

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

ACADEMIC BOARD: 16 JUNE 2015

Minutes of the meeting of the Academic Board on Tuesday 16 June 2015

Present: Professor N Quigley (Chair), Mr S Aitken, Dr C Blickem, Dr T Bowell, Dr A Campbell, Professor B Clarkson, Ms B Cooper, Associate Professor W Drewery, Mr R Hallett, Professor R Hannah, Professor C Hewitt, Professor G Holmes, Dr D Johnson, Professor L Johnson, Professor A Jones, Dr J Lane, Ms A Kurei, Professor R Longhurst, Associate Professor T McGregor, Dr D Marsh, Professor R Moltzen, Professor D Ross, Mr W Rumbles, Professor M Steyn-Ross, Ms S Stewart, Associate Professor J Tressler, Professor K Weaver, Ms A Watson, and Professor M Wilson

In attendance: Ms D Fowler and Ms T Pilet

Secretariat: Ms R Boyer and Ms J Richards

15.31 APOLOGIES

Received

Apologies for absence from Professor B Barton, Professor C Branson, Associate Professor C Breen, Associate Professor C Costley, Professor A Gillespie, Dr A Hinze, Dr T Kukutai, Ms S Nock, Mr M Savage, Mr L Tawha and Professor E Weymes.

15.32 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES (PART 1) OF THE MEETING HELD ON 28 APRIL 2015

Confirmed

The minutes of the meeting (Part 1) held on 28 April 2015, as set out in document 15/236a.

15.33 COUNCIL CONSTITUTION

The Chancellor was in attendance for this item

Reported

1. That the Education Amendment Act 2015 passed in February this year made significant changes to university governance; key changes were that the number of Council members was reduced to between 8 and 12, and representative requirements were removed.
2. That at its meeting on 20 May 2015, Council approved a proposed new constitution for consultation with staff, staff unions, students and other stakeholder groups.

Considered

Feedback to Council on the attached proposed new Council constitution as set out in document 15/241.

Noted in discussion

1. That the rationale for the proposed changes to Council were commendable; however, it was suggested that the proposal to achieve this was flawed. A reduction of democratically elected staff members to Council from three to one could impact negatively on the University's education needs, and the gender and ethnic balance of Council membership, and the University's autonomy may be eroded. It was suggested that the proposal undermined academic freedom and lessened the voice of Waikato University staff and students and that of the four available positions, at least two should be elected by University staff.
2. That it was clarified that the members appointed directly by Council could be drawn from University staff.
3. That as the absolute number of Council members had been legislated at 12, any increase in the number of staff members on Council meant a decrease in other areas. It was noted that the Minister would also be required to ensure ethnic and gender balance amongst the ministerial appointments and that each party would need to ensure the membership of the Council was balanced.
4. That the Act required Council to have a membership with the skill set to govern the University and not just to be representative of stakeholders. The Chancellor reiterated that Council recognised that knowledge of education, teaching and research were vitally important for a responsive Council.
5. That following the re-constitution of Council, the constitutions of all of Council's committees would require consideration. It was likely to include a change to the Academic Board membership to provide an ex-officio position to the staff member of Council, if that person was not already a member of the Academic Board.

15.34 REPORT OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR (PART 1)

Received

An oral report from the Vice-Chancellor (Part 1) in which it was noted:

That members were encouraged to attend the Vice-Chancellor's presentation to staff, which was scheduled for 1pm 17 June 2015, where the change proposal for the new leadership structure would be expanded on.

15.35 MATTERS TO BE RAISED BY STUDENT MEMBERS

Received

An oral report from student members on the following points:

1. Allowance for a 'suspension' clause for masters theses of 90 points or more.
2. The development of a standardised information pack for masters students and support for masters supervisors.

Noted in discussion

1. That students supported the digital submission of masters thesis for examination but many questioned the need for hard bound copies to be submitted at all. It was noted that the regulatory change to allow the soft bound submission of thesis for marking purposes prior to the lodgement of the hard bound copy was a first step and it was likely that over time fully digitised theses would become the norm.
2. That it was proposed that the regulations for a research masters degree include a similar suspension of enrolment clause as was included in the Master of Philosophy and doctoral degree regulations. It was noted that as masters degrees were overseen by faculties, an application for suspension could be dealt with via a Deans' waiver that would allow a Dean to vary the regulations.
3. That it was suggested that it would be useful for masters students to receive a standardised information pack.
4. The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Postgraduate) was aware of these issues and would work with the President of the Waikato Students Union on developments as they progressed.

15.36 REPORT OF COUNCIL

Received

A report from the 20 May 2015 meeting of University Council, as set out in document 15/238a.

15.37 REPORT OF THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Received

The report of the Research Committee, as set out in attached document 15/235.

Noted in discussion

Principles, Guidelines and Processes for the Establishment and Management of Research Centres and Institutes

1. That the criteria for the establishment and management of Research Centres and Institutes were not appropriate for Professional Learning Centres such as those located in the Faculty of Education. It was noted that the equivalent document for Professional Centres and Institutes would be updated and in the interim minor adjustments could be made to accommodate the disparities between Learning Centres and Research Centres. Where there was a direct conflict with what might be sensible in a Faculty the Vice-Chancellor could be consulted.
2. That, dependant on the final leadership structure, it was likely that the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) would be responsible for the development of proposals brought forward, but the ultimate decision with regard to establishment, or disestablishment of Centres and/or Institutes would rest with the Vice-Chancellor.

Resolved

Approval of the proposed changes to the Guidelines for the Establishment of Research Centres and Institutes as set out in document 15/220.

15.38 REPORT OF THE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Received

The report of the Education Committee, as set out in document 15/234.

15.39 CONSTITUTIONS OF THE FACULTY BOARDS

Reported

1. That a major review of the University's committee framework was undertaken in 2011, culminating in a new committee structure which was now well embedded.
2. That it was agreed at the point when the review was concluded that work would continue in support of the Deans and their faculties to address the constitutions of the Faculty Boards; a particular issue that needed to be addressed was the threshold for determining a quorum.
3. That the Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Executive) had worked with the Deans collectively over the past 12 months to consider the different approaches to constitutions and quorums proposed by each Faculty Board. A consistent approach across all Faculty Boards was agreed with respect to some aspects of their constitutions; in others, different approaches were considered appropriate.
4. That each Faculty Board considered the approach that it wished to take at its meeting in May 2015.

Noted in discussion

1. That it continued to be a concern that Faculty Board meetings were not well attended. It was noted that at any one time a percentage of staff would be unable to attend for legitimate reasons; (i.e. teaching, overseas, study leave), and that a realistic quorum was required to ensure decisions made by Faculty Boards were legal.
2. That academic staff had been encouraged to attend and informed about their responsibilities to participate in the decision making processes of the Faculty.

Resolved

Approval of the new constitutions and quorum thresholds for all of the Faculty Boards, as set out in document 15/240, with effect from 1 August 2015.

15.40 GRADING SCALE

Reported

1. That the University of Waikato grading scale was out of alignment with the grading scales used by other New Zealand Universities.
2. That as part of the Curriculum Enhancement Programme it had been determined that the University should change its grading scale to align with the other New Zealand universities that use a percentage-to-letter-grade scale.
3. That the Education Committee supported the proposal at its meeting on 2 June 2015.
4. That, should the proposal be approved by the Academic Board, the Group Manager Student and Faculty Academic Services would co-ordinate the creation of an implementation and communication plan for the change to the grading scale, and an item would be included on the Faculty Board agenda in July 2015.

Noted in discussion

1. That a concern was raised with regard to the impact a change to the grading scale may have on the awarding of honours. It was noted that the Education Committee had considered this matter and associated documents would be checked for consistency across the University. Should the proposal be approved a communication and implementation strategy would be developed.
2. That with regard to the Restricted Pass section, the proposal states “...but must not be awarded where the paper is a prerequisite for a compulsory paper in the student’s programme of study.” It was raised that a student’s programme of study may be unknown and that this sentence should be removed.

Resolved

Approval of the proposal to transition to a new grading scale from 1 January 2016, as set out in document 14/173 (updated 3 June 2015).

15.41 PROGRAMME REVIEWS

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 Audits also recommended that a schedule for the review of programmes be developed.
3. That the Education Committee considered the revised Programme Review Guidelines at the 31 March 2015 meeting and suggested further revisions prior to consideration by Faculty Boards.

Considered

Feedback on the revised Programme Review Guidelines as set out in document 15/128, before the document was circulated to Faculty Boards for consultation.

Noted in discussion

That the revised guidelines attempted to simplify and reduce the costs associated with programme reviews and to institutionalise the practice to ensure that reviews were completed on a regular cycle.

15.42 GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING AND PAPERS

Noted in discussion

1. That further information from the Education Quality Assurance Committee was included in the report with regard to the BLUE and the development of strategies to increase response rates, as requested at the 9 December 2015 meeting of the Academic Board.
2. That the 2014 Online Paper and Teaching Evaluations in BLUE report, as set out in document 14/559, included the results of evaluations conducted in 2014; however, it did not include information about what would constitute an inadmissible response

rate. It was suggested that as reliable research on acceptable minimum response rates was available, it should be articulated and included in the guidelines.

3. That it was suggested that the paper evaluation data provided to the Deans include the ratio of 'respondents : total students'. It was noted that in 2015, papers with low response rates would be excluded from the data provided to the Deans.
4. That individual teaching appraisals data remained confidential to the individual, and at present it was not possible to provide that data to an individual's line manager. It was noted that any substantial change to this policy would require full consultation.
5. That the notion of providing incentives to students to complete the evaluations was raised; however, not everyone agreed it was needed. It was noted that a pan-University approach to incentives would be preferable if the practice were adopted.
6. That some students were concerned about the anonymity of the online appraisal system. It was noted that it is totally anonymous; however, further work may be required to communicate this to students.
7. That the quality scores across the university were very good and suggested that the students who did respond were positive about their papers. It could be interesting to see comparative 'paper quality' data from BLUE versus paper evaluations to assess whether positive response rates had improved.

Resolved

1. Approval of the Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching and Papers, as set out in document 12/126.
2. That a report on what constituted an acceptable minimum response rates would be requested for a future meeting of the Academic Board.

15.43 SCHEDULE OF LIMITATIONS ON ENROLMENTS

Reported

1. That the schedule of programmes and papers for which enrolments were to be limited was published in the Calendar in association with the Limitations Statute.
2. That document 15/165 listed papers for which limitations on enrolments had been proposed for 2016 and included 2015 enrolment figures as at 23 April 2015.
3. That the Education Committee had made further amendments to the Schedule of Limitations at its 2 June 2015 meeting, to ensure limitations were only applied where there was a clearly justifiable reason for the limit.

Resolved

Approval of the Schedule of Limitations on Enrolments for 2016 as set out in document 15/165 (revised 3 June 2015).

15.44 CATEGORY C AND SPECIALISATION PROPOSALS

Received

The list of proposals signalled for Round B 2015, as set out in document 15/02 (revised 12 May 2015).

Reported

1. That the proposal to delete the International Management major set out in document 15/177j, and the proposal to introduce a replacement specialisation in International Management as set out in document 15/178b had been deferred for reconsideration by the Faculty of Management as the Curriculum Committee had expressed concern that the proposed deletion could be detrimental to students and enrolment numbers.
2. That the Curriculum Committee and Education Committee recommended approval of the remaining Category C proposals and Specialisation proposal.

Resolved

1. Approval of the Category C proposals set out in documents 15/177a-i and 15/177k-m, excluding 15/177j.
2. Approval of the Specialisation proposal set out in document 15/178a.

15.45 ACADEMIC COLLABORATION AGREEMENTS

1. Universiti Kuala Lumpur , Malaysia

Resolved

Approval of the Guaranteed Credit Agreement between Waikato Management School at the University of Waikato and Universiti Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, as set out in document 15/159.

2. Sunway College Johor Bahru, Malaysia

Resolved

... Approval of the Guaranteed Credit Agreement between the University of Waikato and Sunway College Johor Bahru, Malaysia, as set out in document 15/161.

3. KYS International College and Consortium Universities

Resolved

... 1. Approval of the justification for the proposed Foundation Programme with KYSIC and the Consortium Universities as set out in document 15/228.

... 2. Approval of the Collaboration Agreement between KYSIC and the Consortium Universities as set out in document 15/229.

15.46 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Reported

That the next meeting of the Academic Board would be held on 11 August at 2.10pm in the Council Room.

15.47 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 28 April 2015
2. Report of the Vice-Chancellor (Part 2)
3. Report from the Honours Committee
4. New Leadership Structure
5. Response in relation to Facebook page on Paid Parking
6. Te Ara ki Angitu: South Waikato Partnerships and Pathways

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, 5 and 6 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

30 June 2015