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Foreword

The Academic Board has long been part of the governance structure at the University of Melbourne. But in discussions with academic colleagues, it seems that many are unclear about what it does, why it is important, why they should care about it and perhaps become involved in its activities. This Quick Guide is written to answer those questions. Further information about the Academic Board and its functions are on the University website – go to the Staff section, and find ‘Academic Board’ under the A-Z Directory there.

It is one of the ‘Expectations of a Professor’ at the University of Melbourne that those holding this rank should contribute to policy formation and to management in those parts of the University in which they are engaged. Involvement in the Academic Board is cited in that list of expectations as a way for professors to contribute to the University community as a whole. The Academic Board officers are grateful to those professors and others who bring their good will, hard work and collegiality to the tasks of the Board, and always welcome new expressions of interest from those who have not yet become involved. Suggestions and expressions of concern may always be made to the Academic Board officers or to the Chairs of the committees of the Board; the email addresses of these individuals are contained within the document that follows.

Rachel Webster  
President, Academic Board, 2015
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1. Purpose of the Academic Board and its role in University governance

The Academic Board is established by the University Council, as a legislative requirement of the *University of Melbourne* Act 2009 and the Acts that have preceded it since 1853.

The University Council is the peak governing body of the University, responsible for ensuring that the stated aims of the institution are achieved. It is accountable for the quality of the University's policies, programs and academic performance, as well as for the financial well-being and probity of the institution in all its activities. The Council of course delegates the organisation and running of the institution to a management staff led by the Vice Chancellor. Under the *University of Melbourne* Act 2009, which establishes the University and the functions its Council must perform to govern it, the Council is required to set up an academic board as well as the suite of faculties and departments through which the academic work of the institution occurs. Specifying the responsibilities of the Academic Board, in statute 4.1 that follows from this Act, we see that the Academic Board is responsible to Council for-

- the supervision and development of all academic activities of the University, including the maintenance of high standards in teaching and research;
- determination of all matters related to courses and subjects, admission and enrolment of students, and assessment and admission to degrees, save for those matters expressly reserved by legislation as requiring Council decision;
- development and maintenance of policies and rules governing academic matters;
- approving the terms of and awarding prizes, scholarships and other forms of recognition governing academic matters; and
- communication with the academic community through the faculties and other academic units.

The Academic Board is also the final appeal body within the University in all academic matters relating to students and their grievances against decisions made by University bodies or individual officers.

Responsibility for formulating and reviewing policies, rules, guidelines and procedures in relation to academic matters and playing an active role in assuring the quality of teaching, scholarship and research in the University are, then, the roles of the Academic Board. To be confident that the policy structures properly sustain academic quality and assurance and are appropriate to the University's needs, the Board monitors their implementation and effectiveness in the University's faculties. Much of
this monitoring takes place through Academic Board reviews, conducted through its various committees. The review process is formative and collegial and aims to provide constructive feedback on the quality of a faculty's educational provision.

The Academic Board runs its own affairs, but reports ultimately to Council and provides Council with appropriate and timely information on academic matters it considers to be of strategic importance. Of course it liaises closely with the academic management apparatus of the University, from senior to junior levels.
2. The Academic (or Professorial) Board in the past compared to the present

Consulting some of the published histories of the University, we see the following commentary on the establishment, activities and purposes of the Academic (previously Professorial) Board.

Soon after its first meeting on May 3, 1853, the Council of the University ‘provided for the establishment of a professorial board, consisting of the professors, any lecturer who might be appointed to assist the professors, and the vice-chancellor *ex officio*. The board was to consider “all questions relating to the studies of the members of the University” – to consider, not to decide. That was the Council’s prerogative’ (*Selleck* 2003: 27-8).

Through the late nineteenth century and first three decades of the twentieth century (when the University was much smaller than it is now) spats between the two major governing bodies of the University, the Council and the Professorial Board, and ongoing re-distributions of roles and responsibilities between them, occurred regularly. (‘The two oligarchies’ (one internal and one external) is the term used to refer to the University Council and the Professorial Board in the mid 1930s by Priestley when becoming the first full-time Vice Chancellor of the University (*Poynter and Rasmussen* 1996: 11)). Examples are given by McIntyre and Selleck (2003): in 1889, Council proposed the appointment of a new position that would be termed Provost (a Chief Executive or Vice Chancellor for the University), but the Professorial Board opposed and defeated this proposal (pp. 24-5); in the early 1900s public examinations for university entrance in Victoria were introduced and the Professorial Board was given control over their content and operation (pp. 49-50); by the late 1930s, Vice Chancellors and Chancellors needed to work with the University’s “key academic forum”, that is, the Professorial Board, to obtain the trust of academic staff (p. 90).

The Professorial Board was responsible for the high standards of the University in the 1930s, which Priestley commented upon, when the number of professors in the institution was 35. ‘The Board, which could discuss and make recommendations to Council “on any matter pertaining to the University”, with special responsibility for its studies, had a reputation for being quarrelsome within itself and disputatious with Council, though individually the professors were reasonable men’ (*Poynter and Rasmussen* 2003, 38).
In the late 1970s (after decades in which the Professorial Board had created academic policy but also used its budgets committee to make internal decisions about how Faculties and Departments would spend their money) the ‘professorial panoply of power was severely dented when Deanships were made open to non-professorial appointments and shaken severely when Chairmen replaced Heads of Departments and the position was made open to any senior member of the academic staff recommended by the Vice Chancellor’ (Poynter and Rasmussen 2003: 396-7) In 1978, the name of the Professorial Board was changed to that of Academic Board, which it has remained.

Now, a concluding comment made from the standpoint of the late 1990s reflected that ‘Universities are now managed, not governed ‘(McIntyre and Selleck 2003: 178). The Academic Board is certainly not the internal oligarchy of the University that it was claimed to be in the 1930s when professors numbered 35 (In 1963, there were 62 professors (Poynter and Rasmussen 2003: 274)). And we now have a highly professional, large, University management, accountable as the Academic Board is to the University Council for maintaining high standards in the institution, and charged with making the University perform ever better. In this environment, what then is the singular role of the Academic Board in the University, when the professoriate numbers about 460? Doesn’t the University’s management structure, centrally and in Faculties and Departments, now set and oversee the standards of the institution’s academic work, as well as undertake (implement) that academic work? The answer is, of course, yes and no.

The quality of the University’s academic work in teaching and research certainly depends upon the high standards of its teaching/research staff as they undertake their academic work, along with high standards in the selection of all students. There are requirements also of oversight of that work, however, in order for its quality to be assured and indeed for an assurance to be given to the University Council that standards are being set and followed appropriately. The Academic Board is tasked with this oversight role, in the statutes and regulations. Alongside and with the University’s management workforce, the Academic Board brings the scrutiny of its members (the senior academic members of the University) to bear on the academic policies, procedures and practices of the institution, including in teaching, research, and student selection. This is done through reviews carried out by the committees of the Academic Board, which meet regularly throughout the year and are made up of Academic Board members from all Faculties. A level of evenness across the University’s Faculties is assured in its academic practices, and a level of cross-Faculty equity, because of these reviews; in the Board’s committee work a practical standard for the University is applied to all Faculties based on knowledge of best practice in all parts of the institution. Reports to the regular, 6-weekly meetings of the Academic
Board are made by these committees, often with recommendations, and discussion of committee findings takes place there.

It is evident that a view has always existed at the University of Melbourne that the Academic Board, that large body of the institution’s senior academic staff drawn from across all its Faculties, is essential in ensuring the quality of the University academically. It brings an ongoing cross-Faculty scrutiny, from people still deeply involved in the core research and teaching activities everywhere in the institution, to our academic activities. An additional benefit of Academic Board processes is that great collegiality and cross-University understanding is produced amongst its committee members because of the work they regularly do together. If this quality in our institution is impossible to quantify and perhaps not therefore valued in some quarters, in the thinking of others it is vital to our ongoing success.

In a recent speech marking his retirement, a Dean of one of our major Faculties portrayed the Academic Board as ‘the soul’ of the University, reflecting his commitment both to his Faculty and to the University as a functioning and collegial whole. There are many Academic Board committees, which undertake much work. Many people participate in them. Sometimes the comment will be made that this is inefficient – we could perform academic oversight adequately by using our management structures better, including on-line administrative systems. That is one view, and certainly it is true that effective management systems are vital for the University to function properly and with continued excellence. The view held by many, especially those who have been involved in Academic Board activities, is that the presence and work of the Board is also most valuable for both protecting our University’s high academic standards with detachment and objectivity, and for making sure that academic staff from across the institution are involved in carrying forward that quality assurance and believing in it.

References:
McIntyre, S and Selleck, R 2003 A Short History of The University of Melbourne. Carlton, Melbourne University Press
3. Contemporary activities of the Academic Board: its members and office bearers, its regular meetings, its committees, its appeal hearings

Academic Board members

Under Regulation 4.1 – The Academic Board Composition and Procedures - the members of the Academic Board are:

- the Chancellor
- the Vice-Chancellor
- the deputy vice-chancellors (including any deputy vice-chancellor appointed as provost)
- the pro vice-chancellors
- the senior vice-principal
- the university librarian
- the academic registrar
- the university secretary
- the professors
- the full-time salaried professorial fellows
- deans of faculties
- heads of academic departments
- heads of schools (including graduate schools)
- the president and one education officer of UMSU and the president of the GSA and one nominee of the president of the GSA
- two members elected by and from the professional staff who will hold office for a term of two years; and
- any other persons whom the Board determines

The three office-bearers of the Academic Board are elected each year by the members of the Board, and it is expected they will serve for two years in each of the three roles available. For 2015, the Academic Board officers are:

**President:** Professor Rachel Webster Email: r.webster@unimelb.edu.au (Faculty of Science/Physics)

**Vice-President:** Professor Nilss Olekalns Email: nilss@unimelb.edu.au (Faculty of Business and Economics/Economics)

**Deputy Vice-President:** Professor Pip Nicholson Email: p.nicholson@unimelb.edu.au (Melbourne Law School)
Regular (about 6-weekly) Meetings of the Academic Board

On one Thursday afternoon roughly every 6 weeks, the Academic Board meets formally in the Council Chambers on the Parkville campus. Meetings are chaired by the President of the Academic Board. A formal agenda is followed, and minutes are kept which are available to the University community on-line. At each meeting, reports and recommendations from each of the Academic Board committees, and from the Vice Chancellor, Provost and Deputy Vice Chancellors, are discussed and (if necessary) voted upon. At each meeting, question time occurs in which any member of the Academic Board can ask any other member a question. In addition, there is provision made for a short presentation and question time where matters of significance to the University’s academic community, and therefore the Board, may be discussed. (Recent examples of ‘matters of broad academic significance’ discussed have been open access journals, open planning in new University buildings, on-line learning, and new promotions criteria).

Student Appeals

Each year the Academic Board hears from many students who consider that they have cause to appeal against a decision about their academic progress, made by those in charge of their course of study, or against decisions of other bodies or individual officers of the University. There are strict grounds on which students can appeal to the Academic Board. If students are unhappy with the decision made by the Academic Board about their appeal, their final recourse is to the State’s Ombudsman.

Each appeal hearing is usually chaired by one of the three officers of the Academic Board, and each appeal committee contains two other members of the Academic Board – emails are sent to Board members asking for members to sit on these appeal committees.

Many of the University’s professors participate in appeal hearings each year.
4. The Committees of the Academic Board

The committees of the Academic Board are listed below, together with their terms of reference, membership, and reports of work completed in 2014. The members of these committees are required to conduct their discussions and decision-making in the interests of the University as a whole, rather than acting as advocates for their own faculties. Meeting between 6 - 8 times per year, each committee is chaired by a professor appointed by the Academic Board. Formal minutes are taken by a staff member of the University Services Division, and are then publicly available to members of the University community.

Note that the Board’s committees have positions for non-members of Academic Board, both from the academic and professional staff, even though the regular meetings of the Academic Board and voting on recommendations there are restricted to members of the Board.

---

**Academic Programs Committee**

**Terms of Reference**

1. The Academic Programs Committee, on its own initiative or on referral from the Board, will develop policies relating to all courses, including teaching and learning practices, for approval by the Board, taking into account national and international best practice in order to ensure that academic programs are of the highest quality and standards.

2. The Academic Programs Committee shall regularly monitor compliance with the policies referred to in 4.1 and, where appropriate, shall make recommendations to the Academic Board.

3. The Academic Programs Committee, on its own initiative or on referral from the Board, shall determine criteria to be used by faculties in the development of proposals for new courses.

4. In accordance with Statute 11.1, Academic Board policies, procedures and guidelines and principles developed by the Committee, the Academic Programs Committee shall review and, as appropriate, make recommendations to the Board on all proposed new courses, discontinuation and/or suspension of courses.
In accordance with Statute 11.1, with Academic Board policies, procedures and guidelines and with principles developed by the Committee, the Academic Programs Committee shall review and, as appropriate, make recommendations to the Board for major changes to courses.

The Academic Programs Committee shall advise the Board on proposals for the suspension of subjects.

The Academic Programs Committee shall be responsible for monitoring delegations to faculties, graduate schools and course standing committees to ensure that they are regularly reviewing the appropriateness of existing courses and the delegated responsibility for approving minor course changes.

The Academic Programs Committee shall monitor non-award courses at undergraduate and postgraduate level offered under the name of the University of Melbourne and, as required, develop policies regarding these programs for approval by the Academic Board.

The Academic Programs Committee shall monitor policies regarding the University of Melbourne Extension Program for approval by the Academic Board.

To receive and make recommendations to the Board on reports from the Melbourne Custom Programs Committee.

The Academic Programs Committee may from time to time make recommendations to amend these terms of reference or the specification of its delegated authorities or to provide for the regulation of its own procedures.

Membership

President of the Academic Board
Vice-President of the Academic Board or the Deputy Vice-President of the Academic Board
A chairperson appointed by the President of the Academic Board
Provost or nominee
Director, Student Enrolment
Chair of the Selection Procedures Committee (or nominee)
Chair of the Melbourne Custom Programs Committee
Academic Secretary or Academic Governance Officer
Six members of the Board elected by the Academic Board for a term of three years; two members to retire each year
Six members of the academic staff not being members of the Academic Board, elected by the Academic Board for a term of three years; one member to retire each year.

Two Academic Support Officers (or equivalent), nominated by the President, Academic Board.

The President of UMSU or nominee and one additional nominee.

The President of GSA or nominee and one additional nominee.

Up to six members of the Academic Board appointed as members of the Committee by the President of the Academic Board for a term of up to two years in order to take into account matters such as the balance of membership by discipline.

Up to six additional members, not being members of the Academic Board, nominated for a term of up to two years by the President of the Academic Board having regard to gender balance and disciplinary expertise of the membership.

The Chair of the APC in 2015, appointed by Academic Board, is Professor Cathy Falk (email: cafalk@unimelb.edu.au).

**Report of work undertaken in 2014**

The APC workload in 2014 showed an increase in volume in all but one category compared to 2013. Members of the Committee, acting as Shepherds to the faculties and schools, considered:

- 51 new course proposals (20 in 2013)
- 112 major change proposals (141 in 2013)
- 108 discontinuation proposals (42 in 2013)
- 548 late change proposals (275 in 2013)
- 9 suspension proposals (0 in 2013)
- 106 award title changes (0 in 2013)

APC brought a number of policies and processes to the Board for approval in 2014. These included recommendations concerning amendments to the following policies and procedures:

- Subject Configuration procedure
- Course, Program and Subject Approval and Review Procedure, and Schedule A made under the Procedure
- Undergraduate Courses Policy
- Graduate Courses Policy
- Subject and Credit Points Policy
- Examinations Procedure, and Schedule A made under the Procedure
In 2013 APC was charged with ensuring that all coursework Masters offered by the University were compliant with the AQF Guidelines. An external consultant, Dr Kerri-Lee Harris, was engaged to review and audit the 128 such courses, for which timely documentation was received by APC from the Faculties and Schools. The Committee reported to the Academic Board on the outcomes of this review and audit in October 2014.
Information Technology Committee

Terms of Reference

1 To define the forms of academic input that are important to the University’s IT initiatives, and to define how these can be incorporated into the University’s strategic decision making with regard to IT and communicated to the academic community.

2 To help to ensure that the University’s IT policies and developments respond to academic input about their impact on teaching and learning, research, and the working lives of academic staff.

3 To monitor the quality of IT policies and practices with regard to the support of high academic standards in academic divisions, as realized in deployment of services and resources.

4 To contribute academic leadership in advising the Academic Board, Provost, Senior Vice Principal, and Chief Information Officer on priority areas for IT innovation in academic research, teaching and learning, and the daily management of academic work.

5 To receive reports from the University’s Information Technology strategy groups, and in relation to IT matters when appropriate, the relevant University committees.

Membership

President of the Academic Board or nominee
Vice-President of the Academic Board or nominee
Chairperson appointed by the President
IT Strategy and Planning Lead
Director Infrastructure Services
Deputy Vice-Chancellor Research (or nominee)
University Librarian (or nominee)
Chair of Libraries and Academic Resources Committee (or nominee)
Chair of TALDEC (or nominee)
Academic Secretary or Academic Governance Officer
Director, Academic Administration
Four members of the Academic Board elected by the Academic Board for a term of two years (two members to retire each year)
Up to two members of the Academic board appointed as members of the Committee by the President of the Academic Board for a term of up to two years in order to take into account matters such as the balance of membership by discipline
The President of UMSU (or nominee)
The president of GSA (or nominee)
Up to four additional members, not being members of the Academic Board, nominated by the President of the Academic Board for a term of up to two years having regard to gender balance and disciplinary expertise of the membership

Up to three members appointed by the committee for the duration of a particular enquiry

The Chair of the ITC in 2015, appointed by Academic Board, is Professor Justin Zobel (email: jzobel@unimelb.edu.au).

Report of work undertaken 2014

In 2014, ITC was in its third year, and had the challenge of maintaining its own role while the Business Improvement Process was underway. In the early stages of BIP, work on a range of IT projects was suspended while others were pursued in a limited form, in recognition of the fact that BIP would lead to entirely new administrative and governance arrangements for IT procurement and development. At the same time, several domain-specific committees were also suspended, again in recognition of the fact that governance arrangements were not yet determined. This meant that there were only limited opportunities for the committee to contribute.

Only a limited number of meetings were held during 2014. These were used to review outcomes of a number of relatively minor projects, and also to hold an initial round of discussion with the Senior Vice-Principal on potential future mechanisms for academic engagement in the University’s IT infrastructure.

It is anticipated that the full work of the committee will resume during 2015 when the committee will look closely at how academic staff may be involved in discussions about and the testing of new IT systems. How academics can engage with relevant Buyers’ Committees, and with processes occurring to design or purchase new IT systems before matters get to Buyer’s Committees, will be of interest and concern to the committee.
Libraries and Academic Resources Committee

Terms of Reference

1. In collaboration with the Provost, Faculties, Graduate Schools and related Academic Board committees, to develop appropriate qualitative and quantitative indicators of the quality of the University’s scholarly information services and resources (including libraries and information technology), taking into account national and international recommended practices, and to oversee, monitor and review their use.

2. To monitor the quality of the University’s scholarly information services and resources and to ensure these are appropriate to academic teaching and research programs, taking account of international developments and best practice in order to ensure that services and resources are of the highest possible quality and standards.

3. To advise the Provost and Academic Board on priority areas for resourcing and development of scholarly information services and resources.

4. To advise the Academic Board on policy matters relating to access to and use of all University’s scholarly information services and resources including library use and user services.

5. To receive reports from University of Melbourne Archives Committee and the Grainger Museum.

Membership

President of the Academic Board or nominee
Vice-President, Academic Board or nominee
University Librarian
Manager, Academic Skills
A chairperson appointed by the President of Academic Board
Academic Secretary or Academic Governance Officer
Chair of the IT Committee
Four members of the Academic Board elected by the Academic Board for a term of two years (Two members to retire each year)
Up to two members of the Academic Board appointed as members of the Committee by the President of the Academic Board for a term of up to two years in order to take into account matters such as the balance of membership by discipline
The president of UMSU or nominee
The president of GSA or nominee
Up to six additional members, not being members of the Academic Board, nominated by the President of the Academic Board for a term of up to two years having regard to gender balance, disciplinary expertise and faculty distribution of the membership
Up to three members nominated by the University Librarian, for a term of two years.
Manager, Grainger Museum
University Archivist

The Chair of the LARC in 2015, appointed by Academic Board, is Professor Andrew Kenyon (email: a.kenyon@unimelb.edu.au).

Report of work undertaken in 2014

Six meetings of LARC were held during 2014, involving library staff and academics from across the University. During the year:

The Committee received regular reports during the year on the progress of Minerva, involving the Library, Research and ITS, which responded in part to new requirements of NHMRC and ARC research funding schemes. Minerva Access successfully launched in the third quarter of the year and Minerva Elements had a soft launch just before the Committee’s final meeting for 2014.

A Digital Preservation Strategy for the University was presented to the September meeting of the Board, where it was approved. The draft Strategy had received input from the Committee as a whole, with the project being overseen by a steering group which included membership of LARC, the IT Committee, Library, Research and ITS, and chaired by Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research Collaboration and Infrastructure) Prof Liz Sonenberg. The Digital Preservation Strategy, across a 10 year time frame to 2025, aims to help the University:

- Address research funder compliance obligations by implementing more effective digital product management and preservation approaches;
- Increase researcher productivity by streamlining research data management processes and reducing the incidence of data loss;
- Enable new opportunities for research by effectively preserving and enabling appropriate access to the University’s digital product.

A working group into Research Data Storage commenced operations in 2014, led by Prof Richard Sinnott, Director eResearch. It produced a draft report on the current state of research data storage, which builds on a report to Council in 2009. The working group is seeking to identify useful avenues for the University in dealing with this challenging issue.
Research Higher Degrees Committee

Terms of Reference

1. To advise the Academic Board on all matters of policy relating to research higher degrees including the degrees of Doctor of Philosophy, Master of Philosophy, higher doctorates and other research higher degrees comprising research and coursework.

2. In accordance with Statute 11.1, Academic Board policies, procedures, guidelines and principles, the committee shall review and, as appropriate, make recommendations to the Board on all proposed new courses, discontinuation and/or suspension of research programs.

3. In relation to coursework components of research higher degrees:
   • provide policy advice to the Academic Programs Committee (APC) on the research components of coursework higher degrees on matters including research supervision, the appointment of examiners, and the content and assessment of the research component; and
   • receive advice from the Chair of the APC in regard to consideration of the details of coursework requirements of research higher degrees and professional doctorates.

4. To regularly monitor research programs to ensure consistency and compliance with University statutes, regulations, policies and procedures and, where appropriate, make recommendations to the Academic Board.

5. To monitor the progress of the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) programs.

6. The Committee will monitor delegations to faculties to ensure that they are regularly reviewing the appropriateness of existing research programs and the delegated responsibility for approving minor program changes.

7. The Committee, on its own initiative or on referral from the Board, shall determine criteria to be used by faculties in the development of proposals for new research degrees and programs.

8. On receipt of annual reports from faculties, advise the Board on matters affecting candidature and examination, including approval of admissions to candidature, confirmation of candidature, variations in conditions of candidature, and the appointment of examiners.
9. To have oversight of and input into any tools used for monitoring of candidature progress.

10. To advise and make recommendations concerning the selection of students into research programs including but not limited to:
   - policies, procedures and guidelines;
   - entry requirements;
   - pathways to research programs;
   - English language standards, and
   - Oversight and input into any tools used for the purpose of selection.

11. To advise and make recommendations concerning research scholarships, student awards and prizes, including but not limited to:
   - policies, procedures and guidelines;
   - proposals for new or revised scholarships, awards and prizes;
   - selection of candidates for scholarships, awards and prizes;
   - the academic progress of recipients of research scholarships; and
   - Oversight and input into any tools used for the purpose of selection and award of students.

12. To monitor the distribution of APA and other RHD stipends in faculties and receive annual reports on the equity and transparency of the selection process of distribution of APAs and other stipends.

13. To receive and make recommendations to the Board on reports from the RHD Scholarships Sub-committee.

14. To review the citations for PhD candidates to be presented at the graduation ceremonies.

15. From time to time to make recommendations which might amend these terms of reference or provide for specification of delegated authorities or provisions by which the Committee might regulate its own affairs.

**Membership**

President of the Academic Board or nominee
Pro Vice-Chancellor, Graduate Research
A Chairperson appointed by the Academic Board
Six members of the academic staff, who are active in research and supervision of higher degree candidates, elected by the Academic Board (3 year term)
Up to six members who are active in research and supervision of higher degree candidates to be appointed annually by the President of the Board in consultation with the Chair having regard to gender balance and disciplinary expertise of the membership.
Two nominees of the President of the Graduate Students Association (GSA) both of whom must be enrolled in a research higher degree
Academic Secretary or nominee
Research Higher Degree Candidature Manager
Director of the Centre for the Study of Higher Education or nominee
Two representatives from Associate Deans, Research Training, one from STEM and one from HASS disciplines, nominated by the Chair in consultation with the President.
Two Deputy Chairpersons appointed by the President, from the committee membership, in consultation with the Chairperson. One Deputy Chairperson will chair the Research Higher Degree Scholarships Sub-committee.
Up to three members appointed by the Committee for the duration of a particular inquiry or project.
Up to two additional members, not being members of the Academic Board, nominated annually by the President of the Academic Board having regard to gender balance and disciplinary expertise of the membership.

The Chair of the RHDC in 2015, appointed by Academic Board, is Professor Joy Damousi (email: j.damousi@unimelb.edu.au).

Report of work undertaken in 2014

The committee considered and recommended changes to its terms of reference to reflect changes to the University’s operating model and the disestablishment of the Melbourne School of Graduate Research. The committee also proposed the establishment of a new sub-committee, the RHD Scholarships Sub-committee, to commence in 2015, replacing the Graduate Research Scholarships Committee. The terms of reference for the Research Higher Degrees Committee and the establishment of the Sub-committee were approved by the Board at the 16 October 2014 meeting.

The committee considered and recommended to the Board the modification to the Melbourne testamur for joint PhD awards, which was approved by the Board at its meeting of 4 September 2014.

The committee recommended to the Board a number of new and revised research programs including:
• Master of Philosophy (Audiology and Speech Pathology)
• Master of Philosophy (Optometry and Vision Science)
• Master of Philosophy (Biomedical Science)
• Master of Fine Arts (Music Theatre)
• Master of Philosophy (Population Health) renamed as Master of Philosophy (Population and Global health)
• Master of Philosophy (Behavioural Sciences) renamed as Master of Philosophy (Psychological Sciences)

The committee received and endorsed proposals to discontinue the following programs:
• Master of Architecture
• Master of Planning and Design (Urban Planning)
• Master of Environmental Studies

The committee also considered and recommended to the Board changes to the minimum entry requirements for all of the University’s research degree offerings; these were approved by the Board at its meeting of 31 July 2014.

The committee received, considered and recommended to the Board the following new and amended policies and procedures:
• Schedule A – Higher Doctorates made under the Graduate Research Course Structure Policy
• Graduate Research Candidature Policy
• Graduate Research Candidature Procedure
• Graduate Research Progress Procedure
• Selection and Admission into Graduate Research Courses Policy
• Schedule A - Approved Outside Institutions
• Program Approvals Process
• Doctor of Laws – Higher Doctorate – in Schedule A – Higher Doctorates
• Graduate Research Programs Progress Report forms
• Supervision of Research Higher Degree Students Policy

The following tasks commenced in 2014 will continue in 2015:
1. Accountability in research training – the committee will continue to receive updates and monitor progress of the proposals aimed at increasing accountability.
2. Entry requirements – the committee will receive and consider advice on equivalences between IELTS and TOEFL scores
3. The committee will monitor the former MSGR functions which have been relocated to the CSHE through reports to the committee.
4. The committee will formalise a model for monitoring the implementation of the allocation of APAs in faculties and receive reports to assist in its quality assurance oversight.
Terms of Reference

1. To advise and make recommendations concerning the selection of students into courses, subjects or groups of subjects for which enrolment is or may be restricted, including but not limited to
   - policies, procedures and guidelines;
   - Academic Board Resolutions on Selection;
   - appropriate communications with the Victorian Tertiary Admission Centre, the Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority and other bodies administering senior secondary school programs or equivalent programs;
   - pathways to award or non-award courses, including pathways with guaranteed entry;
   - Access programs;
   - English language standards.

2. To conduct reviews and undertake other quality assurance activities as appropriate to ensure that the University maintains high international academic standards in its courses, selects only from among applicants those likely to succeed in its courses, and selects in a manner consistent with Board policies and procedures concerning access, equity and conflict of interest.

3. To advise and make recommendations concerning coursework scholarships, awards and prizes, including but not limited to
   - policies, procedures and guidelines;
   - proposals for new or revised scholarships, awards and prizes;
   - selection processes for scholarships, awards and prizes;
   - the academic progress of recipients of coursework scholarships.

   The Committee may delegate decisions that do not create precedents and that clearly meet current guidelines approved by the Committee to the Deputy Chair designated as the Committee’s Scholarship and Awards Coordinator, and may delegate routine decisions concerning the administration of scholarships for which academic judgment is not required to the Melbourne Scholarships.

4. From time to time to make recommendations which might amend these terms of reference or provide for specification of delegated authorities or provisions by which the Committee might regulate its own affairs.
Membership

President of the Academic Board or nominee
Vice-President of the Academic Board or nominee
A chairperson appointed by the President
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International)
Director, Centre for the Study of Higher Education or nominee
Director, International
Associate Director, Admissions
Manager, Scholarships, Bursaries and Fees
A faculty Academic Services Officer or equivalent
Academic Secretary or Academic Governance Officer
One member nominated by the Academic Programs Committee
Five members of the Board elected by the Board for a term of three years
Three members of the academic staff, not being members of the Board, elected by the Board for a term of three years
The President of UMSU or nominee and one additional nominee
The President of GSA or nominee and one additional nominee
Up to two members appointed by the Board on advice from the Committee for a term not exceeding two years.
Up to three members appointed by the Committee for the duration of a particular enquiry.
Up to two additional members, not being members of the Academic Board, nominated annually by the President of the Academic Board having regard to gender balance and disciplinary expertise of the membership.

The Chair of the SPC in 2015, appointed by Academic Board, is Professor Doreen Thomas (email: Doreen.thomas@unimelb.edu.au).

Report of work undertaken 2014

There was a strong push from the 2013 Student Lifecycle Review to
(i) move from prerequisite based selection to “assumed knowledge”;
(ii) simplify and streamline entry requirements and to rewrite the entry requirements in a clearer way.
The Committee, and subsequently the Board, reaffirmed as a matter of principle the retention of enforced prerequisites where these are academically appropriate. However, there was general agreement that each faculty or graduate school should revisit the content of its entry requirements (revising where appropriate), and that these requirements should be written in such a way that the minimum requirements that make an applicant eligible for consideration be distinguished from the selection
instruments used to rank students when not all applicants eligible for consideration are to be selected.

In collaboration with the then DVC (Academic), Professor Pip Pattison and staff from her office, the Chair, Deputy Chairs and Secretary of SPC devised a new format for Resolutions on Selection (approved by the Committee and the Board). The Office of the Provost (project officer Dr Simon Purtell) coordinated the collection from faculties and graduate schools of their proposed rewritten resolutions on selection. These drafts were then edited first by the SPC Secretary and subsequently edited and revised for further clarity and consistency by the SPC chair, before being returned to the Faculty for a final check. To promote greater consistency across Faculty boundaries, redrafted resolutions were grouped so that several graduate schools were presented to SPC and subsequently to the Board as a single document. All undergraduate programs were presented together, and all honours programs were presented together. In several cases, it was necessary for the formal presentation to SPC to be replaced by out-of-session handling in order to ensure steady progress in the project, but in all cases, documentation sent to the Board included an explanation of where substantive changes to content of resolutions (as opposed to layout and wording) had occurred. University-wide English language standards at both undergraduate and postgraduate level were also updated and more clearly expressed. The rewriting of all resolutions on selection dominated the committee’s non-routine activities throughout 2014.

Reviews of the 2014 intakes into three graduate schools and one honours program were completed. In addition, the review of programs associated with University of Melbourne Commercial, which commenced in 2013 and raised interesting challenges, has been dealt with as described below.

a. Melbourne School of Land and Environment
   This review was conducted jointly by Professor Doreen Thomas and Professor Ian Everall and their report has received Board approval.

b. Melbourne Graduate School of Education
   This review was conducted by Professor Ian Malkin and his report has received Board approval.

c. Melbourne Business School and the Bachelor of Commerce (Honours)
   This review was conducted by the Committee chair, Professor Barry Hughes. The review report has been sent to the Faculty for formal response and will be presented to the Board for endorsement at the Board’s first meeting of 2015.

d. University of Melbourne Commercial
   After a careful study of the highly diverse suite of programs offered, which revealed extensive diversity in the entry criteria and selection arrangements, the reviewer (Professor Kate Darian-Smith) recommended to the Committee that in future, UoM Commercial programs should not be reviewed en bloc, but rather that UoM Commercial courses should be reviewed when the Faculty or Graduate School that is
most closely associated with the delivery of the course is reviewed. The Committee 
favoured the adoption of this approach, which will enable closer attention to be given 
to relations between UoM Commercial and faculty courses in the same area, and also 
ensure that some of UoM Commercial’s areas of activity are considered every year.

**Additional contributions to governance made by individual members**

One of the Deputy Chairs (Dr Deb King) had delegated authority to sign off on the 
award of certain scholarships and related matters.

Each year two members of SPC and a professional staff member from Admissions 
contribute to the assessment of the level of selection bonus to be awarded to athletes 
and artistic performers with bona fide elite status. Some changes to the framework of 
the elite athletes and performers scheme have been foreshadowed by representatives 
of the University Executive and it will be important for the Committee to contribute to 
policy development and quality assurance in this area.

Traditionally the chair of SPC has acted on behalf of the Board as the Director of 
Shepherds for the Trinity Foundation Studies program and the annual reports of 
shepherds are submitted to the Committee. In recent years, there have been few 
difficulties, but given the strategic importance to the University of TFS students, these 
activities will always be important.
Teaching and Learning Development Committee

Terms of Reference

1. To advise and make recommendations to the Academic Board (and/or other University bodies or officers, as appropriate), in consultation with the Provost on:
   (i) The most effective ways to promote and encourage excellence, innovation and the support and development of staff and facilities in order to enhance the quality of teaching and learning and academic programs, and provide students with a wider range of enhanced learning opportunities in the University, taking into account the use of emerging technologies and new approaches to teaching and curriculum development, and learning-space design.
   (ii) The progress and effectiveness of curriculum-based and enterprise-wide projects and programs in the University to enhance and encourage teaching and learning innovation and improvement, having regard to national and international benchmarks.
   (iii) Strategies for implementation of improvements or initiatives proposed where relevant.

2. To communicate and work collaboratively with key internal stakeholder centres, groups and units, including, but not limited to, the Centre of Study of Higher Education, Student Success, University Library, Learning Environments, Planning, Associate Deans (Academic) and Course Standing Committee Chairs.

Membership

President, Academic Board
Vice-President or Deputy Vice-President, Academic Board
Pro- Vice-Chancellor (Academic) or nominee
Chairperson appointed by the President
University Librarian or nominee
Director of eLearning
Director, Centre for the Study of Higher Education or nominee
Director, Scholarly Information or nominee
Academic Secretary or Academic Governance Officer
Director, Business Intelligence and Reporting
Associate Director Learning Environments
Four members of the Academic Board elected by the Board for a term of two years; two members to retire in alternate years
Two members of Academic Staff not being members of Academic Board for a term of two years, one member to retire in alternate years
Up to two additional members, holding appointments at Level C, nominated by President, Academic Board
Up to two members of Academic Staff and up to two members of the Professional Staff appointed by the Committee having regard to gender balance and their expertise in matters relevant to teaching and learning and the Terms of Reference of the Committee
Up to five members appointed by the Chair of TALDEC and President, Academic Board, having regard to gender balance and disciplinary expertise of the membership
President of GSA or nominee
President of UMSU or nominee

The Chair of the TALDEC in 2015, appointed by Academic Board, is Professor David Williams (email: d.williams@unimelb.edu.au)

Report of work undertaken 2014

In 2014, TALDEC working groups undertook the following tasks:

Learning Analytics Working Group
Led by Professor Gregor Kennedy, this group aimed to determine the needs and the role of learning analytics at UoM. An extensive investigation of the domestic and international learning analytics landscape was conducted. Current institutional uses of learning analytics were surveyed leading to a report that sought to summarise potential uses of learning analytics at the University of Melbourne. Recommendations focused on strategies to provide staff with relevant data, policies reforms to ensure relevant privacy and confidentiality, and training and professional development support for staff working with and interpreting student data. This group submitted a report with specific recommendations to TALDEC in February 2014.

Working Group on the Future of Campus-Based Education and Classroom Teaching and Learning
Led by Professor Jeff Borland, the aim of this group was to articulate the rationale for campus-based education and classroom teaching and learning, to provide an overview of methods of campus-based teaching currently used at UoM, to consider a broad range of implications of future models for campus-based teaching and learning. The report also summarised some opinion pieces from selective students and teaching groups. No specific recommendations were presented in what is a continually evolving landscape. This group submitted its report for information to TALDEC in November 2014.
**Student Wellbeing Working Group**
Led by Associate Professor Wendy Larcombe this group actually presented recommendations to the December 2013 meeting Academic Board. TALDEC discussions continued in 2014 to ensure that the importance of the recommendations was not lost amidst significant change in the student support structures of the University. The report and recommendations will be offered to the newly established ACCC for further discussion and evaluation of potential resource implications.

**Online Assessment and Examinations Working Group**
To be led by Professor David Williams this group was formed in November 2014. The group proposed to submit draft membership and Terms of Reference for approval at the first meeting in 2015.
Teaching and Learning Quality Assurance Committee

Terms of Reference

1. To advise the Academic Board on quality assurance policy and processes for teaching and learning in undergraduate and postgraduate award courses and subjects. As part of its responsibilities, and within the framework of Growing Esteem and the University’s Teaching and Learning Plan, TALQAC has particular responsibilities in relation to quality assurance of award courses (including course structure and coherence), assessment and examination policies, processes for course management, learning support, student progress and student transition into courses and careers.

2. In collaboration with Faculties, Graduate Schools, related Academic Board committees, the Centre for the Study of Higher Education, the Business Intelligence and Reporting Unit and the Provost to develop appropriate qualitative and quantitative measures of performance of teaching and learning, taking into account national and international recommended practices, including the quality framework of the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA), and to oversee, monitor and review their use.

3. To advise the Academic Board on priority areas for evaluation and quality assurance of academic programs and associated student support programs, and, in collaboration with the Provost to recommend the academic units and areas of teaching and learning that are scheduled for the next annual cycle of evaluations.

4. To review and evaluate quality in teaching and learning of all award courses and associated student support services and programs, and to make recommendations to the Academic Board and through the Board to Council, on appropriate actions to improve the quality of teaching and learning in those courses and programs.

5. To evaluate systems and structures for the effective interaction between Faculties, Graduate Schools, Research and Research Training Committee, relevant Academic Board committees, and University Services in the development and use of measures to encourage adoption of good practice in academic programs.

6. To advise and liaise with the Provost, Director of the Centre for the Study of Higher Education, Deans, Course Standing Committee Chairs, related Academic Board committees, and associated student and administrative supporting programs and services on matters within its purview.

7. To monitor the quality and effectiveness of programs designed to facilitate the transition of students into undergraduate and postgraduate courses and from courses into careers.
8. To review final reports provided by Professional Associations on course accreditation on behalf of the Academic Board.

Membership

President of the Academic Board
Vice-President of the Academic Board or the Deputy Vice-President of the Academic Board
Provost or Pro-Vice Chancellor (Academic)
A chairperson appointed by the President
Director, Business Intelligence Reporting (or nominee)
Director, Student Success
A senior member of the Centre for the Study of Higher Education, nominated by the President of the Academic Board for a term of up to two years
Academic Secretary or Academic Governance Officer
Director, Academic Strategy
Four members of the Board elected by the Academic Board for a term of two years; two members to retire each year
Two members of the academic staff not being members of the Academic Board, elected by the Academic Board for a term of two years; one member to retire each year
An academic staff member with expertise in indigenous studies, nominated by the President, for a period of up to two years
Up to four members of the Academic Board appointed as members of the Committee by the President of the Academic Board for a term of up to two years in order to take into account matters such as the balance of membership by discipline and expertise in teaching and learning
Up to six additional members, not being members of the Academic Board, nominated by the President of the Academic Board for a term of up to two years having regard to gender balance and disciplinary expertise of the membership.
Up to six members of the academic staff at Lecturer B or C level not being members of the Academic Board, elected by the Academic Board for a term of two years; one member to retire each year
Two nominees of the University of Melbourne Graduate Student Association
Two nominees of the University of Melbourne Student Union
One student nominated by the University of Melbourne Student Union (International)

The Chair of the TALQAC in 2015, appointed by Academic Board, is Professor Marilys Guillemin (email: m.guillemin@unimelb.edu.au).
Report of work undertaken in 2014

Course Reviews: Updates on progress

a. Bachelors of Biomedicine and Science Review
   Final report against the action plan was received and noted.

b. Master of Teaching Course Review
   Update of progress against the action plan was received and noted.

c. Melbourne Law Masters MLM Course Review
   Review of the MLM and Graduate Diploma suite of courses-update of progress against the action plan was received and noted.

New course reviews were not conducted in 2014 due to the implementation of the Business Improvement Program. Course reviews will be resumed in 2015.

Subject Experience Survey Advisory Group (SESAG)

Led by Professor Mike Morgan, SESAG considered and developed the following in relation to the SES:

a. Guidelines for the use of incentives to increase SES response rates

   A competition where students could win $500 cash for completing the SES was implemented in 2014. Although this appears to have had a positive impact it is not clear whether this will be sustained. Ongoing effort is required to ensure high response rates.

b. Update on Subject Experience Survey (SES) Response Rates: Learning from recent successes

   A follow up was developed following the development and production of user-friendly two page guidelines developed in 2013; these were aimed at teaching and learning staff and focused on improving SES response rates. The new guideline outlined the strategies implemented in recent departmental and university successes where SES response rates had improved.

c. “Additional questions” SES database

   There was ongoing consideration and approval of questions to the “additional questions” SES database.
d. **Faculty of Arts trial of alternative standard questions for work integrated learning subjects**

To accommodate the increasing use of internship subjects, the Faculty of Arts proposed an alternative set of ten standard questions for the SES. These questions were approved and a trial was conducted in 2014 on the use of these questions for relevant work integrated learning subjects. A report of the trial’s outcomes will be presented in 2015.

**Indigenous Studies Teaching and Learning Programs Review Working Group**

The objective of this working group was to ensure the quality of Indigenous content in existing University courses. Chaired by Professor Shaun Ewen, the working group undertook the development of additional SES question to evaluate Indigenous specific content and skills in relevant subjects. These questions were approved and added to the SES “additional questions’ database. In addition, relevant questions were developed to be incorporated in the course review self-assessment questions from 2015.

**Advisory Group for Survey Reports**

Led by Professor Marilys Guillemin, this advisory group aimed to better utilise the student surveys conducted by the University. It was felt that there needed to be improvement in relevant information being communicated to its target audiences, and information from the survey reports being translated into actions that improve teaching and learning. In 2014, the advisory group developed the following two user-friendly guidelines, in addition to the SES update:

a. **Providing effective feedback to students**

This was prepared to provide teaching and learning staff with an insight into student perceptions of feedback at the University of Melbourne and some principles and strategies for providing students effective feedback.

b. **Assessing class participation: what, why and how?**

This document was developed for subject and course co-ordinators to guide their assessment of class participation.
5. Other committees/activities of the University in which the Academic Board officers represent members of the Academic Board

While there are many committees on which the Academic Board officers represent the interests and priorities of the Academic Board, two of the most important are the University’s Senior Appointments and Promotions Committee, and the University’s Research Ethics and Integrity Strategy Committee.

Senior Appointments and Promotions Committee reviews and approves all Faculties’ proposals of candidates for promotion to Professor, Honorary Professor and Associate Professor/Reader in the University. In this small committee chaired by the Provost, all three of the Academic Board officers are members.

Research Ethics and Integrity Strategy Committee, run under the auspices of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research), sets policy about matters to do with the integrity of research processes such as ethics approvals, monitors research practice in the University and manages responses to grievances and complaints. There are three Academic Board members in this committee, with the Chair of the Research Higher Degrees Committee being an ex officio member.
6. Strategic priorities of the Academic Board Committees 2015

In 2015 the Academic Board committees will be undertaking investigations into the following matters as their strategic priorities, in addition to maintaining their ongoing business. It is to be expected that the results of their investigations will be presented as reports to the meetings of the Academic Board, and will be followed up in other parts of the University to which they are relevant.

**Academic Programs Committee**
- Review new courses and significant changes to courses and subjects.
- Review proposed changes to any relevant policies and procedures as the BIP model progresses.

**Information Technology Committee**
- Review how academics can engage with relevant Buyers’ Committees, and with processes occurring to design or purchase new IT systems before matters go to Buyer’s Committees.
- Investigate how academic staff may be involved in discussions about the testing of new IT systems.

**Libraries and Academic Resources Committee**
- Maintain the Research Data Storage working group
- Provide feedback on, and further publicity about, Minerva
- Monitor digital preservation under the Strategy

**Research Higher Degrees Committee**
- Continue to receive updates and monitor progress of the proposals aimed at increasing accountability in research training.
- Receive and consider advice on equivalences between IELTS and TOEFL scores
- Monitor the former MSGR functions which have been relocated to the CSHE through reports to the committee.
- Formalise a model for monitoring the implementation of the allocation of APAs in faculties and receive reports to assist in its quality assurance oversight.

**Selection Procedures Committee**
- Conduct a study of the extent to which first-year student success is improved if there is more effective enforcement of Diagnostic English Language Assessment and follow-up activities for students identified as vulnerable.
- Conduct an overall audit of Graduate Access Melbourne arrangements.
• Conduct ongoing monitoring and participate in any debate on the principles underlying, and the policies guiding, guaranteed pathways to ensure that the establishment of guaranteed pathways into graduate programs for University of Melbourne undergraduates (especially pathways based primarily on year 12 achievement) does not commit too many places, thereby excluding worthy applicants who improve academically as their undergraduate degree progresses, and applicants from other institutions.

• Conduct an evidence-based assessment of selection instruments for graduate programs.

• Undertake the following selection reviews:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne Law School</td>
<td>Faculty of MDHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Science</td>
<td>Melbourne School of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Humanities and Social</td>
<td>Melbourne School of Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teaching and Learning Development Committee**

• Continue to perform most of its functions through focused working groups with targeted additional membership to allow recruitment of relevant expertise

• Work collaboratively on future projects of interest to the ACCC

**Teaching and Learning Quality Assurance Committee**

• Review the University’s course review process and other quality assurance processes against the Standards for Higher Education.

• Develop further guidelines that better utilise the student surveys conducted by the University.

• Undertake the following course reviews: Bachelor of Commerce; Master of Science (all streams).

7. **The Academic Board Secretariat – supporting the Academic Board**

The Academic Board Secretariat is that part of the University’s central administration which supports the Academic Board. An independent unit, it is headed by the Academic Secretary of the University, Ms Penelope Pepperell (email: pdp@unimelb.edu.au), and assisted by the Academic Governance Officer. It is
administratively located within Chancellery, with reporting lines to the Director, Policy and Projects, and to the President of the Academic Board.

Besides committee oversight, considerable policy research and development is undertaken by the Academic Board Secretariat. For example, in 2015, the Academic Secretary will conduct a review of the University’s Statutes and Regulations in collaboration with the University Secretary.

Research into the University’s policy history is often needed to help determine decisions made in academic appeal hearings, and the administrative officers of the Academic Board Secretariat provide that research capacity. The Academic Secretary is also responsible for the continuing management and monitoring of the work plan for the Board.