Chair spoke to recent trends in cases presented to the University Discipline Committee and reflected upon its experience.
with the introduction of an Academic and Workplace Ethics (AWE) module to provide (compulsory) educative support to those receiving penalties for academic integrity breaches. Members questioned the focus of the University of Sydney paper on detection and discipline. The Chair agreed that this should not be the focus of Macquarie’s approach to tackling these issues, although he acknowledged that a continual improvement in the use and effectiveness of detection mechanisms would always be an important “hygiene” factor. Members expanded upon the view that academic integrity was primarily an issue of good values and evidence based practice, in assessment and curriculum design for example, and that the most effective mechanisms we had to tackle it were educative. In particular, student communication skills and certain kinds of assessment practice were identified as key factors leading students into engaging in forms of un-ethical behaviour. The Chair reiterated the view that the University should adopt a holistic, institution-wide approach to academic integrity. This would ideally include a more carefully articulated and positive policy on academic integrity, systemic changes to assessment practices and curriculum design, better information at orientation with frequent reminders (on campus and online), targeted embedded support at all levels of every program, professional development for staff, academic integrity champions (students and staff) and use of new technologies for detection and education.

**Resolution 15/76**
Academic Senate resolved to note the report of the University of Sydney's Taskforce on Academic Misconduct.

Professor Mariella Herberstein departed the meeting at 11.27am

### 6.4 Student Disability Support Policy

**Resolution 15/77**
Academic Senate resolved to approve the Student Disability Support Policy.

### 7. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Members may submit Questions on Notice to the Chair two days in advance of the meeting.

*Nil received.*

### 8. GENERAL BUSINESS

#### 8.1 Revisions to the General Coursework Rules

The Chair spoke to the paper outlining proposed amendments to the General Coursework Rules.

**Resolution 15/78**
Academic Senate resolved to recommend to University Council the proposed amendments to the General Coursework Rules 2015 with effect from 26 October 2015.

#### 8.2 Revisions to the Academic Senate Rules

The Chair spoke to the paper outlining proposed amendments to the Academic Senate Rules.

**Resolution 15/79**
Academic Senate resolved to recommend to University Council the proposed amendments to the Academic Senate Rules 2015 with effect immediately.

#### 8.3 Issuing of Qualifications

**Resolution 15/80**
Academic Senate resolved that the scope of the Working Party drafting policy and related procedures on the issuing of qualifications be expanded to include recommendation to Academic Senate appropriate delegations for the approval of the development and delivery of non-AQF academic activities.

#### 8.4 Governance of Research and Research Training

Academic Senate considered the Draft Terms of Reference for the Research & Research Training Committee, and the Thesis Examination Subcommittee.

**Resolution 15/81**
Academic Senate noted the Draft Terms of Reference for Research & Research Training Committee and requested that the draft be circulated to all Faculties for feedback.

**Resolution 15/82**
Academic Senate noted the Draft Terms of Reference for Thesis Examination Subcommittee and requested that the draft be circulated to all Faculties for feedback.
8.5 University Council and Academic Senate dates for 2016

Members noted the 2016 University Council and Academic Senate meeting dates. Planning for the 2016 Committees of Senate meeting dates is being scoped to ensure greater alignment with Faculty Standards and Quality Committee and Faculty Board meeting dates.

**Resolution 15/83**

Academic Senate noted the 2016 University Council and Academic Senate meeting dates.

8.6 Vice-Chancellor Commendations - Undergraduate

**Resolution 15/84**

*Academic Senate endorsed that the Vice Chancellor’s Commendation be awarded to the 8 Bachelor degree graduands listed at item 8.6 of the 25 August 2015 Academic Senate Agenda.*

8.7 Vice-Chancellor Commendations - Postgraduate

**Resolution 15/85**

*Academic Senate endorsed that the Vice-Chancellor’s Commendation be awarded to the 32 Master Coursework graduands listed at item 8.7 of the 25 August 2015 Academic Senate Agenda.*

8.8 Transition Admission Scheme for SIBT Students

**Resolution 15/86**

*Academic Senate approved the proposed Transition Admission Scheme for SIBT Students.*

9. **REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

9.1 Academic Senate Standing Committee

The reports of the 14 July 2015 and 4 August 2015 meetings were noted.

9.2 Academic Standards and Quality Committee

The reports of the 19 May, 16 June and 21 July 2015 meetings were noted. A report on the Admission Transition Scheme for SIBT students resulting from the conclusion of the University’s contract with SIBT was considered at Agenda item 8.8 of these minutes.

9.3 Higher Degree Research Appeals Committee

The minutes of the 30 July 2015 meeting were noted.

9.4 Senate Learning and Teaching Committee

The reports the 15 June, 13 July and 10 August 2015 meetings were noted. The Student Disability Support Policy was considered at item 6.4 of these minutes.

10. **REPORTS FROM FACULTY BOARDS**

10.1 Faculty of Arts

The minutes of the 7 July 2015 meeting were noted.

10.2 Faculty of Business and Economics

The minutes of the 7 July 2015 meeting were noted.

10.3 Faculty of Human Sciences

The report of the 2 June 2015 meeting and the minutes of the 7 July 2015 meeting were noted.

10.4 Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences

The minutes of the 6 July 2015 meeting were noted.

10.5 Faculty of Science & Engineering

The minutes of the 7 July 2015 meeting were noted.
11. OTHER BUSINESS

12. CONSIDERATION OF CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

12.1 University Discipline Committee

The minutes of the University Discipline Committee meetings held on 3 June, 22 July and 5 August 2015 were tabled and noted.

13. NEXT MEETING

13.1 The next meeting of Academic Senate will be held on Tuesday 6 October 2015.

Agenda items are due by Tuesday 22 September 2015.

There being no further business the meeting was declared closed at 11.40am.
ITEM 4.1 ACADEMIC SENATE ITEMS REQUIRING ACTION

For information.
ITEM 4.1:  ACADEMIC SENATE ITEMS REQUIRING ACTION AS AT 6 OCTOBER 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14/02/13</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>The Executive Dean, Faculty of Business and Economics to communicate this resolution to the Timetable Project Team. <em>(Related Resolution 13/03 That lectures for First Year day units are prioritised within the timetable for scheduling between the hours of 9am to 5pm)</em> The Executive Dean advised that the Timetabling Team had indicated that for the 2014 they would definitely be prioritising the 100 level scheduling, but further clarification was required to determine precisely what was meant in some unusual circumstances. Otherwise the Timetabling Team were concerned that they might unnecessarily create some dynamics that weren’t intended, or conversely, not apply a principle that they should.</td>
<td>Clarification required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/13</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>That the University develops a policy regarding posthumous awards. Responsible Officer, Chair Academic Senate. <em>(Related Resolution 13/215)</em></td>
<td>To be commenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/13</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>That a copy of the Professional Authority Form (PAF) referred to in the Disruptions to Studies policy is circulated to the members of Academic Senate.</td>
<td>In progress. To be provided at 10 November Senate meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/04/14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>That Academic Senate establishes a working party to review its membership structure and report its findings and recommendations to a subsequent Academic Senate meeting.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 18/07/14       | 9.12        | The following action items were referred as a result of the issues raised by the Session 1 2014 Examination Reports from the Executive Deans:  
- Issues of lack of student engagement and attendance at lectures to be referred to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee.  
- Refer consideration of a consistent University approach to the late submission of assignments to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee.  
- Review of first session of the implementation of the new Disruption to Studies Policy to be referred to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee.  
- The managing of expectations for non ATAR entry English language requirements referred to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee.  
- The use of grade distributions in the University’s assessment practices to be referred for further clarification to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee.  
- Post Session 1 examination results analysis referred to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee for consideration. A report on its findings to be provided to Academic Senate and Faculties for action.  
- Senate Learning and Teaching Committee to consider examination reports and to identify possible policy responses to issues identified.  
- The Deputy Registrar to provide a statistical report on the application of the Withdrawal Without Academic Penalty rule and to provide an update on the progress of the process review. | In progress. Referred to SLTC (9 November) and ASQC  
Ratification of Result Working Group |
<p>| 7/10/14        | 4.2         | The Academic Senate to establish a Working Group to recommend criteria for the award of the University Medal and be provided criteria for members to consider before the end of 2014. | In progress. See Item 10.6 |
| 3/3/15         | 8           | The Chair of Academic Senate to discuss ongoing Warawara representation on Academic Senate with the Executive Dean of Faculty of Arts. Academic Senate discussed and noted the question on notice. The Chair confirmed that he would respond directly to the authors of the letter. | In progress |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/06/15</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>The Senate Learning and Teaching Committee to discuss and consider the recommendations of the Disruption to Studies Working Group and to provide a progress update to the 25 August 2015 meeting of Academic Senate.</td>
<td>In progress. Update to be provided at 10 November Senate meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>That Academic Senate refers relevant issues addressed within the ICAC report to QEC or ASQC.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/06/15</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>That Academic Senate establish a working party (including a student member) to develop a set of principles to govern the rescission of degrees in future cases and to work with the General Counsel to develop amendments to the relevant academic rules to clearly articulate University Council’s powers to rescind awarded degrees.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/06/15</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Comments on the Student Academic Code of Conduct to be forwarded to the General Counsel.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/06/15</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>That the Terms of Reference for SLTC, ASQC and QEC are amended in line with the suggestions of the Senate members and provided for further consideration and approval by Senate at a future meeting.</td>
<td>SLTC and ASQC finalised and approved 4 August 2015 Senate Standing Committee. In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/8/15</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Governance Services and Human Resources to consider and appropriate training package for members of Senate and its committees.</td>
<td>To be commenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/8/15</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>The draft Terms of Reference for the Research &amp; Research Training Committee and the Thesis Examination Subcommittee to be circulated to all Faculties for feedback.</td>
<td>Completed. See Item 10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM 5 REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

For noting.
Report from the Chair of Academic Senate
October 2015

Assessment Policy

In September the Assessment Policy working group attended an intensive, off-campus 'hack-a-thon' with the aim of producing a draft policy for consideration by the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee. Significant progress was made and I’m pleased to report that SLTC previewed the draft document last week. The Policy is intended to apply to all program offerings in which Macquarie certifies attainment of learning, including Higher Degree Research. The Policy is broadly underpinned by seven principles of assessment, which are listed below in no particular order. Importantly, all principles apply equally and must be read in concert:

- Assessment is standards-based
- Assessment must be fit for purpose, and must be efficient in its application
- Assessment will be program-based
- Students and teachers are responsible partners in learning and assessment
- Assessment is fair, transparent and equitable
- Assessment is aligned, valid and reliable
- Assessment promotes academic integrity

The draft Policy will return to Senate, as part of a university wide consultation process, over the coming weeks and months. The draft policy complements the Learning and Teaching Strategy and is the very core on which we will build our curriculum and teaching practice. This is certainly a policy that has a significant impact on students and staff alike, so I encourage everyone to engage with the issues identified during the consultation period. I look forward to seeking your views and feedback on this important policy review over the coming weeks.

Academic Progression Policy

The Academic Progression Working Group of SLTC has met to discuss the principles that will underpin the University’s Academic Progression Policy and govern the progress of students towards the successful completion of their award.

The purpose of this new Policy is to assist students in taking greater responsibility for their progression and to nurture students’ growth and development by:

- serving them with more timely and accurate information on how they are progressing at the macro level,
- establishing a contemporaneous measure of academic standing combined with provisions for graduated probation and intervention as that standing declines, and
- providing more opportunities, both academic and pastoral, to support progression.

Much of the available evidence suggests that a strong ‘sense of belonging’ supported by connections with peers, teachers and disciplines are key factors in student engagement and success. Crucial in this regard is the observation that this sense of belonging can be nurtured by taking deliberate, systematic actions to support progression.

The General Coursework Rules will be amended in accordance with the recommendations of the Academic Progression Working Group. The major changes to the General Coursework Rules are likely to be:

- The GPA based cut-off will no longer be used as a measurement of student progression through a program of study. Instead, a more graduated system of intervention will be introduced based upon whether a student has successfully completed more than 50% of their load in the previous session. Information about each student’s academic standing will be routinely generated and provided to students online. This change will ultimately result in a more comprehensive academic standing measure that incorporates more timely short and medium term performance information.

- The replacement of the unduly long time provisions with specific currency provisions for
certain programs, in particular those with accreditation requirements; and

- Substantial review of the rationale and purpose, and major amendments to, the unit level double fail rules.

The draft Policy and proposed intervention/support models for the progression rules will be discussed at the November Senate meeting.

**Academic Integrity Project**

In the lead-up to Dr Tracey Bretag’s return to campus on Thursday 19 and Friday 20 November, I was invited to brief the Student Advisory Board on the issue of academic integrity. Student involvement, engagement and support for this project are central to its success. The aim of this project is to develop a holistic approach to promoting and embedding academic integrity at Macquarie.

Ultimately, by the end of the 2-day workshop in November, we want to have developed:

1. A plain English Academic Integrity statement / policy / honour code / pledge for consultation with Academic Senate and the broader university community.
2. A "Framework for Action" for endorsement by Academic Senate and University Council. This Framework might include recommendations to:
   - Review the University’s mission statements, marketing and admission processes,
   - Develop an articulated and coherent Academic Integrity policy,
   - Review assessment practices and curriculum design,
   - Introduce information to students at orientation and frequent visual reminders on campus and online,
   - Embed and target support in to programs at every level,
   - Provide professional development for staff,
   - Implement a system of academic integrity champions (students and staff),
   - Ensure the use of new technology for detection and, more importantly, for education.

Students will be invited to participate in sessions and invitations will be sent to members of the Student Advisory Board, Academic Senate Student representatives, student mentors, and academic integrity student ambassadors. I will also be inviting members of Senate and a wide sweep of academic stakeholders to contribute and participate in the development of this initiative.

**Feedback on the Terms of Reference for the Research & Research Training Committee & Thesis Examination Subcommittee**

Thank you to those who provided thoughtful and considered feedback about the draft Terms of Reference for the proposed Research and Research Training Committee & Thesis Examination Subcommittee. All submissions were gratefully received and will be taken into account during the next round of re-drafting. A discussion paper, based on a summary of the feedback received, will be presented for consideration at the Senate meeting.

**University Medal and Academic Freedom Working Groups**

Thank you to those members of Senate who have agreed to be part of the University Medal and Academic Freedom Working Group. The Deputy Chair of Senate, Professor Jacqueline Phillips, is chairing both working groups. The terms of reference for the working groups have been included for noting in the Senate agenda. Please contact Ainslee Harvey (Ainslee.harvey@mq.edu.au) if you would like to be involved in these projects.
ITEM 8.1 DISCUSSION PAPER: GOVERNANCE OF RESEARCH AND RESEARCH TRAINING

Attached:
1. Discussion Paper
2. Senate Research and Research Training Committee – Terms of Reference
3. Thesis Examination Subcommittee – Terms of Reference
4. Academic Board Research Committees – Institutional Benchmarks

For discussion.
ITEM 8.1 DISCUSSION PAPER: GOVERNANCE OF RESEARCH AND RESEARCH TRAINING

Background

The Chair of Academic Senate called for written feedback in relation to the proposed academic governance structures for research and research training.

The following individuals/groups submitted feedback:
- Professor Patrick McNeil, Executive Dean, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences
- Professor Barbara Messerle, Executive Dean, Faculty of Science and Engineering
- Professor Mariella Herberstein, Elected Senate representative, Faculty of Science & Engineering
- Professor Peter Radan, Elected Senate representative, Faculty of Arts
- Professor Roger Chung, Associate Dean (Research & HDR) on behalf of the Faculty of Medicine & Health Sciences
- Associate Professor Judi Homewood on behalf of the Associate Deans (Research) and Associate Deans (HDR)
- Professor Linda Cupples, Elected Senate representative, Faculty of Human Sciences
- Dr Kerry-Ann O’Sullivan, Elected Senate representative, Faculty of Human Sciences
- Associate Professor Genevieve McArthur, Head of Department, Cognitive Science
- Dr Vito Mollica, Director of HDR, MGSM
- Emeritus Professor Richard Henry AM, Acting Executive Dean, on behalf of the Faculty of Human Sciences
- Professor Catriona McKenzie on behalf of the Associate Deans Research
- Professor Nick Mansfield, Dean of Higher Degree Research
- Selina Springett, Rachael Gunn, Cheryl Ware and Jane Franklin – HDR Students

Themes

There were several broad themes that recurred throughout the submissions:
- The practicality of combining the academic governance of research and research training
- Negotiating the boundary between research governance and research administration
- Concerns about the size and expertise of the committees
- Representation of early career researchers, women, research leaders, students and MGSM
- The purpose of the Thesis Examination Committee and views on Faculty based examination of HDR students

These are expanded upon below.

The practicality of combining research and research training

Whilst many acknowledged the strategic benefit of streamlining and combining the academic governance of research and research training, many others worried about the practical reality of doing so by way of introducing a single governance committee. There was concern, given the myriad of issues that would benefit from governance oversight, that the committee may not have the time to pursue both endeavours in an even handed manner.

Ultimately, the purpose of the Committees of Academic Senate is to provide it with expert advice on, and assist it in discharging, its responsibilities in a specialised area of academic governance. While Research and Research Training are clearly closely related activities they are, nevertheless, unique and distinct domains of endeavour. Questions remain as to whether a single committee can contain sufficiently wide and deep expertise in both of these areas.

On balance, feedback narrowly supported the establishment of two closely communicating committees to separately govern research and research training. It was, however, observed that it would be a challenge for
Academic Senate to establish truly effective mechanisms to facilitate co-ordination and integration of activities across two separated portfolios.

It should be noted that this is certainly not a question upon which there is any agreement between Australian Universities. Indeed it is fair to say that institutions oscillate between separation and combination, and that at this point there appears to be no particular common direction to that dynamic process.

Questions for consideration

1. Is it reasonable to expect the Research and Research Training Committee to pursue both endeavours to the satisfaction of the Academic Senate and broader University community?
2. Should more consideration be given to separate Research Training Committee and Research Committee and to the development of associated measures to ensure strong pipelines of communication and collaboration between them?

Negotiating the boundaries between governance and administration

Some respondents put the view that the proposed terms of reference for these committees conflated governance, strategy and management responsibilities.

For example, a number of submissions suggested that it might be inappropriate to refer to strategic matters in the terms of reference of an academic governance committee. Those individuals put the view that the framing of the strategy of the University was largely, if not exclusively, an executive or management function. Other respondents countered this view by observing that the draft terms of reference did not posit that the committee would be responsible for framing or approving strategic initiatives or for conducting strategic planning. They observed that reference to strategy only arises in the first term of reference, which describes the advisory responsibilities of the committee. Specifically this tasks it only with the responsibility to “advise Academic Senate and the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research) on: Strategic planning and quality enhancement in research initiatives and research training academic programs”.

It is worth noting that the consideration of strategic matters features as a responsibility in the terms of reference of the academic board subcommittees of all comparator institutions surveyed.

These advisory provisions derive from clause 10.1 of the Academic Senate Rules of University Council, which task it with:

**10. General functions of Academic Senate**

1) Advise the Council and the Vice-Chancellor on:
   a. academic matters and related activities of the University;
   b. measures to safeguard the academic freedom of the University;
   c. academic standards and quality, and on teaching effectiveness at the University; and
   d. academic priorities of the University.

Consequently, the terms of reference of all Academic Senate Committees contain an initial clause describing those responsibilities that are advisory only. In the case of the draft Research and Research Training ToRs these advisory responsibilities include the provision of advice on

- the activities of Faculties and Offices,
- strategic planning and quality assurance,
- external regulatory requirements,
- implementation of internal and external regulatory frameworks,
- indicators of performance, and
- allocation of resources,

only insofar as they relate to academic matters in research and research training. One might compare these provisions to corresponding clauses in the current terms of reference of Macquarie’s Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC).
The remaining terms of reference given in the draft are all derived from the specific authorities provided to Academic Senate under section 11 of the Academic Senate Rules of University Council, and reflected in the Delegations of Authority register:

11. Specific functions of Academic Senate

1) Approve policies on academic matters.
2) Approve the establishment, dis-establishment or changes to a degree, diploma, certificate or other award course, including programs of study, majors and award rules and academic requirements to be offered by the University or through a third party provider.
3) Request, consider and take action on reports from Faculties, the MGSM and organisational units engaged in supporting the academic activities of the University.

In particular, these terms speak to development, approval and oversight of the operation of policies governing academic matters, the academic conduct of HDR programs, the examination of HDR theses, and the identification of systemic academic risk in research and research training.

It should be acknowledged, however, that one of the key challenges in establishing robust protocols for the academic governance of research and research training will be that of negotiating clearer boundaries between academic matters and management concerns. In shared governance environments this dividing line cannot be simply drawn by the stroke of a pen, it will always require some negotiation and discussion on a case-by-case basis. Given Macquarie’s relative lack of experience in this area, it is likely to take some time, and a significant amount of expert input both internal and external, to establish clearer dividing lines and to openly articulate those set points.

Ultimately the terms of reference proposed here broadly parameterise the academic governance space, are closely aligned to those of long established Academic Senate committees such as SLTC, and allow for flexibility in the process of boundary negotiation. It will be the responsibility of this committee itself to undertake the detailed negotiations required to establish greater clarity in the collaboration between the academic and administrative faces of our research endeavour.

It is important to recognise that any committee we establish will, and should, evolve quickly as it refines its understanding of the governance space. As this happens, Academic Senate will be called upon to regularly review and refine its terms of reference accordingly.

Questions for consideration:

1. Does the draft terms of reference accurately reflect Academic Senate’s role and authority in regard to academic matters as described in the Academic Senate Rules?
2. Does the draft terms of reference provide enough detail to allow for the establishment of the new committee and for a subsequent process of boundary negotiation, review and refinement?

Size and expertise of the Committee

A commonly expressed concern was that, with a membership of around 25 members, the Committee would be too large to operate effectively. A related view was that the committee would not discharge its business unless it was largely populated by a small number of highly active individuals to execute its work. It is interesting to note that while many stakeholders made recommendations for smaller membership, many of those same individuals also suggested additional classes of membership or suggested membership conditions that would increase committee size.

We might compare the proposed committee size with those of some existing committees of the University:

- **Senate Learning and Teaching Committee** – 26 members, with largely the same mix of membership categories as proposed for the Senate Research and Research Training committee.
- **Academic Standards and Quality Committee** – 27 members, also following the committee structure laid out in the standing orders.
- **Research Strategy and Policy Committee** – 11 members plus arbitrary co-options with regular attendance of 20 plus, although the published terms of reference appear to be out of date (2009).
- **Higher Degree Research Committee** – 18 members, this committee of Senate doesn’t currently meet the membership structure outlined in the standing orders, in particular it has no membership drawn from Senate itself and is missing a second member from the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences.
- **Load Planning and Strategy Group** – 16 members but regular attendance of 25 plus, no published terms of reference.
This reveals a relatively small difference in effective size between the University's academic governance committees and some of those engaged in strategic management. Despite their size, all of these committees are key to the operation of the University and provide forums for active and effective decision-making. What is more, academic board research committees at most other institutions have memberships commonly of a size between 20 and 35 members.

That being said, it is generally the case that academic governance committees are characterised by larger memberships, open meetings, and publicly minuted proceedings. They also tend to execute much of the detail of their work between meetings, though the establishment of smaller and highly active specialist working parties to tackle specific issues. In order to achieve truly collegial decision making, a governance committee must ensure that the broad university community, in all of its diversity, is reasonably represented. The Standing Orders for Committees of Academic Senate establish a standard membership construction, designed to promote broad representation and a diversity of views both from those tasked with executive management of an activity and those on the front line with expertise in delivery.

The standing orders also largely federate the decisions about membership to the Faculties, providing for management nominations by each Executive Dean and for nominations from the broader college by Faculty Boards. While this mechanism provides for much prized local autonomy, some respondents warn that stronger safeguards should be put in place to ensure that all nominees, either of the Executive Deans or the Faculty Board, possess the expertise required of a specialist committee of Academic Senate. While it is to be hoped that these nominators would make well-informed judgements in regard to the expertise of their nominees, this is not explicitly required in the standing orders or the draft terms of reference.

Some held the view that Executive Deans should nominate themselves on the Research Committee, on the grounds that research quality is a core function of Faculties and a KPI of every Dean. Many argued that the Associate Deans Research and/or Associate Deans Higher Degree Research, who have day-to-day responsibility for and expertise in managing these areas of activity, should be specified as members of the Research and Research Training Committee and/or its Thesis Examination Subcommittee. If not, they suggest that it would be difficult to smoothly connect with the Research Management Committee and with portfolios that combine strategy, management and governance in each faculty.

We should also recognise that research and research training expertise is not the sole preserve of those tasked with managing this activity. As with Academic Senate itself, it is important that all of our academic governance committees should maintain a balance between executive management and broader expert and collegial representation.

Questions for consideration:

1. Is the size of the membership of the proposed committee appropriate? If not how might it be decreased (or indeed increased) without compromising its construction as a broadly representative body?
2. Should the membership specification of the terms of reference place greater eligibility restrictions on Faculty nominees than currently envisaged in the current draft or the standing orders?
3. Should the Standing Orders for Committees of Academic Senate be modified to specify that Associate Deans be members of the Senate committee in their areas of responsibility?

**Representation of early career researchers, women, research leaders, student representatives and the MGSM**

Some respondents suggested that additional categories of membership be considered.

In particular, a number of submissions stressed the importance of membership categories devoted to early career researchers and women. These groups face particular gender and career stage challenges that should be taken into account when framing academic policy, especially when it comes to factors such as research performance.

Many respondents expressed strong support for the inclusion of the requirement that Faculty Board nominees should be recognised research leaders.

HDR students expressed the view that a committee responsible for the governance of research training required a stronger student voice. They recommended that 2 postgraduate research students be appointed. Furthermore, they strongly expressed the view that space should be allocated on the agenda of this committee for student led business.
The Macquarie Graduate School of Management (MGSM) also argued for membership on the Committee suggesting that the School was eager to be involved in all academic governance activities of the University.

Questions for consideration:

1. Should Academic Senate reserve membership places for the groups identified in the feedback? If so what how would that be achieved without further expanding the size of the committee?

Faculty based examination of HDR

A few respondents suggested that there would be no need for a Thesis Examination Subcommittee if Faculty Boards were given the authority to carry out HDR examination.

As part of this model, the committee responsible for the academic governance of research training would continue to set policies to govern HDR examination and to oversee the operation of the examination process. It would also be responsible for establishing protocols to ensure consistency between Faculties and to provide appropriate quality assurance oversight.

These proposals, however, involve substantial and systemic changes in practice, whose scope goes well beyond that of the introduction or revision of a committee of Academic Senate. Academic Senate may, however, form the view that these ideas should be put to its new expert committee (or committees) in 2016.

Attachments:

1. Draft Terms of Reference, Senate Research and Research Training Committee
2. Draft Terms of Reference, Thesis Examination Sub-Committee
3. Academic Board Research Committees – Institutional Benchmarks

The draft terms of reference provided with this document incorporate some of the more minor or routine amendments suggested by the respondents listed above.

Submitted by: Professor Dominic Verity, Chair Academic Senate

For enquiries contact: Ainslee Harvey, Academic Senate Project Officer, ainslee.harvey@mq.edu.au or ext. 6346.
Senate Research and Research Training Committee
Terms of Reference

The Senate Research and Research Training Committee (the Committee) was established by the Academic Senate of Macquarie University (the University) in XX 2015 under Rule 9(4)(c) of the Academic Senate Rules 2015, and is directly responsible and accountable to Academic Senate for the exercise of its responsibilities.

This Terms of Reference sets out the objective, role and responsibilities, membership, tenure, authorisations and rules of operation of the Committee.

1. Objectives

The Senate Research and Research Training Committee (the Committee) is responsible for advising Academic Senate on academic research and research training matters. Furthermore, the Committee works to promote a culture of sustained excellence, engagement and impact in the University's research activities and research training programs.

The Committee is responsible for the discussion of, and providing advice upon, the research and research training strategies of the University, and for consulting broadly within the University community on these matters.

The Committee also contributes to the identification and response to emerging research challenges (both internal and external) and to encouraging the adoption of best practice in research across the University.

2. Role and responsibilities

The Committee is to:

(1) Advise Academic Senate and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) on:

(a) The activities of Faculties and Offices established within the University that support the University's research activities and research training programs;

(b) Strategic planning and quality enhancement in research initiatives and research training academic programs, such as those that support the implementation of the Strategic Research Framework and achievement of the 2024 research targets;

(c) External regulatory requirements, such as the Higher Education Standards Framework, and on their alignment with the University’s policies and procedures in respect of research activities and research training programs;

(d) Implementation of the Macquarie University Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research, ethics policies and other legislative frameworks both internal and external;
(e) The evolving risk profile of the University’s research and research training programs and on measures to effectively manage those risks;

(f) National and international trends on the development of performance indicators for research; and

(g) The appropriate use of funds allocated to research and research infrastructure.

(2) Regularly review the University’s policies and procedures governing academic matters in research, research training and intellectual property and recommend any necessary amendments to Academic Senate for approval;

(3) Identify the need for the development of new policies, procedures and frameworks that govern academic matters in research and research training, oversee their development, and recommend their introduction to Academic Senate for approval;

(4) Provide advice and make recommendations to Academic Senate on the implementation and effectiveness of academic aspects of research and research training policy;

(5) Oversee the requirements for higher degrees by research admission, supervision, academic progress and assessment;

(6) Advise upon the establishment, review, revision or termination of higher degree research programs, including program and award rules and academic requirements, and make recommendations to Academic Senate for approval;

(7) Advise upon the establishment of joint and cotutelle research training degree programs and make recommendations to Academic Senate for approval;

(8) Receive, consider, and decide upon matters referred to it by its Thesis Examination Subcommittee;

(9) Contribute to the development and maintenance of those aspects of the University’s academic risk register that relate to academic research and research training programs;

(10) Require the Faculties and Offices of the University to report on their activities as they relate to the role and responsibilities of the Committee.

(11) Consider and report on any matters referred to it by Academic Senate, from time to time, as required.

3. Membership

In accordance with Clause 22 of the Standing Orders for Committees of Academic Senate, the Committee shall have a membership, which comprises:

(a) The Chair of the Committee

1 under Academic Senate rule 11(1)
2 under Academic Senate rule 11(2)
Professor Sakkie Pretorius - Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research)

(b) The Deputy Chair of the Committee
   o To be confirmed (to be drawn from the membership of the Committee)

(c) The Chair or Deputy Chair of Academic Senate
   o Professor Dominic Verity

(d) Up to five (5) ex-officio members
   o Pro Vice-Chancellor Research (Integrity & Development) – Professor Lesley Hughes
   o Pro Vice-Chancellor Research (Performance & Innovation) – Professor Peter Nelson
   o Dean of Higher Degree Research – Professor Nick Mansfield

(e) One (1) member nominated by the Executive Dean of each Faculty
   o To be confirmed – Faculty of Arts
   o To be confirmed – Faculty of Business & Economics
   o To be confirmed – Faculty of Human Sciences
   o To be confirmed – Faculty of Medicine & Health Sciences
   o To be confirmed – Faculty of Science & Engineering

(f) One (1) member nominated by the Faculty Board of each Faculty who are high profile, well known researchers.
   o To be confirmed – Faculty of Arts
   o To be confirmed – Faculty of Business & Economics
   o To be confirmed – Faculty of Human Sciences
   o To be confirmed – Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences
   o To be confirmed – Faculty of Science and Engineering

(g) Up to three (3) members of Academic Senate
   o To be confirmed

(h) Up to four (4) members in a specialist capacity
   o Director of the Research Office – Louise Fleck
   o Director of the Higher Degree Research Office – Dr Ren Yi

(i) At least one (1) student member
   o Cheryl Ware – Postgraduate Research student representative on Academic Senate

(j) Up to three (3) co-opted members as required

4. Tenure

(1) The term of appointment of all appointed members, excluding student representative and co-opted members, shall be two (2) years.

(2) The term of appointment of all appointed student representative and co-opted members shall be one (1) year.

(3) The Chair of Academic Senate may renew any such term of appointment.
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5. Authorisations

The Academic Senate shall, from time to time, resolve to grant the Committee specific authorisations to discharge its delegated responsibilities. The Committee may request the granting of such authorisations as it sees fit. All such authorisations shall be documented here.

(1) Approve the academic policies, procedures and guidelines that apply to internal research funding schemes;

(2) Approve the award of HDR degrees on the advice provided by its Thesis Examination Subcommittee;

(3) Approve the award of Vice-Chancellor Commendation for HDR theses on the advice provided by its Thesis Examination Subcommittee.

6. Rules of operation

The Committee shall conduct its business subject to the Standing Orders for Committees of Academic Senate.
Thesis Examination Subcommittee
Terms of Reference

The Thesis Examination Subcommittee was established by the Academic Senate of Macquarie University (the University) in June 2015 under Rule 9(4)(c) of the Academic Senate Rules 2015, and is directly responsible and accountable to the Research and Research Training Committee for the exercise of its responsibilities.

This Terms of Reference sets out the objective, role and responsibilities, membership, tenure, and rules of operation of the Committee.

1. Objective

The Thesis Examination Subcommittee is responsible for the review of examiners’ reports, coordination of recommendations emerging from the examination process, assessment of higher degrees by research (HDR) theses, and ensuring best practice in the thesis examination processes. The Subcommittee makes decisions in accordance with policies of Academic Senate relating to the HDR examination processes.

2. Role and responsibilities

The Committee is to:

(1) Advise the Research and Research Training Committee on:
   (a) Policies and procedures governing HDR examination;
   (b) Statistics relating to the examination of PhD theses.

(2) Oversee the implementation of processes and policies governing the University’s HDR thesis examination;

(3) Approve the appointment of HDR thesis examiners;

(4) Consider reports from examiners of HDR theses and make recommendations on the award of HDR degrees to the Research and Research Training Committee for approval;

(5) Make recommendations on the award of the Vice-Chancellor’s Commendation for HDR theses to the Research and Research Training Committee for approval; and

(6) Receiving advice upon the thesis examination progress of all candidates and taking appropriate action where unreasonable delays are encountered.

3. Membership

The composition of this subcommittee shall be as follows:

(1) The Chair appointed by Chair of Academic Senate,
(2) Dean of Higher Degree Research,
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(3) A nominee of the Faculty Board of each Faculty,  
(4) One elected member of Academic Senate, and  
(5) Two academic staff members nominated by the Research and Research Training Committee.

All nominees to these positions must have demonstrated and substantial experience in HDR supervision and / or administration.

4. Tenure

(1) The term of appointment of all appointed members shall be two (2) years.  
(2) The Chair of Academic Senate may renew any such term of appointment.

5. Rules of operation

The Committee shall conduct its business subject to the general provisions of the Standing Orders for Committees of Academic Senate.
**Academic Board Research Committees – Institutional Benchmarks**

**University of New South Wales**

**Higher Degree Research Committee**

*Roles and responsibilities*

The Committee is responsible for the following matters:

(a) considering strategy as it relates to higher degree research;

(b) advising the Academic Board on higher degree administration and programs

(c) considering and recommending to the Academic Board for approval, the establishment, review, revision or termination of a higher degree research programs, including program and award rules and academic requirements;

(d) recommending policy relating to the following matters to the Academic Board for its consideration and endorsement.

(i) the functions conferred on Academic Board under the by-law and Rules;

(ii) all policy relating to higher degree research matters under the Higher Degree Research Policy Framework.

*Compositions and Structure*

The Committee will comprise up to 21 members:

(a) Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) or his/her nominee;

(b) Pro-Vice Chancellor (Research Training);

(c) 1 nominated member of each Faculty (this may be the Associate Dean (Research Training);

(d) up to 4 members of the Academic Board, one of whom is to be the President, one of whom is to be one of the Deputy Presidents and 2 to be elected members of the Academic Board who are nominated by the Academic Board;

(e) 2 postgraduate research students (one who is a member of the Academic Board and 1 nominated by the Academic Board)

(f) up to 4 such other persons nominated by the Chair

**Research Committee**

*Roles and responsibilities*

The Committee is responsible for the following matters:

(a) considering strategy relevant to research matters;

(b) considering matters relevant to research quality;

(c) considering matters relevant to research operations;

(d) recommending policy relating to the following matters to the Academic Board for its consideration and endorsement.

   (i) the functions conferred on Academic Board under the by-law and Rules;
(ii) Research Code of Conduct and other related research policy under the Research Policy Framework.

Composition and Structure

The Committee will comprise up to 22 members:

(a) Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) or his/her nominee;

(b) Pro-Vice Chancellor (Research);

(c) Pro-Vice Chancellor (Research Training);

(d) 1 nominated member of each Faculty (this may be the Associate Dean (Research));

(e) up to 3 members of the Academic Board, one of whom is to be the President, one of whom is to be one of the Deputy Presidents and 1 to be an elected member of the Academic Board who are nominated by the Academic Board;

(f) 2 postgraduate research students (one who is a member of the Academic Board and 1 nominated by the Academic Board);

(g) up to 5 such other persons nominated by the Chair
University of Technology, Sydney

Research and Research Training Committee

Roles and responsibilities

- To make recommendations to Academic Board on future strategic planning and policy directions for research, research training and intellectual property as it relates to the University's research activities
- To provide advice to Academic Board on the development of the University's research culture, communication and research profile
- To review regularly the University's research, research training and intellectual property policies (as they relate to the University's research activities) and recommend any necessary amendments to Academic Board
- To monitor the operation of the University's research strengths governance instruments and provide recommendations on research strengths, performance and direction, and
- To approve the guidelines, including the selection process, for key University internal research funding schemes.

Composition

- Chair (elected by and from Academic Board)
- Deputy Chair (nominated from Committee membership)
- Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Vice-President (Research) or nominee
- Dean, Graduate Research School or nominee
- Director, Institute of Sustainable Futures or nominee
- Director, Research and Innovation Office or nominee
- University Librarian, or nominee
- One nominee from each Faculty (normally Associate Dean (Research)) nominated by the Dean of the Faculty
- Three Directors of UTS Research Strengths (as set out in the Research Strengths Statement), not necessarily members of Academic Board, nominated by the Deans of the University Faculties
- Two early career researchers (whose PhD or equivalent doctorate has been awarded within the past five years), not necessarily members of Academic Board, elected by the members of Academic Board
- Two research degree students, elected by and from research degree students of the University
- Co-opted members on the basis of their skills and experience as appropriate
Deakin University

Research and Research Training Committee

Purpose

The Research and Research Training Committee is responsible to the Academic Board for assuring the quality and integrity of research and research training as well as advice and recommendations on strategic initiatives related to research and research training.

Functions

1. To propose, monitor, review, and advise on academic standards relevant to the quality of research and research training.
2. To oversee and monitor the requirements for higher degrees by research (HDR) admission, supervision, academic progress and assessment.
3. To provide advice to the Academic Board regarding policy and procedures to ensure academic quality of research and research training.
4. To receive, consider and respond to annual quality assurance reviews from faculties and academic units in relation to research and research training.
5. Through its Thesis Examination Subcommittee, to receive, consider, and decide upon matters pertaining to examination of HDR theses.

Composition

- Two members of the Academic Board, appointed by the Chair of Academic Board, one shall be chair and one shall be deputy chair
- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) or nominee
- Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research Development and Training)
- Dean of Research Training
- University Librarian (or nominee)
- Associate Dean (Research) of each Faculty
- One higher degrees by research coordinator or appropriate nominee nominated by the Geelong Technology Precinct
- A representative from the Institute of Koorie Education
- Director, Quality and Standards
- Chair, Thesis Examination Subcommittee (or nominee)
- One Faculty General Manager, appointed by the Chair of Academic Board
- One higher degrees by research student of the University, appointed by the Chair of Academic Board
- One higher degrees by research coordinator, appointed by the Chair of the Academic Board
- Co-opted members (the committee may co-opt up to three additional members at any given time for a period of up to one year. The co-option may be renewed on an annual basis)
- Standing Invitation (with Right of Audience and Debate)
  - Manager, Research Integrity
  - Executive Officer, Higher Degrees by Research - Deakin Research
University of Queensland

Research Committee

The Research Committee, a Committee of the Academic Board, promotes and supports the research and research training goals in the University’s Strategic Plan. It is a key mechanism for developing the strategy and systems to ensure sustained excellence in research, research training and knowledge transfer. The powers, duties and functions of the Research Committee shall be: to formulate recommendations and policy for the strategic development of research and research training, in conjunction with other relevant committees of the University; to monitor operational goals within the context of the University’s Strategic Plan; to monitor and enhance the quality of the University’s research performance and research environment; to advise the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) on: national and international trends on the development of performance indicators for research; the appropriate use of funds allocated to research and research infrastructure; proposals for change in policy; and any other research-related matters that may from time to time be referred to it.

The powers, duties and functions of the Research Committee shall be—

- to formulate recommendations and policy for the strategic development of research and research training, in conjunction with other relevant committees of the University;
- to monitor operational goals within the context of the University’s Strategic Plan;
- to monitor and enhance the quality of the University’s research performance and research environment;
- to advise the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) on:
  - national and international trends on the development of performance indicators for research;
  - the appropriate use of funds allocated to research and research infrastructure;
  - proposals for change in policy; and
  - any other research-related matters that may from time to time be referred to it.
- to provide a forum for high-level discussion of strategic research issues and initiatives (internal, national and international);
- to monitor trends in State and Federal government policies, and evaluate their impact on the research and research-training environment; and
- to transmit to the Academic Board a report consisting of the minutes of its meetings that involve recommendations.

Composition

Ex-Officio
- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) (Chair)
- Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and International)
- University Librarian
- Chairperson, Research Higher Degrees Committee
- Director, Research Partnerships
- Director, Research Analysis and Operations

Appointed
- a representative of each Faculty, appointed annually by the Academic Board
- a representative from each of the University’s Institutes, appointed annually by the Academic Board

Nominated
- President of the Academic Board or nominee
- a representative of the UniQuest senior management, nominated by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research)
- a representative of early career academic staff, nominated by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research)
- a representative of postgraduate research students nominated by the UQ
Research Higher Degrees Committee

The Research Higher Degrees Committee is responsible for the provision of advice to the Provost and the Dean of the Graduate School on policies and practices for research higher degree programs (PhD and MPhil) and higher doctorates. The Committee consults other senior officers of the University as required.

Specifically, the role of the Committee is:

1. to advise the Provost and the Board on research higher degree studies;
2. to formulate recommendations on policy for the strategic development of research higher degree studies in the context of the University’s strategic plan;
3. to promote and foster research higher degree study;
4. to advise the Academic Board on proposals for changes in policy and rules governing research higher degree programs, including equity issues;
5. to advise the Academic Board on proposals for changes in policy and rules governing research higher degree programs, including equity issues;
6. to recommend to the Academic Board policies and procedures for awarding research higher degree scholarships; and
7. to advise the Academic Board on matters relating to admission, monitoring and support of international research higher degree students.

Composition

Ex-Officio
- Dean, UQ Graduate School (Chair)
- Provost or nominee
- Deputy Dean, UQ Graduate School
- Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and International)
- President, Academic Board or nominee
- University Librarian and Director of Learning Services or nominee

Other
- One representative from each faculty, appointed annually by the Executive Dean
- One representative from each institute that directly enrols research higher degree students, appointed annually by the Director of the Institute.
- One representative of research higher degree students, appointed by the UQ Association of Postgraduate Students
Western Sydney University

Research Committee

The Research Committee:

2.1 is the principal advisory Committee to Academic Senate for research and research training;

2.2 provides strategic advice to Academic Senate on research, research training and research related matters to ensure high academic and ethical standards and support the strategic direction of the University;

2.3 provides strategic advice to the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research and Development) on the implementation of the University Research Plan to enable strategies that support innovative, flexible and inclusive research practice;

2.4 reviews proposed amendments to policies and procedures that relate to research training to ensure compliance with the Higher Education Standards;

2.5 reviews proposed amendments to policies and procedures that relate to research at UWS;

2.6 exercises the responsibilities located in relevant policies and procedures of the University in relation to research and research training related matters; and

2.7 promotes the development of productive collaborative research within the University between UWS Research Institutes and Schools, and external entities.

Function

The Research Committee will:

2.8 Provide advice, and make recommendations, to Academic Senate regarding the development, implementation and effectiveness of research policy and practice in the University. This will include:

a. identifying, encouraging and promoting good practice with regard to the responsible and ethical conduct of research;

b. reviewing and providing advice on the University’s Research Plan, having regards to the University’s mission, goals and priorities;

c. reviewing UWS Research Institutes and Schools research plans and monitoring performance and progress against these plans;

d. developing and monitoring the University’s research policy framework and research performance reports; and

e. providing advice to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Development) regarding the University’s research block grant budget and submissions.

2.9 Provide advice to Academic Senate and Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research and Development) on strategic policy, planning, quality assurance and performance in relation to research training and higher degree research programs. This will include advice on:

a. the pathways that contribute to student access including credit and articulation, participation, retention, and success;

b. the admission and selection policies and procedures for research training and higher degree research programs;

c. the quality and structure of research training and higher degree research programs;
d. the methods of assessing the quality of all research training activities, including those of third party providers;

e. the proposals relating to the establishment, revision, discontinuation and disestablishment of postgraduate research programs; and

f. any other academic policy and quality assurance matters.

Research Studies Sub-Committee

The Research Studies Committee is the principal advisory committee to the Research Committee and Academic Senate on operational matters relating to research training;

The Committee:

(a) provides advice to the Research Committee about policy, planning and quality assurance in relation to research training;

(b) provides advice to the Research Committee and the Academic Planning and Courses Approvals Committee (APCAC) about existing, new or revised research training and higher degree programs; and

(c) monitors the candidature of students in research training programs and higher degree research, and exercises relevant academic delegations.

The Research Studies Committee will:

3.1 assist with, and give advice on, the development of proposals for new and amended research training and higher degree courses;

3.2 exercise relevant academic delegations, provide advice and make recommendations to the Research Committee about research undertaken by students in research training programs or higher degree research. This will include:

a. monitoring student admission and progression, including compliance with relevant Commonwealth legislation and regulations;

b. monitoring variations of candidature;

c. monitoring supervisory panels;

d. managing examination processes, including considering and determining the outcomes from examiners’ reports;

e. considering and determining Show Cause and Termination of Candidature cases; and

f. approving the conferring of degrees for higher degree research programs.

3.3 convene a Scholarship Ranking Panel to determine the ranking of applicants for Higher Degrees by Research, for recommendation to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Development);

3.4 provide advice to the Research Committee on supervisor research training programs;

3.5 assist with the management and codification of supervision requirements
University of Wollongong

University Research Committee

The University Research Committee (URC) oversees research and research training at the University of Wollongong via strategic policy and management decisions taken within the URC and through the activities of its sub-committees and ensuring appropriate interaction on research issues, as well as the dissemination of information and advice to the Academic Senate.

The University Research Committee (URC) shall:

- Support the UOW strategic plan, as we aim for a position in the top 1% of world universities, by building an outstanding research community that values emerging researchers and supports research-active staff to achieve the highest quality results and disseminate their benefits to user communities.

- Develop, monitor and review policies relating to the University's research activities, including research and research training, internationalisation and international reputation, and their management.

- Guide, monitor, review and endorse the activities of its sub-committees and working parties (i.e., the Thesis Examination Committee, the University Ethics Policy Committee, Research IT and Systems Committee and Faculty Research Committees).

- Guide the development of the University’s strategic research priorities and objectives and monitor research performance within the framework of the University’s Strategic Planning process.

- Review, on a triennial basis, submissions for formation and/or continuation of University Research Strengths and advise on funding allocations to, and the status of, all URC-funded research groups.

- Review and monitor the University’s Global Challenges Program and other mechanisms that encourage interdisciplinary research within the University.

- Provide leadership and advice on mechanisms to improve monitoring, benchmarking and reporting of the University’s research performance.

- Facilitate the effective exchange and dissemination of information concerning research and research training issues to the broader research community through a variety of mechanisms, including emails, web based information, events and workshops.

- Inform and advise the Academic Senate on research and research training matters as they arise.

Composition

- The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) (Chair)
- The Dean of Research (Deputy Chair)
- The Chair, Academic Senate (or delegate)
- The Associate Deans (Research) of each Faculty
- The Executive Directors of AIIM, Early Start, IHMRI and SMART (or delegate)
- The Global Challenges Program Director (or delegate)
- Four Research Strength Directors invited by the DVC(R)
- Up to two additional members invited by the DVC(R)
University of Newcastle

Research Committee

Functions

The Research Committee will:

Advise Academic Senate on strategic policy, planning, quality assurance and performance in relation to research, research training and research development. This will include advice on:

a. pathways that contribute to student access including credit and articulation; participation, retention; and success;

b. the admission and selection policies and procedures for research higher degree programs;

c. program quality and structure to ensure nationally and globally competitive graduates who meet the learning outcomes and priorities of the University;

d. methods of assessing the quality of all research training activities, including those of third party providers

e. innovative approaches to ensure the continuing research leadership and excellence of the University;

f. work and research integrated learning opportunities;

g. academic and research and ethics integrity; and

h. the sustainability of high quality research training;

2.2.2 ensure regular monitoring and reporting to Academic Senate on the implementation and effectiveness of research policies, procedures and practices, using reviews and other methods of evaluation;

2.2.3 develop, monitor and review the University’s:

a. research policy framework; and

b. research performance reports. 2.2.4 advise the Program and Course Approval Committee on proposals relating to the establishment, revision, discontinuation and disestablishment of postgraduate research programs; and

2.2.5 provide advice on any other academic policy and quality matters.

Research Training Sub-Committee

The purpose of the Research Training Sub-Committee is to:

(a) advise the Research Committee and the Dean of Graduate Studies, on strategic policy, planning and quality assurance in relation to research training matters; and

(b) advise the Research Committee on existing, new or revised research higher degree programs as required.

The functions of the Research Training Sub-Committee are to:

(a) Exercise the responsibilities and authorities vested in this Committee and its Chair by Council, Academic Senate and relevant University policies;

(b) Advise the Research Committee on the development and endorsement of University research training policies, procedures and practices;

(c) Provide advice on research training matters as requested by the Research Committee, Dean of Graduate Studies or the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research)
ITEM 8.2  INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF MASTER OF RESEARCH PROGRAM

For approval.

Recommended Resolution:
That Academic Senate approve the Quality Enhancement Committee to conduct an independent, external review of the Master of Research program.
ITEM 8.2  INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF THE MASTER OF RESEARCH PROGRAM

Issue

In May 2015 the Higher Degree Research Appeals Committee (HDRAC) upheld two appeals on procedural grounds relating to the 2014 Master of Research examination process.

The Academic Senate Standing Committee (the Committee) met on the 21st September 2015 to determine how to respond to the issues arising from the appeals being upheld. At this meeting, the Committee considered proposals for action submitted by Higher Degree Research Committee, the Chair of Academic Senate in consultation with the Pro-Vice Chancellor Research (Integrity and Development), and the Dean of Higher Degree Research.

One of the proposals was to sponsor a far-reaching external review of the Master of Research Program. As next year marks the 3-year anniversary of the Master of Research Program, it seems an appropriate time to openly interrogate both its great successes and some of its key weaknesses.

It is important to recognise that the introduction Master of Research Program has not been without tension and that it may still be seen as a program that is not owned broadly in Departments and Faculties.

That being said, our academic community is also largely convinced that a well designed 2-year research preparation Masters is both a good thing and a substantial improvement over Honours.

To address any residual concern arising from this history, and to secure the sustainability of this strategically key initiative, it is recommended that the Academic Senate Quality Enhancement Committee sponsor an independent review of the Master of Research program. In light of the questions raised by these appeals cases this should, at the very least, consider:

- the appropriateness of assigning marks to outcomes in this kind of program,
- the way in which external examiners are briefed to engage in our examination process
- the way in which outcomes are agreed and moderated
- the policies and oversight governing the program, and
- the balance and devolved authority in the conduct of the program overall.

The Vice-Chancellor is supportive of the independent review and has expressed a desire to be involved in the drafting of the terms of reference and selection of the review panel, including its Chair.

In the meantime, the Academic Senate Standing Committee has asked the Higher Degree Research Committee to review the protocols it has established for the examination of MRes thesis in 2015 to ensure that they address the procedural unfairness identified in the HDRAC appeal reports. The specific nature of the request from the Chair of the Academic Senate Standing Committee has been provided as Attachment 1.

The Higher Degree Research Committee will provide a full report for consideration, and approval of any resulting process amendments, to the Academic Senate Standing Committee meeting to be held on 19th October 2015.

Consultation Process

The following offices have been consulted prior to the submission of this paper:

- Vice-Chancellor
- Vice-Chancellor’s Office Chief of Staff
- Academic Senate Standing Committee

Recommendation:

That Academic Senate approve the proposal for the Quality Enhancement Committee to conduct an independent, external review of the Master of Research program.
Operational Impact:
- Higher Degree Research Office
- Governance Services
- Dean of HDR
- Associate Deans HDR
- Faculty MRes Directors
- Academic Departments

Submitted by: Professor Dominic Verity, Chair of Academic Senate, dominic.verity@mq.edu.au

For enquiries contact: Ainslee Harvey, Academic Senate Project Officer, ainslee.harvey@mq.edu.au

Issue:

On the 19th May 2015, the Higher Degree Research Appeals Committee (HDRAC) met to consider appeals against the MRes examinations outcomes of students 40973484 and 42497981. The specific matter in question was the procedural fairness of the mechanism used to determine overall final numerical grades in cases where examiners had recommended grades which were at variance of more than 10%.

At that meeting the HDRAC came to the following conclusions:

- The Committee agreed that the appeal of Candidate 40973484 is to be upheld on the grounds that the averaging of the three examiners’ marks without due consideration of the substance of their reports was procedurally unfair, and the processes applied were neither as clear nor as transparent as they could have been, in the opinion of the committee.

- The Committee also agreed that the appeal of Candidate 42497981 is to be upheld for claims 1 and 2 only: specifically, administrative irregularities and miscommunications resulted in distress and anxiety for the student, while the averaging of the three examiners’ marks without due consideration of the substance of their reports was procedurally unfair. In relation to both claims, the processes applied were neither as clear nor as transparent as they could have been, in the opinion of the committee. It was recommended that an official apology be issued to the Candidate from the University, in recognition of the distress and anxiety suffered in relation to claim 1.

The HDRAC report observed that:

- The Committee noted that a simple process of averaging marks to resolve discrepancies could be undertaken by administrative staff without the need for any academic input. However, candidates and their supervisors would reasonably expect an examination process that involves the application of considered, well-informed academic judgment when resolving marking discrepancies and determining a student’s final grade. There would also be an expectation that the process would be ‘clear and transparent’ as specified in the (draft) HES document on Graduate Research, Good Practice Principles.

Given the sensitivity of these decisions, they were reported to the Vice-Chancellor by the Chair of Academic Senate at their regular meeting of the 5th of June 2015. Appeals reports were provided to the Vice-Chancellor, at his request, on the 16th of June 2015 and they were considered, and read into the Academic Senate record, at the 4th of August 2015 meeting of the Academic Senate Standing Committee.

Various subsequent discussions have taken place between the Vice-Chancellor, the Chair of Academic Senate, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research), the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research Integrity and Development), the Dean of Higher Degree Research and the Director of the Higher Degree Research Office. The PESC and HDRC committees have also considered these matters, and a recommendation for how to act in regard to the 2 cases upheld by the HDRAC was submitted by HDRC to Academic Senate for its consideration.

The Academic Senate Standing Committee (ASSC) met on the 21st September 2015, and considered proposals for action submitted by HDRC and by the Chair of Academic Senate in consultation with the PVC Research Integrity and Development and the Dean of HDR. It resolved as follows in regard to the 2 cases upheld by the HDRAC:

- The Committee (ASSC) resolved that for the 2 MRes appeals currently upheld, the owning Faculty Board should appoint a panel of two internal experts for each student, drawn from a closely related discipline but not from within the student’s own Department. That panel would be asked to consider the original examiners’ reports and the students’ work, provide a brief moderation report and propose a final mark. These reports should be endorsed by the Head of Department, approved by the Faculty Board and submitted to HDRC, as the body delegated to ratify HDR grade outcomes, for discussion and grade ratification.
The ASSC also passed the following resolution in regard to the conduct of the MRes examination process for 2015:

The Committee (ASSC) resolved to request HDRC to provide a report demonstrating how its MRes examinations provisions for 2015 address the findings of the HDRAC, as detailed in its report of cases 40973484 and 42497981.

Action:

That the HDRC review the protocols it has established for the examination of MRes thesis in 2015 to ensure that they address the procedural unfairness identified in the HDRAC appeal reports of cases 40973484 and 42497981. This review should also examine the extent to which these examination protocols meet the examination standards established by the Australian Council of Graduate Research in its “Australian Graduate Research, Good Practice Principles” document:

http://media.wix.com/ugd/f39714_e846281b7f0d405284613846b486377.pdf

In particular, this review should examine:

1. The process used to moderate the reports and marks recommended by examiners and to determine a final mark. In particular, it should demonstrate how the 2015 process would ensure that well-informed and independent academic judgement, of appropriate discipline expert(s), is applied to resolving disputes between examiner reports.
2. Whether the examination process adequately addresses standards 6.2, 6.5 and 6.6 of the “Australian Graduate Research, Good Practice Principles” these being:
   - 6.2 The University has clear and transparent procedures for the nomination and appointment of examiners, the identification of inappropriate examiners, a timely examination process, the evaluation of examiners’ reports, and mechanisms for appeal.
   - 6.5 Examiners provide written recommendations to the University on whether or not the thesis meets the award criteria.
   - 6.6 The University’s processes for the (sic) determining the outcome of the examination process are available to candidates, supervisors, examiners, and others, and include the opportunity for written communication between the candidate and committees involved with determining the examination outcome.

The ASSC also asks HDRC to address the following specific recommendations and to provide guidance on the extent to which they can be implemented for the 2015 MRes thesis examination round:

1) All references to the averaging of marks should be elided from the materials sent to students, staff and examiners,
2) All examiners views and marks should be moderated through the vehicle of an expert discipline / Faculty level appraisal of examination reports,
3) That all examiners should be provided with comprehensive instructions, consisting of a marking rubric, a more detailed description / benchmarking of expected standards, a clearer explanation of the structure and duration of the research project component of the MRes, and information about the way that marks will be used in the awarding of PhD places and scholarships.

A full report on these matters should be provided for consideration, and approval of any resulting process amendments, at the meeting of the ASSC to be held on the 19th October 2015.

Submitted by: Professor Dominic Verity, Chair Academic Senate

For enquiries contact: Ainslee Harvey, Project Officer, ainslee.harvey@mq.edu.au or ext 6346.
ITEM 8.3 ENGLISH LANGUAGE POLICY AND RELATED DOCUMENTS - CLARIFICATION OF RESOLUTIONS

For approval.

Recommended Resolutions:
That the Academic Senate:
  i. rescind Resolution 14/194 of 14 November 2014 approving the English Language Policy as presented to the meeting;
  ii. rescind the SLTC Resolution of 17 November 2014 approving the English Language Procedure, English Language Guideline and English Language Resources Schedule as presented to the meeting;
  iii. resolve to approve the English Language Policy, Procedure and Schedule as presented to the Academic Senate Standing Committee meeting of 4 August 2015 in principle, with an implementation date to be identified in the future.
ITEM 8.3 ENGLISH LANGUAGE POLICY AND RELATED DOCUMENTS - CLARIFICATION OF RESOLUTIONS

Issue

Due to the establishment of Academic Policy Approval Process (Resolution15/6, 3 March 2015) which requires Academic Senate approval of policies and procedures and the complexities in the development of an English Language policy and related documents, clarification of the status of the English Language Policy, Procedure and Schedule is required.

The following timeline shows the history of the development of these documents.

17 February 2014 – The Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC) resolved to create an English Language Policy Working Party

12 May 2014 – SLTC resolved to endorse the English Language Policy Working Party Terms of Reference.

14 July 2014 - SLTC noted a progress report from the Working Party.

15 September 2014 – a special combined meeting of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC), Curriculum Standards Framework Committee (CSFC) and SLTC was held to discuss the English Language Policy.

7 October 2014 – Academic Senate noted that the redrafted English Language Policy would be reconsidered by SLTC then returned to Academic Senate at its meeting of 4 November or 18 December (Resolution 14/153)

20 October 2014 – SLTC considered a draft English Language Policy, Procedure, Schedule and an Overview of development of language skills document. SLTC resolved that the English Language Policy; subject to minor amendments, be recommended for approval by Academic Senate.

14 November 2014 - Academic Senate considered the draft English Language Policy and resolved (Resolution 14/194) to approve the English Language Policy subject to amendments discussed at the meeting (Note: the amendment required was to note the teaching in languages other than English).

17 November 2014 – SLTC noted that the English Language Policy had been approved by Academic Senate subject to minor amendments and resolved to approve the English Language Procedure, English Language Guideline and English Language Resources Schedule.

9 February 2015 - SLTC re-considered the English Language Policy with the DVC(A) noting that the absence of an implementation plan was impacting on the operation of the policy. The Committee resolved to establish a Working Group to consider implementation and recommend amendments to the English Language Policy and Procedure as deemed necessary.

9 March 2015 – SLTC noted the Terms of Reference of the English Language Policy Working Group and that an update would be provided in July 2015.

13 July 2015 – SLTC considered recommendations for a pilot project and amendments to the English Language Policy and Procedure. The Committee resolved to endorse the amendments to the English Language Policy and Procedure, endorse the Implementation Pilot Plan, and recommend for approval the English Language Policy, Procedure, Schedule and Implementation Pilot Plan to Academic Senate.

4 August 2015 – The Academic Senate Standing Committee considered an update from the English Language Policy Implementation Working Group and subsequently approved the English Language Implementation Pilot Plan. However, the Standing Committee recommended that the pilot study be expanded to trial implementation in more analytical units such as those in maths, science and
computing. The Chair agreed to raise these concerns with the Pro-Vice Chancellor Learning and Teaching. Following the pilot study, further work will be undertaken on the procedure and schedule to accompany the English Language Policy.

Given implementation and expansion of the pilot project, and the further work to be undertaken on the procedure and schedule to support implementation, it is appropriate to rescind Academic Senate’s initial approval of the English Language Policy as presented to the meeting of 14 November 2014. It is also appropriate to rescind SLTC’s approval of the Procedure, Guideline and Resources Schedule at its meeting of 17 November 2014.

The formal rescission of the resolutions as proposed will remove any ambiguity around the status of the earlier documents pending the completion of the implementation pilot study. It is further recommended that the latest versions of these documents as presented to the Standing Committee in August 2015 be approved in principle for implementation at a future date.

Consultation Process
The following offices have been consulted prior to the submission of this paper:

Governance Services

Recommendation

That the Academic Senate:

i. rescind Resolution 14/194 of 14 November 2014 approving the English Language Policy as presented to the meeting;

ii. rescind the SLTC Resolution of 17 November 2014 approving the English Language Procedure, English Language Guideline and English Language Resources Schedule as presented to the meeting;

iii. resolve to approve the English Language Policy, Procedure and Schedule as presented to the Academic Senate Standing Committee meeting of 4 August 2015 in principle, with an implementation date to be identified in the future.

Operational Impact:

Governance Services

Submitted by: Professor Dominic Verity, Chair Academic Senate

For enquiries contact: Ellen Carlson, Policy Manager, Ellen.Carlson@mq.edu.au or ext. 4791.
ITEM 8.4  POLICY DEVELOPMENT FOR THE MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY INTERNATIONAL COLLEGE

For noting.
ITEM 8.4 POLICY DEVELOPMENT FOR THE MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY INTERNATIONAL COLLEGE

Issue

A number of University policy documents require amendment to incorporate the operations of the Macquarie University International College (MUIC). A number of new policy documents are also required to satisfy legislative requirements.

As far as possible, MUIC processes will be embedded within existing processes and systems. Therefore policy documents covering areas including admissions, withdrawal, disruptions to studies and grade appeals, will require only minor amendment to incorporate MUIC.

New policy documents will be required to cover areas specific to the legislative requirements for MUIC operations, notably in the areas of attendance, progression, variation to enrolment and workload.

The full suite of amended and new policy documents will be presented to the SLTC meeting of 12 October and circulated to the MUIC Sub-Committee of ASQC by flying minute for endorsement, for subsequent approval by the Academic Senate Standing Committee at their meeting of 19 October. This will ensure that relevant policies are in place for the first cohort of students commencing in November 2015.

Consultation Process

The following offices have been consulted prior to the submission of this paper:

MUIC Project Team; Macquarie International; Governance Services: Chair Academic Senate

Recommendation

That the Academic Senate note the update on policy development for the Macquarie University International College.

Operational Impact:

MUIC; Macquarie International; Student Administration; Policy Unit and Quality Assurance and Compliance, Governance Services.

Submitted by: Deidre Anderson, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar)

For enquiries contact: Zoe Williams, Head Governance Services, zoe.williams@mq.edu.au or ext. 4322.
ITEM 9.1 QUESTION ON NOTICE

The following Question on Notice was submitted by the Faculty of Science and Engineering elected members of Academic Senate:

The future of the chiropractic program, and the possible disestablishment of the Department of Chiropractic, at Macquarie University has been under consideration by the Executive.

1. If the decision is made to discontinue the program, how will the University ensure that obligations are met to current and future students enrolled in the chiropractic program and to the staff who teach in the program?

2. What are the factors under consideration in making a decision in regard to the future of the Department of Chiropractic?
ITEM 10.1 HDR TERMINATIONS AND APPEALS: RIE

For noting.
ITEM 10.1 HDR TERMINATIONS AND APPEALS: RIE

Issue
Higher degree research (HDR) candidates are crucial to the research strength of the University, as reflected in Key Objective 2 of the Research Strategic Framework. Macquarie has a very large scholarship budget to support domestic and international candidates. In this context it is not surprising that the University has robust procedures to monitor progress against expected milestones (e.g., commencement seminars and Annual Progress reports). Like most other Universities the procedure at Macquarie when candidates do not make satisfactory progress and cannot be counselled out of their enrolment, is to ask candidates to “Show Cause” why their candidature should not be terminated. Currently there are three reference points: the Higher Degree Research Office Procedure Manual, HDR and MRes Termination of Candidature procedure on Policy Central and Rule 14.2 of the HDR Rules.

While there are only a small number of candidates asked to Show Cause each year, the process is time consuming and lacks transparency and consistency. This has resulted in candidates typically seeking a review of the decision to terminate candidature at the Higher Degree Research Appeals Committee with some Appeals being upheld on grounds of procedural fairness. In at least some recent cases, Faculties were puzzled by and unhappy with the decisions of the HDRAC. A survey of academic staff showed the majority of respondents felt unsupported by policies and procedures when they had requested that a candidate Show Cause.

Taken together these issues motivated a Rapid Improvement Event (RIE) tasked to design a timely and consistent HDR termination and appeals process with clear and distinct stages so that decisions of the HDR appeals are appropriate, transparent and fair. The project sponsors were the Dean, HDR, Director, Research Training and International Research Training Partnerships, and the Chair of Academic Senate.

The following staff have been involved with the RIE
- Robyn Bishop - Faculty HDR Manager, Faculty of Human Sciences
- Jiwook Jang - HDR Coordinator, Applied Finance & Actuarial Studies, Faculty of Business and Economics
- Agnieszka Baginska - Faculty HDR Manager, Faculty of Business and Economics
- Jane Yang Faculty – Faculty HDR Manager, Faculty of Science & Engineering
- Jennifer Martin - HDR Manager (Governance and Management), Higher Degree Research Office (HDRO)
- Adam Moynihan - Student Advocacy & Support Advisor, Campus Wellbeing
- Maryanne Hozijan - Faculty HDR Manager, Faculty of Arts

The outcomes of the RIE are as follows:
- “Show Cause” to be replaced by a formal review panel which decides if a candidate has made satisfactory progress against previously agreed milestones and will complete “in time”;
- the development of resources to support supervisors and candidates (e.g., templates for responding; decision trees);
• ensuring that information for Formal Review Panels and later Appeals is collected once and stored in one central system;
• that regular meetings of the Appeals committee are scheduled with a timetable to published; and
• to embed a communication strategy for all stakeholders (supervisors, candidates, Heads, Faculty HDR managers, HDRO, Dean, HDR) into the process.

Consultation Process
The RIE was informed by a large group of critical friends. Consultation is ongoing with the project sponsors and with the Governance Services unit.

Recommendation
That Academic Senate note the update.

Operational Impact
Academic Senate
HDRO
Dean, HDR
HDR management in each Faculty and MGSM
Governance Services

Submitted by
Assoc Prof Judi Homewood, Associate Dean, HDR Faculty of Human Sciences, member, RIE

For enquiries contact
Assoc Prof Judi Homewood, Associate Dean, HDR Faculty of Human Sciences
ITEM 10.2  TEQSA RENEWAL UPDATE

For noting.
ITEM 10.2  TEQSA RENEWAL UPDATE

Issue
Macquarie University’s TEQSA Registration Renewal submission is due 30 November. The TEQSA Renewal process is underway, and the Project team are collating evidence to support the submission.

Macquarie University has a low risk status, therefore submission covers the core assessment areas only of:
- Governance
- Planning and performance outcomes
- Academic Quality Assurance
- Student Experience and Support

The focus of the audit is on demonstrating the effectiveness of our policies and procedures to appropriately address all academic and operational activities and to ensure we maintain academic standards. It has been very confirming to reveal the comprehensive nature of our institutional documentation, and processes.

The Submission is following TEQSA’s lean process conducted over 4 months following notification by TEQSA of the scope of our audit and a request for the university to nominate sample programs in specific categories:
- one recently accredited course: undergraduate, with an online component - *B Engineering (FoS)*
- one course delivered onshore and offshore – *MBA (MGSM)*
- one clinical course: *D Physiotherapy (FHM)*
- one teacher education course: *B Arts with B Education (Secondary) (FoHS)*
- one recently reviewed course: postgraduate: *M Creative Writing (FoA)*

Consultation and Approval Process
The TEQSA Steering committee includes DVCA, PVC, L&T, EO COO (as delegate for COO), Chairs of Senate and ASQC, Deputy Registrar, Director Risk & Assurance, Director LTC, Director Strategic Planning and Information.

The Project Process of identification and approval of documents includes:
- consultation with all primary stakeholders for each section of the submission,
- review by TEQSA Steering Group, including Chairs of Senate and ASQC
- review and endorsement by ASQC
- approval by Executive Group.

As ASQC is a Committee of Senate with responsibility for Academic Quality, its role in this process is to ensure consistency and appropriateness of the suite of documents in each section. Each of the Chairs of ASQC and Senate perform the role of overviewing the submission for their respective committees, to raise or forward issues as appropriate.

The submission is direct via an online portal on the TEQSA website. Due to the number of submission documents, and to enable feedback from TEQSA prior to the deadline, documents will be progressively uploaded. Three stages of approval have been coordinated around the available ASQC and EG meetings, August to November. We are currently commencing Stage 2.

To date, approximately 250 documents have been identified for submission, of which only 30 documents remain outstanding. By the end of September, 54 documents will have final approval for submission, with a further 170+ ready for October ASQC and EG meetings.

TEQSA Site Visit
TEQSA’s site visit is confirmed for Thursday, 18 February 2016, 11-3pm.

TEQSA has provided a draft schedule of 25 mins sessions, including one with “representatives from the Academic Board and its subcommittees as available”. The VC and DVCA will liaise with Chairs to nominate staff for the relevant sessions. A briefing session will be arranged for all participating staff prior to the Site Visit.
TEQSA has advised that the scope of the Provider Registration Standards Site Visit will be more extensive than the Submission. In preparation, we have documented the alignment of the Standards with our Submission, and with our Policies. This enables us to

i) identify overlapping information with our submission,
ii) identify primary stakeholders for each relevant standard, and
iii) prioritise our briefings to staff.

**Recommendation**
Update for noting.

**Submitted by**
JoAnne Page, Executive Officer, DVC-A, on behalf of Professor John Simons, DVC-Academic

**For enquiries contact**
JoAnne Page, Executive Officer, DVC-Academic
Joanne.page@mq.edu.au
ITEM 10.3 STATEMENT OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM WORKING GROUP
TERMS OF REFERENCE

For noting.
Statement of Academic Freedom
Terms of Reference for Working Group

1. Objective

Pursuant to the Academic Senate Rules, Academic Senate is responsible for advising University Council and the Vice-Chancellor on measures to safeguard the academic freedom of the University.

Academic Senate last endorsed its Statement on Academic Freedom in October 2006. This statement details Senate’s position on the right and duty of academic staff to exercise professional judgment in engaging in teaching and research, and to disseminate the results of that research, without undue interference from governments, the University’s administration, the media, private corporations and other organisations.

Given the changing nature of the academic environment and regulation of the tertiary sector, this working group must now review and make recommendations for revision of the University’s Statement on Academic Freedom.

2. Role and responsibilities

The working party is to:

(a) Review the existing Statement on Academic Freedom

(b) Undertake a benchmarking analysis to compare Macquarie’s statement against those of comparator institutions

(c) Develop a revised Senate Statement of Academic Freedom for consideration and discussion by Academic Senate.

3. Membership

The membership of the working party comprises:

- Professor Jacqueline Phillips (Deputy Chair Senate)
- Professor Richie Howitt, Faculty of Arts
- Professor Simon George, Faculty of Science & Engineering
- Professor Wendy Rogers, Faculty of Human Sciences
- Professor Linda Cupples, Faculty of Human Sciences
- Dr Kate Fullagar, Faculty of Arts
- Associate Professor David Coutts, Faculty of Science and Engineering
- Cathy Rytmeister, Learning and Teaching Centre

4. Timeline

- Draft Statement presented to Academic Senate for consideration at its meeting on 10 November 2015.
ITEM 10.4 UNIVERSITY MEDALS NOMINATIONS WORKING GROUP
TERMS OF REFERENCE

For noting.
Assessment of University Medal Nominations
Terms of Reference for Working Group

1. Objective

Following on the retirement of most of Macquarie’s honours programs, the conditions that apply to the award of the University Medal require amendment.

The objective of this working group is to develop a new policy position to govern the award of the University Medal. This should encompass a specification of those programs that qualify students for this award, eligibility criteria, evidence requirements, and assessment protocols (at the Departmental, Faculty and University levels).

Documents describing the working party’s recommendations should be submitted for consideration at the 10th November 2015 meeting of Academic Senate.

2. Role and responsibilities

The working party is to:

(a) Develop a new policy to govern the award of the University Medal, which includes specification of those programs that qualify students for this award, eligibility criteria, evidence requirements, and assessment protocols (at the Departmental, Faculty and University levels).

(b) Develop nomination templates and guidelines for submission of nominations.

(c) Develop a revised Terms of Reference (TOR) for the University Medals Committee.

3. Membership

The membership of the working party comprises:
- Professor Jacqueline Phillips (Deputy Chair Senate)
- Professor Natalie Klein (Faculty of Arts)
- Associate Professor Tony Bryant (Faculty of Business and Economics)
- Associate Professor Steve Cassidy (Faculty of Science and Engineering)
- Associate Professor Julie Atkin (Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences)
- Associate Professor Kerry Sherman (Faculty of Human Sciences)

4. Timeline

- Working group to be distributed background information by 11th September 2015
- Initial working party meeting 16th September 2015 (2 hours)
- Draft TOR and Policy presented to Academic Senate for consideration at its 10th November 2015 meeting.
ITEM 10.5 ACADEMIC YEAR PLAN 2016

Following the below listed amendments to Macquarie University International College programs and subsequent intake reduction, the Academic Plan for 2016 has been amended to reflect these changes.

- An additional Standard Foundation Program offering has been included at the beginning of the year (commencing Feb).
- The June Standard Foundation Program has been moved to commence in March to align with the Diplomas start date.
- The September Intensive Foundation Program has been moved to commence in October to align with the Diplomas and Standard Foundation.
- Formal name change of the BClinSci T3 to MED3

For endorsement.

Recommended Resolution:
That Academic Senate endorses the amendments to the 2016 Academic Year Plan and recommends this for approval by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>North Ryde Campus</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>City Campus (North Ryde)</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>City Campus (DG)</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>City Campus (DG)</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>City Campus (DG)</th>
<th>DMU</th>
<th>City Campus (Macquarie)</th>
<th>DMU</th>
<th>City Campus (Macquarie)</th>
<th>DMU</th>
<th>City Campus (Macquarie)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Term Dates**

- **25 December - 3 January Session**
- **9 28 April Last day for WWF**
- **23 7 5 5 17 22 Anzac Day: Monday 25 April**
- **School Term Ends: Friday 23 October Results Issued, 8 October**
- **6/03/2017**
- **20/03/2017**
- **24/04/2017**
- **NSW School**
- **27/02/2017**
- **14 Exams Exams Recess 16 16 June Last day for WWF Exams 12 12 24 January Intake ends (Sunday) 29 Queen's Birthday: Monday 13 June**
- **Recess Recess Recess Recess Recess 25 School Holidays**
- **17 January Last Day of Classes**
- **1/05/2017**
- **14 Exams Recess Recess 9 22 September Last day for WWF Recess 2 2 14 43 12 Recess Recess Recess 9 Recess 3 22 January Census 3 3 8 22/05/2017**
- **21 September Last Day of Classes**
- **15-19 February Enrolment of new students**
- **21/02/2017**
- **23/01/2017**
- **30 April designated ANZAC Day**
- **30 September Census 3 15 44 April Intake ends (Friday) 13 30 September Last day for WWF School Holidays**
- **8/05/2017**
- **29/05/2017**
- **22/05/2017**
- **20/02/2017**
- **23/01/2017**
- **6 Exams/Break 7 Exams/Break 21 Exams/Break Recess 24**
- **School Term Resumes: Monday 10 16/01/2017**
- **14**
- **29/05/2017**
- **Sat 12 March designated Good Friday**
- **8/05/2017**
- **15 April Academic Penalty Date, 16 April designated ANZAC Day**
- **15 April Census 3 15 20 School Holidays**
- **11 11 13 13 27 11 9 9 21 26 7 Exams/Break 7 Exams/Break 21 Exams/Break Recess 24**
- **School Term Resumes: Tuesday 19 16 April**
ITEM 10.6  MACQUARIE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT ACADEMIC BOARD - TERMS OF REFERENCE

For approval.

Recommended Resolution:
That Academic Senate approves the Terms of Reference for the Macquarie Graduate School of Management Academic Board.
ITEM 10.6

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MGSM ACADEMIC BOARD

Issue

Under the new Faculty Rules, the Macquarie Graduate School of Management (MGSM) is not regarded as a Faculty, and is therefore not required to establish a Faculty Board. However, MGSM still requires an academic governance structure to ensure the integrity and quality of its academic programs and processes.

At its meeting of 4 August, the Academic Senate Standing Committee approved, in principle, the Terms of Reference for the MGSM Academic Board and established a direct reporting line between the MGSM and Academic Senate. It should be noted that in the Terms of Reference for the MGSM Academic Board, the Academic Senate has authorized the MGSM to:

1. Approve the MGSM’s unit offerings, including the approval of new units and the amendment, renewal or disestablishment of existing units; and
2. Ratify examination results for the MGSM’s units in accordance with the relevant academic rules and quality assurance frameworks prescribed by Academic Senate.

The Chair of Academic Senate attended a meeting with academic staff of MGSM on 25 August to discuss the draft Terms of Reference including roles, responsibilities and membership. As a result of that meeting, minor changes were made to the document, which are now before Senate for approval.

Consultation Process

- Vice-Chancellor
- Pro-Dean MGSM
- Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Academic
- Deputy Dean & Professor of Management
- Chair of Academic Senate
- Academic Senate Standing Committee
- MGSM academic staff

Recommendation: Academic Senate approve the Terms of Reference for the MGSM Academic Board.

Operational Impact:

- Chair of Academic Senate
- MGSM staff
- Governance Services
- Chair of ASQC and SLTC

Submitted by: Professor Dominic Verity, Chair of Academic Senate, dominic.verity@mq.edu.au

For enquirers contact: Ainslee Harvey, Academic Senate Project Officer, ainslee.harvey@mq.edu.au
Macquarie Graduate School of Management (MGSM) Academic Board

Terms of Reference

The Macquarie Graduate School of Management Academic Board (the MGSM Academic Board) is a Committee of the Academic Senate of Macquarie University (the University). The MGSM Academic Board was established on 4 August 2015 under Rule 9(4)(c) of the Academic Senate Rules 2015, and is directly accountable to the Academic Senate for the exercise of its responsibilities.

These Terms of Reference outline the MGSM Academic Board's purpose, roles and responsibilities, composition, membership and tenure, delegations of authority and standing orders.

1. Purpose

The MGSM Academic Board is to ensure the integrity and quality of academic programs and processes administered by the Macquarie Graduate School of Management (MGSM).

2. Role and responsibilities

The MGSM Academic Board is to:

(1) Advise Academic Senate, its committees and the MGSM Dean on:

(a) academic matters relating to the MGSM's teaching programs, research training programs and research activities;

(b) the schedule of academic programs and units offered by the MGSM;

(c) academic standards and quality, and teaching effectiveness in programs delivered by the MGSM;

(d) academic priorities of the MGSM; and

(e) any other issue referred to the MGSM by the Academic Senate or the Dean of MGSM.

(2) Develop proposals to introduce or disestablish courses and programs of study to be delivered by the MGSM, and recommend such proposals to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee for consideration;

(3) Develop proposals to amend courses and programs of study to be delivered by the MGSM, including plans to modify structure, content, method of delivery, naming, admission or completion requirements, and recommend such proposals to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee for consideration;
(4) Monitor and ensure that the MGSM's programs and processes comply with the University's policies pertaining to learning and teaching, and academic standards and quality;

(5) Monitor, provide advice, and make recommendations to Academic Senate on the implementation and effectiveness of academic aspects of research and research training policy as they apply to the MGSM;

(6) Identify and report to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee any need for the development or refinement of the University’s policies that govern the MGSM’s academic activities, and contribute to the development of such policies;

(7) Establish and implement a regular cycle of reviews of the MGSM’s programs and units of study and respond to recommendations arising from such reviews;

(8) Oversee the conduct of reaccreditation reviews of the MGSM’s courses and programs of study as instructed by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee, and advise that Committee on recommendations arising from such reviews;

(9) Contribute to the development and maintenance of the University's academic risk register that relate to academic activities of the MGSM; and

(10) Consider and report on any matters referred to the MGSM Academic Board by Academic Senate as required.

3. Composition and Membership

The composition of the MGSM Academic Board shall be as follows:

1. *The Chair appointed by the Chair of Academic Senate

2. *The Deputy Chair appointed by the Chair of Academic Senate

3. Dean of the MGSM (Ex-Officio)

4. Vice-Dean of the MGSM (Ex-Officio)

5. MGSM Representative on Academic Senate (Ex-Officio)

6. Up to six (6) additional academic staff members drawn from within the MGSM, of which one may be (but is not required to be) an adjunct lecturer.**

7. Up to two (2) co-opted professional staff members appointed on the basis of their skills, experience and knowledge, nominated by the MGSM Academic Board, and

8. One (1) student currently enrolled in an MGSM program.

*The Chair and Deputy Chair are to be appointed from among the academic membership specified in (4) – (6) above.

**Elected academics must have at least a 0.5 appointment.
4. Tenure

(1) The term of office of all appointed members, excluding the student representative, shall be two (2) years.

(2) The term of appointment of student representatives shall be one (1) year.

(3) Elected members can serve no more than two (2) consecutive terms, but may serve again after sitting out one (1) term.

5. Delegations of Authority

The Academic Senate shall resolve to grant the MGSM Academic Board specific authority to discharge its delegated responsibilities. The MGSM Academic Board may request the granting of such authority as it sees fit. All such authorisations shall be documented below:

(1) Approve the MGSM's unit offerings, including the approval of new units and the amendment, renewal or disestablishment of existing units;

(2) Ratify examination results for the MGSM's units in accordance with the relevant academic rules and quality assurance frameworks prescribed by Academic Senate.

6. Standing Orders

The MGSM Academic Board shall conduct its business subject to the general provisions Standing Orders for Committees of Academic Senate.
ITEM 11.1 ITEMS APPROVED BY THE CHAIR

Resolution of the Academic Senate Standing Committee, 14 July 2015:

Resolution 15/19
That the Academic Senate Standing Committee provides the Chair of Academic Senate with the authority to approve the following upon confirmation of business case approval by the Executive Group and pending consultation with the Chair of Academic Standards and Quality Committee:
- Diploma of Speech and Communication
- Graduate Certificate of Business Psychology
- Graduate Diploma of Business Psychology

On 18 September 2015, the Chair of Academic Senate approved the following:
- Diploma of Speech and Communication

On 30 September 2015, the Chair of Academic Senate approved the following:
- Graduate Certificate of Business Psychology
- Graduate Diploma of Business Psychology

For ratification.

Recommended Resolutions:
That Academic Senate ratifies the approval of the Diploma of Speech and Communication as approved by the Chair of Academic Senate 18 September 2015.

That Academic Senate ratifies the approval of the Graduate Certificate of Business Psychology as approved by the Chair of Academic Senate 30 September 2015.

That Academic Senate ratifies the approval of the Graduate Diploma of Business Psychology as approved by the Chair of Academic Senate 30 September 2015.
ITEM 12.1 ONGOING EXEMPTION FROM THE FINAL EXAMINATION POLICY REQUIREMENT TO PUBLISH FINAL EXAMS FOR BIOL345 HUMAN GENETICS THEORY

This item was considered and recommended for approval by Academic Senate at the Academic Standards and Quality Committee held on 22 September 2015 (Refer to Item 13.2).

For approval.

Recommended Resolutions:
That Academic Senate approves that an exemption be granted from the Final Examination Policy requirement to publish final examination papers for the 2015, 2016 and 2017 offerings of the unit BIOL345 Human Genetics Theory, subject to ongoing monitoring.

That Academic Senate request the Faculty of Science and Engineering to provide a report to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee at the end of 2017 to address any academic integrity risk related to this matter.
MEMORANDUM

TO: A/Prof Pamela Coutts, Academic Standards and Quality Committee

FROM: Associate Prof Jenny Donald, Department of Biological Sciences

DATE: 9 February 2015

SUBJECT: Ongoing exemption from the Final Examination Policy requirement to publish final exams for BIOL345 Human Genetics Theory

Proposal

That the undergraduate unit BIOL345 Human Genetics Theory be granted an on-going exemption from the Final Examination Policy requirement to publish final exam papers.

Background

On 12 November 2013, Senate approved a temporary exception to the Final Examination Policy for BIOL345 Human Genetics Theory for 2013 and 2014 offerings. This submission is in support of an ongoing exemption for this unit.

BIOL345 Human Genetics Theory is an advanced 300 level unit. It requires high level analytical and critical thinking skills. It has a total enrolment of about 80 and is taken both by undergraduate students and as a Non-Award unit by 6-10 students each year. These Non-Award students, from all states of Australia and New Zealand, are largely doctors taking it as part of their professional training in clinical genetics. The unit is accredited by the Human Genetics Society of Australasia.

The learning outcomes for this unit are:

1. Use a variety of resources to find up to date information in human genetics
2. Explain the complexities of the relationship between genotype and phenotype
3. Solve problems in human genetics using appropriate analytical methods
4. Read and demonstrate understanding of the primary scientific literature
5. Explain the process of scientific discovery in human genetics and the effects of recent advances.

The learning outcomes for the unit broadly fall into two areas:

- the current state of knowledge in human genetics, how this understanding has developed and how it is changing
- the analytical skills required to identify the correct approaches and successfully solve problems in scenarios encountered in human genetics
The first of these areas is assessed in a variety of assessments throughout the semester, including the final exam. Problem solving and genetic analysis is the focus of the weekly two hour tutorials, and the on-campus sessions for external students. In these highly interactive small group sessions, students work together through a series of graded problems on different topics, to help them develop their analytical skills. These tutorials focus on helping students develop the required problem solving skills and are not assessed.

The assessment of this learning outcome occurs at the end of semester in the final exam. Problems comprise half the final exam. In these problems, students are presented with a variety of scenarios in human genetics and have to deduce how to deal with them, and then apply the appropriate analytical methods. While the numbers and other details of the problems in the final exam vary each year, there are a quite limited number of scenarios in human genetics for most of the analytical areas of the unit. Many of those scenarios have been used in the weekly problems sets, with one or two scenarios being reserved for the final exam. It simply is not possible in this field to devise a very large number of different realistic scenarios to which the students can apply their understanding.

**Implications of publishing the final exam paper.**

The final examination paper has never been available to students. The reason for this is that if the exam paper is published, this means that students no longer have to use critical thinking to identify the appropriate analytical method to use with a particular problem. They would simply be able to memorize which approach to use for a particular scenario that they recognize, and then it is purely a matter of doing the numerical calculations correctly. I would no longer be able to test their higher order analytical thinking. This would result in a significant lowering of standards.

The exam tests students with the sorts of analytical decisions they will be making in their professional careers. This approach to the exam is strongly supported by the professional society, and is required as part of this unit being accredited. The Chair of the Education Committee of the Human Genetics Society of Australasia has provided a letter outlining their position, which is attached to this submission.

**Preparation of students for the final exam**

The students are well prepared for the final exam. The format and type of questions in the exam are discussed in lectures. One of the past exam papers is given to students every year before the end of semester. In fact two of the discussion questions in that paper have routinely been used in subsequent papers. The tutorials in the unit in each of the 13 weeks of semester give the students the opportunity to work through problems of the type they will be encountering in the exam. Working through these as a group gives the students the chance to develop the analytical skills which will subsequently be examined. In addition the students are given a set of revision problems, with solutions, before the exam. Every year
when students give me feedback after they have completed the unit they agree that the exam is challenging but contains nothing unexpected.

**Maintenance of standards**

Use of a very similar exam [with variations in numerical details of the problems] over a period of 19 years has enabled the collection of long term data on student performance. The grading standards for BIOL345 have remained consistent over the years. Throughout this period, student performance has been consistent. If the security of the exam had been breached, one might expect an increase in marks overall or unexpected rises in performance from individual students. This has never been observed.

In summary, I believe there are sound pedagogical reasons for granting an exception to the section of the final exam policy that requires exams to be published to BIOL345 Human Genetics Theory.

Associate Professor Jenny Donald

[jenny.donald@mq.edu.au](mailto:jenny.donald@mq.edu.au)

Convener of BIOL345 Human Genetics Theory
8th September, 2015

Academic Standards & Quality Committee
Macquarie University

To the ASQC Committee,

I write this letter as Chair of the Education Committee of the Human Genetics Society of Australasia (HGSA) to which the Australasian Association of Clinical Geneticists belongs. This professional association is for clinical geneticists and those training in this discipline. The group deals with issues relating to training in clinical genetics as well as policy matters pertaining to this specialty.

One of the core curriculum components for advanced training in clinical genetics is the completion of an approved university genetics course. This course must cover segregation and linkage analysis; statistical approaches to risk interpretation; cytogenetics; molecular genetics; community genetics, including principles and practice of screening; and developmental genetics. The unit BIOL 345 (Human Genetics Theory), offered by Macquarie University, is an approved university genetic course. It is also where the majority of Australian clinical genetics trainees complete this core component of their training.

In order to assess these core components, trainees must be able to demonstrate analytical and problem solving skills. The release of past exam papers would be problematic when assessing these skills, as there are limited scenarios in which these principles can be assessed. If exam questions were to be reused from year to year, the analytic and problem solving skills would no longer form part of the assessment. Rather, trainees would be assessed on their ability to learn a worked example prior to the exam and write it out during the formal examination period. This would lower the standard of the assessment for the unit, and would bring into question its suitability as an approved university genetics course for the purposes of advanced training in genetics.

Students and trainees enrolled in BIOL 345 are provided with numerous worked examples in their tutorials, which provide adequate preparation, while limiting the number of scenarios that remain unseen for the final assessment. If prior examination papers were released to students, the suitability of BIOL 345 as an approved university genetics course for clinical trainees would need to be further investigated. It should be acknowledged that preparing new examination questions every year is not possible, given the limited clinical scenarios that are assessable within this curriculum.

As the chair of the HGSA Education Committee, I have serious concerns about the standard of assessment of BIOL 345, if the University mandated that all exam papers were to be released to students on an annual basis. I support that an exemption be granted to this unit, so that the analytical and problem solving skills can be assessed in the final exam.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Associate Professor Joanne Lind

CHAIR, EDUCATION COMMITTEE
A/Prof Joanne Lind
Telephone 02 4620 3803
j.lind@westernsydney.edu.au
www.hgsa.org.au
ABN 17 076 130 937
ITEM 12.2  PACE UNIT ACCREDITATION CRITERIA – PROPOSED UPDATES

This item was considered and recommended for approval by Academic Senate at the Academic Standards and Quality Committee held on 22 September 2015 (Refer to Item 13.2).

For approval.

Recommended Resolution:
That Academic Senate approve the proposed amendments to the PACE unit accreditation criteria for implementation from 2017, noting that amendments to facilitate these changes will be supported by minor development work in Webforms.
ITEM 7.1: PACE UNIT ACCREDITATION CRITERIA

Background:
The existing criteria for PACE accreditation of undergraduate coursework units were approved by Academic Senate in 2009 and revised in September 2011. In acknowledgement that we are now at 100% implementation of a PACE requirement in all undergraduate degrees from 2016, and the re-branding of the program (2014), we seek to update the unit accreditation criteria to ensure that they comprehensively support a high quality delivery.

The 2014 audit of the PACE program undertaken by Deloitte is another important factor influencing this request. The review highlighted a number of positive frameworks and processes already in place to support the PACE initiative, as well as recommendations for improvements in some areas. One identified priority which we wish to address through the criteria is the need for improved student monitoring and feedback during the PACE activity. This is considered essential from both a pedagogical and pastoral care perspective, in the former case to optimise the learning opportunity and support students to achieve the learning outcomes of the unit. In recent focus groups it was confirmed that such processes occur in diverse ways. Some of the proposed amendments to the PACE accreditation criteria are thus focused on ensuring the pedagogical aspects of monitoring are considered as part of the accreditation, and ultimately unit review processes. The pastoral care components will be incorporated in the broader policy framework for all types of Placement that is being developed concurrently by the SLTC Placement Coordination Taskforce.

Additional minor refinements to the current PACE unit accreditation criteria are aligned with evolving policy frameworks and to make the criteria more succinct. The amendments proposed include the following: (highlighted in the attached version)

- Expanded preamble identifying why units must meet the criteria
- Student monitoring is embedded within academic scaffolding
- Evaluation of the unit (as per the Student Feedback on Learning, Teaching, and Curriculum Policy. Note: the current TEDS survey, Learner Experience of PACE – LEP, is also about to be reviewed to complement this request.)
- Updated reference to professional and community engagement (rather than “participation and community engagement”)
- Appendix 1 expanded with examples of activities which may satisfy the criteria
- Graduate Capabilities moved to Appendix 2
- Greater clarification of the PACE activity (taken from the “Guidelines for Implementation” of the existing Criteria)
- Workload hours have been updated to reflect current standards
- Examples of reflective tools removed (as there are now many resources available from the Learning and Teaching website)

Proposal:

a) We propose that these amendments to the PACE unit accreditation criteria are approved for implementation from 2017. Amendments to facilitate these changes will be supported by minor development work in the Web Forms system.

b) We also propose that a review be initiated, under the leadership of ASQC and in accordance with Senate determined time frames and processes, of the full suite of existing PACE units to assess whether these are compliant against the updated criteria for the 2017 academic year. Any units which are not should be updated to address these concerns, in consultation with the Academic Directors of PACE in each faculty. Such a review would be a starting point following which PACE units could be included in future university-based unit review processes as currently under discussion within ASQC.
Recommendation:  
For approval.

Operational Impact:  
Academic Standards & Quality Committee  
Faculty Standards & Quality Committees  
Academic Directors of PACE  
Senior Academic Developer  
PACE Unit Convenors  
Curriculum & Planning team

Consultation Process:  
The following staff were consulted:  
Academic Directors of PACE  
Faculty PACE teams  
PACE Unit Convenors (3 focus groups held)  
Cathy Rytmeister (Learning & Teaching Centre)  
Anna Rowe (Learning & Teaching Centre)  
Theresa Winchester-Seeto (Learning & Teaching Centre)  
Professor Sherman Young (PVC, Learning Teaching & Diversity)  
Curriculum & Planning team

Submitted by:  
Lindie Clark, Academic and Programs Director (PACE)  
Associate Professor Kate Lloyd, Senior Academic Developer for PACE

For enquiries contact:  
Fiona Courtis (PACE Local and Regional Co-ordinator) fiona.courtis@mq.edu.au  
Tel: 9850 6398
CRITERIA FOR PACE UNITS AND ACTIVITIES

This document outlines the Criteria that Academic Senate has determined that all PACE units and activities must meet. As such, it provides important guidance to academics who are developing a proposal for a PACE unit (be that an existing or new unit), as well as those undertaking a review of a PACE unit.

Completion of a PACE unit is a requirement of all Macquarie undergraduate degrees from 2016. To be accredited as a PACE unit, applicants must demonstrate that the unit meets essential criteria in the areas of Community Engagement and Learning & Teaching. The unit must also conform to all standard university policies and procedures. It is strongly recommended that unit convenors consult with the Academic Director of PACE in their Faculty in the initial planning stage of proposing a PACE unit, as well as in the lead up to the formal review of a PACE unit.

1. PROFESSIONAL COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The following community engagement criteria must be addressed within the context of the unit and its PACE activities. As part of the unit proposal or unit review process, examples which illustrate the below criteria should be provided where possible:

- PACE units and activities must demonstrate community engagement; that is, entering into a partnership of mutually shared benefit between a Macquarie University student and a government, non-government, public or private entity. The partner can be from within the university, based locally (in Sydney), in regional Australia, or overseas.
- PACE units and activities should assist the partner to achieve their mission and purpose.
- The choice of partner and activity must reflect the ethical standards of the University and the broad aim of the Professional and Community Engagement initiative to promote the well-being of people and the planet. Partner and activity selection must comply with all current PACE procedures (which can be found on the Policy Central website: http://www.mq.edu.au/policy/index.html)
- The mode of engagement should be identified and can take place in-person, remotely through technology (e.g. Skype, telephone, email, etc.), or a combination of thereof.

2. LEARNING & TEACHING

PACE Units and activities are undertaken within an academically rigorous framework to develop the capacity and capabilities of students. As part of the unit proposal or unit review process, examples which illustrate the below criteria should be provided where possible. PACE Units and activities must contain the following learning and teaching components:

- **Introduction/Orientation** – this includes review of stakeholder expectations, Macquarie’s administrative requirements (and those of the partner, e.g. WWCC, if appropriate), relevant preparation for activities and overview of the unit (e.g. that which might be discipline-specific and/or non-discipline-specific).

- **Scaffolding for skill and knowledge development** – this involves the formal delivery of the unit and includes the exchange of theoretical and practical knowledge (e.g. through workshops, tutorials, online learning modules and activities, etc.) as well as the monitoring of students throughout to ensure they are making progress in achieving the learning outcomes of the unit. Scaffolding also includes reflective mechanisms (see below for more detail).
The PACE activity - i.e. the experiential component – see “Minimum Hours” below for baseline standards for the length of this component. It is recognised that not all PACE Units will adopt conventional models of internship or practicum-based delivery that require the student to spend a set amount of time physically located in a ‘workplace’. Indeed, it is desirable on both equity and efficiency grounds for a range of flexible and innovative modes of unit delivery to be explored. For example, using online communication technologies to enable students to engage virtually rather than through (or in addition to) face-to-face interactions with the partner organisation; and/or providing opportunities for partner organisations to interact with students on-campus through the use of community reference panels and the like. See appendix 1 for examples of the diverse ways in which PACE units and activities can be delivered.

Assessment tasks

Mechanisms through which students can reflect, document, evaluate and/or critically analyse what they have learned over the course of the PACE unit. Embedded within the scaffolding for skill and knowledge development, this could include reflection by students about: themselves, their interactions with others, the application of their studies in applied contexts, their contribution to the partner organisation and/or community, examination of assumptions, their future career and life directions, etc. The reflective mechanisms must be incorporated into an assessment task1 and/or a required learning & teaching activity in the unit.

Final wrap-up or debrief – this might include reflecting on the PACE activity, what learning can be applied to other settings, as well as an overview of the unit.

An evaluation plan for the unit (incorporating, for example, e.g. Learning Experience of PACE – LEP- survey available through TEDS, a as per the Student Feedback on Learning, Teaching, and Curriculum Policy mechanism for obtaining partner feedback; peer review, etc).

Where appropriate, details on how the unit’s learning outcomes are relevant to the discipline and/or program overall.

Opportunities through which relevant Graduate Capabilities can be fostered as detailed below:

A. At least two of the following cognitive capabilities:
   - Discipline Specific Knowledge and Skills
   - Critical analytical and integrative thinking
   - Problem solving and research capability
   - Creative and innovative

B. Two of the following interpersonal and social capabilities:
   - Effective communication
   - Student engagement as ethical local and global citizens
   - Student engagement as socially and environmentally active and responsible citizens

C. One of the following personal capabilities:
   - Capable of Professional and Personal Judgment and Initiative
   - Commitment to continuous learning

More information on these graduate capabilities can be found in appendix 2.

---

1 Assessment tasks incorporating reflection, or the results of reflective practice, may be assessed on either on a Pass/Fail or graded basis, as may the unit as a whole

PACE CRITERIA – AUGUST 2015
MINIMUM HOURS

To complement the above Learning and Teaching criteria, information in this section details the minimum number of hours required for specific components of a PACE unit. Information showing how the PACE unit meets these standards must be provided when having a unit accredited as PACE (be that an existing or new unit) as well as during formal unit reviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit points</th>
<th>Total Unit Hours (15 weeks)</th>
<th>Minimum hours for experiential component (approx 20%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Credit points</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Credit points</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The PACE components of the unit – i.e. introduction/orientation, scaffolding, the PACE activity, debrief, assessment, reflection and evaluation - should comprise a minimum of 50% of the total workload for the unit. (In some cases it may comprise 100% of the unit).
- A minimum 20% of the total workload for a PACE Unit should be spent on the actual PACE activity (i.e. the experiential component). Every effort should be made to maximise the quality and amount of interaction between students and the partner organisation, and/or the community which the PACE activity is intended to benefit, As a minimum, there should be at least three discrete periods of two-way interaction between students and the partner organisation/community, spread over the duration of the offering. As a guideline, this interaction would be expected to last for at least 18 hours in total in the case of a 3cp unit².

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

The following are also requirements of PACE units and activities that need to be addressed in the delivery of the unit:

- Partners and students must agree to abide by the roles and responsibilities outlined in the PACE Governance and Guidelines Module and Student Undertaking procedure.
- PACE activities must be supervised by a representative of the partner organisation and monitored by an academic or professional member of the University staff (e.g. Faculty PACE staff), and all PACE activities must demonstrate appropriate duty of care. This means that appropriate risk assessment, matching, and identification of roles and responsibilities of involved parties must be undertaken for

² It is acknowledged that it is difficult to fully quantify the hours spent in partner-student interaction when those interactions take place online. Further, it is appreciated that students of a given PACE unit might have diverse contexts; however, unit convenors should make their best possible estimates in this regard.
PACE units and activities. (For further information, see http://staff.mq.edu.au/teaching/professional_and_community_engagement/)

- Learning outcomes for the PACE unit should be clearly communicated to the partner(s) by the Unit Convenor.

Appendix 1

EXAMPLES OF PACE ACTIVITIES THAT MAY SATISFY CRITERIA

- Internship, professional experience and/or practicum
  Individual students are provided with hands-on training in a particular profession under close supervision in the workplace. Professional experience / practicums are usually compulsory components of a curriculum eg. for teachers, engineers and medical /allied health clinicians, while internships are offered across a wider range of disciplines (including business).

- Community/industry panel with project mentoring
  Community or industry experts propose a specific project for students to work on and provide ongoing support throughout the project life. These activities often take place on campus with students working collaboratively in groups.

- Fieldwork with a partnership component
  An activity conducted on a site in the natural environment that is undertaken with and benefits a partner organisation, but is supervised on-site by a Macquarie staff member.

- Research and/or evaluation project
  Research activities contribute to the creation of new knowledge and/or use existing knowledge in new ways so as to generate new understandings. Evaluation projects are typically undertaken to enable a partner to assess the effectiveness, efficiency and equity of a particular program, process, structure or activity.

- Service provision
  Activities that give students the opportunity to directly deliver the services that partner organisations supply as part of their core business (e.g. counselling services for Helplines).

- Mentoring, peer-assisted learning and other forms of student service
  Mentoring provides an opportunity for the sharing and development of work related or personal skills and experience between a mentor and “mentee”. Mentors typically provide support, advice or guidance to mentees. Peer-assisted learning typically involves unit specific workshops for current students in the unit led by trained students who have previously excelled in those particular units. Other forms of student service might also constitute PACE activities, e.g. serving on governance bodies, etc.
Appendix 2

GRADUATE CAPABILITIES

A. Cognitive capabilities:

**Discipline Specific Knowledge and Skills**

Our graduates will take with them the intellectual development, depth and breadth of knowledge, scholarly understanding, and specific subject content in their chosen fields to make them competent and confident in their subject or profession. They will be able to demonstrate, where relevant, professional technical competence and meet professional standards. They will be able to articulate the structure of knowledge of their discipline, be able to adapt discipline-specific knowledge to novel situations, and be able to contribute from their discipline to inter-disciplinary solutions to problems.

PACE units, activities and projects that could help develop this capability include ones where:

- The PACE activity is directly related (content-wise) to the student’s program of study
- The PACE activity relies upon and develops the student’s scholarly understanding of a discipline-specific topic
- The output from the PACE activity meets relevant professional and/or technical standards
- The output or outcome of the PACE activity embodies an interdisciplinary approach to problem-solving

**Critical analytical and integrative thinking**

We want our graduates to be capable of reasoning, questioning and analysing, and to integrate and synthesise learning and knowledge from a range of sources and environments; to be able to critique constraints, assumptions and limitations; to be able to think independently and systemically in relation to scholarly activity, in the workplace, and in the world. We want them to have a level of scientific and information technology literacy.

PACE units, activities and projects that could help develop this capability include ones where:

- The PACE activity encourages students to connect the theory they have learnt at university with real world practice, and to explore the strengths and limitations of current theory and practice in real world contexts
- The PACE activity requires students to: identify contestable issues; to evaluate alternative theories, arguments, and options; to form, express and defend their own point of view on a topic; and appreciate the limitations, weaknesses, or potential objections to this point of view
- The PACE activity requires students to critically analyse and evaluate a range of complex and conflicting data and reports relevant to a particular issue
- The PACE activity enables students to demonstrate scientific and/or information technology literacy.
- The output of the PACE activity relies on the student’s capacity to present ideas with supporting evidence.

**Problem solving and research capability**

Our graduates should be capable of researching; of analysing, and interpreting and assessing data and information in various forms; of drawing connections across fields of knowledge; and they should be able to relate their knowledge to complex situations at work or in the world, in order to diagnose and solve problems. We want them to have the confidence to take the initiative in doing so, within an awareness of their own limitations.
PACE units/activities/projects that could help develop this capability include ones where:

- The PACE activity requires students to apply theoretical knowledge to complex real world situations
- Students are responsible for selecting the most appropriate techniques or tools to collect and analyse data or information.
- The PACE activity involves the student in finding and evaluating evidence from a range of sources.
- The PACE activity builds student competence in accessing, using and synthesising appropriate information.
- The PACE activity is based on research designed and carried out by the student.
- The PACE activity enables students to explore different research methods. OR enables students to learn and/or apply new research methods or techniques.
- Students develop specific skills such as site selection for a field study, sampling analysis and provision for field safety.

Creative and innovative

Our graduates will also be capable of creative thinking and of creating knowledge. They will be imaginative and open to experience and capable of innovation at work and in the community. We want them to be engaged in applying their critical, creative thinking.

PACE units/activities/projects that could help develop this capability include ones where:

- The PACE activity promotes the use of creative problem-solving strategies e.g. working within limited budgets, working around system blockages etc.
- The PACE activity obliges students to understand problems from multiple perspectives and/or devise a range of effective solutions.
- Students face situations where conventional solutions to problems have not worked or are unlikely to work, and where innovative/creative new approaches are needed.

B. Interpersonal and social capabilities:

Effective communication

We want to develop in our students the ability to communicate and convey their views in forms effective with different audiences. We want our graduates to take with them the capability to read, listen, question, gather and evaluate information resources in a variety of formats, assess, write clearly, speak effectively, and to use visual communication and communication technologies as appropriate.

Examples of PACE units/activities/projects that could help develop this capability include ones where:

- The PACE activity assists students to hone skills in scientific writing and/or communicating results of analyses graphically, numerically or visually.
- The PACE Activity relies on presenting arguments in a convincing and persuasive way.
- Students utilise listening and other collaborative skills in working with people from a variety of cultural backgrounds.
- Students utilise negotiating skills with people from a variety of professional backgrounds.
- The PACE activity requires effective oral, written or visual communication which is tailored to a particular audience e.g. colleagues, managers, clients, general public etc.

Student engagement as ethical local and global citizens

As local citizens our graduates will be aware of indigenous perspectives and of the nation’s historical context.
They will be engaged with the challenges of contemporary society and with knowledge and ideas. We want our graduates to have respect for diversity, to be open-minded, sensitive to others and inclusive, and to be open to other cultures and perspectives: they should have a level of cultural literacy. Our graduates should be aware of disadvantage and social justice, and be willing to participate to help create a wiser and better society.

Examples of PACE units/activities/projects that could help develop this capability include ones where:

- The PACE activity provides students with an opportunity to make a valuable and valued contribution to a socially disadvantaged or otherwise marginalised population served by the partner organisation.
- The PACE activity provides students with an opportunity to work within a given role with ‘clients’ whose lived experience is different from their own, and to improve client outcomes by integrating culture, especially the client’s culture, into the organisational context.
- The PACE activity gives students an appreciation of the breadth and complexity of key ethical debates that arise in a particular field, and gives them an opportunity to engage in ethical reasoning.
- The PACE activity encourages students to examine ways in which values and ethical issues affect the application of theory in real world contexts.

**Student engagement as socially and environmentally active and responsible citizens**

We want our graduates to be aware of and have respect for self and others; to be able to work with others as a leader and a team player; to have a sense of connectedness with others and country; and to have a sense of mutual obligation. Our graduates should be informed and active participants in moving society towards sustainability.

Examples of PACE units/activities/projects that could help develop this capability include ones where:

- Students have the opportunity to gain real experiences of cross-cultural interaction that involves tasks, and engagement of the emotions as well as the intellect.
- The PACE activity focuses on an issue of environmental concern
- The PACE activity focuses on an issue of social concern
- The PACE activity fosters understanding of contemporary ethical issues e.g. privacy, confidentiality, ethical research behaviour, intellectual honesty etc
- The PACE activity fosters development of skills in leadership and group management, and of cooperation and working as part of a team.
- The PACE activity addresses aspects of sustainability in a social or environmental context.

**C. Personal capabilities:**

**Capable of Professional and Personal Judgment and Initiative**

We want our graduates to have emotional intelligence and sound interpersonal skills and to demonstrate discernment and common sense in their professional and personal judgement. They will exercise initiative as needed. They will be capable of risk assessment, and be able to handle ambiguity and complexity, enabling them to be adaptable in diverse and changing environments.

Examples of PACE units/activities/projects that could help develop this capability include ones where:

- The PACE activity requires students to juggle competing priorities and exercise professional judgement (e.g. to arrive at an equitable and efficient allocation of scarce resources in the face of divergent and conflicting claims to those resources)
- The PACE activity enables students to recognise and reflect on their own strengths and limitations
- The PACE activity requires students to cope with ambiguity and changing circumstances, e.g. organising a community event where the process of involving key community stakeholders in the decision-marking is just as important as the event itself.
- The PACE activity involves handling situations where there are many interacting factors and a number of possible solutions, and where personal and/or professional judgement is required.

### Commitment to continuous learning

Our graduates will have enquiring minds and a literate curiosity which will lead them to pursue knowledge for its own sake. They will continue to pursue learning in their careers and as they participate in the world. They will be capable of reflecting on their experiences and relationships with others and the environment, learning from them, and growing - personally, professionally and socially.

Examples of PACE units/activities/projects that could help develop this capability include ones where:

- The PACE activity promotes exploration of possible future career options.
- The PACE activity provides students with opportunity and the means to critically evaluate their own performance.
- The PACE activity fosters student engagement in, and capacity for critically reflective practice. This includes acknowledgement of limitations and mistakes.
- Students are encouraged to reflect on their experiences and to show how they would incorporate the lessons learnt into future situations.
- Students are encouraged to recognise their own skill development and to develop plans for further education and training.
ITEM 12.3   PRINCIPLES FOR SHARED TEACHING

This item was considered and recommended for approval by Academic Senate at the Academic Standards and Quality Committee held on 22 September 2015 (Refer to Item 13.2).

For approval.

Recommended Resolution:
That Academic Senate the Principles of Shared Teaching with effect from 1 January 2017, subject to the amendments identified at its 22 September 2015 meeting.
Principles for Combining the Teaching of Different Units (Shared Teaching)

Different cohorts of students may share teaching with that of another unit in limited circumstances with the approval of ASQC on behalf of Academic Senate. The following over-arching principles should be observed:

1) Students are not to be disadvantaged in their capacity to engage with or achieve the learning outcomes of the unit.
2) The quality of the student experience must be preserved while the two cohorts engage in common activities, and/or where there is shared content.
3) Where there is shared activity across cohorts at different unit levels there must be clearly differentiated Learning Outcomes and assessment regimes.

There are 3 categories of shared teaching that can be considered. These categories refer to regular timetabled teaching, and do not preclude the arrangement of one-off guest lectures or other ad-hoc arrangements. These categories also do not preclude access to shared online resources. Two units should not be shared across the categories.

If exemptions to the categories for shared teaching are required an academic rationale for the exemption must be submitted to ASQC for approval. In order to approve an exemption ASQC must be satisfied that the rationale demonstrates that the over-arching principles of shared teaching are being met.

The definitions are as follows:

1) **Co-Badging**
   
   **Definition:**
   
   refers to an arrangement through which a single unit is assigned different unit codes and names.
   
   **Principles:**
   
   a) Co-Badged units will only be approved if taught at the same level and have the same assessments and learning outcomes.
   
   b) Co-Badging is an exceptional arrangement where, for example, funding at the unit level would otherwise be problematic, or students might not consider units with a different subject code.

2) **Co-Teaching:**

   **Definition:**
   
   refers to an arrangement through which students from different units share equivalences of some or all of the learning activities. This can occur in live (lectures, tutorials and seminars for timetabling purposes) or online (including discussion forums, wikis and other activities in iLearn or other LMS/Web-based platform) settings. Co-Taught units must have differentiated learning outcomes and assessment regimes.
   
   **Principles:**
   
   a) Co-Teaching will only be approved if the expected level of preparation for entry to the unit (in order to achieve the learning outcomes) is sufficiently consistent for all students.
   
   b) 100 Level Units will only be approved to be co-taught with other 100 Level Units. This is
because of the specific nature of these units in inducting students to study skills at university level which is distinct to that cohort.
c) UG and PG units will not generally be approved to be co-taught together\(^1\). This is because the differentiation between the learning outcomes, the assessment regimes, as well as the preparation for entry to the units for the respective cohorts should be too pronounced not to impact the quality of the student experience.

3) **Co-Locating:**
**Definition:**
refers to an arrangement through which students from different units share a teaching location but undertake distinctly different teaching activities.
**Principles:**
a) Co-Locating will only be approved if the group activities are sufficiently distinct to meet the needs of all groups of students, and no group will be disadvantaged.
b) Co-Locating will only be approved if the teaching activity concerns individual and/or small group activity such as lab work or some tutorials. Lectures and other large group activities cannot be Co-Located because it is not possible to deliver a different experience/activity to large groups in the same setting.
c) UG and PG units can be co-located together and may offer very positive student experiences in small group settings.

**Table of Examples:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Over-Arching Principle</th>
<th>Co-Badging</th>
<th>Type of Shared Teaching</th>
<th>Co-Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Outcomes must be the same</td>
<td>Outcomes must be differentiated</td>
<td>Outcomes must be distinct and separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated Teaching/ Assessment Activity</td>
<td>Activity must be the same</td>
<td>Activity must be differentiated</td>
<td>Activity must be distinct between cohorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combinations that preserve Student Experience</td>
<td>Units must be at same level</td>
<td>Not Level 100 with other cohorts Not UG with PG</td>
<td>Available for individual/ small group activity only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) For the purposes of this paper 700 level units will be treated as Postgraduate units
ITEM 13.1 ACADEMIC SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE

Attached is the report from the meeting held on 21 September 2015.

*For noting.*
The 10 September 2015 Academic Senate Standing Committee meeting was cancelled and an extraordinary meeting convened on 21 September to address specific issues relating to two appeals by Master of Research (MRes) students that were upheld by the Higher Degree Research Appeals Committee (HDRAC). The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research Integrity and Development), the Dean Higher Degree Research and the Chair of the HDRAC were also invited to the extraordinary meeting to assist the Committee in its deliberations.

The purpose of the meeting was to determine the next steps in the process to resolve the two upheld appeals, to determine how to manage similar candidates who had also been impacted by the process, which had been found to be procedurally unfair, and to determine how the 2015 examination processes and MRes program might be formally reviewed.

**ITEMS APPROVED**

The Chair of the HDRAC noted the process for determining a final grade for a MRes thesis when there was a variation of more than 10% in the results awarded by the two external examiners. This process involved appointing a third internal examiner with the final result being determined by calculating the average of the three marks.

The HDRAC had concluded that in the two cases presented, the process of averaging the three examiners’ marks without due consideration of the substance of the reports was procedurally unfair and that the process lacked transparency and clarity. As such, both appeals were upheld. The HDRAC noted there was uncertainty as to whether students were advised in advance of the process of appointing a third examiner and averaging the three marks and a level of opaqueness in how the Program and Examination Subcommittee (PESC) of the Higher Degree Research Committee (HDRC) reviewed and determined final grades for recommendation to HDRC. The Committee was advised that the minutes of PESC meetings were not formally recorded and that this contributed to a perceived lack of transparency in the process. In closing, the Chair of the HDRAC noted the impact of the lengthy examination and appeal process upon the candidates and the need for a timely resolution of this issue.

**Master of Research: Upheld Examination Appeals – Process for Examination**

Resolution 15/41

The Committee resolved that for the 2 MRes appeals currently upheld, the owning Faculty Board should appoint a panel of two internal experts for each student, drawn from a closely related discipline but not from within the student’s own Department. That panel would be asked to consider the original examiners’ reports and the students’ work, provide a brief moderation report and propose a final mark. These reports should be endorsed by the Head of Department, approved by the Faculty Board and submitted to HDRC for discussion and grade ratification, as it is the body delegated to ratify HDR grade outcomes.

**Other MRes Candidates Impacted by this Situation**

The Committee proposed extending the timeframe for submitting an appeal against 2014 MRes grades for candidates impacted by this situation and sought legal advice before determining this course of action.

**Examination processes for current year 2 MRes students**

Resolution 15/42

The Committee resolved to request HDRC to provide a report demonstrating how its MRes examinations provisions for 2015 address the findings of the HDRAC, as detailed in its report of cases 40973484 and 42497981.

Resolution 15/43

The Committee resolved to recommend to Academic Senate that an independent review of the MRes take place. In light of the questions raised by these appeals cases this should, at the very least, consider the appropriateness of assigning marks to outcomes in this kind of program, the way in which external examiners are briefed to engage in the examination process, the way in which outcomes are agreed and moderated, the policies and oversight governing the program, and the balance between centralised and devolved authority in the conduct of the program overall.

The next meeting of Academic Senate Standing Committee will be held on Monday 19 October 2015.

**Professor Dominic Verity**

CHAIR
ITEM 13.2    ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND QUALITY COMMITTEE

Attached are reports from the meetings held on 18 August and 22 September 2015.

Refer to Items 12.1, 12.2 and 12.3

*For noting.*
ITEMS FOR NOTING

1. Late Changes to the 2015 Schedule of Programs, Majors and Specialisations

The ASQC considered late 2015 Changes and Retrospective Changes, and noted changes which were approved by the Chair of ASQC after its 21 July 2015 meeting.

RESOLUTION

The Committee RATIFIED the late 2015 Changes and Retrospective Changes to the following programs with immediate effect previously approved by the Chair:

**2015 Program Changes**
- Development Studies specialisation
- Graduate Certificate of International Relations
- Corporate and Commercial Law specialisation
- Master of Accounting (Professional)
- Master of Economics
- Master of Engineering

**Retrospective Changes**
- Diploma of Ancient Languages
- Croatian Studies major
- French Studies major
- German Studies major
- Italian Studies major
- Modern Greek Studies major
- Russian Studies major
- Spanish and Latin American Studies major
- Politics and International Relations major
- Modern History major

RESOLUTION

The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the late 2015 Changes and Retrospective Changes to the following programs with immediate effect:

- Diploma of Languages (Japanese)
- 2011-2013 Bachelor of Arts-Media with the degree of Bachelor of Laws

2. Late Changes to the 2016 Schedule of Programs, Majors or Specialisations

RESOLUTION

The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the 2016 late changes to the following programs effective 1 January 2016:

- Bachelor of Medical Sciences
- Master of Education
- Diploma of Languages (Japanese)
- Bachelor of Security Studies
- Master of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism
- Master of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism with the degree of Master of International Security Studies
- Graduate Diploma of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism
- Master of International Security Studies
- Graduate Diploma of International Security Studies
- Graduate Certificate of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism
- Graduate Certificate of International Security Studies
- Graduate Certificate of Intelligence
- Master of Environmental Planning
- English major
- Development Studies and Culture Change major
- Human Geography major
- Master of Applied Finance
- Graduate Diploma of Applied Finance
- Master of Early Childhood
- Master of Information Technology

3. Graduate Certificate of International Relations and Graduate Certificate of Politics and Public Policy

RESOLUTION

The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE:

(i) the amended program structure of the Graduate Certificate of International Relations and Graduate Certificate of Politics and Public Policy that pertained to 600 level units, effective 1 January 2016, and;

(ii) the amended admissions requirements for the Graduate Certificate of International
4. Bachelor of Commerce/Bachelor of Science

RESOLUTION
The Committee ENDORSED the program structure of the Bachelor of Commerce with the degree of Bachelor of Science to satisfy the new Bachelor of Science requirement of a quantitative unit, effective 1 January 2016.

5. Proposals for New Specialisations

RESOLUTION
The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the specialisations Business Valuation and Retirement Outcome in the Graduate Diploma of Applied Finance, effective 1 January 2016:

6. Program Specifications

RESOLUTION
The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the program specifications for the following programs:

Undergraduate majors: Criminology, Croatian Studies, Indigenous Studies, Italian Studies and Japanese Studies

Postgraduate Programs: Graduate Certificate and Graduate Diploma of International Relations and Master of International Communication with the degree of Master of International Relations

7. Changes to 2016 MAFC Programs: Master of Applied Finance, Graduate Diploma of Applied Finance, Graduate Certificate of Finance

RESOLUTION
The Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the change to a single work experience admission requirement for the Master of Applied Finance and Graduate Diploma of Applied Finance, effective 1 January 2016.

8. A Proposal for a Default Currency of Unit-to-Unit Precedents for RPL

RESOLUTION
The Committee ENDORSED an operational paper for unit-to-unit precedents for RPL.

9. Operational Principles for Defining and Representing Block Credit

RESOLUTION
The Committee ENDORSED the approach to the definition and representation of block credit as presented in the paper Operational Principles for Defining and Representing Block Credit.

10. General Business
The following matters were considered and noted by ASQC:

i. A verbal report from the Chair of Academic Senate on the University of Sydney: Academic Integrity Taskforce Report. The Chair of ASQC highlighted a number of issues for future discussion by ASQC.

ii. A General Coursework Rules Review paper that provided an update on the key dates and scope for each of the two stages of the review.

iii. Individual Case Reports from the Faculty of Business and Economics, Faculty of Human Sciences and the Faculty of Science and Engineering.

The next meeting of ASQC will be held on Tuesday 22 September 2015.

A full copy of the minutes summarised above will be accessible after the next meeting of ASQC via this link

A/Professor Pamela Coutts – CHAIR
ITEMS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

1. **Ongoing Exemption from the Final Examination Policy Requirement to Publish Final Exams for BIOL345 Human Genetics Theory**

**RESOLUTION**

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND FOR APPROVAL BY ACADEMIC SENATE that an exemption be granted from the Final Examination Policy requirement to publish final examination papers for the 2015, 2016 and 2017 offerings of the unit BIOL345 Human Genetics Theory, subject to ongoing monitoring; and

REQUESTED the Faculty of Science and Engineering to provide a report to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee at the end of 2017 to address any academic integrity risk related to this matter.

2. **PACE Unit Accreditation Criteria – Proposed Updates**

The Committee supported an update to unit accreditation criteria to support high quality delivery to support the PACE requirement being fully implemented for all undergraduate degrees from 2016.

**RESOLUTION**

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND FOR APPROVAL BY ACADEMIC SENATE the proposed amendments to the PACE unit accreditation criteria for implementation from 2017, noting that amendments to facilitate these changes will be supported by minor development work in Webforms.

3. **Principles of Shared Teaching**

The CSFC approved draft paper *Principles of Shared Teaching*, outlines a framework to identify different categories of shared teaching to assist the development and approval of shared teaching. The draft paper identified “co-locating” as a third category of shared teaching (with “co-teaching” and “co-badging”) to allow arrangements where a teaching location is shared by students from different units undertaking different teaching activities.

**RESOLUTION**

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND FOR APPROVAL BY ACADEMIC SENATE the Principles of Shared Teaching with effect from 1 January 2017, subject to the amendments identified at its 22 September 2015 meeting.

ITEMS FOR NOTING

1. **Late changes to the 2015 Schedule of Programs, Majors or Specialisations**

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the 2015 late changes to the following programs with immediate effect:

- Bachelor of Applied Finance
- Bachelor of Business Administration
- Bachelor of Commerce
- Bachelor of Commerce (Professional Accounting)
- Bachelor of Economics
- Bachelor of Economics

2. **Late changes to the 2016 Schedule of Programs, Majors or Specialisations (For approval)**

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the following late changes to the 2016 Schedule:

- Master of Accounting (Professional)
- Master of Accounting (Professional) with Master of Commerce
- Master of Economics
- Criminology major (with the addition of LAWS300 as amended at the 22 September 2015 ASQC meeting)

3. **Late Changes to the 2016 Schedule of Programs, Majors or Specialisations (For noting)**

The Committee RESOLVED TO NOTE the following late changes to the 2016 Schedule approved by the ASQC Chair or the Chair of Academic Senate after the 18 August 2015 ASQC meeting:

- Ancient History: Egypt and the Near East major
- Ancient History: Greece, Rome and Late Antiquity major
- Juris Doctor
- Master of Applied Finance/Graduate Diploma of Applied Finance
- Master of Environment
4. Macquarie University International College (MUIC) Programs, Changes and Recommendations

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee RESOLVED TO:

i. APPROVE Attachment 1 - the final program/unit information for the Foundation and Diploma Programs of the Macquarie University International College (MUIC);

ii. APPROVE Attachment 2: Tab 1 and Tab 2 - the list of articulations for the Foundation and Diploma Programs, and the associated notes;

iii. NOTE Attachment 3 - the revised MUIC timetable;

iv. APPROVE the packaging/progression of students from a MUIC Foundation Program into a MUIC Diploma Program; and

v. APPROVE the articulation of MUIC Foundation students into an undergraduate degree provided they complete 6 core and 2 elective units even if they do not complete both units from within one academic stream; or even if they choose to progress to a degree not directly associated with the academic stream they have completed, provided they meet the GPA requirement for their chosen degree.

5. Alternative OUA Pathway – Making CSP Entry Requirements Equivalent

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the alignment of entry eligibility for a CSP place into the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Security Studies for both OUA and non OUA students, subject to clarifying the entry eligibility for consideration at the October 2015 ASQC meeting.

6. Faculty of Business and Economics – Revised Schedule to Approved Dual Degree Program between Macquarie University and Central University of Finance and Economics (CUFE), China.

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the updated schedule to the dual degree program between Macquarie University and Central University of Finance and Economics (CUFE) with the 2016 revisions to the Bachelor of Commerce in Finance and the addition of Bachelor of Applied Finance as an alternative dual degree to be available to CUFE students.

7. Faculty of Business and Economics – International Articulation Agreement – Central University of Finance and Economics (CUFE), China

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the International Articulation Agreement between Central University of Finance and Economics (CUFE) (Bachelor of Management) and Macquarie University (Master of Accounting (CPA Extension)).

8. TEQSA Registration Renewal Submission (September 2015)

A presentation was provided on the approach to the University’s TEQSA five-year re-registration process. ASQC was asked to confirm the scope and appropriateness of the proposed suite of documents to be provided as evidence of the TEQSA Core Assessment.

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee RESOLVED TO ENDORSE the following list of proposed documents to be submitted as evidence of the TEQSA Core Assessment requirements:

2.1 Planning and Performance Outcomes (Strategic Plan).

3.1 Review Cycle Information.

3.2 Sample Review Reports (External).

3.3 Self-Accrediting Process (Master of Creative Writing, and Doctor of Physiotherapy).

9. Recognition of the International Assessment Certificate (IAC)

The Academic Standards and Quality Committee RESOLVED TO APPROVE the International Assessment Certificate (IAC) for direct entry to Macquarie University for students who receive 85% and above in the IAC.
10. **General Business**

Other matters considered by ASQC included:

- updates on the Recognition of Prior Learning Schedules;
- critical friends were allocated to Faculty supported *Expressions of Interest* for the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences (Master of Public Health) and the Faculty of Business and Economics;
- Individual Case Reports were received from the Faculties of Arts, Human Sciences, and Science and Engineering;
- The *2017 Academic Program – Procedures and Timetable for Curriculum Proposals* was noted. The 2017 program submission and approval timelines have been brought forward as a result of earlier marketing timeframes. Run new awards (including business cases) will need to be recommended by the ASQC meeting on 17 November 2015 in order to be included in the first publication. Program submissions received after the relevant deadline may still be approved however would be unable to be captured by the Coursefinder go-live.
- The *2016 Academic Program*: ASQC endorsed that no further changes to program structures or unit availabilities will be accepted for 2016 offerings in order to facilitate the work flow for early enrolment.

The next meeting of ASQC will be held on Tuesday 20 October 2015.

A full copy of the minutes summarised above will be accessible after the next meeting of ASQC via this [link](#).

**A/Professor Pamela Coutts – CHAIR**
ITEM 13.3 HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Attached are the minutes of the Higher Degree Research Committee meetings held 17 July, 21 August and 25 September 2015.

For noting.
ITEM 13.3 REPORT OF THE HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

The Higher Degree Research Committee meeting was held on Friday 17 July 2015 & Friday 21 August 2015 in the Senate Room.

A. MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

Friday 17 July 2015

The Committee discussed MRes Thesis by Publications and highlighted some potential concerns such as research integrity and authorships. It was noted that care should be taken to determine the type of publications to be included for examination and that this information on MRes thesis by publications should be included in the Supervision Enhancement Program.

Members were also briefed by Professor Nick Mansfield on the Thesis Examination Sub-Committee development. The Committee has been discussing the matter and all feedback should be provided to the Chair of Academic Senate and PVCRR through the HDRC.

Dr Ren Yi circulated documents on the status of HDR Commencements and Completions, Cotutelle and Joint PhD enrolments. As of 13 July, 695 candidates were enrolled in BPhil/MRes and PhD programs, 309 candidates had completed and 228 candidates are in the Cotutelle and Joint PhD Enrolment program with 87 currently enrolled.

Dr Yi also briefed the Committee on the renewed Joint PhD MOU with Strathclyde University (UK), the new Cotutelle MOU with Aarhus University (Denmark) and the new MRes Exchange Agreement with HsKA (Germany).

Friday 21 August 2015

Associate Professor Andrew Alter presented the Faculty of Arts research training strategic implementation plan as an update to the Committee.

Professor Jacqueline Phillips and Associate Professor Judi Homewood provided an update to the Committee on the progress of Rapid Improvement Project on HDR Appeals which was discussed by the Committee.

Professor Sakkie Pretorius informed the Committee of the upcoming China Scholarship Council trip and the recent visit from KU Leuven (Belgium). Macquarie University will develop a strategic partnership with KU Leuven and strengthen the relationship between the two universities. Professor Pretorius also briefed members on the development of DAAD funded MQ-Hamburg-Fudan project. Currently the project is progressing really well with Cotutelle and joint PhDs. HDRO and MI are working with partners to plan for the activities next year. Professor Pretorius also briefed members on the upcoming Nature special issue featuring Australian research in which Macquarie University will take part.

Dr Ren Yi circulated to members the current status of HDR enrolments and completions. As of 21 Aug 2015, 733 candidates are enrolled into HDR programs, including 549 under RTS, and 347 candidates had completed. Dr Yi also informed members of the Cotutelle MOU with East China Normal University and Radboud University of Nijmegen Netherlands.

Ms Michele Robinson from Macquarie International distributed a list of agreements signed by Macquarie International in the last month together with a list of delegations hosted by Macquarie International. Upcoming Australia Spain Water Forum, Australia China Fund Schemes and Australia India Fund Schemes were also mentioned.

COMPLETION OF REQUIREMENT (PHD/MPHIL)

ADRIAN, CHRISTOPHER FOBE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Sue Wright
Associate Supervisor: Dr Alan Kilgore 71
Thesis submitted for examination: 23 February 2015
Thesis title: The Relative Importance of Corporate Governance Attributes: Evidence from Corporate Stakeholders
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

ALIZADEH, SOMAYEH
Principal Supervisor: Dr Meena Chavan
Associate Supervisor: Professor Lucy Taksa
Thesis submitted for examination: 29 January 2015
Thesis title: Exploring the efficacy of cultural competence on service quality of outpatient care in Australia
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

AN, SHASHA
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Rosalind Thornton
Associate Supervisor: Professor Stephen Crain, Dr Zhou Peng
Thesis submitted for examination: 18 December 2014
Thesis title: The Acquisition of Constraints in Child Mandarin
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

ANDRIANOPoulos, JIM
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Stephen Lack
Associate Supervisor: Professor Ross Street
Thesis title: Units of Skew Monodial Categories and Skew Monoidales in Span
Award Recommended: Master of Philosophy

ASKARI RENANI, EHSAN
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Richard Appleyard
Associate Supervisor: Dr Dane Turner
Adjunct Supervisor: P. Flores
Thesis submitted for examination: 26 March 2015
Thesis title: Tribology of Artificial Hip Joints
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

BARACZ, SARAH JANE
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Jennifer Cornish
Associate Supervisor: Professor Ann Goodchild, Dr Lauren Staples
Thesis submitted for examination: 15 April 2015
Thesis title: The Modulation of Methamphetamine-induced Behaviours by Oxytocin in the Nucleus Accumbens Core and Subthalamic Nucleus
Award Recommended: Combined Award Doctor of Philosophy and Master of Clinical Neuropsychology

BARBER, CHRISTIE LEE
Principal Supervisor: Dr Mio Bryce
Associate Supervisor: Professor John Stephens
Thesis submitted for examination: 03 February 2015
Thesis title: Representing Masculinities in Japanese Film and Television
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

BARKER, ADRIAN WALTER
Principal Supervisor: Dr Nino Kordzakhia
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Andrzej Kozek
Thesis submitted for examination: 27 March 2015
Thesis title: Log Quantile Differences and the Temporal Aggregation of Alpha-stable Moving Average Processes
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

BEATH, ALISSA PAULINE  FOHS  PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Michael Jones
Associate Supervisor: Professor Julie Fitness
Thesis submitted for examination: 25 March 2015
Thesis title: Investigations Into Emotional Intelligence
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

BENZ, VICTORIA RENATE  FOHS  PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Ingrid Piller
Associate Supervisor: -
Adjunct Supervisor: I. Gogolin
Thesis title: Dynamics of bilingual early childhood education: Parental attitudes and institutional realisation
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

BLUMBERG, SANDRA  FOA  PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Sabine Krajewski
Associate Supervisor: Professor Martina Mollering
Thesis submitted for examination: 04 February 2015
Thesis title: "There is nothing that can replace a Personal Relationship" - Practicing Intercultural Competence in German Multinational Corporations in Australia
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

BOU FARAH, LAMA NABIH  FOMHS  PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Simon McMullan
Associate Supervisor: Professor Mark Connor, Associate Professor Ann Goodchild
Thesis submitted for examination: 03 March 2015
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

BUCKLEY, MITCHELL ALAN  FOSE  PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Dominic Verity
Associate Supervisor: Dr Richard Garner
Thesis submitted for examination: 15 June 2015
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

CAMERON, NEIL MATHESON  FOA  PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Mark Evans
Associate Supervisor: Professor John Potts
Thesis submitted for examination: 09 December 2014
Thesis title: Music of the Anglican Cathedral and Selected Anglican Parish Churches of the Diocese of Sydney 1869-1940
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

CARLTON, ANTHONY  FOBE  PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Geoffrey Loudon
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Robert Trevor
Thesis submitted for examination: 02 February 2015
Thesis title: Investigating the Discount on Trade Sale Transaction
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

COTTON, DEBORAH JOAN  FOBE  PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Stefan Trueck  
Associate Supervisor: Dr Huu Truong  
Adjunct Supervisor: D. Michayluk  
Thesis submitted for examination: 04 November 2014  
Thesis title: Efficacy of Emissions Trading Schemes in Australia  
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

**DESPREZ, MARINE FOSE PHD**  
Principal Supervisor: Professor Robert Harcourt  
Associate Supervisor: Dr Clive McMahon, Professor Mark Hindell  
Thesis title: Southern Ocean Sentinels: Demographic Insights Into the Declining Population of Southern Elephant Seals at Macquarie Island  
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

**DULHUNTY, JOHN FOSE PHD**  
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Subramanyam Vemulpad  
Associate Supervisor: Mr Peter Bull  
Thesis submitted for examination: 01 April 2015  
Thesis title: The Measurement and Correction of Sacral Obliquity  
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

**FIGUEROA NERI, FABIOLA FOA PHD**  
Principal Supervisor: Dr Andrew McGregor  
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Chris Houston  
Thesis submitted for examination: 20 October 2014  
Thesis title: New Environmental Citizenship in Mexico. An Exploration of Temacapulin’s Resistance to the Zapotillo Dam  
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

**GALE, PHILIPPA JANE FOA PHD**  
Principal Supervisor: Dr Tanya Evans  
Associate Supervisor: Professor Mary Spongberg  
Thesis submitted for examination: 23 February 2015  
Thesis title: “A Shocking Spectacle”: A Medical and Social History of Craniotomy in Nineteenth-Century British Obstetrics  
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

**GOOCH, KATHRYN ANN FOA PHD**  
Principal Supervisor: Dr Kate Gleeson  
Associate Supervisor: -  
Thesis submitted for examination: 16 October 2014  
Thesis title: Because She's a Woman: Gender Stereotypes and Women's Participation in Australian Politics  
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

**HALLEN, ANDRE FOSE PHD**  
Principal Supervisor: Professor Peter Karuso  
Associate Supervisor: Professor Paul Haynes, Professor Arthur Cooper  
Thesis submitted for examination: 23 March 2015  
Thesis title: Amino Acid Metabolism in the Mammalian Brain  
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

**HAMMOND, REGINA FOSE PHD**  
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Paul Beggs  
Associate Supervisor: Dr Sandra Suchet-Pearson  
Adjunct Supervisor: A. Simpson  
Thesis submitted for examination: 05 December 2014  
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy
Thesis title: Colonial Representations in a Post Colonial World
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

HEZART, ARMIN FOSE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Abhaya Nayak
Associate Supervisor: Professor Mehmet Orgun
Thesis submitted for examination: 20 February 2015
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

HORTLE, ELINOR JANE FOMHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Gaetan Burgio
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Brendan McMorrân, Professor Simon Foote
Thesis submitted for examination: 30 March 2015
Thesis title: ENU Mutagenesis and the Quest for a Malaria Host-directed Therapy
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

HUAN, CHANG PENG FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Christopher N. Candlin / Dr Wu CanZhong
Associate Supervisor:
Thesis submitted for examination: 18 March 2015
Thesis title: Journalistic Stance in Chinese and Australian Hard News
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

JACOMBS, ANITA SIMONE WHICKER FOMHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Anand Deva
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Karen Vickery
Thesis submitted for examination: 27 March 2015
Thesis title: The Consequences and Prevention of Bacterial Biofilm Infection of Silicone Breast Implants
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

JOHNSON, KATHERINE FOA PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Archana Parashar
Associate Supervisor: Ms. Francesca Dominello
Thesis title: The Reconstructionist Model of Mediation: A Social Constructionist View of the Quest for Meaning to Make Sense of Loss
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

KEUK, RITH CHAN NARITH FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Stephen Moore
Associate Supervisor: Dr John Knox
Thesis title: Investigating Communities of Practice and ELT Teacher Research in Cambodia
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

KORTIAN, VIKEN MGSM PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Norma Harrison
Associate Supervisor:
Thesis submitted for examination: 11 June 2015
Thesis title: Organisational Agility and Firm's Performance: The impact of organisational agility in business excellence models of Australian SMEs
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

KUXA, EVGENY FOSE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Michael Heimlich
LAI, HONG FOSE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Mehmet Orgun
Associate Supervisor: Professor Josef Pieprzyk
Adjunct Supervisor: J.H. Xiao
Thesis submitted for examination: 17 April 2015
Thesis title: The Design and Analysis of Classical and Quantum Key Agreement Protocols
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

LEE, NGA YEE MGSM DBA
Principal Supervisor: Professor Greg Elliott
Associate Supervisor: Ms Lara Moroko
Thesis submitted for examination: 22 January 2015
Award Recommended: Doctor of Business Administration

LEONG, HAN MING FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Mark Carter
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Jennifer Stephenson
Thesis submitted for examination: 09 December 2014
Thesis title: Managing Controversial Therapies in Special Education – Sensory Integration Therapy
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

LOTT, MATTHEW FOSE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Michelle Power
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Grant Hose
Thesis submitted for examination: 27 January 2015
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

MAIRET, KATHLEEN SUZANNE FOHS PHD/MCLINPSY
Principal Supervisor: Dr Simon Boag
Associate Supervisor: Professor Ronald Rapee, Dr Wayne Warburton
Thesis title: An Examination of the Theoretical Pathways Proposed by Young's Schema Therapy Model In Relation to Social Anxiety
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy and Master of Clinical Psychology

MANIC, LUDMILA FOSE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Vladimir Gaitsgory
Associate Supervisor: Professor Paul Smith
Thesis submitted for examination: 13 April 2015
Thesis title: Linear Programming Based Approaches to Optimal Control Problems with Long Run Average Optimality Criteria
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

MARTINELLI, JULIETA FOSE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Matthew A. Kosnik
Associate Supervisor: Dr Joshua Madin
Thesis submitted for examination: 09 March 2015
Thesis title: Ecological Interactions and Community Structure in Living and Subfossil Molluscan Assemblages from the Southern Great Barrier Reef
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

MCALISTER, JODI ANN FOA PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Hsu Ming Teo
Associate Supervisor: Professor Marea Mitchell
Thesis submitted for examination: 09 March 2015
Thesis title: Romancing the Virgin: Female Virginity Loss and Love in Popular Literatures in the West
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

MCAULIFFE, JANE PATRICIA FOHS DPSYCH
Principal Supervisor: Adjunct Professor Arthur Shores
Associate Supervisor: -
Thesis title: Predicting deterioration in dementia and MCI using a single administration of the MMSE and the ADAS-Cog.
Award Recommended: Doctor of Psychology

MILLER, ELIOT FOSE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Mark Westoby
Associate Supervisor: Dr Andrew Allen
Thesis submitted for examination: 13 February 2015
Thesis title: Evolution and Ecology of Two Iconic Australian Clades: The Meliphagidae (Birds) and the Hakeinae (plants)
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

MOK, MAN YEE ANGEL FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr David Saltmarsh
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Joanne Mulligan, Dr Michael Cavanagh
Thesis submitted for examination: 02 March 2015
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

MORTIMORE, ANNA FOBE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Hope Ashiabor
Associate Supervisor: Dr Erika Techer
Thesis submitted for examination: 26 November 2014
Thesis title: The Use of Economic Instruments in Managing the Environmental Externalities of Road Transport
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

MULLAN, DAVID FOA PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Vijaya Nagarajan
Associate Supervisor: Mr. George Tomossy
Thesis submitted for examination: 13 February 2015
Thesis title: ASIC and the Secondary Electricity Market
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

PALOMBO, LARA FOA PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Joseph Pugliese
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Nicola Sullivan
Thesis submitted for examination: 04 December 2014
Thesis title: The Racial Camp and the Production of the Political Citizen: A Genealogy of Contestation from Indigenous Populations and Diasporic Women
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy
PAXTON, SIMON REGIN FOA PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Chavalin Svetanant
Associate Supervisor: Dr Mio Bryce
Thesis submitted for examination: 02 March 2015
Thesis title: Tackling the Kanji Hurdle: An Investigation of Kanji Order and Its Role in Facilitating the Kanji Learning Process
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

PEATE, JOSHUA GRAHAME FOSE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Xuan Dong
Associate Supervisor: Dr Christopher Meaney
Thesis submitted for examination: 06 February 2015
Thesis title: Riesz Transform Estimates in the Absence of a Preservation Condition and Applications to the Dirichlet Laplacian
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

PITT, JOSEPH NITIPHON FOBE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Lawrence Ang
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Hume Winzar
Thesis submitted for examination: 20 February 2015
Thesis title: Multi-Modal Food Story Immersion: A Persuasion Mechanism and Theory of Photographic Depiction of Food Products in Advertising and Marketing
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

SARTIKA, DAHLIA EKA FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Mridula Sharma
Associate Supervisor: Dr Robert Mannell
Adjunct Supervisor: P. Newall
Thesis submitted for examination: 23 December 2014
Thesis title: The Development of Speech Perception Tests for Children in the Indonesian Language (Bahasa Indonesia)
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

SELWOOD, AMANDA FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Amanda J. Barnier
Associate Supervisor: Professor John Sutton, Dr Celia Harris
Thesis submitted for examination: 24 April 2015
Thesis title: Collaborative and Autobiographical Memory in Strangers, Friends, Siblings and Twins
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

SEN, YUKA FOMHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Michael Morgan
Associate Supervisor: Professor Albert Avolio
Thesis submitted for examination: 19 February 2015
Thesis title: Medical Image Segmentation System for Cerebral Aneurysm
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

SETHI, MANVEEN FOSE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Morten Thaysen Andersen
Associate Supervisor: Professor Nicolle Packer, Professor Mark Baker, Dr Susan Fanayan
Adjunct Supervisor: W. Hancock
Thesis submitted for examination: 27 February 2015
Thesis title: Mapping the biomolecular deregulation in colorectal cancer using LC-MS/MS-based N-glycomics and proteomics - A quest for potential biomarkers
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy
SIMPSON, SHELLEY LOUISE  FOHS  DPSYCH  
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Robyn Langdon  
Associate Supervisor: Dr Jennifer Batchelor  
Thesis submitted for examination: 17 December 2014  
Thesis title: A Comparative Neuropsychological evaluation of individuals aged >65 years who present with very-late-onset Schizophrenia-like-psychosis, chronic schizophrenia and late onset psychotic depression  
Award Recommended: Doctor of Psychology  

STODDART, PHOEBE ELEESE  FOHS  MPHIL  
Principal Supervisor: Dr Monique Crane  
Associate Supervisor: Dr Melissa Norberg  
Thesis submitted for examination: 28 April 2015  
Thesis title: Toward a Better Understanding of the Relationship Between Impostor Cognitions and Occupational Burnout  
Award Recommended: Master of Philosophy  

SURIYANKIETKAEW, SUPARAK  MGSM  PHD  
Principal Supervisor: Professor Gayle C. Avery  
Associate Supervisor: -  
Adjunct Supervisor: S. Kantabutra  
Thesis submitted for examination: 10 April 2015  
Thesis title: Leadership and Management Factors Predicting Performance Outcomes and Organisational Sustainability in Thai SMEs: An Empirical Investigation  
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy  

TAHURA, UMMEY SHARABAN  FOA  MPHIL  
Principal Supervisor: Dr Margaret Kelly  
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Shawkat Alam  
Thesis submitted for examination: 30 April 2015  
Thesis title: Case Management in Reducing Case Backlogs: Potential Adaptation from the NSW District Court to Bangladeshi Civil Trial Courts  
Award Recommended: Master of Philosophy  

TRAN, TRIDUNG  FOSE  PHD  
Principal Supervisor: Professor Xuan Dong  
Associate Supervisor: Dr Adam Sikora  
Thesis submitted for examination: 14 November 2014  
Thesis title: A Study of Musielak-Orlicz Hardy Spaces, Weighted Morrey Spaces and Boundedness of Operators  
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy  

TUNG, MAN AMY  FOBE  PHD  
Principal Supervisor: Dr Kevin Baird  
Associate Supervisor: Dr Herbert Schoch  
Thesis submitted for examination: 13 November 2014  
Thesis title: The Effectiveness of Environmental Management  
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy  

UDDIN, JASHIM  FOBE  PHD  
Principal Supervisor: Professor Greg Elliott  
Associate Supervisor: Mr Hamin Hamin  
Thesis submitted for examination: 29 January 2015  
Thesis title: The Impact of Country-of-Origin (COO) on Australian Procurement Managers  
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy  

VAN, NGHI CHUONG JIMMY  FOA  PHD  
Principal Supervisor: Professor Tony Cousins
Associate Supervisor: Professor Antonina Harbus
Thesis submitted for examination: 11 March 2015
Thesis title: From Hermes to Holmes: Manifestations of the Trickster as Culture-Hero in Early Detective Fiction
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

VISWANATHAN, DEEPA FOMHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Stuart Graham
Associate Supervisor: Dr John Males
Thesis title: Corneal Structure and Biomechanics: Relationship to Diagnosis and Treatment of Glaucoma and Keratoconus
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

WADE-LEEUWEN, WEN CHEN BRONWEN FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Neil Harrison
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Alma Fleet, Professor Alan Rice
Thesis submitted for examination: 26 March 2015
Thesis title: Out of the Shadows: Fostering Creativity in Pre-service Teachers in Creative Arts Programs
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

WAI, SITHU FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Jacqueline Hayden
Associate Supervisor: Dr Kathryn de Gioia
Thesis submitted for examination: 17 March 2015
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

WENG, HAIJIE FOBE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Stefan Trueck
Associate Supervisor: Dr George Milunovich
Thesis submitted for examination: 04 December 2014
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

WHITE, AMANDA JANE FOHS PHD/MCLINNEUROPSY
Principal Supervisor: Dr Jennifer Batchelor
Associate Supervisor: Dr Susanne Meares
Thesis submitted for examination: 31 March 2015
Thesis title: Cognitive Abilities and Expert Assessment Practices in Fitness to Stand Trial Evaluations: An Australian Study Based on the Legal Standard of Presser
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy and Master of Clinical NeuroPsychology

WILLIAMS TETTEH, VERA NAA OFOSUA FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Ingrid Piller
Associate Supervisor: -
Thesis submitted for examination: 23 April 2015
Thesis title: Language, Education and Settlement: A Sociolinguistic Ethnography on, with, and for Africans in Australia
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

XU, HUILING IRENE FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Chris Candlin / Dr Stephen Moore
Associate Supervisor: -
Thesis submitted for examination: 30 March 2015
Thesis title: Contested Discourses of Women’s Identify in Chinese Print Media
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

ZANONI, LEE ELLYN  FOHS  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Dr Wayne Warburton
Associate Supervisor:  Dr Anne McMaugh, Associate Professor Kay Bussey
Thesis submitted for examination:  17 March 2015
Thesis title:  Child Welfare Fathers as Resources and Risks in Their Children's Lives
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

ZHANG, LI XIN  FOSE  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Associate Professor Judith Dawes
Associate Supervisor:  Professor James Piper, Professor Ewa Goldys, Associate Professor Jin DaYong, Dr Aaron McKay
Thesis submitted for examination:  02 March 2015
Thesis title:  Techniques for Characterisation and Applications of Long-lifetime Luminescence in the Microsecond Region
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

HAO, QIAN  FOBE  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Associate Professor Xian Zhou
Associate Supervisor:  Professor Tak Kuen Siu
Thesis submitted for examination:  09 April 2015
Thesis title:  On Time-Inconsistent Investment and Dividend Problems
Award Recommended:  Doctor of Philosophy

CONSIDERATION FOR VICE-CHANCELLOR'S COMMENDATION

GEORGE, INIGA SERAPHINA  FOSE  PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Professor Paul Haynes
Associate Supervisor:  Professor Robert Willows
Thesis submitted for examination:  24 April 2015
Thesis title:  Proteomic Analysis of Environmental Stress Responses in Grapevine

On 21 August 2015, the Higher Degree Research Committee recommended that Iniga Seraphina George's PhD thesis be awarded.

The following comments were received from the examiners:

"Iniga Seraphina George demonstrates here that she is an excellent expert in proteomics, from protein extraction to statistical analyses of the mass-spectrometry data. It seems clear that she benefited from the excellent context of her laboratory. However, it is also clear that she spent much time to successfully design the best analytical and statistical methods. This skillful work strongly contributes without any doubt to strengthen the reputation of her laboratory in plant proteomics and will also, more globally, have an impact on the plant proteomics community. …this is a solid, and very interesting study that provides a number of original results, notably on two main aspects, namely i) the characterization of grapevine responses to abiotic stress as investigated by proteomics and (ii) the development of novel and very useful proteomic techniques that could be applied to many other studies in plant proteomics. During this thesis considerable work has been done to document these new aspects and the thesis is associated with a high number of papers in the most highly considered journals of proteomics. The manuscript is very well written and the quality of the experimental data is impressive. This excellent work will pave the way for further studies on the mechanisms of grapevine response to abiotic stress. Besides considerable interest at the fundamental level, the potential applications of this work are also of huge interest in agriculture, notably for the development of a more sustainable agriculture. I consider that the present thesis is exceptional … Finally, if the Macquarie University were to award along with the award of Doctor of Philosophy a special mention to highlight the excellence of a thesis, I will recommend without any hesitation distinguish Iniga Georges by awarding her such a mention.

The thesis is based on six articles published in peer-reviewed journals and a manuscript. Mrs. George is first author of four papers. Journal impact factors are around four, for Methods in Molecular Biology, impact factor appears not available, but this paper has been cited four times since 2014. Chapter I presents a well done introduction into the field… Chapter 2. methods used were state of the arts.. Results of this thesis were adequately presented, contribute significantly to our knowledge on molecular mechanisms on environmental stress response in grapevine and established a platform for grapevine shotgun proteomics. It clearly demonstrated the power of proteomic technology for discovery of molecular mechanism in grapevine. Recognition of the high quality of the presented studies was also indicated by selected oral presentations on international meetings, travel grants and awards."
The thesis of Ms. George forms a high quality, extensive, original and comprehensive contribution to our understanding of the effects of environmental factors, temperature and day length, on the proteome of both vegetative and reproductive tissue of grapevine and identifies key pathways and proteins involved in the responses. Knowledge provided in the thesis will facilitate the identification of potential biomarkers which can be used to further selective breeding programs in grapevines. Additionally, the thesis presents an elegant approach to validate protein fold-change analysis by spectral counting employing a novel control-control experimental design. In undertaking the experimental work for the thesis, it is apparent that Ms. George has mastered techniques ranging from standard laboratory methods, including tissue culture, protein extraction and fractionation, to highly specialized and technically challenging analysis that requires expert knowledge, including mass spectrometry and bioinformatics and she should be commended for the high standard of work that is presented. The thesis comprises an impressive 5 published articles including a literature review, a methods paper and original research findings, of which Ms. George is first author and major contributor (>85%) on 4. It shows the student’s insight into the field of study and ability to critically review the literature as well as her own contribution. The quality and quantity of the body of work is commensurate with that expected for Ph.D. studies. I recommend the degree of Doctor of Philosophy should be awarded to Ms. George and congratulate her on her effort.”

Taking into account the examiners reports and the above comments, the committee noted that the thesis was of exceptional merit.

RESOLVED
That Iniga Seraphina George’s PhD thesis entitled “Proteomic Analysis of Environmental Stress Responses in Grapevine” be awarded a Vice-Chancellor’s Commendation.

COMPLETION OF REQUIREMENT (MRES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMRI, AVIANTO</td>
<td>FOSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARRABALDE, ELIZABETH</td>
<td>FOHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DILWORTH, TASMIN-LARA</td>
<td>FOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARDS, MICHELLE</td>
<td>FOHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERNANDEZ, LAURA</td>
<td>FOSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOOR, RAHAT ULAIN SUMMAN</td>
<td>FOMHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEARING, CHLOE</td>
<td>FOSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAMSON, KATHARINE</td>
<td>FOA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESOLVED
That the above candidates be awarded the degree of Master of Research

B. MATTERS FOR RECOMMENDATION

1. Two Joint PhD proposals with University of Pierre Marie Curie (France) and Radboud University Nijmegen Netherlands were put forward and were accepted by the Committee.

The Committee
RECOMMENDS
That the following proposal to establish a Joint PhD Program with University of Pierre Marie Curie (France) and Radboud University Nijmegen be approved.

Proposal for a Joint PhD Program with the Pierre and Marie Curie University (UPMC)

UPMC is a public research university in Paris and is France’s largest scientific and medical complex. UPMC participates in the development of high-level research and collaborates with more than one hundred universities worldwide. There are seven teaching and research departments in chemistry; engineering; mathematics; medicine; physics; and life, Earth, environmental and biodiversity sciences. It also includes the Ecole polytechnique universitaire, the Institut d’Astrophysique de Paris, the Institut Henri Poincaré and three marine stations on the coasts of France. UPMC collaborates with a number of reputable French organisations such as:

- CNRS (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique; French national centre for scientific research)
- INSERM (Institut national de la santé et de la recherche médicale; French national institute for health and medical research)
• INRA (Institut national de la recherche agronomique; French national institute for agricultural research)
• IRD (Institut de recherche pour le développement; French institute of research for development)
• Ifremer (Institut français de recherche pour l'exploitation de la mer; French research institute for exploitation of the sea)
• CEA (Commissariat à l'Énergie Atomique; French atomic energy commission)
• CNES (Centre National d'Études Spatiales; French national centre for space research)

UPMC is also very active in the European 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7), with more than 140 projects and funding at nearly €40m, including grants from the European Research Council and Marie Curie actions.

Key University Figures

• 34,000 students of which 20% are international
• 475,000 m² spread across 18 campuses and locations in four regions of France
• 8,600 in staff, of which 80% are in research structures
• 100 research laboratories
• 8,000 publications per year (approx. 11% of the publication in France)

Rankings and Membership:

• ARWU 2014 rankings - #1 in France
• ARWU 2014 rankings - #35 in the world
• Member of the European innovation networks: Climate KIC, the EIT ICT Labs, and EIT Health

Proposal for a Joint PhD Program with Radboud University Nijmegen

Radboud University Nijmegen is a public university with a strong focus on research located in Nijmegen, the Netherlands. According to International Peer Review Committees that have evaluated their research institutes, almost all research programmes at the university are assessed as ‘very good’ to ‘excellent’. Radboud University distinguish nine leading areas of academic research:

• Organic chemistry
• Physics of condensed matter
• Astrophysics
• Microbiology
• Cognitive neurosciences
• Infection and immunology
• Cyber security
• Human genetics
• Linguistics
• Business and law

There are currently discussions for joint supervision programs in the Faculty of Arts (Department of Philosophy) and Faculty of Human Sciences (Department of Cognitive Science).

Key figures Radboud University

• Total Enrolments in 2014: 19 685
• 14 specialized research institutes
• Doctoral candidates: 1 085.8 FTE
• ARWU 2014 rankings - #131
• Founding member of International Research Universities Network (IRUN)

Research output

• Dissertations: 355
• Scientific publications: 6668
• Professional publications: 864
• Annotations: 264
• Patents: 14

Current Agreements between Macquarie University and Radboud University:
2. The Committee considered the proposal put forward for a Joint PhD program with the University of Toronto, Canada.

The Committee
RECOMMENDS
That the following proposal to establish a Joint PhD Program with University of Toronto, Canada be approved.

Proposal for a Joint PhD Program with the University of Toronto

The University of Toronto (UoT) is a large public research university in Toronto, Ontario, Canada. Founded in 1827, modern day UoT is consistently ranked the top university in Canada. UoT manages the largest annual research budget of any Canadian university.

There are currently discussions in the Department of Health Systems and Populations (FMHS) to host a Joint PhD student from UoT.

Research at UoT
2012-2017 Strategic Research Plan which spans seven thematic areas including:

1. Explore – Our Place in the Universe
2. Sustain – Humanity and the Environment
3. Promote – Healthy People, Healthy Communities, Healthy World
4. Engage – Mind, Language, Culture, Values
5. Advance – Institutions, Peace and Prosperity
7. Build – Community and Liveable Societies

$1.3B of Research Funds Awarded to UoT and Partner Hospitals (by Sector):
- Federal Granting Agencies 28%
- Other Federal 13%
- Government of Ontario 13%
- Other Government < 1%
- Industry 7%
- International 2%
- Inter-Institutional Collaboration 10%
- Not-For-Profit 27%

Students:
- 68,114 Undergraduate
- 56,220 Domestic
- 11,894 International

16,442 Graduates
- 13,927 Domestic
- 2,515 International

Staff:
- 13,239 Faculty Members (excludes Research Fellows, Sessional Lecturers and Teaching Assistants)
- 6,470 Staff Members
- 141 Librarians

Rankings & Membership:
#1 university in Canada
#25 university in the world accordingly to the ARWU Shanghai Jiao Tong 2015 Rankings
Member of the Association of American Universities

Agreements/MOU with Macquarie University:
General Memorandum of Understanding (expired 2005)
3. Associate Professor Andrew Alter proposed that the entry for BPhil/MRes in the Department of Philosophy be increased to a GPA of 3.0 overall and 3.25 at 300 level or equivalent). The Committee considered the recommendation carefully and accepted the proposal.

**The Committee**

**RECOMMENDS**

That the proposal to increase the entry requirement for BPhil/MRes in the Department of Philosophy be accepted and approved.

4. At the meeting held on the 19th of August 2015, the Program and Examination Sub-Committee was asked to recommend a procedure to HDRC as a way to resolve the MRes examination for two candidates (40973484 and 42497981) who appealed against the outcome. The Program and Examination Sub-Committee discussed various options and resolved against the proposal of setting aside the original examiner reports. It has however recommended that, without seeing the Appeals committee documentation, the procedure below in place for 2015 MRes examination be applied.

The procedure is as followed: If the grades from two external examiners cannot be reconciled, the thesis is to be sent to a third external examiner. Once the third report is returned, all examiner reports will be sent to the supervisor for a written response. The supervisor's response and all external examiner reports will be forwarded first to the Dean HDR for review and then to the PESC to determine a numerical grade.

The Committee discussed this recommendation and resolved to approve and recommend it for approval by the Academic Senate.

**The Committee**

**RECOMMENDS**

That the proposal above be approved and that thesis for both 40973484 and 42497981 be sent for examination by a third external examiner. Once the third report is returned, all examiner reports will be sent to the supervisor for a written response. The supervisor's response and all external examiner reports will be forwarded first to the Dean HDR for review and then to the PESC to determine a numerical grade.
ITEM 13.3 REPORT OF THE HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

A. MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

Friday 25 September 2015

Dr Vito Mollica presented MGSM Research and Research Training Strategic Plan to the Committee. MGSM will focus on quality research outputs through increasing quality PhD candidates with industry support.

Professor Verity updated members on the consultation of the proposed Research and Research Training Committee and will work with Professor Leslie Hughes (representing DVC-R) and Ms Melanie Harris (representing VC) on the feedback. Professor Verity also tabled a document on two MRES appeal cases. Members agreed that Professor Verity will consult with the University Legal Council on the process of handling these two appeal cases. Professor Verity and Professor Mansfield will put a paper together for the Standing Panel, the panel will have three weeks to review the two cases. The outcome from the panel will be reviewed by PESC and HDRC. Professor Verity also informed the Committee that an external review of the MRES program will commence in the next couple of months.

Professor Pretorius provided the Committee with an update on the Macquarie Croatia Cotutelle Scholarship Scheme. Five Cotutelle Scholarships have been allocated between Croatian Partners.

Professor Mansfield informed members that the University of Sydney will implement an MRES Program in the future and further updated members on MQ Candidature Management Plan, the Supervision Program, PhD Mentoring Program and 3 Minutes Thesis Competition.

Dr Yi updated members on current enrolments and completions. As of 21 September 2015, 753 were enrolled into HDR programs, including 187 Bphil candidates. 396 candidates have completed (250 PhD and 146 MRES). Dr Yi briefed members on the Cotutelle and Joint PhD Report, the co-funded agreement between Macquarie and the Pakistan Higher Education Commission (HEC), the Cotutelle MOU with KAIST - Korea, the Cotutelle MOU with Xiamen University - China, the Joint PhD MOU with University Sheffield -UK. Dr Yi also advised members on the upcoming DAAD workshop in November. Six delegates from Hamburg and four delegates from Fudan will attend the workshop at Macquarie University.

COMPLETION OF REQUIREMENT (PHD/MPHIL)

**ALNAMLAH, YOUSEF**

FOBE PHD

Principal Supervisor: Professor Lucy Taksa
Associate Supervisor: Dr Alison Barnes
Thesis submitted for examination: 03 March 2015
Thesis title: An Examination of Muslim Religious Practices in the Workplace and Their Implications for Management
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

**ASMUNI, NURIN HANIAH**

FOBE PHD

Principal Supervisor: Dr Sachi Purcal
Associate Supervisor: Ms. Shauna Ferris
Thesis submitted for examination: 30 January 2015
Thesis title: Essays on Annuities and Their Economic Values for Retirees
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

**BLOMSON, DEAN**

MGSM PHD

Principal Supervisor: Professor Guy Ford
Associate Supervisor: -
Adjunct Supervisor: T. Carlin
Thesis title: Caveat Emptor: The Accountabilities and Required Actions of Directors in Securing Value When Merging or Acquiring Companies
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

BOWAN, GILLIAN VITA LORELLE FOA PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Kalpana Ram
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Christopher Houston
Thesis title: Paying Guests: Between Kinship and Capital. An ethnography of boarding house residents in urban South India
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

BROINOWSKI, ANNA FOA PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor John Potts
Associate Supervisor: Dr Karen Pearlman
Thesis title: Tricks of the Trade
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

BYROW, YULISHA FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Lorna Peters
Associate Supervisor: Dr Suzanne Broeren
Thesis title: The Influence of Adult Attachment Style on Social Anxiety
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

CAMPBELL, STACEY ANNE FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Jane Torr
Associate Supervisor: Dr Rosalind Kitson
Thesis submitted for examination: 17 December 2014
Thesis title: Early childhood educators’ views about code-related literacy development, phonics instruction and the use of commercial phonics programs: a quantitative and qualitative analysis
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

CHOO, WEI HAO FOBE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Piet de Jong
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Xian Zhou
Thesis submitted for examination: 07 August 2015
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

DEYO, CLIFFORD LAWRENCE FOHS DPSY
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Robyn Langdon
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Edwin Shores
Thesis title: “Formal Thought Disorder” in Homeless Young Adults with Elevated Schizotypal Traits: Dimensional Structure and Cognitive Correlates
Award Recommended: Doctor of Psychology

DIDIER, SEVERINE JULIE FOA PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Brigitte Jandey
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Karin Speedy
Thesis submitted for examination: 31 March 2015
Thesis title: La transmission de l'héritage culturel intangible par la littérature de jeunesse ; Modélisation sémantico-discursive de "chez soi" dans le conte Mëyëndô (Ponga, 2004)
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy
DING, JIE  FOSE   PHD
Principal Supervisor:  Professor Eryk Dutkiewicz
Associate Supervisor: Dr Gengfa Fang
Thesis submitted for examination: 06 July 2015
Thesis title: Ultra-wideband Wireless Body Area Network Design and Optimisation
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

FAN, NA  FOHS   PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Medhi Riazi
Associate Supervisor: Ms. Jean Brick
Thesis submitted for examination: 13 April 2015
Thesis title: A Study of Vocabulary Knowledge and Vocabulary Learning Strategies of Chinese EFL Learners
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

FOLLETT, RIA MAREN  FOSE   MPHIL
Principal Supervisor: Professor Vladimir Strezov
Associate Supervisor: Dr Tao Kan
Thesis submitted for examination: 03 June 2015
Thesis title: Evaluating the actions of citizens as scientists through experimentation with Aquaponics
Award Recommended: Master of Philosophy

GEORGE, INIGA SERAPHINA  FOSE   PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Paul Haynes
Associate Supervisor: Professor Robert Willows
Thesis submitted for examination: 24 April 2015
Thesis title: Proteomic Analysis of Environmental Stress Responses in Grapevine
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

GOSBELL, LOUISE ANNE  FOA   PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Brent Nongbri
Associate Supervisor: Professor Laurence Welborn
Thesis submitted for examination: 26 March 2015
Thesis title:  'The Poor, the Crippled, the Blind and the Lame': Physical and Sensory Disability in the Gospels of the New Testament
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

GRAHAM, MARNIE LAURA  FOA   PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Sandie Suchet-Pearson
Associate Supervisor: Professor Richard Howitt, Dr Donna Houston
Thesis submitted for examination: 11 February 2015
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

GROSE, CHRISTOPHER  FOSE   PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Juan Alfonso
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor YingJie Yang
Thesis submitted for examination: 15 June 2015
Thesis title: Thermochemical Models of Oceanic Upper Mantle
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

HASWELL, STEPHEN  FOBE   PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Elaine Evans
Associate Supervisor: -
Adjunct Supervisor: M. Page
Thesis title: Fair Value Accounting and Financial Crises: An Actor-network Study
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

HUGHES, KATHRYN ANNE MGSM PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Steven Segal
Associate Supervisor: Dr Peter Tatham
Thesis submitted for examination: 23 April 2015
Thesis title: Decision-making Under Pressure: Critical Factors Impacting Supply Chain Management in the Aftermath of Large, Sudden-onset Natural Disasters
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

JOHNSON, NIKKI FOHS PHD/MCLINPSY
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Cathy McMahon
Associate Supervisor: Dr FL Gibson
Thesis submitted for examination: 30 April 2015
Thesis title: Maternal Psychological Maturity, Parenting and Toddler Regulation
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy and Master of Clinical Psychology

JUNQUEIRA SANTIAGO, MARINA FOMHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Mark Connor
Associate Supervisor: Professor Helen Rizos
Adjunct Supervisor: M. Glass
Thesis submitted for examination: 24 June 2015
Thesis title: Regulation of the µ-opioid receptor signalling in naturally occurring variants and phosphorylation site mutants
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

KAUR, JASHANPREET FOSE PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Helena Nevalainen
Associate Supervisor: Dr Anwar Sunna, Dr Valentino Te’o
Thesis submitted for examination: 11 June 2015
Thesis title: Biological Studies Into Scedosporium aurantiacum: An Opportunistic Pathogen Colonising Human Lungs
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

KIRK, EMMA JOY FOA PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Gunner Mikklesen
Associate Supervisor: Dr Stephen Llewelyn
Thesis submitted for examination: 09 April 2015
Thesis title: Peace in the Chaos: Implications of the Conscious Elimination of Conflict in Divinely Designed and Spontaneous Creation from the Hebrew and Chinese Traditions
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

KRAJENBRINK, JANNA GEERTRUIDA FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Lyndsey Nickels
Associate Supervisor: Dr Saskia Kohnen
Thesis submitted for examination: 10 April 2015
Thesis title: The Nature of Acquired Dysgraphia: Patterns of Impairment and Rehabilitation
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

LOPEZ, YANY PALAMOS FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Jacqueline Hayden
Associate Supervisor: Dr Katherine Cologon, Ms Fay Hadley
Thesis submitted for examination: 07 April 2015
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy
MCCARROLL, CHRISTOPHER JUDE      FOHS      PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor John Sutton
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Richard Menary
Thesis title: Point of View in Personal Memory: A Philosophical Investigation
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

MOKHATEBI ARDAKANI, MOJGAN      FOHS      PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Robyn Moloney
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Abdolmehdi Riazi
Thesis title: A Case Study of Primary School Persian Heritage Language Learners in Australia
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

NADORT, ANNEMARIE      FOSE      PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Ewa Goldys
Associate Supervisor: Dr Andrei Zyvagin
Adjunct Supervisor: A.G.J.M. Van Leeuwen
Thesis title: Glow with the Flow: Quantifying Blood Flow and Photoluminescence Signal in Biological Tissue
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

NUGRAHA, ALBERT KRIESTIAN NOVI ADHI   FOBE   PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Greg Elliott
Associate Supervisor: Mr Hamin Hamin
Thesis submitted for examination: 16 December 2014
Thesis title: Consumers’ Decision to Visit a Risky Destination Country: An Analysis of Tourists’ Risk Taking
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

PORZIG-DRUMMOND, RENATE      FOHS      PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Dick Stevenson
Associate Supervisor: Dr Megan Oaten
Thesis submitted for examination: 07 April 2015
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

ROMANOVA, ANASTASIIA      FOHS      PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Lyndsey Nickels
Associate Supervisor: Dr Kati Renvall
Thesis submitted for examination: 13 April 2015
Thesis title: Word Class Effects on Representation and Processing in Non-brain-damaged Speakers and People with Aphasia
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

ROSS, ROBERT MALCOLM      FOHS      PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Robyn Langdon
Associate Supervisor: Professor Max Coltheart
Thesis submitted for examination: 17 April 2015
Thesis title: Cognitive and Evolutionary Foundations of Culture and Beliefs
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

RYAN, ROBERT JOHN      FOA      MPHIL
Principal Supervisor: Dr Stephen Collins
STUART, JORDYN MICHELLE  FOMHS   PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Mark Connor
Associate Supervisor: Professor Jacqueline Phillips
Thesis title: The Pharmacology of Novel Illicit Synthetic Cannabinoids
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

SUN, ZHU  FOSE   PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Karu Esselle
Associate Supervisor: Dr Basit Zeb
Adjunct Supervisor: Y. Guo, S.S. Zhong
Thesis submitted for examination: 20 August 2014
Thesis title: Multi-Band Dual Polarized Shared Aperture Microstrip Phased Array
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

UKKOLA, ANNA MARIA  FOSE   PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Iain Colin Prentice
Associate Supervisor: Dr Ian Wright, Dr Trevor Keenan
Thesis submitted for examination: 27 January 2015
Thesis title: Effects of Vegetation Processes on Water Resources at Global and Continental Scales
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

WANG, MINGZHU  FOSE   PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Hsing-Chung Michael Chang
Associate Supervisor: Dr Timothy Cohen
Adjunct Supervisor: J. Merrick
Thesis submitted for examination: 04 March 2015
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

ZEMAN, ASTRID ANNEMARIE  FOHS   PHD
Principal Supervisor: Associate Professor Kevin Brooks
Associate Supervisor: Professor Max Coltheart
Adjunct Supervisor: O.Obst
Thesis submitted for examination: 17 March 2015
Thesis title: Computational Modelling of Visual Illusions
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

ZHENG, XIAO MING  FOSE   PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Mehmet Orgun
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Yan Wang
Thesis title: Trust Prediction in Online Social Networks
Award Recommended: Doctor of Philosophy

ZHONG, YOULIANG  FOSE   PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Jian Yang
Associate Supervisor: Mr Weiliang Zhao
Thesis submitted for examination: 21 November 2014
Thesis title: A Peer-based Social Relationship Enhanced Recommendation Model
CONSIDERATION FOR VICE-CHANCELLOR’S COMMENDATION

CHOO, WEI HAOFobe PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor Piet de Jong
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Xian Zhou
Thesis submitted for examination: 07 August 2015

On 25 September 2015, the Higher Degree Research Committee resolved that Choo Wei Hao’s PhD thesis be awarded.

The following comments were received from the examiners:

“This dissertation studies in-depth measurement of risk, dependency and portfolio diversification. These topics are at the heart of quantitative finance and actuarial science. The dissertation has presented new concepts and tools by measuring correlation at various quantiles or layers of a risk (random variable). The mathematical derivations are elegant. The new concepts and results have profound implications in quantifying portfolio diversification benefits, and will most likely generate several research publications in actuarial and quantitative journals. Among 16-18 doctoral theses that I have read, this one stands out as the best (or tied to the best). I enjoyed reading this fine piece of research work.”

“This work is divided into 4 original papers supplemented with an introduction and a conclusion. The authors propose new dependence/risk measures, concentrating on the tails of the distribution. The new measures are built from (re)insurance layers whose endpoints are quantiles (or value-at-risk) and are thus very appealing with actuaries and other risk analysts. The text is clearly written, the ideas are innovative and the whole work constitutes a nice and useful addition to the existing literature. …this PhD is of high quality and the 4 papers certainly deserve to be published.”

“I think that Mr. Choo is a very talented young man possessing exceptional originality that is clearly demonstrated in this dissertation. I have not seen many (if at all) attempts to use ‘percentile layers’ in the literature. That being said, I think that the idea is quite promising, and in particular I like its applications to creating measures of local dependence. I also like the applications of the ‘layers’ idea to creating the trade-off premium. Overall, I think that the material herein is novel and original, and I would like to extend my congratulations to Mr. Choo and Prof. De Jong and to wish the former many more successes in his future endeavors.”

Taking into account the examiners reports and the above comments, the committee noted that the thesis was of exceptional merit.

RESOLVED
That Choo Wei Hao’s PhD thesis entitled “Novel Tools in Quantitative Risk Management” be awarded a Vice-Chancellor’s Commendation.

GROSE, CHRISTOPHER Fose PHD
Principal Supervisor: Dr Juan Alfonso
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor YingJie Yang
Thesis submitted for examination: 15 June 2015
Thesis title: Thermochemical Models of Oceanic Upper Mantle

On 25 September 2015, the Higher Degree Research Committee resolved that Christopher Grose’s PhD thesis be awarded.

The following comments were received from the examiners:

“The studies in the first three chapters of this thesis offer a very thorough analysis of the data and propose models that are consistent with our present knowledge of the properties of the oceanic crust and mantle. The research has been very carefully conducted and the author has investigated a whole range of model parameters consistent with the data. This very thorough investigation has potentially important implications for
Taking into account the examiners reports and the above comments, the committee noted that the thesis was of exceptional merit.

RESOLVED
That Christopher Grose’s PhD thesis entitled “Thermochemical Models of Oceanic Upper Mantle” be awarded a Vice-Chancellor’s Commendation.

MCCARROLL, CHRISTOPHER JUDE FOHS PHD
Principal Supervisor: Professor John Sutton
Associate Supervisor: Associate Professor Richard Menary
Thesis title: Point of View in Personal Memory: A Philosophical Investigation

On 25 September 2015, the Higher Degree Research Committee resolved that Christopher Jude McCarroll’s PhD thesis be awarded.

The following comments were received from the examiners:

“This thesis is a detailed, imaginative and incisive examination of the nature and importance of observer perspectives in episodic, autobiographical memory. McCarroll’s thesis takes a huge step towards addressing this neglect of observer memory. Central to his thesis is the ingenious idea that there is more information available at the encoding stage – the stage where memories are first formed – than is apparent if we think of perception simply as a matter of sensory stimulation. This idea has two advantages. First of all: It is novel. I work in this area, and I know of no one else who has defended this idea. Secondly, while novel, it is also, given what we know about memory more generally, plausible. The result, in McCarroll’s hands, is a central thesis that is both original and convincing. Having defended it, he then goes on to examine some of its implications both for our understanding of memory and the way memory contributes to personal identity. This is an outstanding thesis in all respects. Far too many doctoral thesis of today are concerned with the minutiae found on paths well-trodden by others. McCarroll’s thesis is a welcome exception to this. Not only is the central idea bold and original, it is defended with exceptional skill. The result, in McCarroll’s hands, is a central thesis that is both original and convincing. Having defended it, he then goes on to examine some of its implications both for our understanding of memory and the way memory contributes to personal identity. This is an outstanding thesis in all respects. Far too many doctoral thesis of today are concerned with the minutiae found on paths well-trodden by others. McCarroll’s thesis is a welcome exception to this. Not only is the central idea bold and original, it is defended with exceptional skill. In fact, it is, in my view, a model of how to engage in research in this sort of area. McCarroll knows the science very well, but he is not afraid of it... he is also a philosopher of great ability, equally at home in both analytic and continental traditions. I have been working in this area for some time, but, nevertheless, I learned a lot from this thesis. It was both a pleasure and a privilege to read. It is probably the best doctoral thesis I have examined, and if there is any justice in the world, it should find a home as a book with a top tier university press. I strongly recommend that he be awarded his doctorate, and I look forward, with great interest, to McCarroll’s career.”

“This is an excellent thesis, and I think it clearly merits the award of Doctor of Philosophy as it stands. I would not request any corrections. It’s a very tightly focused piece of work, on the existence, analysis and significant of ‘observer perspective’ memories. These are memories in which one sees oneself as one of the participants in a remembered scene. I’m not aware of any other work that gives this phenomenon such intensive study.
It's beautifully done, demonstrating a good philosophical sensibility on the part of the author, well in control of the subject matter but alive to the broader philosophical significance of the topics discussed. The work does a good deal to bring out the interest of this subject, and will be a valuable resource for further research. It shows a good independent mind in its marshaling of literature from quite different areas – from psychodynamics to linguistics – that bears directly on the core topic. And it's written with great lucidity. I think that it would be the basis of an excellent monograph on the topic. It organizes a subject area in a way that hasn’t been done before, and raises a great many further interesting and challenging questions. It's a real contribution to the subject."

“Christopher McCarroll’s thesis explores an important, yet still under-discussed, topic in philosophy of mind: the nature of "observer memories". The significant achievement of this thesis is to lay out a framework for thinking about the nature of memory that shows how observer memories can be understood as genuine memories, on a par with (universally accepted) field perspective memories. McCarroll marshals a commendably wide variety of sources to make his case here, both philosophical and empirical, and handles this range of material deftly, perceptively, and with subtlety and precision. There’s an admirable carefulness to the argumentation here, and indeed a certain pervasive modesty. McCarroll rarely seems to argue directly that memory is constructive or that the observer perspective is typically unoccupied, for instance. Rather, he begins from the hypothesis – clearly warranted by our experience of observer memories – that these should be taken seriously as genuine memories, and then proceeds to show how a series of important objections to this hypothesis are based on premises that need not obtain. So what we end up with isn't the definitive argument for observer memory being (as) genuine (as field memory), so much as a clearing away of reasons for us not to accept them as such. That’s no small feat, though, and the thesis has performed an important service by achieving it. I cannot conclude without saying a word or two about the splendid quality of the prose here. Despite all the ‘scaffolding’ sentences which are unfortunately necessary for a thesis, this commendably lucid, engaging, and warmly personalized philosophical writing was a pleasure to read. I hope that we’ll see some of this thesis reworked for publication, and I very much look forward to following where this research project goes next. My congratulations to the author on a fine piece of work. ”

Taking into account the examiners reports and the above comments, the committee noted that the thesis was of exceptional merit.

RESOLVED
That Christopher Jude McCarroll’s PhD thesis entitled “Point of View in Personal Memory: A Philosophical Investigation” be awarded a Vice-Chancellor’s Commendation.

COMPLETION OF REQUIREMENT (MRES)
DABINET, ANMARIE FOA
GURUNG, AMIT FOSE
HAN, YINGYING FOBE
NGUYEN, VIET HUNG FOSE
RAHMAN, JASMINE FOHS

RESOLVED
That the above candidates be awarded the degree of Master of Research

B. MATTERS FOR RECOMMENDATION

Associate Professor Judi Homewood provided the background information for Chao Han (SN 42499542) with regards to his PhD Examination. The Committee discussed the item in details and resolved to approve the recommendation.

The Committee RECOMMENDS
That the PhD award be granted based on two examiner’s reports.

A request to offer the Master of Research in external mode at the Institute of Early Childhood was put forward and discussed by the Committee.

The Committee
RECOMMENDS
That the request be accepted and approved.
ITEM 13.4  HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH APPEALS COMMITTEE

Attached are the minutes of the Higher Degree Research Appeals Committee meeting held 27 August 2015.

For noting.
A meeting of the Higher Degree Research Appeals Committee was held on Thursday 27th August 2015 at 2pm in the Higher Degree Research Office Meeting Room C5C Level 3 (East Wing)

PRESENT: Professor Julie Fitness (Chair)
Professor Anne Castles (Faculty of Human Sciences)
Associate Professor Brian Atwell (Faculty of Science and Engineering)
Dr Alison Holland (Faculty of Arts)
Associate Professor Chris Baumann
(Faculty of Business and Economics)

IN ATTENDANCE: Ms. Jennifer Martin (Higher Degree Research Office)

APOLOGIES: Ms. Amanda Phelps (Academic Governance)
Professor Alberto Avolio (Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences)

A meeting of the Higher Degree Research Appeal Committee (HDRAC) was held to determine the Committee’s response in the case of Master of Research Candidate 40350290.

1. Procedural introduction
General committee business was discussed. The minutes from the last meeting were approved by the Committee via email. The Chair provided an update from Academic Senate on actions arising from the May HDRAC meeting. The decisions of the May meeting have not yet been implemented. The final decisions on what actions to take are due to be made at the October meeting of Academic Senate.

The Secretary provided a brief update on the current Rapid Improvement Project on HDR Termination and Appeals. The one week event has taken place and the project team has had its first project team meeting. Key improvements include that the new process will be ‘front loaded’ at the Faculty to give both students and Faculties a more structured and formalized HDR progress review process, a centralised documentation system to capture evidence of managing performance and termination and better governed, quicker and more transparent appeal processes. Governance Services will support the HDR appeals committee from a date to be confirmed.

Master of Research examination processes were discussed by the Committee. In reference to the case for this meeting, the pressure of having external examiners at this master’s level and the reliance on a numerical mark to directly determine scholarship allocation were highlighted in the Committee’s opinion as procedural areas warranting further management discussion. In the opinion of the Committee, there are also procedural questions on the content of the briefing documents for Master of Research thesis examiners which arise from this case.
2. Conflicts of Interest
n/a

3. Candidate 40350290
Committee Discussion from documentation
The Committee discussed the agenda papers as circulated. There was agreement that the candidate is a capable research student who should be encouraged to publish and who has been unlucky that the current processes have not worked for him.

It was discussed that additional information being provided by the University to examiners explaining the grading system may have helped in this case, or that the examiners being asked to link comments to grades may have helped this Candidate feel that they had been examined more fairly.

However, the Committee noted that the current information is useful for examiners, had been issued to the examiners for this case, and from the evidence provided the examiners have done what they have been requested to do in this case. The outcome of the Candidate not receiving the scholarship is unfortunate, but the result reflects the examinations undertaken. The Candidate is being encouraged to apply for scholarships with other rating criteria.

The pressure for scholarship allocation being tied to the numerical grade of 85% was commented on by the Committee. The Secretary advised that this will be phased out as part of the continual improvement of the Master of Research program. (Higher Degree Research Committee April 2015)

From the evidence provided by the Faculty for the agenda papers the selection of examiners for this case followed due process. No third examiner was required.

Appeal Claims: The Candidate is appealing the processes relating to the decision to award the Year 2 result of 83.5. The grounds of the appeal are claims that the examiners were not briefed adequately by Macquarie University for Master of Research thesis examination, that one of the examiners did not follow the grading criteria correctly and the Candidate questions this examiner’s ability to be a suitable examiner for this thesis.

The Candidate presented to the Committee at 3pm with their PhD supervisor
In response to questioning from the Committee, the Candidate provided the following details:
- that the supportive, commending, positive comments from examiners was inconsistent with the award of a grade below the requirement for progress to PhD with scholarship
- the Candidate acknowledged that the examiners chosen are top professionals in their fields
- the Candidate asserts that the examiners should be made aware by the University in the official briefing material for examiners of the impact of their marks on the outcomes for the Candidate (i.e. The 85% being needed for scholarship)
- the Supervisor advised that he only wrote a short email to potential examiners when asking them to examine the thesis, and did not mention this context of the numerical marks being linked to scholarship allocation
- the examiner who requested the thesis undergo corrections has differences of opinion with the candidate about various conceptual and methodological matters. The Candidate questions why this examiner was chosen to examine their thesis
- the Candidate asserts that if the examiners had known that their numerical grading had an impact on scholarship allocation that they would have awarded their marks differently
- the Candidate advised that they had initially nominated these examiners as potential
examiners during the nomination of examiners process.

In regards to the academic matter of questioning the examiner’s interpretation of the thesis, the Chair advised the Supervisor that this is a matter for the Program and Examinations Subcommittee (PESC) of the Higher Degree Research Committee (HDRC) chaired by the Dean, Higher Degree Research. The request for the candidate’s grade to be reviewed and a special consideration for a scholarship to be awarded was considered and rejected by PESC. The Supervisor advised that he was not satisfied with the reasoning provided for this decision, and that he will follow up with the Dean, Higher Degree Research.

After the presentations, the Committee deliberated further on the case. The key additional evidence from the presentations for the Committee was that the Candidate had direct input into the nomination of the examiners for their thesis.

From all the evidence provided, the Committee concluded that the current nomination of examiners and examination processes were followed by the University and the examiners. While it was suggested by Committee members that improvements could be made to the briefing of Master of Research examiners, the Committee agreed that current processes are adequate and were followed correctly and fairly in this case.

The Committee was therefore not able to find any evidence of any procedural irregularity or unfairness in relation to the examiners being adequately briefed, the examiners’ use of the grading criteria and the nomination and appointment of the examiners in this case.

Hence, the Committee agreed that the claim of procedural unfairness and irregularity in this case should not be upheld.

4. Conclusion

The Committee agreed that the appeal of Candidate 40350290 is to not be upheld on the grounds that the current procedures were followed correctly and fairly by the Faculty and University in appointing the examiners, briefing the examiners and examining the thesis.

5. Next Meetings
PhD case Tuesday 17th September 2015

6. Procedure improvements suggested through the investigations for this case:
The Committee suggests review of the information provided to potential examiners by supervisors and by the University explaining the examination of Master of Research theses. It was noted that this has been discussed in the Master of Research procedure working party currently working on continual Master of Research procedure improvements. Improvements in this area are being implemented.

The Committee suggests to management to further consider the question of whether or not the impact of Master of Research grading on scholarship allocation should be disclosed to examiners in their briefing documents.
ITEM 14.3 REPORT THE FROM FACULTY OF HUMAN SCIENCES FACULTY BOARD

Attached is the report from the Faculty of Human Sciences Faculty Board meeting of 4 August 2015.

For discussion.
ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

Student representation on Academic Senate

A/Professor Pamela Coutts confirmed that at the Academic Senate Standing Committee held early on 4 August 2015 approval to co-opt Julia Yang as the Student Representative from the Faculty Board to the Academic Senate had been provided.

ITEMS FOR NOTING

Report from the Executive Dean

The Acting Chair reported that:

1. The Institute of Early Childhood/Education merger has been approved by the Vice-Chancellor.
2. Advertisement for the new Head of Department of the merged department has been released, and consultant Philip Pogson has been engaged to facilitate the initial merger process.
3. Professor Mike Jones will take up an appointment as ADR and the recruitment process will commence for the ADI role shortly.
4. New Head of Linguistics Department - Short-listing for the new HOD of Linguistics has completed with interviews to follow.
5. University of Leuven - A potential partnership with the University of Leuven in Belgium is looking positive, with resourcing from both universities. An update will be provided at the next meeting.

General Business

The Faculty Standards and Quality Committee Terms of Reference was noted.

Reports from Subcommittee’s

The minutes of meetings held by the Learning and Teaching Subcommittee and WHS Subcommittee were noted. The unconfirmed minutes of meetings held by Higher Degree Research Subcommittee and Research Subcommittee were also noted at this meeting.

Report from the Faculty General Manager

a. The Executives have approved a new Faculty funding module for implementation as of 2016 which will provide the Faculty with further control over some University level income.

b. A Workload Review Group has been formed with members from both management and staff. The group is aiming to finalise a workload model which complies with the Academic Staff Enterprise Agreement prior to 2016 with a view to implement it in 2017. The Psychology School will be a pilot group to test the effectiveness of the alignment in PDR and Academic Workload management systems.

c. Offsite interview checklist, completed by researchers and the Health and Safety unit, will be circulated regarding offsite interviews conducted by MQ students and staff.

d. Everyone is recommended to take part in Health and Safety program to familiarise with the protocol on “active shooters”.

Standards and Quality Subcommittee

The Faculty Board approved the RPL schedules discussed and approved by the FSQC.

Minutes from Departments

The minutes of the meetings held by the Institute of Early Childhood, the Department of Psychology, the Department of Linguistics and the School of Education were noted.

The next meeting of Faculty of Human Sciences Faculty Board will be held on 6 October 2015. Agenda items are due by Monday 28 September 2015.

Professor Lori Lockyer

ACTING CHAIR
ITEM 14.4  REPORT THE FROM FACULTY OF MEDICINE AND HEALTH SCIENCES FACULTY BOARD

Attached is the report from the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences Faculty Board meeting of 7 September 2015.

For discussion.
REPORT TO ACADEMIC SENATE
FACULTY OF MEDICINE AND HEALTH SCIENCES
MEETING OF 7 SEPTEMBER 2015

ITEMS FOR APPROVAL BY ACADEMIC SENATE
There were no items requiring Academic Senate approval.

ITEMS FOR NOTING
Report from the Executive Dean
The Chair provided a verbal report on the following matters:

- Macquarie University Health Sciences Centre
  Integration of the activities and goals of Macquarie University Hospital; the Faculty and clinical practitioners. The new MUHSC website has now launched and the Strategic Plan (2015 -2020) is now available. Macquarie University Clinical Associates has been established and the appointment of the Clinical Leadership Group has commenced. This includes six Clinical Program Heads and a Chief Medical Officer.
- WHS Awareness and Training
  The Executive Dean is the Chair of the new Faculty Work Health and Safety Committee. All staff are to complete online learning and attend applicable training.
- Education – MD Planning Day
  The Doctor of Medicine Planning Day took place on 4 September 2015 with approximately 30 attendees. The Stage 1 submission to the Australian Medical Council is due the beginning of November.
- Masters of Public Health
  There is a planning workshop scheduled for 18 September 2015.
- Research
  The Chair spoke to the Barlow Report covering from 1991 to 2013. Barlow has identified that Macquarie will need to provide more teaching to ensure enough funds for research.
- Resources
  There is to be a new Student Centre built at 75 Talavera Road. The Department of Clinical Medicine will be placed on Level 4, Building F10A. There will be renovations of Level 1, 75 Talavera Road for the Department of Biomedical Sciences.

Reports from Faculty Committees
- Assessment Committee (FAC)
  The report from the FAC meeting held 20 August 2015 was noted and the following resolution made:
  - Four prize nominations were ratified by the Faculty Board following approval by flying minute.
- Education Committee (FEC)
  The report from the FEC meeting held 17 August 2015 was noted and the following resolutions made:
  - The Committee’s membership was approved.
  - The Simulation Working Group was established as a subcommittee of FEC.
  - The Faculty Board supports the Expression of Interest for the Master of Public Health and recommends it for approval by Academic Standards and Quality Committee.
  - The Faculty Board approved the assessment change for MEDI013 and MEDI206, increasing the number of essays required from one essay, to two.
- Higher Degree Research Committee (FHDRC)
  The report from the FHDRC meeting held 22 July 2015 was noted and the following resolutions made:
  - The Committee’s membership composition was changed by removing; one representative from the central Higher Degree Research Office and one representative from the Library. One early career researcher position was added. The Committee’s Terms of Reference are amended accordingly.
- Research Committee (FRC)
  The report from the FRC meeting held 12 August 2015 was noted and the following resolutions made:
  - The Committee’s membership composition was changed by removing; one representative from the Research Office; one representative from the central Higher Degree Research Office and one representative from the Library. The postdoctoral fellow member was increased from one member to two. The Committee’s Terms of Reference are amended accordingly.

Reports from the Associate Deans
Reports from each of the Associate Deans were received or provided verbally.
- Professor Kirsty Forrest, AD Learning and Teaching:
  - All staff are encouraged to attend the Learning and Teaching Week (14-18 September) programs.
  - An update was provided in relation to the Assessment Policy “hackathon” and the Academic Integrity Working Group.
  - The Executive Dean, AD L&T and Hayley Harris will represent FMHS at the MQ Open Day
  - The Faculty has now started to receive applications for the Bachelor of Clinical Science.
• **Professor Roger Chung, AD Research and Higher Degree Research**
  – Work has commenced to develop the FMHS Strategic Research Plan (2015-2024). Consultation with staff will commence following the next Research Committee meeting.
  – Faculty guidelines have been introduced to support HDR activities.
  – An update was provided following Academic Senates request for feedback on the Terms of Reference for the Research and Research Training Committee and its subcommittee. Faculty Board to also provide feedback on the draft documents to the AD RHDR.

• **Professor John Cartmill, AD Clinical**
  – The Faculty Board noted the tabled report.

• **Professor John Boyages, AD International and Engagement**
  – The Faculty Board noted the tabled report, taking note that Dr Lesley Halliday has been appointed as the Engagement Manager and will commence at the beginning of November.

**Minutes from Departments**
The minutes and reports of the meetings held by the Australian Institute of Health Innovation, the Department of Biomedical Sciences and the Department of Health Professions were noted.

**Other Business**
The Faculty Board was advised that Dr Alisha Sial, a student member on the Faculty Board is also member of the Student Advisory Board (SAB). The Faculty Board has now requested that Dr Sial provide a report to the next Faculty Board meeting advising of the matters for consideration by SAB.

The next meeting will be held Monday, 2 November 2015. Agenda items are due Monday, 30 November 2015.

**Professor Patrick McNeil**
CHAIR
ITEM 14.5 REPORT THE FROM FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING FACULTY BOARD

Attached is the report from the Faculty of Science and Engineering Faculty Board meeting of 16 September 2015.

For discussion.
ITEMS FOR APPROVAL BY ACADEMIC SENATE

There were no items requiring Academic Senate approval.

ITEMS FOR NOTING

Report from the Executive Dean
The Executive Dean provided a verbal report on the following matters:

- **Faculty Strategic Planning.** The Departments will be consulted throughout October on the draft Faculty Strategic Plan, with the launch of the final plan scheduled for November.
- **Building Resources.** Property has engaged with external architects to review existing buildings of FSE and potential new approaches for housing FSE. Reports of which are to be presented to the AD’s for consultation in due course.
- **Research.** There are new strategies in place to assist with Linkage and industry collaboration moving forward. Professor David Raftos and Dr Robert Pfeifer were acknowledged for each winning external prizes, the Board was advised that Faculty Research prizes will be awarded at the end of year function. The ARC Training Centre for Molecular Technology has opened and the MQ Planetary Research Centre has now launched.
- **Marketing** review remains ongoing. The following events were reported on: Pioneering Minds, Science Week and MQ Open Day.
- **The new Faculty WHS Committee** structure has been functioning since August with Committees in all Departments expected to be fully functioning at this point.
- **Government STEM Consultation.** A Working Group was established and prepared a University response.

Reports from Faculty Committees

- **Learning and Teaching Committee** - The draft minutes of the meeting held 27 August 2015 were noted.
- **Higher Degree Research Committee** - The minutes of the meeting held 29 July 2015 were noted
- **Research Committee** - The minutes of the meeting held 12 May, 9 June and 11 August were noted.

The Faculty Board also considered an updated Terms of Reference for the Committee and made the following resolutions:

1. The Faculty Board resolved to establish the Faculty Research Committee as a Committee of Faculty Board.
2. The Faculty Board resolves to approve the Terms of Reference for the Faculty Research Committee.

Other Business

Program alteration/proposals for 2017
The Faculty Board heard the following verbal proposals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry and Biomolecular</td>
<td>To create a new program in the Department. The new program would see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>the existing majors; (1) Chemistry and (2) Biomolecular Sciences, combine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>into one major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing</td>
<td>To rebadge the existing Bachelor of e-Business as Bachelor of Digital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To create a new Major in Cyber Security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>To create a two new minors within the Department:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Biomedical Engineering, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Energy and Environmental Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each proposal, the Faculty made the following resolutions:

1. The Faculty Board approved in principle the development of the proposed programs.
2. Each Department is to manage the development of its program and refer to the Faculty Learning and Teaching Committee for review and approval.
3. Each Department is to provide evidence of adequate stakeholder consultation to the Faculty Learning and Teaching Committee

Minutes from Departments

The minutes of the meetings held by the following Departments: Biological Sciences, Chemistry and Biomolecular Sciences, Chiropractic, Computing, Earth and Planetary Sciences, Engineering, Environmental Sciences, Physics and Astronomy and Statistics were noted.

The next meeting (exam result ratification meeting) will be held on Tuesday, 8 December 2015. General business items are due Thursday, 26 November 2015.

Professor Barbara Messerle
CHAIR