

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

ACADEMIC BOARD: 1 MARCH 2016

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 1 March 2016

Present: Professor N Quigley (Chair), Mr S Aitken, Professor B Barton, Dr C Blickem, Dr T Bowell, Assoc Professor C Breen, Dr A Campbell, B Clarkson, Ms B Cooper, Assoc Professor W Drewery, Ms C Green, Mr R Hallett, Professor R Hannah, Professor C Hewitt, Dr A Hinze, Professor B Hokowhitu, Mr I Jayasundara, Dr D Johnston, Dr J Lane, Professor R Longhurst, Assoc Professor T McGregor, Professor R Moltzen, Assoc Professor S Morrison, Assoc Professor W Rumbles, Professor L Smith, Professor M Steyn-Ross, Assoc Professor J Tressler, Professor K Weaver, Assoc Professor E Weymes, Professor D Willis, and Professor M Wilson

In attendance: T Fernandez, D Fowler, Ms H Pridmore and Professor J Swan

Secretariat: Ms R Boyer and Ms J Richards

16.01 APOLOGIES

Received

Apologies for absence from Professor N Boister, Assoc Professor C Costley, Professor G Holmes, Professor A Jones, Professor P Kurian, Dr D Marsh, Ms S Nock and Professor M Thrupp.

16.02 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 8 DECEMBER 2015

Confirmed

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 December 2015, as set out in document 16/61a subject to the following amendment to 15.75: "An update on the Curriculum Design Framework from the ~~Assistant~~ Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic..."

Noted in discussion

1. That at the 8 December 2016 meeting of the Academic Board a concern had been raised about the requirements outlined in the Curriculum Design Framework for students completing a double major in a four year honours degrees. The expectation appeared to specify that students would be required to undertake 30 points of research in each major. It was pointed out that for many honours students it would be unrealistic to expect them to complete 60 points of research, and students may struggle to find a sufficient number of original topics to satisfy the requirement. It was suggested that the requirements for a second major could be met without research being required for that major.

2. That clarification was sought as to whether members had agreed that all students completing a double major in a four year honours degree would be required to complete either 30 points of research in each major or a 45 point combined research project, as set out on page 18 of the Curriculum Design Framework, or whether the requirement should simply specify a minimum requirement of 30 points of research. This would be the subject of further discussion by the Curriculum Design Framework Evaluation Group.

16.03 EXECUTIVE APPROVALS

Reported

That minor changes to the Paper Outline Policy, as set out in document 16/67, were approved executively by the Chairperson of the Academic Board between 8 December 2015 and 29 February 2016.

Noted in discussion

1. That it was noted that regardless of whether a paper was offered by distance or face to face the paper outlines should resemble each other, as the learning outcomes would be the same. It was suggested that the policy could be amended to clarify this.

16.04 REPORT OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR (PART 1)

Received

The report of the Vice-Chancellor (Part 1), as set out in attached document 16/62a.

Acknowledgement

1. That the University acknowledged the passing of Professor Ranginui Walker. Professor Walker had a long association with the University and served as a member of Te Rōpū Manukura during the 1990s. He was also involved with programme reviews and worked with Professor Russell Bishop to deliver Te Tiriti o Waitangi workshops for senior leaders of the University.

Welcome

2. That Professor Deborah Willis, Professor Brendan Hokawhиту and Mr Indula Jayasundara were welcomed to the Academic Board.

Productivity Commission

3. That the Vice-Chancellors Committee had met with the Productivity Commission with regard to the 'New Models of Tertiary Education' issues paper released by the Commission in February 2016. Universities New Zealand would also draft a submission.
4. That given the environmental and demographic factors that were expected to impact on universities' growth in the future, the government was concerned about the increased investment in physical infrastructure and face-to-face teaching and queried whether investment may be better placed into internet-based learning. It was noted that online teaching, done properly was no more cost-effective than face to face teaching.
5. That the University would make a submission on the Productivity Committee report, which would be considered by the Senior Leadership Team at its meeting on 2 March

2016. A draft submission would be available for comment and staff were encouraged to engage with the paper. The deadline for submissions was 4 May 2016.

16.05 MATTERS TO BE RAISED BY STUDENT MEMBERS

Anonymity on Exam Papers

That student members suggested that the requirement to record the student's name on exam transcripts should be removed and that student ID numbers should be used instead. It was raised that a second identifier may be required in case of error or poor handwriting, and it was noted that the Faculty of Law employed a client code for this purpose.

Resolved

That the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) would investigate the feasibility of anonymising examination scripts, and would report back to a future meeting of the Academic Board.

16.06 REPORT OF COUNCIL

Received

1. An oral report from the Academic Board Nominee to Council.
2. A report from the 7 December 2015 and 10 February 2016 meetings of University Council, as set out in document 16/63.

Noted in discussion

That Council members attended a strategic planning day in February 2016 which focussed on the external environment. It was noted this would further discussed in relation to the Cycle 5 Audit.

16.07 CURRICULUM DESIGN FRAMEWORK

Received

The approved Curriculum Design Framework as set out in document 15/419 (updated 15 February 2016).

Reported

That at the 8 December 2015 meeting of the Academic Board, the Curriculum Design Framework had been approved in principle, subject to some minor revisions and clarifications, which had since been made.

Noted in discussion

1. That after further consultation with the Faculty of Science and Engineering amendments were made to the Comprehensive Undergraduate Degree Requirements, set out on page 16.
2. That in relation to the compulsory papers required in each degree the following addition was made to page 14: *Faculties will have the option of delivering these as discrete*

papers or as modules embedded within a number of papers. Further clarification on this would be forthcoming.

3. That in relation to the award of third class honours for four year degrees, it would be useful in some instances to keep a non-honours qualification on the books as an exit qualification, which could be awarded but not enrolled into.
4. That it was queried whether the move to 15 point papers would increase the cost of a degree. It was noted that that the cost “per point” would remain the same.
5. That members discussed the point raised by the Faculty of Management in regard to the requirements for students enrolled in a double major in a four-year honours degree. The requirements for a major may be met without research being required for that major, as set out in the CUAP rules for an Honours degree, and that a combined 45 point research topic may be difficult to fulfil in practice.

16.08 APPOINTMENT TO THE STUDENT DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE

Reported

1. That clause 2 of the constitution of the Student Discipline Committee called for “Two people appointed by the chairperson of the Student Discipline Committee from a panel of eight academic staff nominated by the Academic Board for terms of up to three years such that the terms of the members provide for continuity.”
2. That the terms of Associate Professor Umesh Sharma and Dr Michael O’Driscoll’s as members of the panel under clause 2 ended on 31 December 2015.
3. That Associate Professor Umesh Sharma was willing to be reappointed for a three-year term, and Dr Michael O’Driscoll was willing to be reappointed for a one-year term.
4. That any additional nominations would be accepted prior to, or at the Academic Board meeting; any Academic Board member who made a nomination should ensure they had the consent of the nominee, preferably in writing.
5. That in the case of the receipt of more than two nominations, appointment would be by way of a simple majority of votes by those Academic Board members present at the meeting.

Resolved

The appointment of Associate Professor Umesh Sharma for a three-year term and Dr Michael O’Driscoll for a one-year term to the Student Discipline Committee under clause 2 of its constitution.

16.09 REPORT OF THE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Received

The report of the Education Committee, as set out in document 16/65.

16.10 REPORT OF THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Received

The report of the Research Committee, as set out in document 16/66.

16.11 SIGNIFICANT ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Received

The current List of Proposals for Round One 2016, that had been signalled to date or deferred from previous rounds, as set out in document 16/19 (revised 25 Feb 2016).

Noted in discussion

1. That the Vice-Chancellor was concerned with regard to the significant number of proposals submitted for consideration. It was reiterated that the addition of more degrees with fewer students in each served to drive up the cost of degrees with little benefit and significant risk to the University.
2. That most proposals also required new papers without indicating that existing papers would be deleted. One of the aims of the Curriculum Enhancement Project was a consolidation of papers and programmes, which was not reflected in the proposal.
3. That the Vice-Chancellor would establish a process that would occur before the Round One submission date to CUAP that would require proposers to justify their proposals.

16.12 CATEGORY C AND SPECIALISATION PROPOSALS

Received

The list of proposals signalled for Round A 2016, as set out in attached document 16/13 (revised 25 Feb 2016).

Noted in discussion

1. That the changes to the International Relations and Security Studies specialisation and to the Bachelor of Environmental Planning were minor and related solely to paper changes.
2. That the amendment to the regulations and required papers for the Bachelor of Social Work were intended to open up a pathway for people with a Diploma of Social Work to upgrade to degree.
3. That the Postgraduate Certificate in Management (PGCert(Mgt)) Health Management and Leadership proposal was aimed at management professionals in the health sector.

Resolved

Approval of the following Category C and Specialisation proposals for Round A 2016, as set out in document 16/13:

- a. Specialisation in International Relations and Security Studies for the Political Science major in the Bachelor of Arts (BA) and the Bachelor of Social Sciences (BSocSc) (16/27a).
- b. Bachelor of Environmental Planning (BEP) (16/27b).
- c. Amendment to the regulations and required papers for the Bachelor of Social Work (16/27c).
- d. Deletion of the Psychology and Management specialisation from the Psychology major of the Bachelor of Social Sciences (16/27d).
- e. The Postgraduate Certificate in Management (PGCert(Mgt)) Health Management and Leadership Specialisation proposal (16/23b).

16.13 GRADUATING YEAR REVIEWS (GYRs)

Reported

1. That at the 12 November 2015 meeting of CUAP, the two University of Waikato GYRs for 2015 were approved.
2. That in accordance with the CUAP Graduating Year Review process, the University of Waikato would be required to submit four GYRs in 2016.
3. That the Faculties would submit draft GYRs to the Academic Office in June for consideration at the June/July meetings of Faculty Boards, Education Quality Assurance Committee and Education Committee.
4. That information relating to the completion of GYRs, and the required template, would be sent to the nominated GYR coordinators.

Received

1. The list of University of Waikato Graduating Year Reviews required by CUAP in 2016, as set out in document 16/01.
2. The 2016 Graduating Year Reviews Timeline, as set out in document 16/02.

16.14 CYCLE 5 ACADEMIC AUDIT

Reported

1. That the Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand Universities (AQA) released its report on the University of Waikato's Cycle 5 Audit on 4 December 2015.
2. That the report focused on teaching and learning and student support and was available on [iWaikato](#).
3. That the report commended the University on several aspects including postgraduate processes and support for Māori and Pacific students. It also recommended areas for action, including reviewing then ensuring that practices facilitated consistent quality of support for all staff and students.
4. That the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic would work with relevant staff to develop an action plan for the recommendations made in the report.

Received

1. The executive summary of the University of Waikato Cycle 5 Audit report, as set out in document 16/10.
2. Academic Audit summary of recommendations, affirmations and commendations, as set out in document 16/57.

Noted in discussion

1. That there were drivers in the external environment which would impact on the way in which universities conducted their business. Demographic factors forecast a static, or diminishing student cohort in future which could impact on funding. It was noted that the Waikato catchment area had one of the youngest populations, but this presented a number of challenges as well. It was suggested that senior academic leaders should be engaged in this discussion and use it to inform similar discussions in their own areas.

2. That with regard to the government intention to publish graduate outcome data, there could be considerable risk to enrolments in particular fields. It was noted that a risk analysis should be conducted before any data was provided.
3. That one of the aims of the Curriculum Enhancement Programme CEP was to make degrees more flexible and innovative. Staff also needed to step outside of what was best for their own degrees and Faculty and think about what was best for the University and the students. A cross-faculty approach would be transformational, academically sensible and would be an attractive student option.

16.15 REVISED CORE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Reported

1. That a consultation webpage had been active from 14 September to 16 October 2015 to provide staff with the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed new paper and teaching evaluation questions and new four point *Likert* scale. In addition to gathering staff feedback, an online survey had been conducted from 18 - 27 November 2015 to gather student feedback on the wording and formatting of the proposed new questions. A synthesis of the feedback informed the revised evaluation questions.
2. That changes were made to the proposed new paper and teaching evaluation questions in light of the feedback received from staff and students. These changes were outlined in the revised Core Evaluation Questions document, as set out in the document 15/275 (updated 20 January 2016).

To consider

1. Faculty Board feedback on the Revised Core Evaluation Questions, as set out in document 16/43.
2. Response from the Director, Centre for Tertiary Teaching and Learning to the Faculty Boards' feedback, as set out in document 16/58.
3. Approval of the Revised Core Evaluation Questions, as set out in document 15/275.

Noted in discussion

1. That a revision to the questions could be problematic in terms of having consistent bench-marked data. It was noted that the benchmarks changed when the University moved to online evaluations.
2. That it was unclear whether the justification for the revision was sufficient to prompt the current changes, and whether the amendments were an improvement on the questions. It was important to ascertain what information line managers required before the core questions were resolved.
3. That a concern was raised that students had been forgotten in this process; there was a need to ensure that these questions were ones that students would be able to answer and would elicit useful and relevant information.
4. That the questions appeared to be very subjective, based on students 'feelings'. It was suggested that as the data were intended to be provided to line managers, the questions should be more objective and concrete. It was noted that the new questions invited students to reflect and comment on the paper in terms of their own experience. It was intended to be part of a larger process that would establish a regime of continual

- evaluation and feedback from students throughout the paper and would be more effective in helping students to “join up the dots” at the end.
5. That it was suggested that a paper be developed which drew together all the ways teaching could be evaluated, as it may be preferable to look at the whole package rather than bits and pieces on the way. It was noted that the Cycle 5 Audit mandated a number of actions, including closing the feedback loop to line managers. A good deal of material around evaluations and expectations for teaching development had already been developed, and would be packaged up for consideration at a later meeting.
 6. That it was suggested that it could be useful to run a professional development session around evaluations, appraisals and how students could be involved in these processes from the start of the paper.
 7. That it was agreed that the questions may be subject to further amendment when the rest of the package of related information was considered at a future meeting.

Resolved

Approval of Revised Core Evaluation Questions, as set out in document 15/275.

16.16 STUDY LEAVE REPORTING

Reported

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

Received

A report from the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor in relation to 2015 study leave activities and outcomes, as set out in document 16/68.

Noted in discussion

1. That it was important that Deans and the University as a whole took a keen interest in the outcomes of periods of study leave.
2. That a report on study leave trends over time and how the University benchmarked against other universities would be useful. It was agreed that a report on study leave trends would be provided to a future meeting of the Academic Board.

16.17 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Reported

That the next meeting of the Academic Board would be held on Monday 18 April 2016 at 2.10pm in the Council Room.

16.18 PROCEEDINGS WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED**Resolved**

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

1. Minutes (Part 2) of the Academic Board meeting of 8 December 2015
2. Report of the Vice-Chancellor (Part 2)
3. Emeritus Professors and Honorary Fellows

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

Item 1 affected material previously dealt with in a meeting from which the public was excluded.

Item 2 affected the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or advantage and to protect the commercial interests of the University.

Item 3 affected the privacy of natural persons.

Renée Boyer
Jeanie Richards
Academic Office

7 March 2016