The Chairperson opened the meeting and welcomed members, alternates and observers, she especially welcomed new members who were attending their first meeting of Academic Board inviting them to introduce themselves. Prof Waye acknowledged the fact that the meeting was taking place on the
traditional country of the Kaurna people of the Adelaide Plains, and recognised and respected their cultural heritage, beliefs and relationships with the land, as well as acknowledging their continuing importance to the Kaurna people living today.

1.2 TABLED PAPERS

2 There was one tabled paper:

2.1 Academic Board Action Sheet 8/2018 (Agenda Item 2.1)

1.3 STARRING OF AGENDA ITEMS

3 Agenda Items 1, 2.1, 3, 4, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3 and 8.4 were starred for discussion.

1.4 APPROVAL OF UNSTARRED ITEMS

2019/1/1 Academic Board resolved:

that all unstarred items be received or approved without discussion.

Moved: Assoc Prof John Medlin
Seconded: Ms Grace Dixon
CARRIED

1.5 NOTICE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

4 It was noted that no members had given notice of a potential conflict of interest in relation to any items of business on the agenda for consideration at the meeting.

1.6 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

2019/1/2 Academic Board resolved:

to accept the minutes of the meeting held on 23 November 2018 as a correct record.

Moved: Ms Adrienne Nieuwenhuis
Seconded: Prof Marie Wilson
CARRIED

ITEM 2 – BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

5 There was no business arising from the minutes.
ITEM 3 – CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

6 The Chairperson, Prof Vicki Waye, reported that the draft Academic Freedom Statement had been finalised by the Working Group and submitted to senior staff in the People Talent and Culture portfolio to ensure coherence with existing UniSA policies and planned revisions of policy. It was then to be submitted to Senior Management Group (SMG) for feedback, but meanwhile in late 2018 the Federal government commissioned a review led by former Chief Justice Robert French into the rules and regulations protecting freedom of speech on university campuses. Just recently the French review had produced a draft Model Code of Conduct on Academic Freedom. Much of the intent of the draft Statement produced by the Working Group was reflected in the French Model Code. The French Model Code and the draft Working Group Statement would now go to SMG together for consideration. As a result, discussion on the proposed UniSA Academic Board Working Group draft would be postponed until the March meeting.

7 At the December 2018 Council meeting and the Strategy Day in February 2019, the major items on the agenda were Enterprise 25 and the University’s financial position. The Vice Chancellor Prof David Lloyd presented to the Council on Enterprise 25. Council had previously approved the 5-year Enterprise 25 Strategic Plan together with an envelope of funding for its constituent projects. However, since its earlier iteration the Plan had been revised to incorporate restructuring of the University so that its structure better reflected the strategic aim of strengthening the orientation of the organisation around Programs, People and Precincts. As the Vice Chancellor had already indicated in his University staff communications, the number of academic units in the University would be reduced from 14 to 7 – 9 units. These units would be overseen by an Executive Dean assisted by a Dean Research, a Dean for Students, and Program Deans responsible for clusters of programs, in turn, managed by program directors. Additionally, the SMG would be streamlined to a much smaller number of persons with the aim of compressing reporting lines between staff undertaking the core functions of teaching and research and those responsible for implementing university strategy. Savings generated through organisational transformation would be used to invest in new academic positions. The timing and funding of campus consolidation plans were also revised, so that consolidation was now scheduled to occur over a longer period and in a more staged manner.

2019/1/3 Academic Board resolved:

to receive the Chairperson’s Report.

Moved: Prof Vicki Waye (from the Chair)

CARRIED

ITEM 4 – VICE CHANCELLOR’S REPORT

8 The Vice Chancellor, Prof David Lloyd, introduced his written report, which was taken as read, by providing members with a brief policy update. He reported that in the lead up to Christmas 2018, the university sector saw the release of a range of consultation and discussion papers by the Commonwealth including: the independent Review of policies supporting Freedom of Expression and Intellectual Inquiry in Australian Higher Education; the Review of Higher Education Provider Category Standards; the Review of the Australian Qualifications Standards; the National Regional, Rural and Remote Education Strategy Framing Paper; Performance -based funding for the Commonwealth Grant Scheme; and reallocation of Commonwealth supported places for enabling, sub-bachelor and postgraduate courses. While each had implications for UniSA, and the last two were of special significance. In the case of performance-based funding, from 2020 funding for growth in bachelor-level places would be tied to population growth in the 18 years to 64 years age bracket. It was intended that universities’ access to that funding was to be determined through specified performance criteria, noting that the amount of funding available across the whole sector
would be $70 million per annum. The reallocation of Commonwealth supported places for enabling, sub-bachelor and postgraduate programs was in response to previously foreshadowed intentions by successive Federal ministers to review the current distribution and purpose of enabling and sub-bachelor places, and to reconsider the allocation of Commonwealth supported places for Master’s level programs. Responses to each of the papers was being coordinated through the Vice Chancellor’s Office.

2019/1/4 Academic Board resolved:

   to receive the Vice Chancellor’s Report.

   Moved: Prof Vicki Waye (from the Chair)

   CARRIED

ITEM 5 – MATTERS FROM ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND QUALITY COMMITTEE (ASQC) 1/2019

5.1 BUSINESS SCHOOL

5.1.1 NEW UNISA ONLINE PROGRAM – BACHELOR OF MARKETING AND COMMUNICATION (UNSTARRED ITEM)

2019/1/5 Academic Board resolved:

   to approve the new UniSA Online Bachelor of Marketing and Communication to be offered from Study Period 4, 2019.

5.1.2 NEW 3+1 MASTERS PATHWAYS: SCHOOL OF COMMERCE (UNSTARRED ITEM)

2019/1/6 Academic Board resolved:

   to approve the administration-only specialisations effective from Study Period 5, 2019 for the Bachelor of Business (Financial Planning) (DBRF), the Bachelor of Business (Property) (DBFY), and the Bachelor of Commerce (DBCA).

5.2 DIVISION OF HEALTH SCIENCES

5.2.1 NEW PROGRAM – BACHELOR OF HEALTH SCIENCE (PUBLIC HEALTH)

2019/1/7 Academic Board resolved:

   to approve the new Bachelor of Health Science (Public Health) for introduction from Study Period 2, 2020.

5.2.2 NEW UNISA ONLINE PROGRAM – BACHELOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH

2019/1/8 Academic Board resolved:

   to approve the new Bachelor Public Health for introduction from Study Period 2, 2020.
5.2.3 PROGRAM EVALUATION AND REACCREDITATION REVIEW REPORT – GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN BREAST IMAGING

2019/1/9 Academic Board resolved:

to receive the Program Evaluation and Reaccreditation Review Report for the Graduate Certificate in Breast Imaging and approve the reaccreditation of the program from 2020 until 2025 inclusive.

5.3 UNISA COLLEGE

5.3.1 PROGRAM REPACKAGING AND WITHDRAWAL – DIPLOMA IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (UNSTARRED ITEM)

2019/1/10 Academic Board resolved:

to approve the new Diploma in Construction, Diploma in Engineering, Diploma in Information Technology and the new Diploma in Science and Environment for implementation in 2020, and the withdrawal of the Diploma in Science and Technology from 2020, with the last admission in Study Period 5 2019.

5.3.2 NEW SATAC PACKAGED PROGRAMS (UNSTARRED ITEM)

2019/1/11 Academic Board resolved:

to approve the UniSA College proposed SATAC packaged programs for inclusion in the 2020 SATAC Guide and eGuide.

5.4 OTHER MATTERS

5.4.1 SCHEDULE OF PROGRAMS FOR REVIEW IN 2019 UNDER ACADEMIC POLICY A35A – QUALITY ASSURANCE AND IMPROVEMENT: PROGRAMS, COURSE AND TEACHING ARRANGEMENTS (UNSTARRED ITEM)

2019/1/12 Academic Board resolved:

to note the reporting requirements and the schedule of programs for review in 2019 under Academic Policy A35A – Quality Assurance and Improvement: Programs, Courses and Teaching Arrangements.

ITEM 6 – MATTERS FROM RESEARCH DEGREES COMMITTEE (RDC) 1/2019

6.1 RESEARCH DEGREE COMPLETION OF REQUIREMENTS (UNSTARRED ITEM)

2019/1/13 Academic Board resolved:

to receive the report from Research Degrees Committee.
ITEM 7 - BUSINESS

7.1 NEW PRIZE – SCHOOL OF LAW (UNSTARRED ITEM)
2019/1/14 Academic Board resolved:

to approve the new Peter Tiffin Prize for Evidence.

7.2 NEW PRIZES – SCHOOL OF MARKETING (UNSTARRED ITEM)
2019/1/15 Academic Board resolved:

to approve the new Lyft Inc. Prize, the Mediacom Singapore Pty Ltd Prize, the HSBC Holdings PLC Prize and the Coca-Cola South Pacific P/L Prize.

7.3 NEW GRANT – BPW ADELAIDE HEATHER SOUTHCOTT MEMORIAL PRIZE (UNSTARRED ITEM)
2019/1/16 Academic Board resolved:

to approve the new BPW Adelaide Heather Southcott Memorial Grant.

7.4 NEW SCHOLARSHIP – AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT UNISA REGIONAL JOURNALISM SCHOLARSHIP (UNSTARRED ITEM)
2019/1/17 Academic Board resolved:

to approve the new Australian Government UniSA Regional Journalism Scholarship.

7.5 NEW SCHOLARSHIP – AUSIMM STEM ACCESS SCHOLARSHIP (UNSTARRED ITEM)
2019/1/18 Academic Board resolved:

to approve the new AusIMM STEM Access Scholarship.

7.6 NEW SCHOLARSHIP – SCHEER HONOURS SCIENCE SCHOLARSHIP (UNSTARRED ITEM)
2019/1/19 Academic Board resolved:

to approve the new Scheer Honours Science Scholarship.

7.7 NEW GRANT – WATTLE RANGE COUNCIL UNISA STUDY GRANT (UNSTARRED ITEM)
2019/1/20 Academic Board resolved:

to approve the new Wattle Range Council UniSA Study Grant.
ITEM 8 – FOR INFORMATION

8.1 2018 UNISA ACADEMIC BOARD EVALUATION

The Chairperson, Prof Vicki Waye, thanked members who had taken the time to complete the Academic Board Evaluation and for their constructive suggestions for improvement. The Academic Board Evaluation was first administered in 2014 with question categories closely aligned to the UniSA Council Survey around role and function, sector awareness, governance, relationships and interactions, induction, and overall performance. While there were no evaluations in 2015 and 2016, the survey was now conducted annually.

It was noted that overall it appeared that members believed that Academic Board was fulfilling its terms of reference. Members were generally positive around the opportunity to assess and approve program evaluation and reaccreditation issues as well as program development issues (3.91 as compared to 3.56 in 2017). However, they indicated that they would prefer more involvement and input into program evaluation and development, with access to Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) papers, or more information appended to ASQC summaries. It was suggested that one possibility would be linking to PCMS to facilitate more interaction between the Board and its sub-committees. Members were satisfied that Academic Board received adequate information by way of reports and presentations on major issues facing the University (3.91 as compared with 3.82 in 2017), but they indicated that they wanted more broad higher education sector related discussions.

It was further noted that members strongly believed that the processes for circulating meeting agendas and receiving accurate and timely minutes were working effectively, and that during meetings agendas were adhered to and appropriate time was allocated to issues being discussed (4.30 compared to 4.10 in 2017). Likewise, members strongly believed that the duration and format of Academic Board meetings was appropriate, and the number of meetings per year enabled the Board to discharge its role and functions (4.26 compared with 4.03 in 2017). Members also believed that the Executive Officer performed well and provided a quality service that met the needs of the Board and its sub-committees, and that the Chair was doing a very good job in her role particularly at engaging members. In addition, the move to electronic documentation was welcomed.

Prof Waye reported that areas for improvement included more interaction, and communication between members and the wider University community. Room acoustics were cited as problematic, and discussions were taking place with the ITS AV team, with consideration being given to ceiling microphones and the possibility of remote attendance was being explored. In the future there would be more meetings at other campuses. More work was being done on communication processes, with the Academic Board agenda incorporating informed debate on major issues such as Enterprise 25 and how these changes might affect staff and students, as well as more issues of concern to the higher education sector in general. At the same time, Academic Board’s Charter and terms of reference would need to be revised to reflect the new structure later in 2019.

Academic Board resolved:

to receive and note the report on the Academic Board Evaluation.

Moved: Prof Vicki Waye (from the Chair)

CARRIED
8.2 REVIEW OF HIGHER EDUCATION PROVIDER CATEGORY STANDARDS

The Director: Office of the Vice Chancellor and Strategic Programs, Ms Adrienne Nieuwenhuis, provided Academic Board with a summary of key issues from the Review of the Higher Education Provider Category Standards discussion paper and requested comment from members to inform UniSA’s submission to the Review. Some members had provided written comment before the meeting. To facilitate discussion at the meeting, the Chair divided members into small groups, before a larger group discussion using pair-share methods on the broader question of the definition of a university. The discussion centred around what characteristics should define higher education providers and the university in the Provider Category Standards. There was also some discussion on whether research institutes should be able to use the title ‘university’. It was noted that a number of research institutes had applied to TEQSA to become higher education providers, but that none had been successful. On the balance members supported the status quo, and that research institutes lacked the expertise, infrastructure and resources to adequately administer and deliver students undergraduate and postgraduate courses of study across a range of broad fields of study. On the question of whether the title ‘university’ was fit for purpose, members were reasonably satisfied with the current definition and the existing Provider Category Standards categories, as well as the norm that within Australia universities were places that undertook both teaching and research.

2019/1/22 Academic Board resolved:

to receive and note the discussion of issues from the Review of the Higher Education Provider Category Standards.

8.3 REVIEW OF THE AUSTRALIAN QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORK

The Director: Office of the Vice Chancellor and Strategic Programs, Ms Adrienne Nieuwenhuis, provided Academic Board with a summary of key issues from the Review of the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) discussion paper and requested comment from members to inform UniSA’s submission to the Review. Some members had provided written comment before the meeting. Once again, to facilitate discussion at the meeting, the Chair divided members into small groups, before a larger group discussion using pair-share methods on the broader question of the incorporation of a wider range of qualifications to the AQF, for example enabling/foundation programs, MOOCs, skill sets, micro-credentials, as well as private provider qualifications such as Microsoft technical certifications. Members believed that the inclusion of shorter form credentials in the AQF presented a potential range of opportunities for the higher education sector, especially given the emergence of micro credentials and approaches to professional education, however, it was also seen as presenting a range of quality assurance issues given the role and purpose of the AQF as the national policy for all regulated qualifications in Australia. The question of regulation was raised as a serious issue, along with transparency and consistency. Concerns were raised in relation to the international currency and transferability of the AQF. The potential benefits of aspects of the New Zealand model was raised. The observation was made that at present the complexity of the taxonomy – the language and definitions used – undermined the usability of the framework for regulators, education providers, students and other stakeholders seeking to clearly understand the difference between qualification types. A major criticism was that the AQF was so complex in its taxonomy that it did not define anything.

2019/1/23 Academic Board resolved:

to receive and note the discussion of issues from the Review of the Australian Qualifications Framework.
8.4 VICE CHANCELLOR’S EXTERNAL REVIEW OF THE SCHOOL OF MARKETING AND THE EHRENBERG-BASS INSTITUTE

The Pro Vice Chancellor (Business and law), Prof Marie Wilson, introduced the Vice Chancellor’s External Review of the School of Marketing and the Ehrenberg-Bass Institute. The Review Panel concluded that the Marketing discipline at UniSA was highly successful and recognised as producing world-class research, making a significant contribution to the discipline in Australia, as well as producing two-thirds of the research income for the marketing discipline. The Institute was globally recognised for its research in brand management, for its relationships with global corporates and for influencing change in marketing strategy and practice within industry worldwide. The Institute made a significant contribution to the University’s international reputation for engaged research. Likewise, the School of Marketing was highly regarded for its quality teaching and student satisfaction. The Panel met with students who presented capably, communicated effectively and felt supported as well as graduates who valued the industry content within the program, identified with the School and in some instances had returned to undertake contract work with the Institute. Staff were highly engaged and committed to teaching and research quality. The panel commended the Head of School for his leadership in creating a strong work and academic environment within the School and for the collaborative relationship with the Institute. The Review’s observations and recommendations were a considered assessment of the opportunities, and also the potential risks to the future growth and ongoing success for the discipline, the School and the Institute. In concluding the discussion, the Vice Chancellor, Prof David Lloyd, observed that Senior Management Group (SMG) had reviewed the Panel’s report, the School and Institute response, and accepted all 12 recommendations arising which added value, and would oversee the additional implementation work required.

2019/1/24 Academic Board resolved:

to receive and note the Vice Chancellor’s External Review of the School of Marketing and Ehrenberg-Bass Institute.

ITEM 9 – CLOSURE

16 The Chairperson thanked members for their attendance and closed the meeting at 3.35pm

ITEM 10 – NEXT MEETING

17 The next meeting of Academic Board would be held on Friday 22 March 2019, at 2.15 pm in Room RR 5-09, Rowland Rees Building, City West Campus. Closing date for papers – Monday, 11 March 2019.

PETER CARDWELL
EXECUTIVE OFFICER