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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.

_Ruth Fincher_
_President, Academic Board, 2014_
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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 undertaking (implementing) 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 2014, the Academic Board officers are:

**President:** Professor Ruth Fincher Email: r.fincher@unimelb.edu.au (Melbourne School of Land and Environment/Geography)

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

**Deputy Vice-President:** Professor Nilss Olekalns Email: nilss@unimelb.edu.au (Faculty of Business and Economics/Economics)
**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. In addition, at each meeting, a question time occurs in which any member of the Academic Board can ask any other member a question and a short presentation and question period occurs on a matter of significance to the University’s academic community and therefore the Board. (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 other 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 2013. The members of these committees are required to conduct their discussion 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 member of the University’s Academic Governance Unit which supports the Academic Board, 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.

5 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.

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

7 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.

8 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.

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

10 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
Provost or Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) or nominee
Academic Registrar (or nominee)
Chair of the Teaching and Learning Quality Assurance Committee (when not the President of the Academic Board)
Chair of the Teaching and Learning Development Committee (or nominee)
Chair of the Selection Procedures Committee (or nominee)
Chair of Melbourne Model Committee (or nominee)
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 Student Centre Managers, one undergraduate and one graduate, 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 2014, appointed by Academic Board is Professor Cathy Falk will (email: cafalk@unimelb.edu.au).

Annual Report of APC activities in 2013

The APC workload in 2013 showed an increase in volume in all but one category compared to 2012. Members of the Committee, acting as Shepherds to the Faculties and Schools, considered:

- 20 new course proposals (26 in 2012)
- 141 major change proposals (101 in 2012)
- 42 discontinuation proposals (22 in 2012)
- 275 late change proposals (122 in 2012)
- suspension proposals (2 in 2012)

In July the Academic Board agreed to amend the Terms of Reference to increase the membership of the committee in order to share the high workload experienced by members particularly in the June-July period of the annual cycle of approval processes. The Board also approved an amendment to the composition of the committee to replace the position of Faculty General Manager with two positions for Student Centre Managers, one undergraduate and one graduate.

The adoption of the dual shepherding process with the appointment of primary and secondary shepherds to review and make recommendations regarding proposals continued in 2013 and members agree that this system strengthens the integrity and efficacy of the academic approval process.
Professor Catherine Falk replaced Professor Nilss Olekalns as Chair of the Committee and Associate Professor Helen Cahill agreed to become one of the two Deputy Chairs in July.

APC brought a number of policies and processes to the Board for approval in 2013. These included recommendations concerning access by students to past examination papers; an amendment to the Subject and Credit Points Policy amending the time commitment in subjects; and a review and revision of the scheduling of examinations, including establishing a process for overseeing how students with exam clashes are managed. APC works closely with the Associate Deans (Teaching and Learning) Forum before bringing such recommendations to the Board.

In 2013 APC was charged with ensuring that all coursework Masters offered by the University are 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 will report to the Academic Board on the outcomes of this review and audit in 2014. Matters considered by APC in 2013 that will carry forward to 2014 for consideration by the Academic Board include the definition of Major Change for the purposes of academic approval, and the process for the implementation of the compliance audit for changes approved under delegated authority. APC will also be involved in ensuring that Graduate and Postgraduate Certificates and Diplomas meet AQF threshold standards for nomenclature and specifications.
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 Advisory Group, and in relation to IT matters when appropriate, the Infrastructure Planning Group and the Administrative Business Advisory Group.

Membership

President of the Academic Board or nominee
Vice-President, Academic Board or nominee
Chief Information Officer
Representative of Information Technology Services (ITS)
DVC Research (or nominee)
University Librarian (or nominee)
Chair of Libraries and Academic Resources Committee (or nominee)
Chair of TALDEC (or nominee)
Executive Director Student Services & Academic Registrar (or nominee)
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 2014, appointed by Academic Board, is Professor Justin Zobel (email: jzobel@unimelb.edu.au).

Report of work of ITC in 2013

In 2013, ITC was in its second year, and has had the challenge of developing its own role while several of the University’s major IT systems underwent significant renewal. Specific activities include:

- Review of our initial terms of reference, in particular to capture the core element of our role.
- Identification of how the contributions of academics can best be used to help ensure that the University has high-quality IT systems that meet our needs.
- Development of a framework for provision of input into development of University IT systems.

The intention of this document is that it provides guidelines on the levels of engagement required to help ensure acceptance of systems (and of their limitations) by the academic community, while also helping to ensure that new developments are suitable and achievable.

Ongoing observation of the renewal of University IT systems, in particular Themis. The Themis upgrade was used as a study of how engagement with the academic community might be pursued during a major system development, with the intention that lessons (both successes and failures) be actively applied in subsequent cases. Numerous other developments were also monitored, as minuted in our regular reports to Academic Board.

Use of the committee as a forum for raising specific IT issues, in particular in cases where there was a conflict between academic policy and practical implementation (and achievability). An example was management of email accounts and other sign-on online resources for people whose formal contact with the University had ceased, such as completed students. The committee was also used to provide feedback to ITS on successes and failures, such as reporting of our appreciation of the improvements to UniWireless.

Our ability to undertake these tasks was greatly facilitated by the participation of and contributions from senior staff in the University’s Student Services and Information Technology divisions, for which we are highly appreciative.
Libraries and Academic Resources Committee

Terms of Reference

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.

1. 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.

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

3. 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.

4. To receive reports from University of Melbourne Archives Committee, the Scholarly Information Advisory Group and the Grainger Museum.

Membership

President of the Academic Board or nominee
Vice-President, Academic Board or nominee
University Librarian
Academic Registrar
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 two members of Scholarly Information Advisory Group (SIAG)

A nominee of the Archives Advisory Board

The Chair of the LARC in 2014, appointed by Academic Board, is Professor Andrew Kenyon (email: a.kenyon@unimelb.edu.au).

Report of work of LARC in 2013

Five meetings of LARC were held during 2013, involving library staff and academics from across the University. During the year, the Committee:

- Reviewed its terms of reference and composition, with minor changes being approved by Academic Board. This occurred because, after consultation with the University Librarian and Chair of LARC, the Provost had disbanded the Scholarly Information Advisory Group (SIAG) to avoid the substantial duplication in the activities of LARC and SIAG. LARC took on its slightly augmented role from the start of 2013.

- Received regular reports about and discussed Library activities, including the major stocktake completed in 2013, Library redevelopments, collection moves, subscription reviews, and general Library policies. In this way, LARC provided an avenue for academic staff and students to raise concerns or queries about or praise any aspect of the Library’s operation.

- Provided a forum linking academics into two larger ongoing processes in the University relevant to libraries and academic resources. First, the Open Access Compliance Committee steering committee (which is involved with University processes related to the NHMRC and ARC open access policies and matters such as the Institutional Repository Upgrade project) and, second, the Digital Preservation Working Group.

- Developed guidelines on submitting honours and other coursework theses to the University’s institutional repository, which were approved by Academic Board, circulated to departments and are now in operation.

- Received regular reports from the Grainger Museum, the University Archives and the Archives Advisory Board, and the IT Committee of Academic Board.
Research Higher Degrees Committee

Terms of Reference

1. To advise the Academic Board on all matters of policy relating to postgraduate courses in which the research component is at least 66%, including the degrees of Doctor of Philosophy, Master of Philosophy and other research higher degrees comprising research and coursework.

2. To review and make recommendations on all proposed new research higher degrees as specified in 1, above, and major course changes. (Faculties have delegated responsibility for all minor course changes unless the matter involves two or more faculties).

3. To receive advice from the Chair of the Academic Programs Committee in regard to consideration of the details or coursework requirements (for example subject level, content descriptions, assessment requirements, workload, etc) or research higher degrees and professional doctorates.

4. To provide policy advice to the Academic Programs Committee in regard to the research components of coursework higher degrees (postgraduate courses in which the research component is less than 66%) on matters such as requirements of research supervision and guidelines on the appointment of examiners.

5. To ensure consistency in adherence with regulations governing research higher degree courses administered by the Melbourne School of Graduate Research.

6. To advise the Academic Board on policy matters affecting candidature and examination, including approval of admissions to candidature, annual reports and the appointment of examiners.

7. Receive reports from the Graduate Research Scholarships Committee.

Membership

Pro Vice-Chancellor, Graduate Research  
Deputy Dean, Melbourne School of Graduate Research  
President of the Academic Board or nominee  
Chairperson of the Graduate Research Scholarships Committee or nominee  
Chairperson of the Academic Programs Committee or nominee  
Academic Registrar or nominee  
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 6 appointed members to be determined annually having regard to gender balance and disciplinary expertise of the membership
Up to 3 representatives nominated by the President of the GSA of whom at least two must be enrolled in a research higher degree
One Faculty General Manager or nominee

The Chair of the RHDC in 2014, appointed by Academic Board, is Professor Joy Damousi (email: j.damousi@unimelb.edu.au).

Report of work undertaken in 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations to Academic Board</th>
<th>Status of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course, subject and scholarships approvals</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to repeal Regulation 11.1.A1 – Awards of the University</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to Supervision of Research Higher Degree Students Policy - revisions and new clauses</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Philosophy with publications – extend PhD with publications to the MPhil degree.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor’s Prize for Excellence in the PhD thesis – names of supervisors be included as a footnote in the citations and adoption for this for all future citations.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Programs Report from Working Group and recommendations on Governance Models</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Integrity and recommendation to adopt the Epigeum Research Integrity online training package. Completion of the University’s research integrity online training module be required as a pre-requisite of confirmation.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report of work undertaken in 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports to Academic Board</th>
<th>Status of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review of research programs and PhD coursework – working group formed to consider Research Commission report, governance structure, content and funding. LMS Academic Support report provided.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Registration update noting the Supervision of Research Higher Degree Students Policy (MPF1244) is now published in the Policy Library.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSGR Audit of Graduate Research Candidature management under devolved model report provided.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of Conduct and compliance with the Code</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint badged domestic PhDs with Group of Eight (G08) member universities.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Research Policy Vision and Map – how the graduate research policies might be developed and fit within the structure of the Melbourne Policy Library.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations to Academic Board</td>
<td>Status of items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious objection to animal use procedure – reviewed for compliance with the requirements of research students.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-line progress reporting – report on Engineering online candidacy progress reporting system</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 2006-2012 RHD Exit Survey Results</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEQSA Draft Standards for Research, Research Training and Learning Outcomes (Research Training) – response to the Higher Education proposed revisions to the current Higher Education Standards Framework</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports from Graduate Research Scholarships Committee Meetings Initial report on the allocation of 2013 graduate research scholarships and final report for 2012</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion rate data report.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Research Policy Review Working Group – feedback provided on the following draft policies and procedures:</td>
<td>Completed – for University-wide consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Graduate Research Course Structure policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Graduate Research Progress procedure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Examination of Graduate Research Students policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Examination of Graduate Research Students procedure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Schedule A – Grading scale for Masters Degrees (Research)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Schedule B – Examination procedures following receipt of examiners’ recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preparation of Graduate Research Theses procedure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing co-examiners’ reports for a revised and resubmitted thesis</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance of Academic Board Committees</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of graduate research policy and procedures to align graduate research policies with the Melbourne Policy Framework</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing management of supervision training policy</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On behalf of RHDC for the period 1 November 2012 to 31 October 2013</td>
<td>3 hearings completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal unsatisfactory progress</td>
<td>31 completed (6 UP AB appeals) 13 ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints and Grievances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal grievances</td>
<td>3 completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal grievances</td>
<td>3 completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic misconduct</td>
<td>2 completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>4 competed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 of candidates 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
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Academic Registrar or nominee
Director, Centre for the Study of Higher Education or nominee
Executive Director, Office of Admissions
Director, International
Five members of the Board elected by the Board for a term of three years
One member nominated by the Academic Programs Committee
Three members of the academic staff, not being members of the Board, elected by the
Board for a term of three years
A Faculty Manager or Graduate School Manager 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 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
inquiry.
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 2014, appointed by Academic Board, is Professor Barry Hughes
(email: barrydh@unimelb.edu.au).

Report of work completed in 2013

The terms of reference and composition of SPC were changed in mid-2013, in response
to aspirations arising from the Student Lifecycle Review and from university
stakeholders for greater clarity and succinctness in terms of reference of Board
committees and more efficient processes. It is important to note that in redrafting the
terms of reference, all areas involving selection of students that are the responsibility
of the Board under statute, regulation or policy remain clearly enunciated.

The most substantive change has been the re-adsorption into SPC of the former
Coursework Scholarships and Awards Committee. It was seen as essential to ensure
that routine proposals for new scholarships and awards that comply fully with existing
policy and precedents can be approved swiftly and that scholarship offers proposed
after appropriate selection committee processes can be issued promptly. In response,
SPC has acquired a second deputy chair, with delegated authority to approve routine unproblematic proposals (with subsequent reporting to SPC). Generally the SPC part of the scholarship process has worked well. However, reallocation of some administrative responsibilities between National Admissions and Melbourne Scholarships and personnel reassignment have led to a few glitches with the overall scholarship process that have now been identified and should not recur.

A number of proposals relevant to SPC were raised during the Student Lifecycle Review (SLR), or incorporated into the formal recommendations. SPC was not directly represented at any stage in the process and some confusion concerning the nature of current arrangements might have been avoided if SPC had been more directly involved.

One concern that was raised early in the SLR process was that certain aspects of Board policy concerning the functioning of selection committees and processing of applications might be unnecessarily cumbersome or wasteful of academic staff time. In response SPC issued a short but clear statement of the actual requirements of policy, distinguishing between those aspects of selection in which decisions are algorithmic and transparently auditable, where the bulk of work can be handled by trained professional staff, and those aspects where academic judgment and subjective decision making is required, where the Board’s requirement of defensible committee processes must be fully respected.

The SPC chair and deputy chairs are currently liaising with the DVC (Academic) and the Office of the Provost concerning formal SLR recommendations that fall within SPC’s area of responsibility. Some of these are easily accommodated, while others are more problematic to a number of Board committees. Of particular concern are the proposals to replace formal enforced prerequisites by unpolicied “assumed knowledge” and to adopt a more relaxed view of degree rules. A recent national workshop on the consequences of an assumed knowledge approach to undergraduate science and mathematics education has confirmed that Academic Board concerns about the “assumed knowledge” approach are well founded. Where SLR recommendations are unproblematic, Board committees including SPC have demonstrated a capacity for timely appropriate policy development. For example, a foreshadowed SLR recommendation to use the ISIS-generated weighted average mark (WAM) as the default grade-point average, replacing the Standard Grade Point Average, was considered by SPC and recommended to the Board at the earliest opportunity, before the issuing of the SLR report.

Most of the vital work done by the committee on entry requirements for new courses or modifications to entry requirements for existing courses does not require specific highlighting here, but it is appropriate to note that after a process of careful
deliberation over several meetings, SPC recommended to the Board the acceptance in principle (subject to some tight restrictions) of direct entry of Chinese students who have completed the GaoKao (National College Entrance Examination). SPC’s position, endorsed by the Board, remains that the entrance bar should not be set below levels required for competitive selection into the most elite Chinese universities.

An important contribution by SPC to institutional governance and quality assurance is its periodic reviews of graduate schools and honours programs. Reviews of the 2013 intakes into the Faculty of Veterinary Science, the Faculty of the Victorian College of the Arts and the Melbourne Conservatorium of Music, and Melbourne Consulting and Custom Programs were undertaken to round out the first four-year review cycle. The MCCP review is still being finalised by the reviewer. The other two reviews have already been approved by the Academic Board and the Faculties have agreed with all recommendations made.

The review of the VCA and MCM was of particular interest. Normally, undergraduate programs based on ATAR-based selection nuanced by Access Melbourne are reviewed annually by SPC on the basis of data provided by National Admissions, but the additional selection instruments used for the Bachelor of Music and the Bachelor of Fine Arts (which include auditions or other stream-specific requirements) meant that these undergraduate degrees also required attention. In addition, the Southbank campus staff members have been typically less experienced in terms of central university policies and procedures, and selection into VCA and MCM programs is particularly likely to be subject to appeal. While the integrity of selection in all VCA and MCM programs was found to be high, there were a number of places where improvements were recommended. The Access Melbourne arrangements for the Bachelor of Music are well developed and working well. The implementation of appropriate Access protocols for postgraduate MCM programs and for all VCA programs is the most urgent recommendation (with the proposed protocols to be provided to SPC by 30 June 2014).

Reviews of the 2014 intake into the Bachelor of Commerce (Honours) and the Melbourne Business School, the Melbourne Graduate School of Education and the Melbourne School of Land and Environment are now being undertaken. SPC is an important contact point for matters arising at the Victorian Tertiary Admissions Centre and the Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority. In 2013 the chair attended meetings held at VTAC concerning English as an Additional Language (EAL), formerly referred to as English as a Second Language, and the proposed VCE (Baccalaureate).
In 2014, in addition to fulfilling its normal quality assurance and proposal approval role in all aspects of student selection, SPC will address developments arising from the Student Lifecycle Review, conduct quantitative research on matters relevant to selection, and pay appropriate attention to issues of English language standards, alternative entry pathways, access and equity and the particular demands of selection into graduate programs.
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 or Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) on:
   a. 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.
   b. 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.
   c. 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, Academic Enrichment Services, University Library, Learning Environments, Finance and Planning, Associate Deans (Academic) and Course Standing Committee Chairs.

Membership

President, Academic Board
Vice-President or Deputy Vice-President, Academic Board
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) or nominee
University Librarian or nominee
Chair, Academic Programs Committee or nominee
Chair, Teaching and Learning Quality Assurance Committee or nominee
Director of eLearning or nominee
Director, Centre for the Study of Higher Education or nominee
Director, Scholarly Information or nominee
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
Director, Institutional Planning, Evaluation and Quality, or nominee
Director, Student Services or nominee
President of GSA or nominee
President of UMSU or nominee

The Chair of the TALDEC in 2014, appointed by Academic Board, is Professor David Williams (email: d.williams@unimelb.edu.au)

Report of TALDEC work completed in 2013

In 2013 two TALDEC working groups completed reports:

1. Lecture Capture Working Group - (May 2013) (Chair Associate Professor Gregor Kennedy)

2. Teaching and Learning and Student Wellbeing Working Group- Report ‘Developing Student Wellbeing’, (December 2013) (Chair, Associate Professor Wendy Larcombe)

In addition, in 2013 TALDEC established the following new working group:
- The Future of Campus-Based and Classroom Teaching
  (Chair - Professor Jeff Borland)
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 and the University Planning Office, 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 Standards Agency (TEQSA), and to oversee, monitor and review their use.

3. To advise the Provost and Academic Board on priority areas for evaluation and quality assurance of academic programs and associated student support programs, and 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 advise and make recommendations to the Academic Board on the plans of Course Standing Committees, Faculties and Graduate Schools to modify the structure, content, method of presentation and delivery of award courses in response to quality assessments received in the previous year in order to ensure that these programs are of the highest possible quality.

6. To evaluate systems and structures for the effective interaction between Faculties, Graduate Schools, the School of Graduate Research, Research and Research Training Committee, relevant Academic Board committees, associated administrative supporting services and the University Planning Office in the
development and use of measures to encourage adoption of good practice in academic programs.

7. 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, particularly in the use and efficacy of LMS and other educational innovations.

8. 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.

Membership

President of the Academic Board
Vice-President of the Academic Board or the Deputy Vice-President of the Academic Board
Provost or Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning)
Director, University Planning (or nominee)
Chair of the Academic Programs Committee (or nominee)
Chair of the Teaching and Learning Development Committee
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Graduate Research) (or nominee)
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
Two nominees of the University of Melbourne Graduate Student Association
Two nominees of the University of Melbourne Student Union
One student nominated by the Melbourne University Overseas Students Service
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
Director, Academic Enrichment Services
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

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

Report of work TALQAC completed in 2013

Course reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>REPORTING STATUS (Feb 2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master of Teaching (Nov 2012):</strong> Evaluation of the deployment and effectiveness of the actions developed by the Melbourne Graduate School of Education (MGSE) in response to the 2010 TALQAC review recommendations, and the financial and operational management of the course</td>
<td>Progress report approved at Feb 2014 TALQAC; to be presented at Feb Senior Executive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biomed/Science (Nov 2012):</strong> Review of the Bachelor of Biomedicine (BBiomed) and the Bachelor of Science (BSc)-integrated management and teaching and learning review, evaluating course quality from both academic and management perspectives. The two degrees have been reviewed jointly due to the close relationship between the two courses that share a Course Standing Committee and eleven majors.</td>
<td>Awaiting Biomed progress report, Science progress report ready for submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master of Engineering (Nov 2012):</strong> Review of the M Eng as an integrated management and teaching and learning review, evaluating course quality from both academic and management perspectives.</td>
<td>Progress report approved at TALQAC in 2013 and will go to Feb 2014 Senior Executive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Melbourne Law Masters MLM (Nov 2013):</strong> Review of the MLM and Graduate Diploma suite of courses as an integrated management and teaching and learning review, evaluating course quality from both academic and management perspectives.</td>
<td>Action plan to be presented to March 2014 TALQAC and Senior Executive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bachelor of Environments (Nov 2013):</strong> Review of the B Envs as an integrated management and teaching and learning review, evaluating course quality from both academic and management perspectives.</td>
<td>Review report discussed at Feb 2014 TALQAC and to be presented at Feb Senior Executive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revision of course review process:
From 2012, the University adopted a streamlined approach to Accountability and Performance Management Cycle reviews. The revised approach brings together course review activities undertaken by the Teaching and Learning Quality Assurance Committee (TALQAC) of Academic Board, Melbourne Students and Learning and the
Finance & Planning Group (FPG) to evaluate course quality in an integrated manner, from both academic and management perspectives. In broad terms, the purpose of a course review is to evaluate and identify as follows:

- The processes in place to assure the quality of the course in question;
- Whether evaluative processes are in place, examine how are they used to ensure continuing high quality of the course;
- Where a weakness in the course is identified, examine how the quality assurance processes in place ensure that the weakness is remedied; and
- What evidence and reference points are identifiable which can demonstrate the quality of student learning outcomes and standards, course management and viability?

During the 2013 course reviews, the process continued to be revised. In 2014, there will be further review and revision of the process to ensure an optimal process for all stakeholders.

**Subject Experience Survey Advisory Group (SESAG)**
Led by Professor Mike Morgan, SESAG considered and developed the following in relation to the SES

- Introduction of the use of incentives to increase SES response rates, commencing in 2014
- Guidelines for SES Timing and Duration: principles to be applied when considering the survey’s timing, and its administration during regular and standard survey periods
  
  [SES Guidelines: Guidelines on Survey Timing and Duration](#)

- Guidelines on providing feedback on SES results to students
  
  [SES Guidelines: Guidelines on Providing Feedback to Students](#)

- Guidelines on interpretation of SES data
  
  [SES Guidelines: Guidelines on Interpretation of SES Data](#)

- Ongoing consideration and approval of questions to the “additional questions” SES database

**Indigenous Studies Teaching and Learning Programs Review**
Led by Associate Professor Shaun Ewen, this working group aims to ensure the quality of Indigenous content in existing University courses. To do this in a systematic manner, the focus has been on embedding relevant questions in the course review self-assessment questions.

**Advisory Group for Survey Reports**
Led by Professor Marilys Guillemin, this advisory group aims 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;
information from the survey reports being translated into actions that improve teaching and learning; and ensuring closing of the feedback loop to students completing these surveys.

The advisory group determined three possible report types for student survey findings:

1. Teaching and Learning Performance Reports: this provides information on performance against University targets, highlights areas for improvement and identifies areas for potential future investigation;

2. Investigative Reports: these would be in-depth diagnostic reports triggered by the Teaching and Learning Performance Report, and other relevant issues; and

3. SES Data Report: this would provide SES data directly to staff in a timely manner.

In 2013, a literature-based investigative report was carried out, in collaboration with CSHE, examining successful strategies for improving student survey responses. From this, a 2 page practice-focused flyer was prepared, documenting the trends in SES response rates at the University, and strategies to improve student survey responses. This was distributed to all teaching staff of the University.

SES Guidelines: Guidelines for Increasing the Survey Response Rate

Professional Accreditation of Courses – Alignment with UoM T & L QA requirements

Led by Professor Sandra Kentish, the accreditation working group has worked to have professional accreditation of courses recorded in the University Handbook. A process was also developed to update and monitor the University database on accredited courses, maintained by the Academic Board (through the Academic Secretary). This would enable central storage of professional accreditation reports, and enable access to complement the data informing course reviews.
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 2013-14

In 2014 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 of all Masters programs in the University to ensure compliance with the AQF.
- Preparation of responses to questions that will be raised by TEQSA on the academic standards of our courses and subjects.

**Information Technology Committee**
- Review progress of the Workspace Computing Project
- Collaborate on research data management and storage development project

**Libraries and Academic Resources Committee**
- Review the University’s approach to Open Access journals
- Collaborate on research data management and storage development project

**Research Higher Degrees Committee**
- Review of question of PhD research programs at the University.
- Preliminary review of how Research Higher Degrees might better reflect the varied careers sought by PhD graduates.
- Review of graduate research policy and procedures to align graduate research policies with the Melbourne Policy Framework
- Bedding down the Supervisor Training Policy

**Selection Procedures Committee**
- Development of a response to recommendations made by the Review of Undergraduate Selection Criteria and Practices
- Development of undergraduate entry pathways other than those for school leavers
- Consideration of issues related to postgraduate coursework programs, including the role of grade point averages as a selection instrument and general considerations concerning Graduate Access Melbourne
- Liaison with the Advancement Office over the academic oversight of new scholarships and awards during the forthcoming campaign for the University.
• Undertake the following selection reviews:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne School of Land and Environment</td>
<td>School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Business and Economics (Melbourne Business School and BCom (Hons))</td>
<td>Faculty of Science (Graduate School of Science and BSc(Hons))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne Graduate School of Education</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts (Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences and BA (Hons))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teaching and Learning Development Committee**

• Report on learning analytics and how well the University is using them in teaching and learning.
• Report on how student well-being can be supported in curriculum design.
• Investigation on combining our University’s strengths in on-line and face-to-face teaching and learning.

**Teaching and Learning Quality Assurance Committee**

• Review of professionally accredited courses requiring Indigenous content, and how adequately this requirement is being met.
• Analysis of qualitative comments on CEQ, and MES surveys, in order to better diagnose the reasons for the University’s rankings on these surveys and what remedial actions TALQAC and the Board may take in response.
• Develop guidelines for the effective implementation of the Subject Experience Survey (SES), and strategies to increase SES response rates from students.
• Review accreditation reports of professionally accredited courses taught at the University of Melbourne.

• Undertake the following course reviews:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Generation degree TBC</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Medicine</td>
<td>Master of Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>Executive Master of Arts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Academic Governance Unit – supporting the Academic Board

The Academic Governance Unit 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 staffed by a number of executive officers and an administrative officer who support the committees of the Academic Board and organise the hearing of student appeals to the Academic Board. It is administratively located within the Provost’s Division, with reporting lines to the Academic Registrar and to the President of the Academic Board.

Besides committee support, considerable policy research and development is undertaken in the Academic Governance Unit. For example, in 2014, the Unit will continue the review of all policies in which a gap has been identified to ensure compliance with TEQSA standards. Other areas of policy being worked upon include development of an Academic Honesty policy and procedure to be placed under Statute 13.1 – Student Discipline. 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 Governance Unit provide that research capacity. The Academic Secretary is also responsible for the continuing management and monitoring of the work plan for the Board and the Unit.