

THE UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO
TE WHARE WĀNANGA O WAIKATO

ACADEMIC BOARD

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 23 October 2014

Present: Professor Alister Jones (Acting Chair), Professor B Barton, Professor N Boister, Dr T Bowell, Professor Chris Branson, Professor K Broughan, Dr K Bryan, Dr A Campbell, Ms B Cooper, Associate Professor C Costley, Associate Professor W Drewery, Mr R Hallett, Mr D Harrison, Ms L Hines, Dr A Hinze, Professor G Holmes, , Dr A Kingsbury, Dr T Kukutai, Mr A Letcher, Professor R Longhurst, Dr D Marsh, Ms S Morrison, Mr W Phee, Mr M Savage, Dr M Schoenberger-Orgad, Professor L Smith, , Professor J Swan, Professor K Weaver, Mr R West, Professor M Wilson and Professor R Yates.

Secretariat: Ms M Jordan-Tong and Ms R Boyer

In attendance: Dr T Cartner, Ms A Drake, Professor L Johnston, Ms H Pridmore and Professor M Steyn-Ross

14.46 APOLOGIES

Received

Apologies for absence from Ms C Blickem, Professor R Crawford, Professor A Gillespie, Dr D Johnson, Dr J Lane, Professor S Jones, Professor R Moltzen, Professor B Morse, Ms S Nock, Associate Professor J Tressler, Mr J Tupaiki and Associate Professor E Weymes.

14.47 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 12 AUGUST 2014

Confirmed

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 August 2014 as set out in document 14/532a.

14.48 REPORT OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR

Received

The report of the Vice-Chancellor as set out in document 14/533a.

14.49 CURRICULUM ENHANCEMENT PROGRAMME

Received

A progress report from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor with respect to the University's Curriculum Enhancement Programme (CEP) as set out in document 14/534.

Noted in discussion

1. That the CEP working group was keen to disseminate information for staff in a user-friendly way and a website had been set up to assist this.
2. That the CEP website should include reassurance that information provided by staff for external audit purposes could also inform the CEP and would not be required to be produced twice.

14.50 CYCLE 5 ACADEMIC AUDIT**Received**

A report on the Cycle 5 Academic Audit from Student and Faculty Academic Services, as set out in document 14/528.

Noted in discussion

1. That the University needed to ensure that the appropriate processes and practices were in place to evidence the statements that would be made in the self-review portfolio for the audit. It was important to include projects and processes that were being worked on and/or in development.
2. That a writer had been contracted to write the self-review portfolio from the material provided by the relevant staff and chapter leads.

14.51 MĀORI ADVANCEMENT PLAN**Reported**

1. That the current Māori Plan ran from 2012-2014.
2. That in July the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Māori) had initiated a consultation process to inform the development of the Māori Advancement Plan for 2015-2017.
3. That based on stakeholder feedback a draft Māori Advancement Plan for 2015-2017 had been developed and feedback was invited prior to the plan being presented to Council in December 2014.

Considered

A recommendation to Council in relation to the draft Māori Advancement Plan for 2015-2017, as set out in document 14/329.

Noted in discussion

1. That it was noted that monitoring of the plan would be through the Pro Vice-Chancellor Māori and Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Executive), but that actions would be delegated to people/areas with specific responsibilities
2. That 'support' as referred to in 1.4 included all student support, including health, counselling, pastoral care and other support services
3. That given the proposed changes to University governance signalled by the Government, if 2.2 was envisioned as a Council position this could become problematic. It was noted that the terms of reference for Te Rōpū Manukura had not changed. It was a body that could add value to the University in a number of ways which included

engagement and planning and this did not preclude the establishment of relationships with other groups.

4. That the Māori Advancement Plan presented a great opportunity to enhance the University as a place where it was easy for staff to collaborate with iwi. It was suggested that perhaps this could be better articulated.
5. That in relation to student retention encapsulated in 1.1 and 1.2 it was noted that a UK report on retention found that retention rates rose when students felt they belonged to the institution and were part of a community of learning.

Recommended

That Council approve the Māori Advancement Plan for 2015-2017 subject to minor changes in line with the comments noted in discussion.

14.52 REPORT OF THE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Considered

The report and recommendations of the Education Committee, as set out in document 14/535, in relation to the following items:

1. Graduating Year Reviews
2. Significant Academic Developments
3. Category C and Specialisation Proposals
4. Schedule of Limitations on Enrolments
5. Gao Kao
6. Articulation Contracts
7. Academic Collaboration Agreements

Noted in discussion

That the Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP) had commended the quality of the University of Waikato's Graduating Year Reviews.

Resolved

1. Approval of the following Category C proposals:
 - a. Amendment to the compulsory papers for the BCGD, as set out in document 14/482a.
 - b. Amendment to the Health Communication specialisation – change to required papers, as set out in document 14/482c.
 - c. Amendment to compulsory paper requirements for Management Sustainability (includes new paper (ECON3XX Economics and the Environment), as set out in document 14/482d.
 - d. Amendment to compulsory paper requirements for Entrepreneurship with introduction of new paper (STMG3XX) and the renaming of existing paper, as set out in document 14/482e.
 - e. Amendment to compulsory paper requirements for Public Relations, as set out in document 14/482f.
 - f. Amendment to compulsory paper requirements for Hospitality Management for BMS(Hons), as set out document 14/482g.

- g. Amendment to compulsory paper requirements for Tourism Management for BMS(Hons), as set out document 14/482h.
 - h. Amendment to compulsory paper requirements for Accounting for BMS/BMS(Hons), as set out document 14/482i.
 - i. Amendments to compulsory paper requirements in Agribusiness for BMS/BMS(Hons), Generic 2nd Major and GradDip, as set out document 14/482j.
2. Approval of the following Round C 2014 Specialisation proposals:
 - a. Introduction of new specialisation to PGCert(Mgt) in Communication Management, as set out in document 14/483a.
 - b. Introduction of a new specialisation to the PGCert(MGT) in Human Resource Leadership, as set out in document 14/483b.
 3. Approval of formal recognition of the following Gao Kao entry pathways:
 - a. Tier 2A and above Gao Kao students would be granted direct entry into undergraduate programmes via an accelerated bridging programme.
 - b. Tier 2B and below Gao Kao students would be granted entry to Foundation Studies.
 4. Approval of the following 2015 Articulation Contracts:
 - a. Bay of Plenty Polytechnic 2015 Articulation Agreement as set out in document 14/516.
 - b. Waiariki Institute of Technology 2015 Articulation Agreement as set out in document 14/517.
 5. Approval of the following academic agreements:
 - a. The Memorandum of Understanding between the University of Waikato, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Wairoa District Council, as set out in document 14/523.
 - b. The Memorandum of Agreement between the Bay of Plenty Polytechnic and the University of Waikato for the delivery of Graduate Diplomas in Tauranga, as set out in the document 14/474.

14.53 REPORT OF THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Considered

The report and recommendations of the Research Committee, as set out in document 14/536, in relation to the following items:

1. Terms of Reference for Review of Research Centres and Institutes
2. Requirements for Doctoral Supervision

Noted in discussion

1. That some academic staff felt that they were being held back by the overly stringent requirements for registration as a chief supervisor. That the current requirements excluded contracted staff and were out of alignment with other universities.
2. That changes to the *Requirements for Doctoral Supervision* were proposed so that in order to be approved as a chief supervisor, staff would need to:
 - a. have been a member of a supervisory panel for at least one candidate who had completed their doctoral study.
 - b. participate in professional development workshops
3. The changes would also allow contracted staff to act as chief supervisors where appropriate.

4. That having a contracted staff member as a Chief Supervisor could be problematic if the student took longer than expected to complete. It was possible for someone who had left the University to continue as a Chief Supervisor, although it carried some risk for the student. It was noted that this would continue to be managed by Deans on a case-by-case basis.
5. That clarification was needed regarding staff who had a heavy supervision workload. It was suggested information relating to this be recirculated to all Chairs.

Resolved

Approval of the *Requirements for Doctoral Supervision* as set out in document 12/584.

14.54 **INTEGRITY OF ASSESSMENT**

Reported

That the Student Discipline Appeals Committee, a sub-committee of Council, had identified three issues regarding the integrity of student performance in assessment that had arisen out of the student discipline appeal process. They had recommended that the issues be referred to the Academic Board in the first instance.

Considered

The report on Integrity of Assessment and Academic Practice to Reduce Student Misconduct as set out in document 14/537.

Noted in discussion

1. That some kinds of assessment were more vulnerable to dishonesty than others. It was worth reflecting on current practice and ways to mitigate risk.
2. That the Student Discipline Appeals Committee (SDAC) only dealt with a small number of cases each year and it was not for SDAC to set policy; however, it was good to discuss opportunities to improve assessment practices.
3. That the types of assignments set could make it easier or harder for students to plagiarise. There should be support for academic staff to identify the best ways to work.
4. That it was encouraging that the University was being proactive, particularly in relation to websites that sold assignments.
5. That there was currently no access for staff to run students' drafts through Turnitin where plagiarism was suspected. It was noted that a shell paper could be set up which students could submit drafts to. Using Turnitin in this way could be educative and its use as an educative and disciplinary tool should be increased.
6. That if there was uncertainty in relation to potential academic misconduct the matter should be referred on to the Student Discipline Administrator to ensure matters were dealt with consistently and records kept.
7. That the variation of assessment practices and design across the University was an issue and some fundamental changes and a cultural shift was required. The report could provide the impetus for staff and faculties to review current assessment methods and practices and identify methods to embed best practice into their teaching.

Recommended

1. That the report on Integrity of Assessment and Academic Practice to Reduce Student Misconduct as set out in document 14/537 be provided to Faculty Boards for discussion.
2. That the recommendations in the Student Discipline Committee Annual reports should be given closer attention by the academic committees and Faculties.

14.55 ACADEMIC BOARD ELECTION TO COUNCIL

Reported

1. That the constitution of Council included one academic staff member elected by and from the members of the Academic Board.
2. That the current member of Council under this provision was Dr Alison Campbell, whose term ended on 31 December 2014; the incumbent was eligible for re-election.
3. That the members of the Academic Board had been notified of the election by email on 9 October 2014.
4. That under current legislation, members who were elected to Council held office for four years; however Government had indicated an intention to complete a range of governance reforms, which meant that while the timing of any new legislation was uncertain, any new appointments to Council under its current constitution may be for terms shorter than four years.
5. That an election was conducted at the meeting in accordance with the University's Election of Members of the Council Statute 2012.

Noted in discussion

That one nomination was received, for Dr Alison Campbell; no voting was required.

Resolved

That Dr Alison Campbell was declared duly elected as the Academic Board member of Council for a term beginning 1 January 2015.

14.56 ELECTION OF TWO PROFESSORS TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD

Reported

1. That Clause 8 of the constitution of the Academic Board provided for four professors to be elected by and from the academic staff, for terms of three years from 1 January, such that the terms of members provide for continuity.
2. That two positions became vacant during 2014 and an election was called to fill the vacant positions.
3. That nominations were called for these positions and closed at 5pm on Thursday 28 August 2014. Four nominations were received by the closing time.
An online election was held with voting open from Thursday 11 September until Thursday 25 September 2014.
4. That the successful candidates were Professor Lynda Johnston and Professor Moira Steyn-Ross.

14.57 ACADEMIC BOARD APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES

1. Appointments to Committees of the Academic Board

Reported

1. That the constitutions of a number of committees provided for appointments by the Academic Board.
2. That nominations were provided to the Secretariat before or at the meeting; nominators were advised to ensure the nominee consented to the nomination.

Considered

The schedule of committees requiring members to be appointed or elected by the Academic Board for 2015, as set out in document 14/539.

Noted in discussion

Special Consideration Committee

1. That the current appointee under Clause 5 was not seeking re-appointment.
2. That as there were no other nominations, the appointment of a Chair for the Special Consideration Committee was deferred to the 9 December 2014 meeting.

Resolved

1. The re-appointment of Dr J Thacker to the Special Consideration Committee.
2. The re-appointment of Dr D Foo to the Student Discipline Committee.

2. Appointment to the Honours Committee

Reported

1. That the constitution of the Honours Committee provided for *“Three members of the academic staff of the University, at least one of whom is a member of the sub-professorial academic staff, appointed by the Academic Board for terms of up to three years, so that the term of each person expires in a different year.”*
2. That Professor Peter Kamp’s term as an appointee of the Academic Board on the Honours Committee ended on 31.12.2014 (the other members under this provision were Ms Sandy Morrison (to 31.12.2015) and Professor Anne McKim (to 31.12.2016)).
3. That Professor Kamp had indicated his willingness to be appointed to the Honours Committee for a further term.

Resolved

The re-appointment of Professor Peter Kamp to the Honours Committee for a three-year term ending 31 December 2017.

14.58 TOPICS FOR FUTURE AGENDA

Noted in discussion

That the following topics were requested for consideration at a future meeting of the Academic Board:

1. Implementation and practice around readmission of students
2. Language competency thresholds

14.60 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Reported

That the next meeting of the Academic Board would be held on 9 December 2014 at 2.10pm in the Council Room.

AGENDA PART TWO – CONFIDENTIAL

Resolved

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

1. Minutes (Part 2) of the Academic Board meeting of 12 August 2014
2. Report of the Vice-Chancellor (Part 2)
3. Zhejiang University City College Joint Institute
4. Faculty of Education Restructure


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

Michelle Jordan-Tong
Renée Boyer
Student and Academic Services Division

31 October 2014

Minutes approved


_____ (Chairperson)

Date

