

**THE UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO  
TE WHARE WĀNANGA O WAIKATO**

**ACADEMIC BOARD: 3 March 2015**

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 3 March 2015 in the Council Room.

**Present:** Professor N Quigley (Chair), Mr S Aitken, Professor B Barton, Dr C Blickem, Professor C Branson, Associate Professor C Breen, Dr A Campbell, Ms B Cooper, Associate Professor C Costley, Associate Professor Wendy Drewery, Professor A Gillespie, Mr R Hallett, Professor R Hannah, Dr D Johnson, Professor L Johnston, Professor A Jones, Associate Professor S Jones, Associate Professor A Kingsbury, Dr T Kukatai, Dr J Lane, Professor R Longhurst, Associate Professor T McGregor, Dr D Marsh, Professor R Moltzen, Associate Professor S Morrison, Mr W Rumbles, Mr M Savage, Dr M Schoenberger-Orgad, Ms S Stewart, Professor M Steyn-Ross, Professor K Weaver, Associate Professor E Weymes, Ms A Watson and Professor M Wilson

**In attendance:** Ms D Fowler, Ms H Pridmore and Ms J Richards

**Secretariat:** Ms M Jordan-Tong and Ms R Boyer

**15.01 APOLOGIES**

**Received**

Apologies for absence from Dr T Bowell, Professor B Clarkson, Ms K Davey-Morland, Professor C Hewitt, Dr A Hinze, Professor G Holmes, Mr N Orr, Professor L Smith and Mr J Tuaupiki.

**15.02 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING (PART 1) HELD ON 9 DECEMBER 2014**

**Confirmed**

The minutes of the meeting (Part 1) held on 9 December 2014 as set out in document 15/81a.

**15.03 REPORT OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR (PART 1)**

**Received**

The report of the Vice-Chancellor (Part 1) as set out in document 15/82a.

**15.04 REPORT OF COUNCIL**

**Received**

A report from the 10 December 2014 and 11 February 2015 meetings of University Council, as set out in document 15/83.

### **Noted in discussion**

1. That Council had held a preliminary discussion about the Council reconstitution process. The discussion would continue at future meetings with the aim of having the new constitution finalised for implementation from 1 January 2016.
2. That the process for reconstitution of Council would include consultation with staff and the opportunity for staff input.
3. That with a smaller Council, the University would also need to consider the membership and constitution of committees of Council, of which Academic Board was one. The reconstitution process would include discussion of not only the Council structure itself, but also the way in which committees of Council fit into that structure.
4. That the Vice-Chancellor would bring an item on this topic to Academic Board later in 2015 with suggestions and the opportunity for the Board to provide feedback.

## **15.05 REPORT OF THE EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

### **Considered**

The report and recommendations of the Education Committee, as set out in document 15/80, in relation to the following items:

1. Significant Academic Developments
2. Category C and Specialisation Proposals
3. Paper Outlines
4. Graduating Year Reviews
5. International Agreements
6. NZ Music Examinations Board Memorandum of Understanding Renewal

### **Noted in discussion**

#### Paper Outlines

1. That it was queried whether directed study papers required paper outlines. It was the University's position that they did, to ensure that assessment requirements were clearly specified for both staff and students. Many directed studies were taught with a cohort of students, but even where an individual student was undertaking a directed study, an individual paper outline needed to be produced.
2. That some academic staff felt that defining assessment in too much detail before the paper commenced would reduce their ability to adapt the content and assessment to the cohort as the semester progressed. However, it was noted that for students to be able to manage their workload effectively, it was important that they had a clear understanding of the paper structure, expectations and assessment requirements.
3. That it was noted that changes to assessment dates and/or content could be made after the paper outline was published, as long as the relevant Chair agreed, and students were informed, with the opportunity for any issues to be resolved. Some programmes co-ordinated assessment dates and types among them, to assist students in spreading their workload across the semester, which needed to be considered before changes could be made.
4. That it was not clear to all staff what was expected in the Paper Appraisal section. It was noted that it was not intended to be a prescriptive section, nor should it always or solely include Blue data. This section was intended to allow staff to provide feedback to students

about how previous feedback had been taken on board, and what changes, if any, had arisen from this.

**Resolved**

1. Approval of the Category C Proposal to amend the LLB, LLB(Hons) and conjoint degree regulations, as set out in document 14/230i
2. Approval of the Paper Outlines Policy as set out in document 14/323 and the Paper Outline Template as set out in document 14/464.
3. Approval of the New Zealand Music Examinations Board Memorandum of Understanding renewal, as set out in document 15/13.

**15.06 REPORT OF THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

**Received**

The report of the Research Committee, as set out in document 15/84, in relation to the following item:

Proposed change in name for the Centre for Educational Leadership, to the Educational Leadership Research Centre.

**Noted in discussion**

1. That the Centre for Educational Leadership was the oldest research centre in the Faculty of Education, and it had changed since its inception to be primarily research-focussed, following the creation of the Institute of Professional Learning. The proposed change in name signalled a demarcation between the Centre and the Institute.
2. That the Research Committee had suggested an alternative name - the Centre for Educational Leadership Research – which the Dean of the Faculty would consider.
3. That once the English name of the Centre had been confirmed, the Dean would consult with the School of Māori and Pacific Development to confirm the Māori name for the Centre.

**15.07 CURRICULUM ENHANCEMENT PROJECT**

**Received**

A report from the Programme Director on the progress of the Curriculum Enhancement Programme (CEP), as set out in document 15/85.

**Noted in discussion**

1. That considerable progress had been made in the first, information gathering phase of the CEP, and the University would now move into the second phase. The Steering Group was currently considering a report from the Programme Director, which included a number of recommendations.
2. That the Deputy Vice-Chancellor had arranged three sessions to communicate the purpose and progress of the CEP to staff.
3. That each Faculty had a representative on the Working Group, each of whom would provide a report to sit alongside the Programme Director's report, and a consolidated version would be made available to all staff for consultation.

4. That areas under consideration for changes and/or improvements included bridging students into and through their first year of university study, Māori and Pacific student support, the University's suites of academic programmes, structure and number of masters degrees, and structure of higher degrees, as well as potential changes to the academic year and the University grading scale.
5. That some changes were relatively small and could be implemented quickly, while others were more significant and would need to be progressed over a longer period of time. A timeframe for the implementation of intended changes and initiatives would be developed by the end of 2015.
6. That staff could provide feedback through the CEP website, by emailing the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education) directly, or by talking to their faculty Working Group representative.

## **15.08 CYCLE 5 ACADEMIC AUDIT**

### **Received**

A report from the Project Manager on the progress of the Cycle 5 Academic Audit, as set out in document 15/76.

### **Noted in discussion**

1. That all chapters of the Self Review Portfolio had been received back from the writer, and would be added to by the chapter leads and relevant others before final drafting.
2. That the entire Self Review Portfolio would be provided to the next meeting of the Academic Board for approval.
3. That the Audit Panel Site visit was taking place from 17-21 August 2015.

## **15.09 SUBMISSION OF MASTERS THESES**

### **Reported**

1. That at its August 2014 meeting, the Academic Board had approved in principle a change to the Dissertation and Theses Regulations to allow first masters theses to be submitted for marking in soft-bound form, in order to allow for minor corrections to be made after the examination process and before the thesis was hard bound.
2. That some issues were subsequently raised around the verification and marking processes for masters theses should the proposed change be introduced.
3. That the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Postgraduate) had met with representatives from Student and Academic Services to develop the proposed process for soft bound submission of first masters theses.
4. That Faculty Boards considered the proposal in January 2015.

### **Considered**

1. Faculty Board, Postgraduate Research Committee, and student feedback on the proposed process for soft bound submission of first masters theses as set out in document 15/88.
2. Approval of the proposed process for soft bound submission of first masters theses, as set out in document 15/16 (updated 24 February 2015).

### **Noted in discussion**

1. That some Faculty Boards had proposed solely digital submission of theses for examination; not all Faculties were in support of this, but the option for solely digital submission for examination had been added to the regulations as an option.
2. That any corrections made following examination would be minor, related to grammar, spelling, punctuation and similar. The thesis would not be re-marked after corrections were made and there would be no change to the student's grade.
3. That it was suggested that students might be reluctant to make changes that would not affect their final grade. However, feedback received from current and former masters students indicated that the quality of their final submission was of great importance to them, particularly for those students who intended to progress to doctoral studies and/or research careers, and that the opportunity to make corrections before final submission of a masters thesis was desired.
4. That some academic staff expressed a concern that students would make more substantial changes to their thesis post-examination, which could pose risks to academic integrity.
5. That there was concern that supervisors would be required to re-read each masters thesis after examination and before final submission to ensure that the student had not made substantial changes to his or her thesis.
6. That students would need to sign a statement to confirm that they had made only editorial changes. If there was any doubt, the supervisor could ask the student to use tracked changes to check the extent of the changes made.
7. That there could be additional cost to the student if additional printing was required for the soft-bound and hard-bound copies. However it was noted that the cost of re-printing the thesis itself was significantly less than getting it completely rebound if changes were desired. With solely digital submission, there could be additional costs to the department if a hard copy was preferred for marking purposes.
8. That there was concern that once a grade was received, there would be no motivation for a student to submit their hard-bound thesis. However, the regulations stated that a student would not be able to graduate unless they submitted the hard-bound final thesis.

### **Recommended**

That the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Postgraduate) consider changes required to the proposal as a result of the Board's feedback, and bring it back for consideration at the next meeting of the Academic Board.

## **15.10 TERMS OF REFERENCE AND CONSTITUTION**

### **Received**

The Terms of Reference and Constitution of the Academic Board as set out in document 15/89.

## **15.11 TOPICS FOR FUTURE AGENDA**

### **Considered**

Requests or suggestions for topics to be included on future agenda.

### **Noted in discussion**

That it was proposed that a discussion of ePortfolio submission of theses be added to a future agenda. The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Postgraduate) advised that ePortfolios had been submitted as part of a thesis but not as the whole of the document. A change of this nature might require a change to the definition of a thesis.

## **15.12 STRATEGIC DIRECTION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO**

### **Noted in discussion**

1. That a Council workshop had been held on 27 February 2015 to discuss the University's strategic direction, and the Vice-Chancellor had been holding discussions around strategy with the Deputy Vice Chancellor, Deans and other senior leaders.
2. That informal updates would be provided to staff through the Vice-Chancellor's column in Community. Feedback from all staff was welcomed.

## **15.13 MĀORI NAMES FOR SCHOOLS AND FACULTIES**

### **Noted in discussion**

1. That the Vice-Chancellor had held a discussion with the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Māori) and the Deans as to whether there was a need to standardise practice across the University in relation to the order of English and Māori names for Schools and Faculties.
2. That the position of the Vice-Chancellor and the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Māori) was that there was no need for a common convention across the whole University, as long as justification was provided for a proposed format.
3. That it was noted that consideration may need to be given to search engine optimisation, although the planned investment in the University website should resolve some of the issues around this.

## **15.14 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

### **Reported**

That the next meeting of the Academic Board would be held on 28 April 2015 at 2.10pm in the Council Room.

## **PART TWO – CONFIDENTIAL**

### **Resolved**

That the public be excluded from the meeting to allow consideration of the following items:

1. Minutes (Part 2) of the Academic Board meeting of 9 December 2014

2. Report of the Vice-Chancellor (Part 2)

**The interests protected under the Local Government Information and Meetings Act 1987 and/or the Official Information Act 1982 which would be prejudiced by the public conduct of these proceedings were:**

Item 1 affected material previously dealt with in a meeting from which the public was excluded.  
Item 2 affected the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or advantage and to protect the commercial interests of the University.

Michelle Jordan-Tong  
Renée Boyer  
**Student and Academic Services Division**

23 March 2015

Minutes approved



\_\_\_\_\_ (Chairperson)

Date

16 June 2015

