

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

ACADEMIC BOARD: 28 APRIL 2015

Minutes of the meeting held on 28 April 2015

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

In attendance: Ms S Berry, Professor D Clark, Ms D Fowler, Ms H Pridmore.

Secretariat: Ms M Jordan-Tong and Ms R Boyer

15.16 APOLOGIES

Received

Apologies for absence from Professor G Holmes, Ms S Nock, Dr M Schoenberger-Orgad, Associate Professor J Tressler, Mr J Tupaupiki and Ms A Watson.

15.17 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES (PART 1) OF THE MEETING HELD ON 3 MARCH 2015

Confirmed

The minutes of the meeting (Part 1) held on 3 March 2015, as set out in document 15/135a.

15.18 REPORT OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR (PART 1)

Received

The report of the Vice-Chancellor (Part 1), as set out in document 15/136a.

Noted in discussion

That Mr J Macfarlane would be relocated to the Office of the Vice-Chancellor from the Office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Māori). With responsibility for the Māori Advancement Plan, Mr Macfarlane would work directly with both with Vice-Chancellor and Pro Vice-Chancellor (Māori) to progress the aims of the plan.

15.19 REPORT OF COUNCIL

Received

A report from the 18 March 2015 meeting of University Council, as set out in document 15/137.

Noted in discussion

Strategic Investment Funding

1. That consideration had been given to changing the budget allocation model in relation to Strategic Investment Funding.
2. That the budget allocation model for Faculties included a rigid allocation of the proportion of gross income generated that would transfer to faculties. This could be problematic for new programme developments that may require more investment than the model allowed.
3. That at present Council did not have fixed view on the allocation model but understood the need for flexibility in the way strategic initiatives were funded. It was expected that the 2015 budget process would provide some clarity for Council around this and further information would be provided to the Academic Board once this had occurred.

15.20 HONORARY AWARDS

1. Emeritus Professorships and Honorary Fellowships

Noted in discussion

1. That concern was expressed as to whether the awards for Emeritus Professorships and Honorary Fellowships should be solely determined by the Vice-Chancellor. It was suggested that linkages should be retained with Honours Committee, although it was noted that a better administrative framework could be developed to consider awards in a timelier manner following a retirement.
2. That it was suggested that situations had arisen where there had been merit in making a group decision rather than individual decision. Better articulation of the benefits that would be gained by this change would be useful.
3. That the criteria for Emeritus Professorships were quite explicit and bore directly on employment records. There would be situations where the Vice-Chancellor had employment-related knowledge about an individual that would not be appropriate to share with a committee, particularly one that included external members. Other awards were made on the basis of information available in the public domain.
4. That the Vice-Chancellor would have residual decision making rights with regard to the awards; however, he agreed it would be appropriate to advise the Academic Board prior to seeking the approval of Council.
5. That the Academic Board would be provided with further information in relation to how the process would work outside of the Honours committee, at the next meeting of the Board.

Recommended

That Council approve the recommendation from the Vice-Chancellor and the Honours Committee that Emeritus Professorships and Honorary Fellowships would, in future, be awarded at the discretion of the Vice-Chancellor at the time of staff retirement or resignation, as set out in document 15/138.

2. Distinguished Alumni Awards

Noted in discussion

1. That the current process had not been reviewed since its inception.
2. That it was appropriate, given the award criteria for the Distinguished Alumni Awards, that they be incorporated into the honorary awards framework.

Recommended

That Council approve the proposal from the Vice-Chancellor and the Honours Committee that the Distinguished Alumni Awards be incorporated within the University's wider framework of honorary awards so that the awards were recommended by the Honours Committee, through the Academic Board, to Council for approval, as set out in document 15/139.

15.21 REPORT OF THE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Considered

The report and recommendations of the Education Committee, as set out in document 15/133, in relation to the following items:

1. Significant Academic Developments
2. President College - Foundation in Science Programme
3. Pearson Test of English Academic
4. Programme Reviews

Noted in discussion

That the Education Committee had commenced work on formalising the structure of programme reviews.

Resolved

Approval of the proposal to amend the MBM regulations to include a Writing Competency Module, as set out in document 15/104, for submission to CUAP.

15.22 REPORT OF THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Received

The report of the Research Committee, as set out in document 15/134, in relation to the following item:

1. Review of Research Centres and Institutes
2. PhD Structure

3. Definition of Theses Written in Te Reo Māori

Noted in discussion

1. That the programme of reviews for Research Centres and Institutes had commenced and the Wilf Malcolm Institute of Educational Research (WMIER) would be the first institute reviewed.

PhD Structure

2. That the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Postgraduate) had sought feedback from the Research Committee regarding the proposal to allow PhD candidates to enrol in 60 points of taught papers as part of their PhD programme. The proposal would be submitted formally to the Academic Board through the Research Committee in due course.
3. That it was suggested that the proposal not restrict the level of the papers in which a student could enrol. An appropriate suite of papers would be determined on a case by case basis and could include undergraduate level papers as well those at the 500 level. There may also be an opportunity to create specific 900-level papers.

15.23 ENGLISH LANGUAGE COMPETENCY THRESHOLDS

Reported

1. That the Student Discipline Appeals Committee (SDAC), a sub-committee of Council, had identified three issues regarding the integrity of student performance in assessment that had arisen out of the student discipline appeal process. They had recommended that the issues be referred to the Academic Board for discussion in the first instance.
2. That the first of the issues, relating to integrity of assessment, was discussed by the Academic Board at the meeting of 23 October 2014.

Considered

A report on English Language Competency Thresholds, as set out in document 15/87.

Noted in discussion

1. That the Student Discipline Appeals Committee had, in course of its work, come across students who presented with what seemed to be a limited ability to operate in the English language (written and oral) and required an interpreter. The SDAC had noted that low levels of English competency could increase anxiety and the temptation to cheat, particularly where failure had serious personal and financial consequences for the student and their family.

International English Language Testing System (IELTS)

2. That New Zealand universities had to match English language proficiency levels to comparable international universities to reduce barriers to enrolment.
3. That IELTS tested only for English language proficiency and not for whether a prospective student had any experience of studying in English, or in a particular subject area.
4. That anecdotal evidence from Pathways College suggested that students who were accepted into degree programmes before English language and/or foundation

programmes had been completed may not be sufficiently prepared for university level study and required further acculturation in particular.

5. That it would be useful to analyse the grades obtained by each cohort of students accepted with IELTS 6.0. Data would aid future decision making around language proficiency levels.

Student Support

6. That having a large cohort of students with low levels of English proficiency could be frustrating for other students in tutorials and when completing group work.
7. That there was a difference between the ability to read English and having oral fluency. It was noted that support may be required to improve student's oral fluency.
8. That it should be noted that for the majority of students enrolled under the current enrolment requirements, the support systems worked well. For the small percentage of students to whom these concerns applied, it may be useful to look at what was provided at the margins.

Support methods

9. That there was a need to review the provision of language support at the University as it was not clear where students who required support with language could be referred.
10. That the provision of some dedicated support in Student Learning may be required.
11. That the University offered a number of credit-bearing *English as a Second Language* papers related to academic preparation, and reading and writing confidence. It was suggested the inclusion of these papers in a students' programme could make a significance difference to their verbal and written literacy.
12. That regardless of what the benchmark for entry was, the University had a responsibility to ensure that students were provided with adequate support once they were here. .

15.24 CYCLE 5 ACADEMIC AUDIT

Reported

1. That the Academic Quality Agency (AQA) Cycle 5 panel visit would take place during the week of 17 August 2015.
2. That in preparation for the visit, the University was required to submit a Self-Review Portfolio.
3. That the Self Review Portfolio was developed in consultation with a wide range of staff from across the University, which included at least one Working Group member from each Faculty, the Deans, Pro Vice-Chancellors and relevant Heads of Division.

15.25 TERTIARY TEACHING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

Reported

1. That at the 9 December 2014 meeting of the Academic Board, the Board indicated approval in principle of the Tertiary Teaching Development Proposal, but that before final approval could be granted, the Board required:
 - a. An explanation of how the proposal aligned with the University's Vision
 - b. More flexibility to be built into the requirements

- c. An implementation plan
2. That the Director of the Centre for Tertiary Teaching and Learning responded and made the requested changes to the proposal where appropriate.

Considered

Approval of the Tertiary Teaching Development Proposal, as set out in document 13/378 (rev 13/4/2015).

Noted in discussion

1. That the document (13/378) had clarified how the proposal aligned with the University's vision and its flexibility in terms of different staff requirements. It also confirmed that the implementation plan would be worked on this year once approval was provided by the Academic Board.
2. That whilst the proposal emphasised the flexible nature of professional development for academic staff, the model appeared to be quite fixed. It was noted that a bespoke pathway would be negotiated between staff member and line manager and points like this would be more fully articulated in implementation plan.
3. That it would be useful to include generic content relating to te reo Māori and tikanga Māori (including the correct pronunciation of Māori words).
4. That it was unclear how professional development in tertiary teaching would feed back into the promotion process. Planned changes to the ASP was a step toward the recognition of teaching quality. It would be useful to include a definition of what constituted 'teaching excellence'.
5. That the proposal articulated the University's professional development expectations around tertiary teaching. It was not a set of rules but rather a professional development pathway that would be negotiated between a staff member and his or her line manager.
6. That it was suggested that online and blended teaching and learning required focus and investment to ensure staff developed the necessary skill set for tertiary teaching in the digital age.
7. That concern was raised in relation to the professional development needs of contract staff who often had a heavy teaching load. It was noted that accommodation for the professional development of contract staff was under consideration.

Resolved

Approval of the principles on page 5 with the intention to develop an implementation plan which would be submitted to Academic Board for approval once developed.

15.26 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 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) 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 and the Academic Board considered the proposal in March 2015. Further changes were requested.
5. That the proposal had been updated in line with Academic Board and Faculty feedback.

Noted in discussion

1. That it was anticipated that eventually all theses would be provided in digital format only, and this proposal was an incremental step towards that.
2. That the scanning of existing hard bound theses and the lodgement of them into the digital commons required resourcing. This applied to all theses lodged prior to 1996 and would require the permission from each student to allow their thesis to be lodged in the public domain.
3. That Examiners would continue to receive a paper copy if requested.
4. That students supported the proposed changes.

Resolved

Approval of the changes to the *Dissertations and Theses Regulations* and the proposed process for soft bound submission of first masters theses, as set out in document 15/16 (updated 17 April 2015).

15.27 STUDY LEAVE REPORTING

Reported

That the University of Waikato Study Leave Policy stated that “The Dean (or equivalent) sends study leave reports which he or she considers satisfactory to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor for final approval. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor makes regular reports to the Academic Board regarding study leave activities and outcomes in terms of their contribution to the University’s academic strategic goals.”

Received

A report from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor in relation to 2014 study leave activities and outcomes, as set out in attached document 15/142.

Noted in discussion

1. That when considering applications for study leave, the Dean needed to ensure that the absence would be adequately covered, and that the obligations of staff and expectations of the Faculty were clear and unambiguous.
2. That in some smaller faculties, staff involved in PhD research were unable to take extended leave and shorter periods of leave were instead negotiated. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor would continue to consider appeals related to declined study leave applications.

16. ANNUAL REPORTS

Received

The 2014 Annual Report of the Human Research Ethics Committee, as set out in document 15/143.

*19. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Reported

That the next meeting of the Academic Board would be held on 16 June 2015 at 2.10pm in the Council Room.

PROCEEDINGS WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

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)
3. Report of the Honours Committee
4. Cycle 5 Academic Audit Self-Review Portfolio

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. Items 2 & 4 affected the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or advantage and to protect the commercial interests of the University. Item 3 protected the privacy of natural persons.

Michelle Jordan-Tong
Renée Boyer
Student and Academic Services Division

1 May 2015

Minutes approved



(Chairperson)

Date

16 June 2015