

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

ACADEMIC BOARD: 11 August 2015

Minutes of the meeting of the Academic Board on Tuesday 11 August 2015

Present: Professor N Quigley (Chair), Dr C Blickem, Professor N Boister, Dr T Bowell, Assoc Professor C Breen, Professor B Clarkson, Associate Professor W Drewery, Professor A Gillespie, Ms C Green, Dr A Hinze, Professor G Holmes, Dr D Johnson, Professor L Johnson, Professor A Jones, Ms A Kurei, Dr J Lane, Professor R Longhurst, Associate Professor T McGregor, Dr D Marsh, Professor R Moltzen, Ms S Morrison, Professor D Ross, Mr W Rumbles, Mr M Savage, Professor L Smith, Professor M Steyn-Ross, Ms S Stewart, Mr L Tawha, Associate Professor J Tressler, Professor K Weaver, and Assoc Professor E Weymes.

In attendance: Ms D Fowler and Ms H Pridmore

Secretariat: Ms M Jordan-Tong and Ms R Boyer

15.48 APOLOGIES

Received

Apologies for absence from Mr S Aitken, Dr A Campbell, Ms B Cooper, Assoc Professor C Costley, Mr R Hallett, Professor R Hannah, Professor C Hewitt, Dr T Kukutai, Mr N Orr, Ms A Watson and Professor M Wilson.

15.49 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 16 JUNE 2015

Confirmed

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 June 2015 as set out in document 15/341a subject to the following amendment to minute 15.42 (3): “It was noted that in ~~2015, papers with low response rates would be excluded from the data provided to the Deans~~ 2016 the aggregated data provided to the Deans would carry an explanatory note”.

15.50 REPORT OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR (PART 1)

Received

The report of the Vice-Chancellor (Part 1) as set out in document 15/342a.

Noted in discussion

Leadership Structure

1. That applications for the three senior positions had closed and interviews would be completed within the next week to ten days with the results announced shortly after.
2. That it had been decided to move forward with a staggered approach to allow the successful applicants to be involved in the appointment process for the other positions.

Wiki o te reo

That the Vice-Chancellor expressed his thanks to those involved for the organisation of a very successful programme of activities for Te Wiki o te Reo Māori.

15.51 REPORT OF COUNCIL (PART 1)

Received

The report of University Council (Part 1) as set out in document 15/349a.

15.52 REPORT OF THE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Received

The report of the Education Committee, as set out in document 15/343.

15.53 REPORT OF THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Received

The report of the Research Committee, as set out in document 15/344.

Noted in discussion

Intellectual Property Policy (IPP)

1. That the revised IPP had been considered by the Intellectual Property and Investment Committee, the Postgraduate Research Committee and the Research Committee and feedback had been provided to the Office of the Vice Chancellor.
2. That once the feedback had been considered and the draft policy finalised, it would be provided to the Office of the Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Executive) who would commence the formal consultation process. Once completed, the IPP would be submitted to the Academic Board for approval. It was noted that the Research Data Management Policy was dependent on the IPP being ratified.

15.54 PROGRAMME REVIEWS GUIDELINES

Reported

1. That the Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP) required that all New Zealand universities conduct ongoing programme reviews on a cyclical basis.
2. That the Cycle 3 and Cycle 4 Academic Audits also recommended that a schedule for the review of programmes be developed.
3. That the Academic Board had previously approved in principle the revised Programme Reviews Guidelines for circulation to the Faculty Boards.
4. That the Faculty Boards were generally in support of the Programme Reviews Guidelines, and changes were made to the document to take into account the relevant feedback.

Received

Faculty Board feedback on the revised Programme Reviews Guidelines as set out in document 15/301.

Noted in discussion

1. That the establishment of a formalised programme review process with central oversight brought the University into alignment with CUAP requirements and responded to the recommendations that arose from the Cycle 4 Academic Audit. The revised guidelines had been designed to reduce the costs associated with programme reviews.
2. That the Academic Board had approved the guidelines in principle at the 16 June 2015 meeting. Faculty Boards considered the guidelines in July and provided feedback which was incorporated into the final draft. All Faculty Boards recommended the guidelines for approval. It was noted that there was appreciation from Faculty Boards that the guidelines had been made more flexible.
3. That the guidelines did not include a robust estimate of the resources that would be required to implement ongoing programme reviews. It was suggested that a rough estimate of the potential staff time required would be useful. However, given the variations in the breadth, spread and size of the programmes and units to be reviewed, it was decided not to include this in the guidelines.
4. That the University was required to establish a programme review system and that it would need to be resourced effectively. The Deans would put together a rolling schedule and budget and plan for this accordingly.
5. That implementation would commence in 2016. Faculties would work out a timetable and the Deans would be required to develop a schedule to commence in 2016.

Resolved

Approval of the revised Programme Reviews Guidelines as set out in document 15/128.

15.55 PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A SCHOOL OF GRADUATE RESEARCH**Considered**

Advice to the Vice-Chancellor on the proposed establishment of a school of Graduate Research, as set out in document 15/346.

Noted in discussion

1. That students would continue to be enrolled in the faculties; the School of Graduate Research was a vehicle to provide overarching support for research students and supervisors. The proposal also sought to strengthen external engagement, particularly with Crown Research Institutes, and to improve the student experience.
2. That the proposed school would replace a number of existing functions, many of which were currently located in Student and Academic Services Division, but with additional work streams.
3. That more information was requested with regard to the links between the school and the new external engagement position created in the Marketing and Communications Division.

Finances

4. That more information on the likely cost of the change process would be useful. It was noted that a full business case had not yet been developed. The proposal sought to relocate existing roles within the School and would change reporting lines rather than create new positions. Should the proposal be approved in principle by the Academic Board, a business case would be built which would include the full costings.
5. That the proposal stated that the school would be largely funded through the use of existing resources; more information on these resources would be useful. It was noted that the intention was not to funnel any money away from faculties and that the roles to be included were generally existing and already budgeted for.

Scholarships

6. That there needed to be assurance that locating the Scholarships office within the school would not create a bias against non-research related scholarships. It was noted that there would be structures in place to ensure this did not occur. It was convenient and administratively efficient to retain the Scholarships office as one entity as there were administrative/mechanical elements common to all scholarships.
7. That some of the major undergraduate scholarships, which were entry scholarships, would carry on as a largely administrative function of the enrolment process.

Student Experience

8. That a coordinated approach was required to ensure students had access to the resources and knowledge they needed and ensure all the types of skills were covered. More information on how this would occur be useful.
9. That the promotion of publishing with students would be good to include in the document.
10. That honours students enrolled in .75 EFTS could be covered by the school but those below would not as their research would not fall into research programmes for PBRF.
11. That it may be useful to refer to EFTS weighting rather than points, as there was variation in the number of points for a thesis a student could be enrolled in.

Recommended

That the Vice-Chancellor approve the establishment of a School of Graduate Research, as set out in document 15/346, subject to consideration of the points noted above.

15.56 CHANGE TO PHD TO ALLOW TAUGHT COMPONENT

Reported

1. That at the 28 April 2015 meeting of the Academic Board, the proposal to allow up to 60 points of taught papers in the PhD programme was supported in principle by the Board.
2. That feedback was received from Faculty Boards, the Postgraduate Research Committee, Education Committee and Research Committee, and changes incorporated where appropriate.
3. That further changes had been made to the proposal following consultation with the Vice-Chancellor, Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor and other members of the Senior Leadership Team.

Noted in discussion

1. That students would still be able to audit a paper rather than enrol, although if it was recommended that a student take a paper, enrolment was preferred. Full enrolment was more beneficial to students as they would receive feedback on their understanding of the material, and would have the paper recognised on their academic transcript.
2. That it could be advantageous for faculties to offer a paper relating to writing for publication. It would be beneficial for this to be taught to a cohort rather than every supervisor providing this information to the students they supervised.
3. That point 16 had been reworded as: "Students who are required by their supervisor(s) to take up to 60 points of taught papers as part of their doctoral programme will not be charged fees for those papers. This requirement will normally be specified in the students' conditional or confirmed enrolment letter, or will otherwise be confirmed in writing by the supervisor and agreed to by the student. Students who choose to take taught papers in addition to the requirements of their doctoral programme will pay the normal domestic or international student fees."
4. That point 17 in the circulated document had been deleted, and the following points renumbered.

Resolved

Approval of the proposal to include a taught component of the PhD as set out in document 15/263 (revised 2 August 2015), subject to the revision of point 16 and the deletion of point 17 as noted above.

15.57 UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS STATUTE 2015**Reported**

1. That at its meeting on 15 July 2015, following wide consultation, Council approved a new University of Waikato Council constitution for effect from 10 December 2015.
2. That a University of Waikato Council Appointments Statute 2015 had now been developed, as set out in document 15/348.

Noted in discussion

That comments could be relayed to Vice-Chancellor before the Council meeting on 19 August 2015

15.58 SIGNIFICANT ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENTS ROUND TWO 2015**Received**

1. The current list of proposals for Round Two 2015 that had been signalled to date or deferred from previous rounds, as set out in document 15/90 (revised 1 August 2015).
2. The following academic development proposals:
 1. Introduction of a Māori Medium endorsement to the Master of Teaching and Learning
 2. Introduction of a Master of Business and Management – Specialised
 3. Introduction of a Bachelor of Aviation
 4. Introduction of a Civil Engineering stream to the Bachelor of Engineering (Hons)

5. Introduction of an Environmental Engineering stream to the Bachelor of Engineering (Hons)
6. Introduction of Environmental Sciences as a subject for the MSc(Research)
7. Amendment of the wording of the Special Criteria for Admission to the Bachelor of Social Work
8. Introduction of a Master of Information Technology & PGCert in Information Technology to be jointly awarded with the University of Auckland
9. Amendment to the Master of Computer Graphic Design degree regulations to allow a 180 point option for students with a three year undergraduate degree in Computer Graphic Design

Reported

That the listed Significant Academic Development proposals were considered and recommended for approval by the Curriculum Committee and the Education Committee at their July 2015 meetings.

Resolved

Approval of the Category 1-5 proposals and Category 6-9 proposals signalled for Round Two 2015, as set out in documents 15/180b-h and 15/297a-c for submission to CUAP.

15.59 CATEGORY C AND SPECIALISATION PROPOSALS

Received

The list of proposals signalled for July 2015, as set out in document 15/02 (revised 8 July 2015).

Resolved

Approval of the Category C proposals signalled for July 2015, as set out in documents 15/298a-c.

15.60 ACADEMIC COLLABORATION AGREEMENTS

1. Sunway College Kuching, Malaysia

Received

A proposal for collaboration between the University of Waikato and Sunway College Kuching, Malaysia, as set out in attached document 15/256.

Recommended

Approval of the Guaranteed Credit Agreement between the University of Waikato and Sunway College Kuching, Malaysia, as set out in document 15/257.

2. Waikato Medical Research Foundation

Recommended

Approval of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the University of Waikato and the Waikato Medical Research Foundation (WMRF), as set out in document 13/468.

15.61 DEGREES, DIPLOMAS AND CERTIFICATES STATUTE

Reported

That the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates Statute was updated annually to take account of new qualifications that had been approved by Universities New Zealand Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP).

Recommended

That Council approve the Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates Statute 2015 as set out in document 15/347.

15.62 TOPICS FOR FUTURE AGENDA

Considered

Requests or suggestions for topics to be included on future agenda.

Noted in discussion

1. That the form and membership of Council Committees should be considered and in that context for there to be a conversation about membership of the Academic Board at Waikato. Academic Board membership at the University was relatively small comparative to other New Zealand universities and it may be timely to consider whether a wider membership would be beneficial.
2. That thoughts and/or suggestions from members about the end result or discussion process should be communicated to the Vice-Chancellor.
3. That a proposal would be presented at the next Academic Board meeting which at the least would cover the process to be adopted.

15.63 CURRICULUM DEGREE FRAMEWORK

Noted in discussion

1. That more information was requested on the consultation process for the proposed new curriculum degree framework under the Curriculum Enhancement Project and how it would fit into Faculty Board and Academic Board processes.
2. That the proposal would go out for wider consultation with University community. Once feedback had been considered, a final draft of the proposal would go through the committee process. It was noted that new degrees and major changes to degrees could not be introduced without going through the Academic Board and CUAP.

15.64 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Reported

That the next meeting of the Academic Board would be held on 27 October 2015 at 2.10pm in the Council Room.

15.65 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 16 June 2015
2. Report of the Vice-Chancellor (Part 2)
3. Report of Council (Part 2)
4. Report of the Honours Committee

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

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

Items 2 & 3 affected the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or advantage and to protect the commercial interests of the University.

Item 4 affected the privacy of natural persons.

Michelle Jordan-Tong

Renée Boyer

Student and Academic Services Division

1 September 2015