

REVIEW OF ACADEMIC COMMITTEE

Emeritus Professor Andrew Lister

August 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	BACKGROUND	2
2	LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS	2
3	THE ROLE OF ACADEMIC COMMITTEE	5
	3.1 Introduction	5
	3.2 Deliberation on strategic issues	6
	3.3 Alignment with strategic objectives.....	6
	3.4 Quality assurance	8
4	ACADEMIC COMMITTEE PROCEDURES AND MEMBERSHIP	9
	4.1 Procedural issues.....	9
	4.2 Membership	10
5	PROGRAMS COMMITTEE.....	12
	5.1 Program approval, monitoring and review	12
	5.2 Membership	13
6	RESEARCH COMMITTEE AND BOARD OF GRADUATE RESEARCH	13
7	LEARNING AND TEACHING COMMITTEE	14
	7.1 Role	14
	7.2 Chair.....	15
	7.3 Membership	16
	7.4 Educational Excellence Committee	16
	7.5 Assessment Committee	17
	7.6 Student Orientation and Engagement Committee.....	18
	7.7 Learning Environments Committee.....	18
8	INTERNATIONALISATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE.....	19
9	GENERAL ISSUES.....	20
	9.1 The roles and responsibilities of members.....	20
	9.2 Induction of members	21
	9.3 Student representation.....	22
	APPENDIX 1 Review Terms of Reference.....	23
	APPENDIX 2 Academic Committee Constitution	25
	APPENDIX 3 Subcommittees of Academic Committee.....	29
	APPENDIX 4 Agenda Template	30
	APPENDIX 5 List of Submissions And Interviewees.....	32

1 BACKGROUND

This Review of Academic Committee and its subcommittees was commissioned by the Chair of Academic Committee in March 2010. The Review's Terms of Reference are given in Appendix 1. Most of the subcommittees undertook a preliminary self-review, and a request for written submissions was widely circulated. The Review received 6 self-reviews from subcommittees, 3 submissions from Faculty or Group Boards, and 5 submissions from individuals or groups of individuals. The Review also interviewed 71 members and recent members of Academic Committee and its subcommittees (67 staff, 1 former staff and 3 students) individually or in groups. A list of submissions and interviewees is provided in Appendix 5.

The Review was provided with an analysis of Academic Committee agenda items and attendance during 2008-09, and also examined the reports of similar reviews at other universities and the report of a benchmarking exercise undertaken in 2008 by Griffith University and the University of Western Sydney.

The Review is grateful to all those who contributed, and also acknowledges the support provided by Ms Amanda Clark, Mr Garry McSweeney, Ms Lea-Anne Stafford and Ms Gillian Collom.

2 LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

That Academic Committee act as a major forum for discussion and debate of strategic issues of University wide importance.

Recommendation 2

That Academic Committee and its major subcommittees explicitly align their work with the University's Strategic Plan and supporting documents.

Recommendation 3

That Academic Committee and its subcommittees more effectively discharge their assigned roles in quality assurance by paying more attention to the Review-Improve parts of the quality cycle.

Recommendation 4

That the Chair of Academic Committee implement procedural changes as suggested in this report, including changes to the structure and order of the agenda, introduction of an annual work plan, and reversion to face to face meetings.

Recommendation 5

That the membership of Academic Committee be amended to include all Heads of School, three academic staff elected from each Group, two undergraduate students, one postgraduate coursework student and one postgraduate research student.

Recommendation 6

That the constitution of the Programs Committee be amended to include a role in monitoring the performance of programs from a University perspective, and that it perform this role by considering Annual Program Review and Improvement Reports and Five Year Program Review Reports of programs considered to be performing poorly.

Recommendation 7

That the functions of the Board of Graduate Research be amended to include the monitoring of postgraduate research outcomes from a University perspective.

Recommendation 8

That significant advice provided by Research Committee to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) be also reported to Academic Committee.

Recommendation 9

That the functions of the Learning and Teaching Committee be amended as described in this report.

Recommendation 10

That the Learning and Teaching Committee be chaired by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic).

Recommendation 11

That the membership of the Learning and Teaching Committee be

- the Chair (the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic))*
- one Dean (Learning and Teaching) from each Group*
- one academic staff member from each Group, appointed by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor*
- one undergraduate student and one coursework postgraduate student*
- the Dean, Student Outcomes and Director, GIHE*
- the Director, INS (Learning and Teaching)*
- the Chair of Programs Committee*
- the Chair of the Assessment Committee*
- the Chair of the Educational Excellence Committee*

Recommendation 12

That the functions of the Educational Excellence Committee be amended to emphasise and more clearly define its operational role, and that the membership be

- the Chair, nominated by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)*
- the Dean (Student Outcomes) and Director, GIHE or nominee*

- *two academic staff members from each Group, appointed by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor*
- *one undergraduate student and one coursework postgraduate student*

Recommendation 13

That in mid-2011 Academic Committee reconsider membership of the Assessment Committee, particularly membership by the Deans (Learning and Teaching), Director of Student Administration, the Head of the Secretariat and the Director INS (Learning and Teaching).

Recommendation 14

That the Academic Registrar, in consultation with the Chair of the Assessment Committee, determine how best to meet the Committee's needs for administrative and professional support.

Recommendation 15

That the Student orientation and Engagement Committee be disestablished, that the organisation of the University's orientation program be delegated to a working party of stakeholders convened by the Dean (Student Outcomes), and that the Dean (Student Outcomes) report to the Learning and Teaching Committee on any strategic issues which emerge.

Recommendation 16

That the Learning Environments Committee be disestablished and that pedagogical issues relating to learning environments be considered by the Learning and Teaching Committee.

Recommendation 17

That induction for new members of Academic Committee be conducted twice a year, and include not only procedural issues but also the roles of members in representing and communicating with their constituencies and contributing to debate.

3 THE ROLE OF ACADEMIC COMMITTEE

3.1 Introduction

Academic Committee is the *'senior body within the University which debates, decides and makes recommendations to the Council on academic developments, policies and procedures'* (Constitution, para.2). It is responsible to Council for assuring the quality of the University's academic activities in both teaching and research. It also has delegated authority from Council for establishing awards, approving programs which lead to awards, approving academic policies, and approving changes to the constitutions of its subcommittees.

Academic Committee may also advise the Council, the Vice-Chancellor, Executive Group and other bodies on a wide range of matters, including the University's mission, goals and strategic plan; the academic organisation of the University including the creation of Faculties, Schools and Centres; strategic links with other academic institutions; and the academic implications of the University budget. Academic Committee's constitution, which defines its functions, authorities and membership is given in Appendix 2.

Given its wide range of functions, Academic Committee naturally conducts much of its business through subcommittees, though it retains the authority to approve (or otherwise) all recommendations arising from subcommittees. The current committee structure is at Appendix 3.

The Review found mixed perceptions of Academic Committee. Most respondents¹ valued the Committee's role in program approval and academic policy development, but many indicated that the Committee could engage in more discussion of substantive academic issues. Those interviewed suggested several ways in which the performance of the Committee could be significantly improved. They noted that the Committee could have a much stronger impact on University decision making, and that it should not become a forum serving only to note or endorse decisions made elsewhere. While there is general (but not unanimous) agreement that Academic Committee subcommittees do valuable work, some respondents question the value added by Academic Committee in its current form. Several respondents noted that they see the same issues discussed in many fora – in the Groups, at Academic Committee subcommittees or at Executive Group – so that by the time the issues reach Academic Committee there is little to add. Interestingly, the more junior members of Academic Committee, who do not participate in other fora, have a generally more positive view: they are more likely to see Academic Committee as providing an insight into how the University works and an opportunity to contribute to discussion.

¹ The term includes both those who made written submissions and those who were interviewed.

Academic Committee does not appear to play a major role in providing advice on significant issues as permitted by its constitution. Most respondents commented that the University would have much to gain if Academic Committee could fulfil a broader role in providing advice to the University, and act as a channel for communication and consultation at a University-wide level.

3.2 Deliberation on strategic issues

It is clear that many respondents would like Academic Committee to be (or return to being) a forum in which issues of strategic importance are discussed and debated. It can be argued that the sector-wide trend toward executive governance, rather than reducing the need for such a forum, has increased it. Senior management's² responses to strategic issues can be informed and enhanced by the views of the wider academic community; conversely, the wider community can be better informed and take greater ownership of subsequent managerial decisions. The Review therefore considers that Academic Committee should play a greater role as a place of discourse between and among members of senior management and the wider academic community, and a forum for discussion of issues of University-wide strategic importance. Such a role falls well within Academic Committee's constitution, but it is a role which could be far more effectively played.

Some respondents have pointed out that the University is faced with many issues to which it must respond too quickly to allow wide discussion. While this is true, there are many other issues with much longer lead times (e.g. the advent of TEQSA, the ERA, various outcomes of the Bradley Review). These are issues on which the University would benefit from wide ranging discussion before decisions are taken or policies adopted. Such discussion would not erode the authority of the relevant decision makers – it would inform them and could lead to better outcomes, and it would provide a wider sense of ownership of the decisions or policies eventually adopted. There is no shortage of significant long term issues – they may arise, for example, from government or other external initiatives, from the University's strategic plan, or from the annual leadership forum.

Recommendation 1

That Academic Committee act as a major forum for discussion and debate of strategic issues of University wide importance.

3.3 Alignment with strategic objectives

Many respondents to the Review commented that Academic Committee needs a greater sense of purpose and coherence. Similar remarks were made about Academic Committee's subcommittees, with some puzzlement expressed about the origin or purpose of certain agenda items. A small number of respondents went so far as to

² The term 'senior management' is used in this report to mean the Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellors and Pro-Vice-Chancellors, while 'middle management' is used to mean Deans and Heads of School. The terms may be somewhat crass, but they serve as useful abbreviations.

describe some subcommittees as being in search of a role or ‘captured’ by enthusiasts for specific interests. Analysis of various committee agendas over the last two years gives some support to these views.

These observations are not intended to denigrate the work performed by Academic Committee and its subcommittees, most of which is undoubtedly valuable. Rather, the purpose is to suggest that Academic Committee and its subcommittees could perhaps have greater impact if they had work plans³ shaped by coherent and evident strategic intent. Such intent should be derived from the University’s Strategic Plan and its various core activity and support plans, such as the Academic Plan, the Research Plan and the Internationalisation Strategy. For example, the work of the Learning and Teaching Committee should be shaped by the Academic Plan: the Committee should contribute to the periodic reformulation of the Plan, its policy development work should be directed towards realising the Plan, and it should monitor the University’s progress in meeting the Plan’s objectives. Following such a work plan would give the Committee’s work a coherence it currently lacks: many of the issues discussed would undoubtedly be the same as at present, but discussion would occur in a context in which the relevance and importance of specific issues would be clear. Similarly, the work plans of the Research Committee and the Internationalisation Committee should be aligned to the University’s Research Plan and Internationalisation Strategy respectively. The work plan of Academic Committee itself should be shaped by the University’s overarching Strategic Plan.

Of course some alignment of this kind already exists. It is perhaps most evident in the work of the Research Committee, but less evident in the work of the Learning and Teaching Committee and the Internationalisation Committee. The Review suggests that greater and more explicit alignment will give sharper focus to the committees’ work, resulting in more useful outcomes and greater transparency.

Committee work plans should not be overly formal. They should indicate what issues the committee thinks it important to address during the forthcoming period, and the strategic rationale for doing so. They should not be unduly prescriptive, nor should they be seen as excluding other important issues which will inevitably arise from time to time. They can be formulated periodically (annually, say) under the leadership of committee Chairs. They need not be discussed extensively, being a means to an end rather than an end in themselves. Their main purpose is to serve as a strategic framework for the committee’s work and priorities.

Recommendation 2

That Academic Committee and its major subcommittees explicitly align their work with the University’s Strategic Plan and supporting documents.

³ The term ‘work plan’ is used to mean a coherent program of work which a committee anticipates undertaking in the forthcoming period (most conveniently the current academic year).

3.4 Quality assurance

The first of the functions listed in Academic Committee's constitution is to be *'responsible to Council for assuring the quality of the University's academic activities through its oversight of learning and teaching and research processes and outcomes ...'*. Academic Committee fulfils this function in a number of ways, most obviously through its procedures for program approval and change, administered largely through its Programs Committee. Through its Learning and Teaching Committee it develops policies to enhance the quality of student learning, and its Research Committee advises the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) on policies to enhance the quality of research. These activities are essential elements of quality assurance, but in terms of the Plan–Implement–Review–Improve quality cycle espoused by the University they appear to focus more on Plan and Implement than on Review and Improve. The minutes of relevant committees, and the comments of many respondents, suggest an emphasis on policy development and operational matters, with much less attention paid to monitoring outcomes and devising improvements.

Quality Assurance is particularly prominent in the current higher education environment, with the quality of learning and teaching about to be scrutinised by TEQSA and the quality of research being an important element of ERA and its associated funding. It is therefore important for the University to ensure that the entire quality cycle receives appropriate attention. Of course much of that attention is rightly given in the Groups, Schools and Research Institutes, which are accountable for performance against key indicators. However, similar attention needs to be given by Academic Committee, which is the originator of many of the policies and procedures, particularly in learning and teaching and research, within which the academic elements operate. Academic Committee is also uniquely positioned to offer a University wide perspective on the complete quality cycle.

The Review therefore suggests that Academic Committee pay more attention to the Review and Improve parts of the quality cycle – in quality parlance, that it 'closes the loop'. There are two aspects to this. The first is to ensure that the policies and procedures developed and approved through Academic Committee are effective in terms of achieving the University's goals. Putting this another way, Academic Committee needs to be confident that academic performance is not inhibited by poor policies or procedures. The second aspect is to monitor outcomes in learning and research from a University wide perspective and to make constructive suggestions where appropriate. Both aspects can be pursued largely through Academic Committee's subcommittees, where much of the detailed work should take place (with recommendations for improvement referred to Academic Committee for approval). For example, Programs Committee's principal function is to consider proposals for new programs and major changes to existing programs. However, its constitution gives it no role in monitoring the performance of the programs it has recommended for approval. From a quality assurance point of view it is important to know why a program is performing poorly and whether the criteria or procedures for approval need amendment. Similarly, the Learning and Teaching Committee recommends policies to improve the quality of teaching and student

learning: to close the quality loop it should seek evidence that the policies are effective and should also monitor the University's learning and teaching performance indicators to ascertain areas of potential improvement. These issues are pursued further in the sections of this report devoted to specific subcommittees.

Recommendation 3

That Academic Committee and its subcommittees more effectively discharge their assigned roles in quality assurance by paying more attention to the Review-Improve parts of the quality cycle.

4 ACADEMIC COMMITTEE PROCEDURES AND MEMBERSHIP

Recommendations 1 and 2 imply a need to reconsider both the procedures and the membership of Academic Committee.

4.1 Procedural issues

1. Recommendation 1 implies that strategic issues should be elevated to a position high on the agenda, with adequate time for discussion, while items for formal approval and noting appear later in the agenda. This demarcation already occurs to some degree, but much of the early part of a meeting is apparently taken up with formal reports on which discussion rarely occurs. At least one (and probably only one) strategic issue should be selected for early discussion, presented by a member of senior management or some other member of Academic Committee designated by the Chair, and formulated in such a way that Academic Committee is asked to provide advice on the issue to an appropriate body or individual (e.g. Executive Group, an Academic Committee subcommittee, or a senior manager).
2. Discussion of strategic issues requires adjustment to other parts of the agenda, to provide the necessary time and avoid potential redundancy. The Review makes the following suggestions.
 - (a) The Vice-Chancellor's report and question time is an important opportunity for communication between the Vice-Chancellor and the academic community. Members place high value on the Vice Chancellor being present for this element of the agenda. The item should remain near the head of the agenda and members should take greater advantage of the opportunity than they reportedly do.
 - (b) The Chair's Report should be limited to important issues not appearing elsewhere on the agenda. The Deputy Chair's report can probably be subsumed into the reports from the committees s/he chairs.
 - (c) Reports from subcommittees of Academic Committee should remain as matters for noting or formal approval (Section IV of the agenda), except where the

Chair of Academic Committee considers a particular item merits discussion under Section II. Members should continue to have the opportunity to move specific items from Section IV to Section II for discussion.

- (d) All agenda items should have a minuted outcome in terms of a formal resolution (e.g. that an item be approved, noted or forwarded to another body for consideration). In the case of discussion of strategic issues the outcome may be that Academic Committee resolves to advise Executive Group of the points made in discussion or that it resolves to refer a matter for detailed consideration by one of its subcommittees. Such minuted outcomes give closure in a way which readily allows further actions to be tracked where appropriate.

A suggested agenda template is given in Appendix 4.

3. In recent years Academic Committee has held its meetings over video-conference among multiple locations. This practice attracted almost universal criticism from respondent to the Review. While video-conferencing reduces travel time, risk and environmental impact, the strong view among respondents was that the technology seriously impairs the value of Academic Committee meetings for members not at the primary site. Problems include the difficulty of attracting the Chair's attention, inability to sense the mood or dynamics of the meeting, and the intrusion of background noise picked up by microphones. The Review considers that the problems are not susceptible to an easy technical fix and that video-conferencing is unsuitable for a forum of the nature envisaged in this report. It therefore recommends that meetings be held alternately at the Nathan and Gold Coast campuses (and occasionally at other campuses if appropriate) and that members attend in person. Such face to face meetings would enhance debate and emphasise Academic Committee's importance as a senior body for discussion of academic matters. The University may care to investigate parking and joint travel arrangements (e.g. minibus) to facilitate attendance. Meetings of subcommittees, which are much smaller, can continue to be held by video-conference as appropriate.

Recommendation 4

That the Chair of Academic Committee implement procedural changes as suggested in this report, including changes to the structure and order of the agenda, introduction of an annual work plan, and reversion to face to face meetings.

4.2 Membership

Academic Committee currently has 54 members, including all members of the senior management, 2 members of Council, all Deans, the Academic Registrar, the Director of GIHE, 2 Heads of School elected from each academic Group, 10 elected members of academic staff, 2 elected postgraduate students and 5 elected undergraduate students. Many respondents to the Review consider that this number is too large, suggesting variously that it inhibits debate and decision making, absorbs excessive time and resource, and involves senior managers in multiple fora which discuss the same issues.

If one were to adopt a minimalist view of Academic Committee there would be a strong case for reducing the number of members, largely on grounds of efficiency. However, adoption of Recommendations 1 and 2 may lead to a different conclusion. The role of Academic Committee envisaged in those recommendations requires broad membership across multiple levels of the University, encompassing senior management (Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellors, Pro-Vice-Chancellors), middle management (Deans and Heads of School), grass roots academic staff, and students. Of these groups, middle management is not well represented at present, with only 8 Heads of School out of 28. In the context of Recommendations 1 and 2 the position of Head of School is important: the Head is usually the largest single influence on the ethos and performance of the School while at the same time being a representative and advocate for staff. Understanding by staff of University decisions and policies depends very much on communication and ownership by the Head of School; conversely, the Head is in a unique position to convey and represent staff views to higher levels of management. Membership of Academic Committee by all Heads of School would provide greater empowerment of Heads and enhance the Academic Committee's capacity to discuss, debate and advise on strategic issues as envisaged by Recommendations 1 and 2. It would also improve communication about the issues discussed by Academic Committee into all academic elements in the University.

Academic Committee's proposed role in discussing, debating and advising on strategic issues requires that all senior managers continue to be members. One might expect them to introduce and lead discussion of particular issues, to contribute their experience and knowledge, and to be informed in their executive roles by the views of other members.

The Review heard no arguments for increasing the number of elected academic staff, but did hear suggestions that those elected could perhaps play a larger role in debate. Most elected members who spoke with the Review felt that their contributions to debate are welcome but mentioned a number of factors which tend to inhibit them. These factors include the formality of proceedings, a sense of knowing less about an issue than more senior members, some uncertainty about their role as individuals or representatives of their colleagues, and problems with video-conferencing (see section 4.1). The Review considers that some of these factors can be ameliorated through more effective induction of new members (see section 9.2) and by helping members communicate with their constituencies (see section 9.1). The 10 academic staff members are currently elected by all academic staff in the University, with the proviso that at least two members must come from each Group. The electoral process, and communication between members and constituencies, might be simpler if each Group elected 3 academic staff (a net gain of 2 members).

The Review heard that the two Council positions on Academic Committee are rarely filled and that attendance is negligible. The Review understands that Council may want to retain the capacity for a watching brief, but suggests that Council consider whether one appointed member would be sufficient.

The Academic Registrar and the Director of GIHE have expertise which is highly relevant to Academic Committee's business, and both should continue to be members.

Student membership of both Academic Committee and its subcommittees is discussed in detail in section 9.3. That discussion concludes that the student representation on Academic Committee should be reduced in number but increased in effectiveness. The proposed student membership is 2 undergraduate students, 1 postgraduate coursework student and 1 postgraduate research student (a net reduction of 3).

The proposed changes to Academic Committee's membership are summarised in the following recommendation.

Recommendation 5

That the membership of Academic Committee be amended to include all Heads of School, three academic staff elected from each Group, two undergraduate students, one postgraduate coursework student and one postgraduate research student.

5 PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

5.1 Program approval, monitoring and review

The principal role of the Programs Committee is to consider proposals from the Faculties for new programs and major changes to existing programs, and to recommend approval by Academic Committee as appropriate. It may also advise Academic Committee on issues of educational policy or practice. The Committee is widely regarded as very effective, with its effectiveness attributed to a well defined operational role, a highly evolved set of procedures, and excellent administrative support both centrally and in the Faculties.

As pointed out in section 3.4, the Committee's constitution gives it no role in monitoring the performance of the programs it has recommended for approval. Annual program monitoring and periodic (5 year) program review are rightly carried out in the Faculties, which are responsible for program delivery. However, from a quality assurance point of view it is important to know at an aggregate University level why programs are performing poorly and whether the criteria or procedures for approval need amendment. The Review therefore suggests that Committee receive copies of those Annual Program Review and Improvement (APRI) Reports for which the source data indicates there may be a significant problem (to receive all APRI Reports would be impractical and unnecessary). Similarly, the Committee should receive Five Year Program Review Reports, paying particular attention to those whose summary recommendation is for program withdrawal or conditional continuation. The Committee should use APRI and Five Year Review Reports to detect any systemic problems in program performance, thus closing the quality loop on program approval.

Recommendation 6

That the constitution of the Programs Committee be amended to include a role in monitoring the performance of programs from a University perspective, and that it perform this role by considering Annual Program Review and Improvement Reports and Five Year Program Review Reports of programs considered to be performing poorly.

5.2 Membership

Programs Committee has 13 members, comprising

- the Chair (the Deputy Chair of Academic Committee)
- 3 members appointed *ex officio* for their specific expertise (the Academic Registrar, the Director of GIHE or nominee, the INS Director for Learning and Teaching)
- 8 members from the Groups (the Dean (Learning and Teaching) and one other)⁴
- 1 student.

Since the Committee demands considerable time from its members, one might wonder whether its size can be reduced without impairing its efficiency. An obvious possibility is to reduce the representation from the Groups to one person, namely the Dean (Learning and Teaching). However, the Review heard that the two members from each Group support each other in handling the work load, and in view of the proposed expansion of the Committee's role the Review considers it would be unwise to reduce Group representation at this time. The Review questions (section 9.3) the value of student membership and suggests it is unnecessary.

6 RESEARCH COMMITTEE AND BOARD OF GRADUATE RESEARCH

These committees were established in 2010 after a review of the Griffith Graduate School recommended that the responsibilities of the former Research and Postgraduate Studies Committee be shared between two separate committees. Neither committee has operated long enough in its current form for any firm judgements to be made. The Review notes that the constitution of the Research Committee already follows the spirit of Recommendation 2 by aligning the Committee's work to the University's Research Plan. The Review suggests that as both committees evolve they pay appropriate attention to the monitoring of outcomes against the University's goals in research and postgraduate studies, as suggested in Recommendation 3. This role appears explicitly in the constitution of the Research Committee (function ii(e)) but not in that of the Board of Graduate Research.

⁴ The Review has assumed throughout this report that by the start of 2011 the reorganization of the Arts, Education and Law Group will result in committee representations similar to those of the other Groups.

Recommendation 7

That the functions of the Board of Graduate Research be amended to include the monitoring of postgraduate research outcomes from a University perspective.

Much of the work undertaken by the Research Committee results in advice to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research). The Review recommends that the most important elements of such advice be also reported to Academic Committee. This would reduce the impression in some quarters that Academic Committee is principally a body concerned with learning and teaching and reinforce Academic Committee's role as the senior body which deliberates on *all* academic issues.

Recommendation 8

That significant advice provided by Research Committee to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) be also reported to Academic Committee.

7 LEARNING AND TEACHING COMMITTEE

This section discusses both the Learning and Teaching Committee and its subcommittees.

7.1 Role

The Learning and Teaching Committee's constitution requires it to advise Academic Committee on a wide range of planning, policy development and quality assurance issues related to learning and teaching. It also has an operational role, discharged through its Educational Excellence Committee, in overseeing the University's teaching award schemes and fostering applications for external teaching awards. The broad scope is appropriate, but it poses challenges in ensuring that the Committee remains focused on the 'big picture' rather than pursuing a set of unrelated issues of variable importance. The Committee's agendas over the last two years include numerous major issues, but it is difficult to perceive any overall strategic intent. As suggested in section 3.3, the Committee's work would have greater coherence and impact if it were more obviously shaped by the University's Academic Plan. Implementation of Recommendation 2 will require the Committee to follow a work plan directed at implementing the Academic Plan and monitoring progress towards its achievement. The work plan should be developed with a sense of strategic priorities under the guidance of the Chair and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic). One of the immediate priorities may be to provide Academic Committee and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) with advice on the current redevelopment of the Academic Plan.

Following Recommendation 3, the Learning and Teaching Committee should pay greater attention to the Review and Improve parts of the quality assurance cycle. This implies a more active role in monitoring the University's learning and teaching performance

indicators to ascertain areas of potential improvement and to ensure that performance is not inhibited by poor policies.

The Review recommends that the functions of the Learning and Teaching Committee be amended so as better to reflect the role described above. Specifically:

- function 1 (identifying issues and priorities) should be deleted, and subsumed into a new version of function 2 which emphasises the Committee's role in developing, implementing and monitoring the Academic Plan
- function 3 (policy development) should be linked to the Academic Plan
- functions 4 and 9 (on internal and external grant schemes) should be linked
- function 5 (communities of practice) is overly specific and rather dated, and should be deleted
- functions 6 and 10 (performance monitoring) should be combined.

Recommendation 9

That the functions of the Learning and Teaching Committee be amended as described in this report.

7.2 Chair

Until 2008 the Learning and Teaching Committee was chaired by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), who also chaired Academic Committee. Subsequent changes to senior management positions have led to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) no longer chairing the Learning and Teaching Committee. Some respondents to the Review consider that the status of the Learning and Teaching Committee, and hence the importance of learning and teaching, has been diminished by these changes. The Review accepts that the changes may have sent misleading signals to the academic community, but is concerned less with the status of the Learning and Teaching Committee than with how effectively it can conduct its business. The role of the Committee, as outlined above, gives it a key responsibility in developing, advancing and monitoring the Academic Plan, and places it squarely in the forefront of policy development in learning and teaching. It can be argued that to play this role effectively the Committee needs to be chaired by the senior manager with responsibility for learning and teaching, namely the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic). There is a clear analogy with the research domain, in which the Research Committee is chaired by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research). On the other hand, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) has a heavy work load and also chairs Academic Committee, whose role covers all academic activities. The arguments are not overwhelming, but on balance the Review supports the idea that the Learning and Teaching Committee should be chaired by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic).

Recommendation 10

That the Learning and Teaching Committee be chaired by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic).

7.3 Membership

The Committee is the largest of Academic Committee's subcommittees, with 27 members comprising

- the Chair (the Dean (Student Outcomes) and Director of GIHE)
- the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
- 4 members appointed *ex officio* for their specific expertise or position (the Associate Director of GIHE, the INS Director for Learning and Teaching, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Chair of Programs Committee)
- 12 members from the Groups (the Dean (Learning and Teaching) and 2 others)
- 4 students (one from each Group, of whom 3 are undergraduate)
- 4 Chairs of subcommittees
- the Director of Human Resources Management.

One might question whether this large membership is necessary, particularly as some of the Committee's detailed work is carried out by subcommittees which themselves have wide representation and appropriate expertise. The Research Committee, which is functionally similar to the Learning and Teaching Committee, has only 11 members.

The Review considers that most of the membership categories above can be reduced without impairing the representative nature of the Committee or the expertise available to it. Recommendation 11 below results in a membership of 16 with reduced membership categories as follows.

- the Chair (the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic))
- 3 members appointed *ex officio* for their specific expertise or position
- 8 members from the Groups (the Dean (Learning and Teaching) and 1 other)
- 2 students
- 2 Chairs of subcommittees (see sections 7.4-7.7).

The Committee may of course request other persons to attend for specific items.

Recommendation 11

That the membership of the Learning and Teaching Committee be

- ***the Chair (the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic))***
- ***one Dean (Learning and Teaching) from each Group***
- ***one academic staff member from each Group, appointed by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor***
- ***one undergraduate student and one coursework postgraduate student***
- ***the Dean, Student Outcomes and Director, GIHE***
- ***the Director, INS (Learning and Teaching)***
- ***the Chair of Programs Committee***
- ***the Chair of the Assessment Committee***
- ***the Chair of the Educational Excellence Committee***

The subcommittees of the Learning and Teaching Committee are discussed in the following paragraphs.

7.4 Educational Excellence Committee

The Educational Excellence Committee has a largely operational focus. It manages, monitors and advises on the various schemes which reward and promote excellent teaching. It may also propose and advise on new schemes such as the Griffith Academy of Learning and Teaching Scholars to be established by the start of 2011. The EEC relieves the Learning and Teaching Committee of some time-consuming operational issues.

The Review recommends that the functions of the EEC be amended to emphasise and more clearly define its operational role. There is an argument for reducing Group representation from two members per Group to one, but the current representation was approved only two years ago and the Committee apparently values the input of the grass roots academic staff. However, the Review considers that the *ex officio* membership can be reduced slightly without reducing the Committee's effectiveness.

Recommendation 12

That the functions of the Educational Excellence Committee be amended to emphasise and more clearly define its operational role, and that the membership be

- ***the Chair, nominated by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)***
- ***the Dean (Learning Outcomes) and Director, GIHE or nominee***
- ***two academic staff members from each Group, appointed by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor***
- ***one undergraduate student and one coursework postgraduate student***

7.5 Assessment Committee

The Assessment Committee was established in late 2009 in recognition of the pivotal role of assessment in student learning and the increasing emphasis on academic standards in the higher education sector. The Committee has an important role in monitoring and reviewing the University's assessment policies and in overseeing implementation of the University's academic integrity framework. Its immediate work plan is shaped by the need to oversee implementation of an AUQA recommendation on moderation and to anticipate and respond to external events such as national developments on academic standards and the advent of TEQSA. These issues are sufficiently weighty to need detailed consideration by a subcommittee of the Learning and Teaching Committee. Indeed, given the immediacy of some of the issues, the Committee will need to prioritise its work.

The membership of 20 includes the 8 Chairs of Faculty assessment boards and the 4 Deans. Since methods of assessment and definition of academic standards tend to be discipline specific it is important to maintain wide Faculty representation. However, membership by the Deans of Learning and Teaching is questionable, as the Deans also sit on the Learning and Teaching Committee, to which the Assessment Committee reports. The Review recommends that after a further year of experience Academic Committee should reconsider the *ex officio* membership of the Deans. At the same time it should

also consider the membership of the Director of Student Administration, the Head of the Secretariat and the Director INS (Learning and Teaching).

Recommendation 13

That in mid-2011 Academic Committee reconsider membership of the Assessment Committee, particularly membership by the Deans (Learning and Teaching), Director of Student Administration, the Head of the Secretariat and the Director INS (Learning and Teaching).

The issues facing the Assessment Committee imply a need for significant administrative and professional support. Some support is currently being given by GIHE, but the ongoing needs should be assessed and provided for.

Recommendation 14

That the Academic Registrar, in consultation with the Chair of the Assessment Committee, determine how best to meet the Committee's needs for administrative and professional support.

7.6 Student Orientation and Engagement Committee

The Student Orientation and Engagement Committee has an operational role in coordinating the University's orientation program across all campuses and a strategic role in advising on policies regarding student orientation, transition and engagement. The Review heard that the Committee's most valuable work relates to the orientation program and that it has provided little strategic advice. The Review considers that the orientation program would be best organised by a working party of stakeholders convened by the Dean (Student Outcomes) and that any strategic issues emerging from its work be conveyed by the Dean to the Learning and Teaching Committee.

Recommendation 15

That the Student Orientation and Engagement Committee be disestablished, that the organisation of the University's orientation program be delegated to a working party of stakeholders convened by the Dean (Student Outcomes), and that the Dean (Student Outcomes) report to the Learning and Teaching Committee on any strategic issues which emerge.

7.7 Learning Environments Committee

The Learning Environments Committee's role is to advise the Learning and Teaching Committee on various aspects of physical and virtual educational resources. Study of its agenda suggests that in recent years it has been concerned primarily with developing and monitoring implementation of the University's blended learning strategy. Several respondents questioned the continuing value of the Committee. The Review is not persuaded that the Learning and Teaching Committee continues to need a subcommittee devoted to learning environments. The pedagogical issues relating to learning environments can be discussed by the Learning and Teaching Committee itself, and the

implications for infrastructure can be conveyed to the responsible bodies. In particular, the implications for information technology can be conveyed to the INS Learning and Teaching Portfolio Board by the Dean (Student Outcomes) and the Director INS (Learning and Teaching), both of whom are members. The implications for physical space can be conveyed to Executive Group by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic). Implementation of blended learning can be overseen by the Deans (Learning and Teaching) in their respective Groups, possibly facilitated by a community of practice.

Recommendation 16

That the Learning Environments Committee be disestablished and that pedagogical issues relating to learning environments be considered by the Learning and Teaching Committee.

8 INTERNATIONALISATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Internationalisation Advisory Committee's constitution requires it to advise a number of University bodies on a wide range of matters related to internationalisation. As noted in the case of the Learning and Teaching Committee, the broad scope poses challenges in ensuring that the Committee remains focused on the 'big picture' rather than pursuing a set of unrelated issues of variable importance. The challenges are perhaps accentuated by the fact that internationalisation cuts across the University's two core activities of teaching and research. This leads not only to potential diffusion of effort, but also to questions of duplication of the work of other committees. Evidence presented to the Review suggests that the Committee has only recently begun to address these challenges.

As suggested by Recommendation 2, the Committee should use the University's Internationalisation Strategy as the framework for its activities. The Committee should develop a work plan directed at pursuing the Strategy and monitoring progress towards its achievement. Given the Strategy's broad scope, the work plan should be developed with a sense of strategic priorities under the guidance of the Chair and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (International). Recommendation 3 implies that the work plan should include adequate emphasis on monitoring the University's performance against the indicators listed in the Strategy. As noted in other parts of this report, the aim is not to erode executive authority or accountability but to ascertain areas of potential improvement from a University perspective and to ensure that performance is not inhibited by poor policies.

As mentioned above, the Committee's scope cuts across both teaching and research and can lead to some confusion with the work of other Academic Committee subcommittees. The Review suggests that the confusion can be resolved by recognising that Learning and Teaching Committee and the Research Committee have the principal responsibility, and the expertise, for developing policy in learning and teaching and in research. Similarly, the Programs Committee has operational responsibility in program approval, monitoring

and review. The Internationalisation Advisory Committee should be asked for advice on the internationalisation aspects of all these activities, but should limit its policy development to those areas of the Internationalisation Strategy (such as the international student experience, student mobility, the cross-cultural competence of staff) not covered by other committees. Two recent examples may illustrate the issue.

Transnational programs

There is apparently confusion in some quarters about where responsibility for quality assurance of transnational programs lies. However, the University's procedures for *Program Planning, Development, Approval and Review* clearly place the responsibility with Programs Committee. The peculiar characteristics and risks of transnational programs imply that it is quite appropriate for the Internationalisation Advisory Committee to provide advice on the procedures used, as it did when the procedures were first developed. Programs Committee should continue to call on the expertise of the Internationalisation Advisory Committee as appropriate.

Internationalisation of the curriculum

The Review was told of some confusion between the roles of the Learning and Teaching Committee and the Internationalisation Advisory Committee in this area. Since the Learning and Teaching Committee is the principal body for curriculum policy development, it should have carriage of policy in this area, but should seek advice as necessary from the Internationalisation Advisory Committee.

The demarcation suggested above refers to the Internationalisation Advisory Committee's role in policy development. The Internationalisation Advisory Committee's monitoring role should cover all aspects of the Internationalisation Strategy as it the only committee able to take a University wide view of all internationalisation activities.

9 GENERAL ISSUES

This section addresses matters in the Review's Terms of Reference which are not discussed above.

9.1 The roles and responsibilities of members

Several respondents felt that the effectiveness of Academic Committee and its subcommittees would be enhanced if members better understood their roles and carried out the associated responsibilities. The issue has several aspects.

- *Representation.* The membership of Academic Committee is designed to bring a broad cross-section of views and expertise from across the University. Most members represent some form of constituency: this is most obvious for elected members but it is also true for many *ex officio* and appointed members. For example, Heads of School represent the concerns of academic staff as evidenced in their

Schools, and Deans represent the views of the Faculties and Groups on matters within their delegation. If Academic Committee is to function effectively it is important that members adequately represent these various constituencies. In the case of elected members the University may need to provide some help (see below). Similar remarks apply to Academic Committee's subcommittees.

- *Engagement.* Members have a duty to engage in the business of their respective committees. This involves reading the agenda papers, willingness to contribute to debate, and follow-up of any requested actions. Elected members of Academic Committee, particularly junior staff and students, may feel an understandable reluctance to speak: they should be helped through the induction process (see below) and by sympathetic treatment by the Chair. Of course not all members can or should speak on every issue, but members should feel free to do so when they have particular insight or expertise or when the issue intimately concerns the constituency they represent.
- *Communication.* If Academic Committee and its subcommittees are to be effective channels for consultation and communication it is important that members communicate with their constituencies as broadly defined above. Deans, for example, should report on relevant items of business to their Faculty Boards and other appropriate Faculty and Group committees, and Heads of School should report to their staff. Elected members may need some help in communicating with their large and diverse constituencies – for example, the University may need to publish their email addresses and/or provide bulletin boards on the Academic Committee web site.

The Review suggests that the Chair remind members of these roles and responsibilities, and that they be explicitly addressed in the induction process for new members (see below).

9.2 Induction of members

Induction sessions for new members of Academic Committee, conducted by the Deputy Chair and the Committee Secretary, are held before the first meeting of the year. Those who attend appear to find the session useful. Some respondents to the Review indicated that induction tends to concentrate on procedural issues and suggested it should place more emphasis on the roles of members in representing their constituencies (see above) and contributing to debate. The Review supports this suggestion. The Review also recommends that the induction session be held at the start of both semesters to cater for members who are appointed or elected after the start of the year. Attendance by the Chair would emphasise the status of Academic Committee and its membership.

Induction for subcommittees is conducted by members of the secretariat. This practice is useful, and would be enhanced by the presence of the subcommittee Chair.

Recommendation 17

That induction for new members of Academic Committee be conducted twice a year, and include not only procedural issues but also the roles of members in representing and communicating with their constituencies and contributing to debate.

9.3 Student representation

Students are represented on Academic Committee and all its subcommittees, but many student positions are unfilled and attendance is generally poor. This may be due in part to the lack of an active student representative council and associated bodies such as postgraduate and international students associations. Experience elsewhere suggests that effective student representation on university committees depends more on the commitment of student members than on their number, and that commitment tends to be strong when the student bodies themselves are strong. The Review hopes that efforts by the University to re-establish a student representative council will be successful, and suggests that when such a body is formed its principal officers take two of the student places on Academic Committee. In the meantime, the University should renew its efforts to attract nominations for student positions on Academic Committee and its subcommittees, supplementing general calls for nominations by direct approaches to those active student bodies which exist (e.g the Gold Coast Student Guild, the Griffith Honours College). To emphasise the quality of representation rather than the quantity the Review recommends that the student membership of Academic Committee be reduced from seven to four and of the Learning and Teaching Committee from four to two (Recommendations 5 and 11 above). Student membership of the Internationalisation Advisory Committee has apparently been questioned: however, one of the Internationalisation Advisory Committee's major concerns is the international student experience and the Review considers it appropriate for students to continue to be represented. The Review does however question the value of student representation on the Programs Committee, where the student voice seems of marginal relevance and students apparently struggle with the operational work load.

APPENDIX 1 Review Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference and Procedure for the 2010 Review of Academic Committee and its Sub-Committees

Introduction

In February 2009, the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic), as the Chair of Academic Committee, announced a Review of Role and Structure of Academic Committee, including its constitution, role, membership and modus operandi. In December 2009, the subsequent Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) engaged Emeritus Professor Andrew Lister, formerly President of the Academic Board at UQ, to coordinate the review during 2010 and to provide recommendations for the consideration of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic).

Terms of Reference

The purpose of the review is to assess the effectiveness of Griffith University's academic committee and its subcommittees in contributing towards assuring the quality of the university's educational activities and attaining its strategic academic goals.

Specifically, the review will evaluate and make recommendations on the following:

- a) The Academic Committee's and subcommittees' role and effectiveness in contributing to maintaining and enhancing academic standards, to assuring the quality of the university's educational activities, and to attaining the university's strategic academic goals.
- b) The Academic Committee's constitution and modus operandi in terms of membership, size, number and length of meetings, and sub-committee structure, in terms of effectively fulfilling Academic Committee's functions and delegations.
- c) The constitutions of its subcommittees, including functions, delegations, membership, size, number and length of committee meetings, in terms of effectively assisting the university to achieve its strategic academic outcomes.
- d) The effectiveness of Academic Committee in communicating with the University community about its business and in achieving distributed participation in policy development by staff, students, and organisational units.
- e) The effectiveness of Academic Committee as a forum for debate about contemporary issues in Higher Education, to inform the University's policies and procedures.
- f) The effectiveness of Academic Committee and its sub-committees in ensuring that committee processes are transparent and accountable in terms of the actions taken and the regular reporting of progress.
- g) The effectiveness of Academic Committee's processes for induction and training of new members, succession planning, sharing of institutional knowledge and mechanisms for monitoring its performance.

Procedure

The Review will seek submissions from staff and from the student representative body, and will interview a range of selected stakeholders.

The Review timetable is expected to be as follows:

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| 1. Call for submissions: | week commencing 10 May |
| 2. Deadline for submissions: | Thursday 24 June |
| 3. Interviews with selected stakeholders: | week commencing 19 July |
| 4. Report and recommendations: | Tuesday 31 August |

The report and its recommendations will be considered for implementation by the start of the 2011 academic year.

31 March 2010

APPENDIX 2 Academic Committee Constitution

ACADEMIC COMMITTEE

Committee of the Council

2006/004538

Established by Council: 5/72 6.6.72

(2006/004505) (Revised)

Constitution last amended: 5/2006 04.12.06

INTERPRETATION

- 1 In this constitution, references to academic elements and academic management positions shall be as defined in *Academic Structure of the University and Academic Manager Positions*.

INTRODUCTION

- 2 The Academic Committee is the senior body within the University which debates, decides and makes recommendations to the Council on academic developments, policies and procedures.

FUNCTIONS

- 3
 - (1) The Academic Committee is responsible to the Council for assuring the quality of the University's academic activities through its oversight of learning and teaching and research processes and outcomes, in particular its monitoring of the effectiveness of policies, systems and procedures related to program and course management and research management.
 - (2) The Academic Committee may advise the Council on the academic aspects and implications of any business coming before the Council.
 - (3) The Academic Committee shall discharge such responsibilities as shall be delegated to it by the Council except in circumstances where the Committee decides to seek the advice of the Council.
 - (4) Without limiting the generality of sub-sections 1 and 2, the Academic Committee may -
 - (a) advise the Council on the mission and goals of the University and the strategy by which such goals should be pursued;
 - (b) advise the Council on the appropriate organisational structures for academic activities including the creation of Faculties, Schools, Centres and Units;
 - (c) advise the Council on the conduct, evaluation and enhancement of teaching-and research;
 - (d) advise the Council on strategic links and affiliations with other academic institutions or organisations.

- (5) The Academic Committee may advise the Vice Chancellor, as it sees fit, from time to time, on the budget allocations as they impinge on the quality of the academic activities of the University.
- (6) The Academic Committee may advise the Vice Chancellor's Executive Group of its views on any matter under consideration by that body.
- (7) The Academic Committee may advise any committee or organisational element within the University on the academic aspects of any issue which comes within the province of that body.
- (8) The Academic Committee may address the Council on any matter affecting the University. Where any such matter falls within the responsibilities or functions of any other committee of the University, or of the officers of the University, the Academic Committee shall ensure that such committees or officers are informed of its communication to the Council.
- (9) The Academic Committee shall monitor the implementation of academic policies and procedures and initiate reviews and improvements.
- (10) The Academic Committee shall monitor progress towards the University's goals of equity of access and academic opportunity and monitor the implementation of strategies to achieve these goals.
- (11) The Academic Committee shall monitor progress towards the University's goals in sustainability and monitor the implementation of strategies to achieve these goals.
- (12) In the performance of its obligations, the Academic Committee shall, wherever appropriate and practicable, consult the academic Groups, Faculties and Schools and other affected elements of the University.

DELEGATED AUTHORITIES

- 4 The Academic Committee has the authority to -
 - (1) establish awards, approve the detailed requirements for awards and approve the structure and content of programs leading to awards;
 - (2) approve changes to the content of academic programs and detailed requirements for awards, including the introduction of new courses and modification of existing courses;
 - (3) approve the academic policies of the University, including admission policies;
 - (4) approve changes to the constitutions of sub-committees of Academic Committee.

MEMBERSHIP

- 5 (1) The members of the Committee shall be -
 - (a) the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) as Chairperson, *ex officio*;

- (b) Deputy Chair and, *ex officio*, the Chairperson, Programs Committee appointed by the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) following a process of consultation;
 - (c) the Vice Chancellor, *ex officio*;
 - (d) Deputy Vice Chancellors, *ex officio*;
 - (e) Pro Vice Chancellors, *ex officio*;
 - (f) two members of the Council, who are neither members of the full-time faculty staff nor students of the University, to be appointed by the Council;
 - (g) the Faculty Deans – Arts, Education and Law Group, *ex officio*;
 - (h) the Dean (Academic), Dean (Learning and Teaching) and Dean (Research) – Griffith Business School; Griffith Health; and the Science, Environment, Engineering and Technology Group, *ex officio*;
 - (i) the Academic Registrar, *ex officio*;
 - (j) the Dean (Student Outcomes) and Director, Griffith Institute for Higher Education, *ex officio*;
 - (k) ten members of the full-time academic staff of the University to be elected by members of the full-time academic staff of the University, at least two of whom shall be from each Group;
 - (l) two Heads of School from each academic Group, to be elected by the Heads of School in the Group;
 - (m) two postgraduate students who are on the Postgraduate Students Roll, to be elected by members of the Postgraduate Students Roll of the University, provided that each shall be from a different Faculty;
 - (n) five undergraduate students who are either on the Full-Time Students Roll or the Part-Time Students Roll, to be elected by members of the Full-Time Students Roll and Part-Time Students Roll of the University, provided that no two members shall be from the same Faculty.
- (2) Members appointed under sub-section 5(1)(b) and 5(1)(f) shall hold office for a period of two years, up to 31 December of the relevant anniversary year.
 - (3) Members elected under sub-sections 5(1)(k) and 5(1)(l) shall hold office for a period of two years, up to 31 December of the relevant anniversary year.
 - (4) Members elected under sub-sections 5(1)(m) and 5(1)(n) shall hold office for a period of one year, up to 31 December of the succeeding year.
 - (5) All members shall be eligible for re-election or re-appointment.

INVITATION TO ATTEND

- 6 Office Directors of administration and support offices, and other University staff may be invited by the Chair of the Academic Committee to attend.

SECRETARY

- 7 (1) The Pro Vice Chancellor (Administration) shall appoint the Secretary to the Committee, who shall have rights of audience and debate.

SUB-COMMITTEES

- 8 The Academic Committee may establish sub-committees of either a standing or an *ad hoc* nature. Membership of both standing and *ad hoc* committees should not be restricted to persons who are members of the University.

APPENDIX 3 Subcommittees of Academic Committee

ACADEMIC COMMITTEE

- **Programs Committee**
- **Learning and Teaching Committee**
 - Educational Excellence Committee
 - Assessment Committee
 - Learning Environments Committee
 - Student Orientation and Engagement Committee
- **Research Committee**
- **Board of Graduate Research**
- **Internationalisation Advisory Committee**

APPENDIX 4 Agenda Template

SUGGESTED TEMPLATE FOR THE ACADEMIC COMMITTEE AGENDA

GRIFFITH UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC COMMITTEE

AGENDA

- 1.0 APOLOGIES
- 2.0 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
- 3.0 BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES
- 4.0 MEMBERSHIP
Changes for noting

ORDERING OF THE AGENDA

At this point in the Agenda the Chair will advise members about any matter on the Agenda not included in Section II, that members have requested prior to the meeting be so included.

This is the opportunity for members to list for discussion any items from subcommittee reports which have not already been listed by the Chair or the Chair of the subcommittee.

- 5.0 VICE CHANCELLOR'S FORUM AND QUESTION TIME

SECTION I: STRATEGIC ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION AND ADVICE

- 6.0 ISSUE X
With background paper and presentation by a senior member of the University.

SECTION II: MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION AND DECISION

- 7.0 CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT
For discussion and noting

8.0 ITEMS FROM SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Items proposed by the Chair, the subcommittee Chair, or requested by a member for inclusion in Section II.

SECTION III: MATTERS REQUIRING RATIFICATION OF EXECUTIVE ACTION

SECTION IV: MATTERS FOR NOTING AND WHERE APPROPRIATE, ACCEPTANCE OF RECOMMENDATIONS – PROGRAM SUBMISSIONS

9.0 REPORTS OF SUB-COMMITTEES OF THE ACADEMIC COMMITTEE AND OTHER COMMITTEES

Items not selected for discussion in Section II

Items from Programs Committee

TABLE OF CONTENTS: PROGRAM SUBMISSIONS FOR RESOLUTION

New Programs

Item X.0

Program Changes

Item X.0

Program Withdrawal (for noting)

Item X.0

10.0 OTHER BUSINESS

11.0 MEETING DATES

For the remainder of the year – for noting

APPENDIX 5 List of Submissions And Interviewees

Submissions

NAME	POSITION
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE	
Self-Review	Assessment Committee
Self-Review	Learning and Teaching Committee
Self-Review	Educational Excellence Committee
Self-Review	Programs Committee
Self-Review	Internationalisation Advisory Committee
Self-Review	Learning Environment Committee
Response	Health Group Board
Response	Science, Environment, Engineering and Technology Group Faculty Board
Response	Arts, Education and Law Group Faculty Board
Response	Division of Information Services supplement to Learning Environment Committee Self-Review
UNIVERSITY STAFF	
Ms Kathy Grgic	Academic Registrar
Professor Royce Sadler	Professor, Griffith Institute for Higher Education
Ms Karen van Haringen	Head, Secretariat, Academic Administration
Professor Sue Spence	Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) & Chair, Academic C'ttee
STUDENTS	
Mr Brendan Johnstone	Undergraduate Student Representative, Academic Committee
Mr Samuel Richards	Undergraduate Student Representative, Learning and Teaching Committee

Interviewees

NAME	POSITION
UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE	
Professor Ian O'Connor	Vice Chancellor and President
Professor Sue Spence	Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) & Chair, Academic C'ttee
Professor Ned Pankhurst	Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research)
Mr Colin McAndrew	Pro Vice Chancellor (Administration)
Ms Linda O'Brien	Pro Vice Chancellor (Information Services)
Mr Chris Madden	Pro Vice Chancellor (International)
Professor Paul Mazerolle	Pro Vice Chancellor (Arts, Educational and Law)

NAME	POSITION
Professor Alan Cripps	Pro Vice Chancellor (Health)
Professor Sue Berners-Price	Pro Vice Chancellor (Science, Environment, Engineering and Technology)
Professor Christine Smith	Acting Pro Vice Chancellor (Business)
UNIVERSITY STAFF	
Dr Afshin Akhtarkhavari	Acting Head and Deputy Dean (Learning & Teaching), Griffith Law School
Dr Kevin Ashford-Rowe	Director, Learning and Teaching, INS
A/Professor Janis Bailey	A/Professor, Department of Employment Relations and Human Resources
Professor Michelle Barker	Senior Fellow, Griffith Institute for Higher Education
A/Professor Rodney Barrett	A/Professor, School of Physiotherapy and Exercise Science
A/Professor Peter Bernus	Head, School of Information and Communication Technology
A/Professor Helen Blanchard	Research Leader, Institute for Glycomics
Professor Michael Blumenstein	Dean (Research), Science, Environment, Engineering and Technology Group
Mr Mark Bolton	Associate Lecturer, Griffith School of Engineering
Ms Lyn Bosanquet	Director, Scholarly Information & Research, INS
Ms Nicole Brigg	Director, Griffith English Language Institute
Professor Gillian Bushell	Deputy Chair, Academic Committee and Professor, School of Biomolecular and Physical Sciences
Professor Nick Buys	Dean (Learning & Teaching), Griffith Health Group
Mr Bruce Callow	Director, Information and Communication Technology Services, INS
Ms Lucinda Chappell	Senior Manager, International Office, Griffith International
Professor Paul Cleveland	Director, Queensland College of Art
Ms Sharon Clifford	Program Accreditation Officer, Secretariat, Academic Administration
Professor Graham Cuskelly	Dean (Research), Griffith Business School
Adjunct A/Professor Dave Edwards	Adjunct A/Professor, Griffith School of Engineering
Ms Samantha Ermer	Manager, Learning & Teaching, INS (Health Group)
Ms Kathy Grgic	Academic Registrar
Professor Lyn Griffiths	Dean (Research), Griffith Health Group; Director, Griffith Health Institute; Director, Genomics Research Centre, School of Medical Science
Dr Maureen Harrington	Senior Lecturer, Department of Tourism, Leisure, Hotel and Sport Management
A/Professor Saras Henderson	Deputy Head, School of Nursing and Midwifery

NAME	POSITION
Dr Ray Hibbins	Projects Manager, Office of the Pro Vice Chancellor (Business)
Ms Sue Hickson	Manager, Learning & Teaching, INS (Business Group)
Dr Robyn Hollander	Acting Dean (Learning & Teaching), Griffith Business School
Mr Ian Johnson	Director of Studies, English Language Enhancement Program
Professor Kerri-Lee Krause	Dean (Student Outcomes) and Director, Griffith Institute for Higher Education
Dr Don Lebler	Deputy Director (Learning & Teaching), Queensland Conservatorium
Mr David Lloyd	Deputy Director (Learning & Teaching), Queensland College of Art
Ms Catherine Longworth	Manager, Griffith Graduate Research School
Ms Mary Meadowcroft	Manager, Research Grants and Centres, Office for Research
A/Professor Reza Monem	A/Professor, Department of Accounting, Finance and Economics
A/Professor William MacNeil	Acting Dean, Griffith Law School and Director, Socio-Legal Research Centre
Ms Sheila McCarthy	Manager, Learning & Teaching, INS (SEET Group)
Ms Carol O'Faircheallaigh	Manager, INS Planning Office
A/Professor Wendy O'Loughlin	Dean (Learning & Teaching), SEET Group
Ms Kare Rees	Academic Services Officer (Business), Secretariat, Academic Administration
Professor Royce Sadler	Professor, Griffith Institute for Higher Education
Ms Diane Selzer	Manager, Learning & Teaching, INS (Arts, Education and Law Group)
Professor Parlo Singh	Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School
Dr Calvin Smith	Associate Director, Griffith Institute for Higher Education
Professor Nerida Smith	Head, School of Pharmacy
Ms Lea-Anne Stafford	Senior Advisor, Academic Planning and Policy
A/Professor Anna Stewart	Head, School of Criminology and Criminal Justice
Mr John Swinton	Associate Director, Organisational Development, Office of HRM
Ms Karen van Haeringen	Head, Secretariat, Academic Administration
Dr Joan Vaccaro	Senior Lecturer, School of Biomolecular and Physical Sciences
Dr Ian Walkinshaw	Lecturer, English Language Enhancement Courses
Professor Clyde Wild	Dean (Academic), Science, Environment, Engineering and Technology Group
A/Professor Hugh Wilkins	Director, Off-Shore Operations, Office of the Pro Vice Chancellor (Business)

NAME	POSITION
Professor Keithia Wilson	Professor, School of Psychology
Professor Marie Wilson	Dean (Academic), Griffith Business School
A/Professor Patricia Wise	Associate Professor, School of Humanities
A/Professor Ross Woodrow	Deputy Director (Postgraduate and Research), Queensland College of Art
Professor Bofu Yu	Head, Griffith School of Engineering
STUDENTS	
Ms Sarah Gardiner	Research Higher Degree Student Representative, Board of Graduate Research
Mr Mohammad Islam	Postgraduate Student Representative, Academic Committee
Ms Julie Kennedy	Past Student Representative, Academic Committee
EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS	
Professor John Dewar	Provost, University of Melbourne (Former DVC(Academic))