1. Procedural Motion – Attendance and Apologies

2. Procedural Motion – Acceptance of Previous Minutes
   2.1. September 2012

3. Procedural Motion – Acceptance of Tabled Reports
   3.1. Education-Council President (Annexure 3.1)
   3.2. Arts Union (Annexure 3.2)
   3.3. Blackstone Society (Annexure 3.3)
   3.4. ECOMS (Annexure 3.4)
   3.5. HSS (Annexure 3.5)
   3.6. MSS (Annexure 3.6)
   3.7. Science Union (Annexure 3.7)
   3.8. SNAGS (Annexure 3.8)
   3.9. UDSS (Annexure 3.9)
   3.10. Guild President (to be spoken to or tabled separately)
   3.11. BPhil Board of Studies (to be spoken to or tabled separately)
   3.12. ALVA (to be spoken to or tabled separately)
   3.13. UEC (to be spoken to or tabled separately)
   3.14. WAMSS (to be spoken to or tabled separately)

October BA, BSc, BDes and BCom Boards of Studies meetings were cancelled.

4. Motions on Notice
   4.1. Ed Council requests the Guild Education President clarify the current status of
       the data from the Guild Education survey, given the motion passed in the
       April 2012 meeting.
       Mover: Luke Rodman       Seconder: Alex Drake-Brockman

       Note the motion passed in the April 2012 meeting – “Education council takes
       the position that questions 9-14 on the survey should be removed from the
       survey immediately in order to allow faculty societies to facilitate the success
       of the e-Learning part of the survey”.

   4.2. That the deadline for Faculty Society Awards be 5pm on Friday October 19.
       Mover: Naomi Elford       Seconder:

   4.3. Ed Council requests that the EAN coordinator distribute remaining funds in
       the 2012 EAN budget equally amongst faculty societies.
       Mover: Alex Drake-Brockman       Seconder: Tom Henderson

5. General Business

5.1. E-Learning
   5.1.1. Universal Lecture Capture and Download
   5.1.2. 48 Minute cutoff
   5.1.3. MOOC

5.2. UWA Futures (Annexure 5.2)
5.3. Course Quality
   5.3.1. Tutors Policy
   5.3.2. Weightings Policy

5.4. New Courses
   5.4.1. Legacy Courses Transition Policy
   5.4.2. Academic Policy Services Weightings Policy updates (Annexure 5.4)
   5.4.3. Feedback on New Units (MSS)
   5.4.4. New Undergraduate Course Structure Restrictions (MSS)
   5.4.5. New Masters Courses Quality Concerns (MSS)

5.5. UWA Placement Project & A Place for ME (Wed Oct 3, 4pm, PSA Lounge)

5.6. Base Funding
   5.6.1. Government Response to Lomax-Smith
   5.6.2. Behrendt report on Indigenous Higher Education

5.7. UWA Act and Guild Regulations Redraft

5.8. Guild FacSoc Awards and Guild Ball (26 Oct)

5.9. Ancillary Fees and Charges Review

5.10. Inter-Society Cooperation
   5.10.1. ASIA Cooperation
   5.10.2. MSS Lunchtime Concerts (1pm Thursdays)
   5.10.3. Elections – AGM must be published in G-News

   ALVA:
   Arts Union: Nominations Close 15 Oct, AGM 16 Oct, Voting 16-18

   ECOMS:
   MSS: AGM 25 Oct
   Science Union: Voting ~ 22nd – 26th
   SNAGS: AGM & Voting at Quiz Night 24 Oct

   UDSS:
   UEC:

   Education Council Elections Tuesday 30 October 6pm
NE opened the meeting and acknowledged the Traditional Owners

1. **Procedural Motion: Attendance and Apologies**
   - **Proxies:** Blackstone - Mitch Tatum (MT) for Sophie van Hattem
     Science Union Kaila Stevens (KS) for Kieran Clancy Lowe
   - **Apologies:** UDSS
     Education Council Treasurer - Ben Tomasi
     Design Board of Studies - Ben Watson
   - **Absent:** Arts Union - Chris Colallilo (CC) – enters at 6.40pm
   - **Attending:** Guild President - Matthew Mckenzie (MM)
     Education Council President - Naomi Elford (NE)
     Education Council Vice-President - Claudia Von Peltz (CVP)
     Education Council Secretary - Rubin Trehan (RT)
     Education Council Ordinary Councilor - Cameron Barnes (CB)
     Commerce Board of Studies – Elselynn Leighton (EL)
     ALVA – Edward Davies (ED)
     Arts Union – Priya Brown (PB)
     Blackstone – Alex Drake Brockman (ADB)
     ECOMS – Justin Bloomfield (JBl) and Rob Purdew (RP)
     HSS – Julian Lee (JL) and Sophie Greer (SG)
     MSS – Thea Rossen (TR) and Joshua Bamford (JBa)
     Science Union – Alex Bennet (AB)
     SNAGS – Scott Thompson (ST) and Andrew Smith (AS)
     UEC – Lachlan Astfalck (LA and Thomas Henderson (TH)
     WAMSS – Thomas Bartlett (TB)

2. **Procedural Motion: Acceptance of Previous Minutes**
   - 2.1 Education Council 7 August 2012
   - 2.2 Education Action Network 23 August 2012
     Amendment of previous minutes to include the UEC report which was circulated separately.
     Moved: NE
     Seconded: CB
     All in favour, motion passed.

3. **Procedural Motion: Acceptance of Tabled Reports**
   - 3.1 Arts Union (Annexure 3.1)
   - 3.2 HSS (Annexure 3.2)
   - 3.3 MSS (Annexure 3.3)
   - 3.4 WAMSS (Annexure 3.4)
     Guild President, Education-Council President, Bachelor of Philosophy Board of Studies, Commerce Board of Studies, Design Board of Studies, Science Board of Studies, Blackstone, ECOMS, SNAGS, UDSS, and UEC reports were circulated separately
     Science Union Oral report by AB:
     - Ball and PJ party sold out.
ANNEXURE 2.1
SEPTEMBER MINUTES

• Quiz night next week.

ALVA Oral report by ED:
• Meeting fortnightly with Dean. Extra A1 and A0 printer.
• Applause for Edd!!
• Met with firms to organize a competition.

Acceptance Moved: NE
Seconded: LA
All in favour, motion passed.

4. Motions on Notice

NE read motion 4.1:

4.1 To amend 3a. of the Faculty Society Grants Guidelines on Contestable Funding to read:
The Education Council President and Treasurer reserve the discretion not to award funding, or reduce claims by a percentage, for any expenses incurred at an event where alcohol was served.

NE: HSS awards night wasn’t able to be funded in semester grants due to alcohol content and inability to reduce claims by a percentage, despite it being partially Educational.

ADB: Any indication of what kind of events would have the reduction?
SG: HSS balls which have a mixed purpose. HSS balls are much tamer.
ADB: (To NE) Could Blackstone Dinner Debate be claimed?
NE: Blackstone Dinner Debate has been claimed in the past, so historically has been found to fall within the eligibility criteria.
ADB: Doesn’t think Dinner Debate should be eligible under the Guidelines, and if the amendment is to be passed there needs to be some sort of guidelines.
NE: The Guidelines allow the Education Council President and Treasurer to determine whether an event is educational or social.
MM: Agrees with ADB that there needs to be guidelines.
NE: Presently quiz nights don’t fall in within the funding guidelines.
PB: Don’t a lot of people run quiz nights within Ed?
NE: SSAF regulation prohibits expending funds on alcohol events.
RP & PB: What if a quiz night is run at the tav, and no alcohol is provided?
NE: NE and BT determined that this is where they would draw the line this year.
PB: Can Ed Council put this off until ed council until there are guidelines?
NE: MSS and Arts Union have events that require certainty for funding prior to commitments being made.
PB: Arts Showcase serves alcohol, (to NE) why is that Ed?
NE: NE and BT applied a predominant purpose test, and showcase fell on the side of ‘equity’, which is Ed under Guideline 2.

ADB suggested a friendly amendment, rephrasing the motion as:
**ANNEXURE 2.1**  
**SEPTEMBER MINUTES**

To amend 3a. of the Faculty Society Grants Guidelines on Contestable Funding to read:

The Education Council President and Treasurer reserve the discretion to award, or not to award, funding for any educational expenses incurred in an event where alcohol was served.

*NE was amenable.*

Moved: NE  
Seconded: RP  
Opposed: LA (as he didn’t get to second)

5. **General Business**

NE: Procedural Motion to move to Orientation Review first  
All in favour

**Orientation Review**

MM: The result of the Review includes –
  - orientation events can’t be sponsored by alcohol companies,
  - attendees will have to purchase alcohol per drink,
  - likely that under and over 18s will be permitted,
  - thorough training for event management, abiding by RSA, etc

Guild will have comprehensive documents on all of the above

**Mental Health**

ADB: (To NE) Have mental health grants been distributed?  
NE: WAMSS received cheques, Blackstone can check and email confirmation.

**Legacy Courses**

CB: At the July meeting with the VC CB asked about LLB, MBBS, BEng. The VC expressed a strong opinion that students should be able to complete course requirements. (To NE/MM) Have you had any luck at filtering that sentiment down to the faculties?  
NE: That is the purpose of getting the VC and DVC(Academic) to approve a Legacy Courses Discontinuation and Unit policy covering minimum notice, availability of alternative on-campus units, and teaching format and contact hours are not sacrificed. With the support of the vice chancellor it is anticipated that it will go through.

5.2 **eLearning**

- **Universal Lecture Capture**  
  NE: LCS motion is on tomorrow at Academic Council. This includes universal capture – mandatory for lectures to be available online (bar exceptions) and opt out downloadability and addressing current policy restrictions limiting recording to 48 minutes.
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ADB: Would it be useful to meet with deans if we’d been informed of this a month ago?
NE: Probably not. The point is not to aggravate CATL (Centre for Advancement of Teaching and Learning).

- **48 minute cutoff**: Negotiation, Posters, Template letters
ADB: EAN discussed the issue of 48 minute cut-offs. Are we doing anything on the ground?
CVP: Only very briefly discussed. MM was going to go talk to Shannon to find out if it was a hardware issue or a policy issue. NE wrote a research paper.
ADB: raised the idea of putting alarm clocks in lecture theatres.
PB: Could we send individual emails to units?
ADB: Is EAN just for everyone to discuss issues and then everyone go off to do their own thing? Or is there going to be mobilization?
CVP: Claudia will send through outline.
RT: Can send through poster that Blackstone has already done.
NE: EAN budget can be used for printing them out.

5.1 Faculty Lobbying Policies
Tutor Quality Policy
NE: This is a policy in the works to be pursued through Academic Board. (To RP) ECOMS had some discussions at T&L, what were they?
RP: Business School T&L discussed hiring of tutors, but this was referred to the Personnel board. The personnel board doesn’t seem to have gotten much done.
NE: Will see if the Guild can access personnel board minutes.

5.2 University Restructures
NE: The Faculties of Life and Physical Sciences and Natural and Agricultural Sciences are merging. As a result all of the student representative positions are changing. The “Faculty Board” as we currently know it is becoming the “Science Executive”. NE is working to get the Science Union President onto that executive, but there are a number of challenges that must be met to get that outcome. In particular SU needs to show it has a relationship with both undergraduates and postgraduates in all of the 9 Science Schools, which will involve strengthening relationships between SU and existing School Clubs and creating new initiatives to involve Schools which currently don’t have a student Club.
Other Faculties should keep an eye out if there are any restructures going on within their Faculty, especially where there will be a shift in the predominant discipline to postgraduate but where there is still an undergraduate presence (eg Law).
PB: Will the SU restructure have an effect on ed council?
NE: Doesn’t recommend any change to the voting structure of Ed Council. MSS is a school as opposed to a Faculty, and the Health Faculty has three School Clubs represented on Ed Council. So there shouldn’t be any major problems in the near future (1-3 years).
5.4 Postgraduate Commonwealth Funding
NE: NE wrote a lobbying paper to the Review of Commonwealth Supported Postgraduate Coursework Places in December. NUS does not have a lobbying platform on the issue, adopting CAPA’s submission (Council of Australian Postgraduate Associations), which is inconsistent with the New Courses Funding Model originally envisaged. At present only ALSA (Australian Law Students Association) and AMSA (Australian Medical Students Association) have positions supporting 100% Commonwealth support for JD and MD programs. The Guild will need to work closely with the University to assist in lobbying and Governmental negotiations.

5.5 Unit Timetabling
NE: Unit Timetabling was raised in EAN. The Universitity is re-doing the system, and by coordinating our push we should be able to get class and exam timetables up to two weeks earlier. However, because of shortcomings in the current system, and a reluctance to change the system all at once it may not be implemented until as late as mid-2014.

5.6 Ed and Soc Funding differentials
NE: Currently Clubs like FAWA, ECS, PSYCHOS are funded out of Societies Council, with very different funding guidelines, and much lower expectation that funds will be used in an educationally productive way. NE wants to look at Ed and Soc funding guidelines to try and get more consistency in rules and application. This could be through two ‘purpose’ pools that are shared between SOC and Ed – an “Education” pool and a “Social” pool. That way if Science Union want to get funding for a Social event they are eligible and if PSYCHOS wants funding for an Ed event then it is eligible

ADB: (To NE) Can we move FAWA to be a FacSoc? (Joking) LA seconded.
NE: Only Guild Council can affiliate new FacSocs and the procedure under section 12 of the Guild Regulations is quite arduous. It is unlikely we could, and if FAWA wanted to pursue it the application would need to go to Guild Council.
CB: Isn’t this an issue for a 2013 Guild? Why are we discussing it now?
PB: Doesn’t think Ed Council should bring extra clubs into Education Council funding.
ADB agrees
PB: Arts Union covers ALL the arts units, so no room for Faculty Societies doing Education Activities in other areas
CB: Education Council has a $60K funding pool – would it increase under this model? Would there be a shift in Ed council away from educational events, by effectively increasing the funding for Social events?
ADB: FacSocs shouldn’t lose money to Societies Council club events.
TH: This should be something for SOC and PAC next year to decide.
NE: If another club wants to compete with Arts Union it’s probably because they are doing educational events, instead of charity galas. Why should the Guild refuse to fund Educational events simply because of who is organizing them?
CB: Why don’t we have this discussion at the next meeting when we know the result of the Guild elections?
NE: The possibility was raised of a change from a “types of club” funding structure to a “type of event” funding structure. This proposition should rightfully be brought to this Council first to see whether it is something that the Guild should invest time into working up a full proposal on. The sentiment of the room is clear - it is not popular, and the old structure should stay.

**FacSoc Funding**

TB: The University raised around 2.4 million made from the SSAF, (to NE) is that money going to come through to FacSocs?
NE: The share of the SSAF is as follows. First the University takes out administration costs. This amounted to around 11% this year. Then the Guild gets 70% of the remainder, or roughly 62.3% of the total SSAF revenue. Then the University demanded the Guild pay for a number of existing services that the University used to fund, asking for $600,000. The end result is we received only $400,000 more under the higher compulsory fee than we did under the cheaper, voluntary fee.

TB: So next year there should be a $400,000 surplus that can go to FacSocs?
NE: The guild wants to see more distributed to Faculty Societies, especially considering the really big difference in services that FacSocs provide. In terms of where the $400,000 went this year, in 2009 the Guild committed to buying back the South Wing at a cost of $1.3 million, and the Guild has to find cash for that. That’s over 3 years of the difference between the figures. The agreement was, when we move into the new building, we will then have to pay it. This means we will have to find $1.3 million next year, and the extra club room space is what the Guild is getting with the $400,000.

CB: Can the Guild have better FacSoc involvement in the making of the guild budget, like a consultation plan for the budget process?
MM: Is happy to do that and is sure Ben Watson would be too. Last year MM was not consulted at all until 1 December, as incoming President, and on second day in office was given a $1.8 million deficit. But yes, we will aim to do better than that this year.

5.7 **City of Subiaco Food Permits**

NE: The City of Subiaco has approached the Guild very displeased with Clubs and Societies not getting Food Permits to have BBQs on Oak Lawn. They have said they will come on campus and fine clubs, and if clubs continue to fail to get Permits the Guild may be denied permits for any BBQs at all. It takes two weeks to get a permit, so all FacSocs need to do is talk to Ben Johnston in the Events Office at least two weeks before the BBQ and he will assist with paperwork.

TH: UEC has weekly BBQs, can they just apply for 10 now?
NE: Imagines multiple bookings would be possible.
ADB: (To NE) What’s actually the fine for not having a permit?
NE: Is unsure, but Ben Johnston will know.
LA: If an individual student brings his BBQ in that he keeps in the UEC common room and gives sausages to his friends, that wouldn’t need one surely?
NE: Is unsure, but would imagine it would be any food provision, just like free food on O-Day.
RT: Free sausage is not a thing.
ADB: Let’s make FAWA the new mayor of Subiaco.
NE: A BBQ in law link would be much higher risk than a BBQ over at UEC, which is a much higher risk than a BBQ in the Business School. Just be sensible, know the risks and ramifications for others and make an informed decision.

5.8 **Second Club Carnival: 11 September**
NE: The First Club Carnival was rained out, so there will be another one next week. Speak to Ben Johnston in Activities.

5.9 **Dates and Timetabling**
NE: Next meeting 6pm Tuesday 2 October 2012. Following meeting is scheduled for study break (6pm Tuesday 6 November 2012), should it be moved to the last week of Semester (6pm Tuesday 30 October)? Show of hands was in favour of 6pm Tuesday 30 October.

ADB: When is WAMSS’ “Are you OK day” event?
CVP: Will email details

Meeting Closed.
1. Education Council and Guild Administration and Reform

Faculty Society Grants
First drafts of the updated Ed Council Semester Grants form are being prepared for implementation by the end of Semester.

2. Lobbying and Higher Education Policy Activities

Welfare:

Mental Health Grants
The Students’ Passionate About Mental Health’s inaugural “R U OK Day” event went off without issue. It is great to see the Guild providing additional funding for such initiatives.

A Place for Me – Student Placement Project
The final meeting for the A Place for Me student placement project will be at 4pm on Wednesday October 4th and all encouraged to attend.

UWA Placement Working Party
The Working Party is drafting guidelines to cover all placements for credit, including the engineering 12 week work experience requirement. These will include recommendations that technically fall beyond the scope of its Terms of Reference, including increasing the accessibility of counselling and academic support services, as placement students often cannot contact such services during business hours.

Ancillary Fees and Charges
Academic Policy Services is now engaging the Faculties for Review of the policy. Naomi is working hard to ensure that all Faculties have a Faculty Board Meeting for the purpose and that students are represented in the process.

Migration Agent
Lloyd Kilbrick (the Migration Agent) has been underutilised in the past few weeks. Naomi has requested Memberships step up promotion of the service. Naomi is still conducting research on how to improve International Students employment options in Australia, including student education, employer education, and Governmental lobbying.

Tax Help
Our twice weekly Tax Help sessions have been a huge success, with appointments filling up well in advance. The continued popularity of the service may make expansion desirable next year, and further investigation alongside Volunteer Hub to incorporate final year accounting student participation.

Legal Assistance
Matthew and Naomi have arranged meetings with an ex-managers of the Citizens Advice Bureau. More to come.
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eLearning/LCS:

Universal Capture and Download Lobbying
The universal lecture capture and download lobbying paper was presented to Academic Council and referred to a Committee, who will determine the copyright issues of recorded material. This will be a point of especial interest over the coming months, especially with Melbourne University and University of Queensland joining the Massively Open Online Course providers through Coursera and EdX respectively. The need to embrace online learning was also part of the Vice Chancellor’s UWA Futures Paper which I encourage you all to read:
http://www.staff.uwa.edu.au/?a=2168647

LCS Cutting out
Naomi’s research on the recording time of lecture capture at other universities in WA and nationwide failed to get the desired response from CATL. Naomi has now produced posters through EAN to inform lecturers of the cut-off and to minimise missed material.

New Courses and Units:

Transition Arrangements
Naomi raised transition issues with the Faculty of Law Dean at the most recent Academic Board meeting held on September 19. Naomi firstly commended Stuart Kaye on advertising the dates for the last run of units, as she is currently lobbying other Faculties to follow suit, followed by two questions: (1) The Vice-Chancellor Paul Johnson indicated in a meeting in July that undergraduate students would be able to complete equivalent Masters units to fulfill the requirements of their degrees. Naomi asked whether he intended to make this available for students who fail to complete discontinued units in the year they are taught in an alternative format. Stuart said that he aimed to have all LLB students complete the discontinuing units through the LLB alternative delivery units rather than the JD units because material has been redistributed so to cover the same content an LLB student may well have to complete 3 JD units. (2) Naomi then raised the course quality concerns students have with the alternative delivery method, and dissatisfaction with the use of online lecture recordings in lieu of lectures, and a consequential drop in contact hours. Stuart responded by saying that whilst they would make available the previous year’s recordings, the focus would be on seminar style teaching, and that contact hours would not be decreased. He indicated that the end result was that students would get greater individual attention. Naomi has forwarded the law unit progression list to the student members of the Faculty of Sciences, ECM and Business School Boards, with the aim of a similar resource being set up for students in Legacy Courses majors.

Additionally Naomi is preparing a paper to be brought to Academic Council, and is aiming to back up the recommendations with Survey results. The survey will be circulated to Ed Council and Guild Council prior to being published.

New Courses Assessment Guidelines
The Academic policy Services discussion paper titled Assessment Items and Weightings referred to in my last report was presented at the Science Board of Studies, with the Board having a different preference to the Arts Board – preferring that specific weightings for each unit are approved by the board. Other feedback given to APS included that it was important to provide specific assessment weightings in the Handbook to give students a fair choice and could assessment weightings be treated as ‘indicative’, permitting changes to occur within the Curriculum Change process before weightings are published. These will be considered during the New Courses review.
Course Quality:

Tutor Policy
Naomi’s first draft of the Tutor policy is in the final stages of completion. The next step is to negotiate changes with the PSA, followed by the NTEU, before publicising it for comment by Council and students. It will then be pursued through Academic Council or Academic Board depending on timelines.

Weightings Policy
Naomi is conducting a review of Assessment weightings after a series of Complaints in Business, Engineering, Mathematics and Design. This is currently in its first draft and will be open to comment before being pursued through Academic Council or Academic Board depending on timelines.

Base Funding:

The Federal Government have announced they will be releasing their response to the Lomax-Smith Review in the coming two months.

Best,

Naomi Elford
2012 Education Council President
ed@guild.uwa.edu.au
0403885815
Back to School Quiz Night
This event was held on Wednesday 5th September in the Tavern. It was highly successful, with all tables full. All enjoyed the eight rounds of questions, the crowd being the most rowdy I’ve ever encountered at a quiz night. People drank lots, won lots of prizes and had overall good times.

Arts Union Ball
This was held at the Parmelia Hilton on Friday 14th September. The theme was Bollywood. It was a very cosy event, with 130 people attending. Whilst ticket sales for this event were slow, it turned out to be a successful evening.

Careers Handbook
We are hoping to launch an Arts Union’s Careers handbook. The details are yet to be determined.

Peacock Magazine
Arts Union’s publication has received several submissions and is currently being complied by editor David Meyer. David is pleased with the quality of contributions from students thus far, however, more submissions are needed in before the magazine is printed. Ideally, this will be launched in late October.

Advocacy
This Semester, the Arts Union would like to place different, more direct questions on the SPOT surveys conducted by the university in order to evaluate teacher quality and course structure for specific units. Priya and I will discuss this in our meeting with the Arts Dean, Dr Krishna Sen in the coming weeks.

AGM
The Arts Union AGM will be held on the 16th October 2012. Nominations open of the 9th October and close on the 15th October. Voting begins after the AGM and finishes on the 18th October. This year, we will be having a proper hand-over process to allow next year’s committee to be informed and experienced at organising Arts Union events.

Chris Colalillo
UWA Arts Union Education Vice-President 2012
ANNEXURE 3.3
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Education

LLB Student Phase Out Issues
A number of LLB students have expressed concerns over the future of their course with the introduction of the JD in 2013. Rubin Trehan is currently collecting personal accounts from students who are affected so that we can report to faculty. A common concern being expressed is that there is not enough information available and the lack of communication from faculty on the issue.

Assessment Review Survey
On September 11 we met with the faculty education committee to present our recommendations based on the Assessment Review Report. Unfortunately the faculty is not willing to ban optional non-redeemable assessments, however we had some success. The faculty that 24 hour take home exams should not be an acceptable form of assessment mechanism. The faculty has also agreed to work on assessment criteria to make tutorial marking more transparent and fair.

Blackstone Unit Guide
We have not had many responses so far to our Unit Guide survey, so we will be collecting responses over the rest of semester and leaving this as a project for next year.

Onyx
Submissions are now open for the third edition and final edition of Blackstone’s academic journal for 2012.

Equity and Social Justice

Clifford Chance Indigenous Mentoring Scheme
The proposed mentoring scheme will be going ahead. Clifford Chance is looking into taking on interns as a result of the scheme.

Stress Less Week
Given the high incidence of stress and mental health issues prevalent among law students Blackstone is running Stress Less Week in week 9. Events start with free breakfast on Oct 1, to be followed throughout the week with free massages, an inspirational poster series and a petting zoo.

Social

Relay for Life
We have had a lot of interest in Relay for Life and will be entering a pre-law team, a running team and two social teams. We are tin rattling on Oct 2 to raise money, but more importantly we are launching the BLACKSTONE WAXATHON. If we raise $2000 Blackstone President Alex Drake-Brockman will let us wax his chest, and if we raise $3000 Simon Vidovich will join him. Donations can be made online or at the Blackstone Common Room 12-2 Monday-Thursday, message educationvp@blackstone.asn.au for more details.

Prez’s Keg
Our annual event for the announcement of next year’s committee will be held at the Claremont on Oct 19.

Ball
The ball was a huge success, held on September 8.

Tri-Law Footy
On 21 September Blackstone came second in a casual AFL competition against Murdoch and Notre Dame. It was a great bonding event for Perth’s three law schools.
Past Events

**Women in Business** – This event was a massive success! We filled out a full seminar room with many lovely ladies. Each student was paired up with a mentor in industry and they exchanged contact details so they’ll be able to meet up in the future. We will also be holding a closing event at the end of semester or in the first week of the holidays to reflect on how it went.

**Careers Cocktail** – Firms and students mingled in the Business foyer to discuss vacation work and the grad programs firms offer. An ECOMS classic, this year we were low on numbers due to the poor timing of the event.

Future Events

**Relay for Life** – we’ll be there to reclaim our 2010 crown of most laps ran, as well as actually donate a bit of money. Our tent is the most luxurious and open to everyone – FACSOCs should come chill!

**R Handbook** – a number of students have complained about the economics statistics units (ECON 2272/3372 – econometrics) so we’ll be writing up a guide of how to use the primary software utilized by the course: R. Given that this is the source of most complaints, we figured it would be a good idea!

**The Bull & the Bear** - after a low amount of submissions last semester, we’re out to do a massive sponsorship drive to get more students involved in our publication. Deadline to be the 22nd of October.

**Economics Debate** – we’ve never run one of these before, but fortunately we’re getting some help from the Debating Union. It looks like this will be in the last week of semester. Not sure whether to have a competition, or to make it an exhibition-styled debate.
Health Students’ Society Report

Relay For Life
We’re holding a barbeque at Bunnings Claremont on Sunday 7\textsuperscript{th} October, with money raised going to our relay for life team. Looks like we’re going to have a larger team on the day than last year!

Quiz Night
We’re looking forward to our Quiz Night on 17\textsuperscript{th} October at the Tav. Trying to get as many people from each of the disciplines there as possible & encouraging Health Science Alumni to have a few tables. Of course anyone is welcome to come along, and help us raise as much money for charity as we can.

Committee
Hurray! We’ve found more new committee members- setting us up for a stronger next semester!

Sophie Greer
HSS Education Vice President
education-vp@hss.org.au
Past Events:
- MSS Contemporary Concert. Great feedback from students and staff that attended.

Education Issues (Josh Bamford)

- Exams - Recitals
  Concerns have been expressed to me over performance assessments. A examined recital may contribute 80%-100% of the mark for a 12-point unit in the performance major, it is delivered publically to friends and family, and is usually assessed by two people on a panel (usually staff members who would know the performer quite well); this is potentially a stressful experience, however it reflects the way the music industry operates. It has been suggested that having external examiners would be more equitable although, given how small the music community is, there are limitations to that. I will soon be meeting with the Head of School and would like to know if there are any general rules for assessment within the Arts Faculty that may be relevant.

- Printing costs
  Students had been asked to print out their own scores for major performances, which could cost up to $20 each. The School of Music has agreed to now supply scores for students taking part in these performances.

- New Courses
  I have had numerous conversations with many students about the new units that have been introduced as part of the New Courses. They mostly have the regular problems that occur in the first year that any new unit is run. We will be having a feedback session next week (with pizza!), at which I hope to gather some more detailed information from students. This will then be presented to the Head of School.

  Some students have expressed to me that they feel New Courses are restrictive, with students wishing to continue practical music studies for longer while also studying other areas. This is similar to the problems the School of Psychology faced with restrictive course requirements. I am curious to know whether any undergraduate, concurrent Diploma programmes are still running or if they have all been phased out, as reintroducing the DipMus may be a potential solution.

- BMusEd
  The Bachelor of Music Education is being phased out and will move to a postgraduate course within the new Master of Teaching. I have been speaking to current BMusEd students about their course and will provide this feedback to the coordinator of the Master of Teaching, to be incorporated into the new course.

  The biggest issue to come out of this is a desire for more time in the classroom on prac and better preparation for prac, with most students feeling insufficiently prepared for its demands. There have also been issues with the selection of mentor teachers, with some students feeling their mentor has not supported them sufficiently.

  It seems as though there will be no issue with any current BMusEd students finishing their course in time, before it is phased out. This does, however, provide us with a fantastic opportunity to be involved with the design of the new MTeach which should lead to better outcomes for future students.
These meetings have highlighted for me the need for education students to be adequately represented. When the BMusEd course is phased out, the music education students will be based at the Faculty of Education and thus will technically no longer be represented by the Music Students' Society.

Lunchtime Concerts
- If any FacSoc would like to mention that we have a free Lunchtime Concert every Thursday at 1pm (starting again on the 2nd of August) in their next newsletter that would be great

Upcoming Events
- MSS Quiz night at the Tav, 23rd October.
- Soloist Concert 4th October. Callaway Auditorium.
- Feedback Session 4th October. Callaway Auditorium.
- AGM 25th October at 2pm.
- Composition Concert 1st November Callaway Auditorium 730pm.
- MSS Ball 24th November at the Parmelia Hilton in Perth.

Other
- Construction on the lift at the school of music is nearing completion. MSS has plans to organise a festival-like opening ceremony, with bands, a fairy floss machine and a ribbon cutting ceremony with the head of school. This lift brings the School of Music up to standard in terms of disabled access.

Thea Rossen: President
Joshua Bamford: Education Vice President
Science Union report - September 2012

Education
- Careers expo to be held on Wednesday the 17th of October.
- Next careers talk postponed to the 18th of October. Likely to be for the School of Earth and Environmental Sciences
- Meeting with Aspire UWA. Discussed the Science Union’s involvement with their outreach programs.
- Meeting with UPS. Discussed the Science Union umbrella-type scheme for student representation and how collaboration between faculty society and school clubs are beneficial. UPS agreed to be involved.

Other/social events
- Pub crawl to be held on the 4th October - Nintendo themed
- CHeMnBiO to hold their first event on the 16th October - Sausage sizzle

Sponsorship
- Planning for the next year’s sponsorship underway. Reports for current sponsors to be written.

AGM
- AGM, voting and elections for 2013 committee to be held in the 2nd last week of semester.
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STUDENTS OF NATURAL AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES (S.N.A.G.S)
REPORT FOR EDUCATION COUNCIL MEETING
(2nd of October 2012)

General:
Not much happened in the last month since our last meeting so the following report is much like the last one just reminding what events and things are going on in SNAGS.

Events:
Our next event on our calendar for second semester is our cocktail ball on the 5th of October (this Friday). Tickets are on sale now and they are also on sale at the door.

Sports day:
The following Friday (12th of October) after cocktail we are having a sports competition day at Muresk. As Muresk Ag institute is slowly getting phased out it will be one of the last joint event with the Muresk Agriculture students. The SNAGS students look forward to the good bus trip out to Northam for a good day of sports and festivities with the Muresk Ag crew.

Quiz night:
The 24th of October is when we will be holding our Quiz night in the Uni Tav. Happy to have booked in this event as this is where we will hold our elections for SNAGS committee for 2013. We are hoping to find a few more interested students to step up and give it a crack and have a good time whilst running a great faculty society.

Education:
In terms of any other things concerning education council and what’s going on in SNAGS there isn’t much else to report at this stage, although when it comes around we will tackle it appropriately.
Event reports

- UDSS Quiz night
  - Was held in the tav on the 14th of September. The theme was dress as a country. We had a pretty good turnout considering that numbers at some social events this year have been low due to having no freshers this year.

- Guest lecture 2
  - We had a guest lecture by Dr Delcanho on sleep disorders and their relevance to dentistry. The lecture was sponsored by MIPS. We had pizza and soft drinks after the event. The lecture was very helpful as this is a topic that is not included in the current curriculum yet is very relevant to clinical practice.

- Sports day
  - UDSS sports day was held at Lords on Saturday the 1st of September. 2nd, 3rd and 4th years played each other in volleyball, soccer and basketball. It was great to see students getting out there, away from study and having a go.

Upcoming events

- 4th year exams
  - 4th year go on exam break straight after the mid-semester break and then come back for 4 weeks of clinic after exams.

- Dental dinner
  - Plans are underway for dental dinner at the end of the year. It will be held at the Hyatt.

- Lifecare drinks
  - Lifecare dental have invited the 4th years to have a chat about opportunities to assist for them whilst studying or work for them upon graduation.
UWA Futures

Introduction

The University of Western Australia can proudly claim a century of outstanding intellectual achievement and distinguished service to the State of Western Australia. Since UWA opened its doors in 1913, more than 100,000 students have graduated from the University, taking their skills and knowledge in medicine, engineering, science, business, law, arts, education and architecture into organisations and communities locally, nationally and internationally. Academic staff at UWA have made fundamental discoveries and contributions to human understanding across all areas of intellectual endeavour, and have brought distinction and acclaim to the University and the State through international recognition of their achievements. The University has made major contributions to public and community life in Western Australia through its support of the arts, the allocation of major tracts of University land for the development by the State government of public hospital and sporting facilities, and through its extension and outreach activities.

In looking forward to our second century of achievement, we should aim not just to replicate past success, but also to set new goals which will ensure that the University remains relevant and valued in the changing circumstances of the twenty-first century. We have already demonstrated that we can establish clear targets, and then direct our energy and resources to achieve them. The University has succeeded in achieving its goal of being counted among the world's top 100 research universities by the time of its centenary in 2013. We now need to focus on the larger agenda of becoming recognised as a top 50 university by 2050 - a goal that relates not just to our research, but equally to our educational programs and activities and to our broader social and community impact, particularly within Western Australia. Having established our objectives, we will need to ensure that our policies, actions and behaviours are all designed to support our ambitions and achieve our goals.

This paper is intended to promote discussion and debate within the University about what our goals should be, and how we should endeavor to achieve them. We will need to build on past achievements, but also be alert to new opportunities and changing expectations both within and beyond the University community. We will need to redefine our role as an institution of higher learning in an environment of ever widening access to information, knowledge and educational opportunity. And we will need to be clear about how we can both contribute to and derive benefit from the current, and we hope long-lasting, economic prosperity of Western Australia.

The paper represents my personal views on these issues. As a newcomer to the University I am well aware that I may have misread some important aspects of UWA's history and character, and I welcome the opportunity to learn more about how the strengths of the past can be harnessed to promote success in the future. I also recognise that the future is inherently unpredictable, so speculations made here about long-run trends may turn out to be wrong. On the other hand, we can be sure that tomorrow will be different to today, so it would be foolhardy to draw comfort from a belief that the status quo will naturally carry past success into the future.

In the paper I present a number of proposals about our educational, research and community activities and how we might further develop and strengthen them. Some of the ideas are fairly well developed, others are more speculative, and in some cases they do no more than identify a wide range of options open to the University. The paper is not a policy document, but rather a stepping-stone towards a new medium-term strategy for the University which will be adopted in our centenary year. I encourage you to read this paper, join the discussion, add your own ideas, and be part of building UWA's future.

Paul Johnson
Vice-Chancellor

August 2012

1. Context: The changing world of higher education
Since the creation of the modern scientific university in the nineteenth century, universities have engaged in three distinct but related types of activity:

- Education, learning and personal development for students
- Research, discovery and innovation
- Engagement with local, national and international communities and interests

The balance of these activities varies between universities, and has changed over time, but the similarities between institutions within the higher education sector are substantial. A core part of their purpose is to educate and develop students. They typically do this on a fairly small scale and in a localised setting. They also require active participation in scholarship, and usually in research, on the part of their academic staff, and they expect the activities of their staff to have an impact on a broader community of scholars (through publication) and increasingly on other interested parties through knowledge exchange and community engagement.

In return for the substantial contribution universities make to the creation of human capital and useful knowledge they receive substantial public funding (this is true for almost all private universities, as well as for public institutions). They also receive income from purchasers of their services. They have typically charged fees to students for residential and educational services (with governments often paying some or all of the education fees), and they also charge fees to external parties who purchase research services.

The Acts or Charters of most universities require them to carry out these activities for the public good, and in most cases universities, whether public or not-for-profit private entities, and regardless of their formal reporting requirements, are perceived as being quasi-autonomous public entities.

Although some universities have developed global reputations - for example, the value of Harvard's brand has recently been estimated at $37 billion, ahead of many major multinational corporations - almost all universities remain small and localised. Harvard educates just 21,000 students, almost all of them within a few kilometres of Harvard Yard. There are few universities with more than 50,000 students, and in no major national higher educational systems do the leading university 'brands' account for more than a small proportion of total educational activity. This is in contrast with most major economic sectors, where a small number of leading brands typically hold significant national and international market share. The higher education sector displays unique characteristics: it is highly globalised and represents a substantial share of the international trade in services, yet the individual universities are small-scale and highly localised in their physical operations.

This unique structure owes much to the public origins and highly regulated development of local and national higher education systems, but it is a structure that is now under stress and is certain to change. Regulatory, commercial and technological developments are reshaping the higher education landscape, and no university will be untouched by these forces, although the impact will vary greatly between institutions, depending on their location, purpose, performance and adaptability.

**Regulation**

The Australian higher education sector, which until 1989 was comprised only of public universities offering a comprehensive range of academic subjects, is becoming more diverse. The sector now includes not-for-profit private universities (Bond, Notre Dame), branches of overseas public and private universities (UCL Adelaide, Carnegie-Mellon Adelaide); specialist institutions (MCD University of Divinity), and public and private educational organisations that offer degree programs as franchisees of both Australian and overseas universities (TAFEs, Navitas, etc). A number of existing TAFEs and private providers are eager to obtain independent degree-awarding powers, as are new ventures. In 2011 the South Australian government approved an application by Laureate Education, Inc., a private US company, to establish a new private for-profit university in Adelaide - Torrens University. This venture still has a number of regulatory hurdles to cross, but once the new standards regime for Australian higher education has been determined,
there will be little reason to deny degree-awarding powers to entities that can demonstrate compliance with the minimum standards. Similar developments have occurred in other jurisdictions, notably the UK, which has recently authorised the creation of a new private for-profit university and is extending university status to small non-comprehensive colleges.

Commercialisation
Regulatory change is linked to commercialisation. The huge size of the higher education sector around the world and the small scale of existing operators increasingly is being seen by business as an opportunity to inject new management ideas and operational norms into a traditional sector in order to increase the scale of activity and generate substantial profit. Publishing companies, investment banks and venture capitalists, in addition to more narrowly-focused educational companies, are now all well represented in the higher education market, and they are expanding their market share. They concentrate their effort on teaching rather than research or community engagement, and this singularity of mission enables them to deliver effective learning opportunities to students at lower cost than most traditional universities.

Technology
A key reason for the entry of commercial operators into higher education is their belief that technology can fundamentally change how teaching is conducted in a way which will both improve the learning experience for students and generate substantial profit. University teaching has traditionally been a craft activity conducted on a small scale in small, localised institutions. The professor, on the basis of many years of personal research and study, devises and delivers to her students the curriculum, and assesses and grades their performance. As enrolments have expanded and class sizes have risen (the average student-academic staff ratio in Australian universities has risen from 14 to 21 over the past 20 years), the professor's task list has expanded to include the management of a team of class teachers, but the mode of production has remained fundamentally the same. Although the professor is now much more likely than 20 years ago to work with some colleagues from her own faculty in devising and delivering the curriculum, there is seldom co-operation between universities in developing teaching materials.

This artisanal mode of production means that each subject offered to students is individually crafted by the course proprietor (or team), even though it may be little different in substance to other individually crafted courses offered in other universities. Few such courses, even at first-year level, will enrol more than a couple of hundred students in any one semester. Contrast this with online courseware. The University of Phoenix, a largely online US university (part of the Apollo education group, an S&P 500 company with a market capitalisation of more than $5 billion), delivers programs to almost 400,000 part-time students, with most courses enrolling several thousand students. This is higher education on an industrial scale, and with it comes a much lower unit cost than traditional programs devised for and delivered to small numbers of students.

Although large-scale online higher education has been in existence for less than a decade, it is already being challenged by a new model of provision (massive open online courses - MOOC) recently launched by some of the world's leading research universities which have started to put their high-quality courseware online for free, together with free access to assessments and certificates of completion. Harvard, MIT and Berkeley offer their programs through edX.org. Stanford, Princeton, Michigan, Johns Hopkins and others (including partner universities in the UK and Canada) offer similar opportunity through coursera.org. The first unit offered by Stanford through this new structure enrolled more than 100,000 students world-wide.

It remains to be seen what value employers will place on the certificates of completion, and what judgments students deliver about the effectiveness and value of the learning experience. Once the identity assurance of students is packaged around the online testing (something that educational testing companies are already working on), it may well be the case that certificates of completion and achievement from these high-quality high-status online courses will rival the market value of degree certificates from lesser institutions. Open-source quality-assured higher education programs may
challenge traditional university offerings in the same way that open-source information provided by Wikipedia challenged, and eventually replaced, commercial encyclopedias.

The regulatory, commercial and technological changes discussed here are not prospective - they are already happening. Massively open online courseware is widely seen as a disruptive technology that has the potential to completely transform the structure and nature of higher education over the next 15 years. It also seems inevitable that universities' quasi-monopoly control of degree-awarding powers will be eroded as new entities, both commercial and not-for-profit, enter the hitherto protected territory of higher education. These changes will present considerable challenges to existing universities, but will also open up great opportunities for development and innovation. We need to ensure that UWA seizes these opportunities so that we can continue to provide exceptional education for our students, produce world-changing research, and contribute to the dynamic economic, social and cultural development of Western Australia. In the following sections I will outline where I think we need to make changes in order to take control of our own future.

2. Education

Education is a fundamental purpose of the University, enshrined in the 1911 Act of foundation: ‘provision should be made for further instruction in those practical arts and liberal studies which are needed to advance the prosperity and welfare of the people’. We make our largest contribution to individual opportunity through the learning and personal development programs we offer our students, and we achieve our greatest economic and societal impact through the activities of our graduates. We also devote a large proportion of our time, energy and resources to education, from which we derive a large proportion of our total revenue.

Over the past decade we have expanded our student (especially undergraduate) intake, with our total full-year student load (EFTSL) rising from 13,726 to 20,622 since 2003. In growing by an annual average rate of five per cent, we have followed a pattern common to the Australian higher education sector over this period. The expansion has had two principle elements: increased recruitment of international students, and rising numbers of domestic undergraduates. Increased student intake has allowed us to capture some economies of scale, increase our total revenue, and thereby have the financial capacity to implement much needed investment in infrastructure, revise academic programs, invest in research and recruit additional staff.

We now need to adjust our operations and expectations to a future that will be characterised by modest or negligible growth in student numbers for the remainder of this decade. International student recruitment into Australia has been declining for the past two years - a consequence of the high value of the Australian dollar, changes in student visa regulations, concerns among international students about their personal security, and greatly increased competition from North American and UK universities. UWA has largely bucked this downward trend, in part due to the demographics of our international student cohort, which differ from universities in the eastern states, but it would be rash to presume that there will be any rapid return to a pattern of significant annual growth in numbers or revenue.

Domestic undergraduate numbers are also unlikely to increase, largely because there is little or no unmet demand left in the system. Furthermore, within Western Australia there will be a reduction in the size of the undergraduate intake in 2015 because the cohort of school-leavers in November 2014 will be only half the size of the preceding and succeeding cohorts (a consequence of the decision implemented nine years ago to raise the school entry age by six months). All WA universities will experience this effect, which will reduce undergraduate numbers over the period 2015-17.

Our undergraduate student population at the end of the current decade will be little different to that of today as long as we can continue to attract a constant proportion of school-leavers. However, we can reasonably anticipate that the next decade will see more competition for students from alternative providers, both real and virtual. In particular, we can expect much of this competition to be centred on price. At present the Australian higher education sector operates in a fixed-price world determined by government regulation. New entrants to the sector are likely to undercut existing
universities in order to gain market share, and it is possible that a future Australian government will follow international trends by introducing a degree of price flexibility into the market for degrees.

If the opportunity to vary price emerges UWA will want at least to maintain, and possibly increase, its student fees. The university is a high-cost educator, with some of the lowest student-staff ratios in the sector, excellent campus facilities and support services for students, and highly qualified teaching staff, many with international research reputations. But if our fees rise above those charged by competitors (and even if fees do not rise, they will surely exceed the costs of online learning), we will need to ensure that the educational experience we offer our students is of sufficient distinction, quality and value to justify and sustain the price.

Feedback from recent graduates (through the national Course Experience Questionnaire) indicates that they were fairly satisfied with their experience of study at UWA - we generally scored higher than our Group of Eight peers and higher than the national average. Our internal surveys of teaching demonstrate that around 90 per cent of the units taught in 2011 attained the high evaluation scores which we set as a minimum standard; nevertheless it is clear that we could improve student appreciation of teaching and learning in some areas. We also know that increasing numbers of students do not attend lectures; that students want more learning material to be accessible online; that they want fuller and more rapid feedback on their assignments; that they value engaged learning advice from expert staff; that they want flexible learning schedules around which they can arrange their work and social commitments; that they want undergraduate programs that will position them for success in the job market; that they expect university to be intellectually challenging; that they hope university will be socially rewarding.

We will need to develop and adapt our educational offering in order to meet the changing expectations of students and employers, in order to take advantage of technological advances, and to position ourselves to compete effectively with alternative providers. We have already initiated a fundamental change and modernisation to the structure of our undergraduate programs (New Courses 2012), and we now need to undertake a similarly fundamental revision of our pedagogy.

Proposal 1: That the University conduct a full review of pedagogic purpose and practice in 2013, with the aim of introducing new pedagogies from the beginning of 2015. The review will consider, among other factors:
- the effectiveness of different teaching styles
- the preferences of students for different combinations of online and face-to-face learning
- the technological and infrastructure requirements of different approaches to teaching and learning
- the skills and capabilities required of teaching and support staff
- the opportunities for national and international collaboration in the design and delivery of educational programs

In order to ensure that we deliver a distinctive, high-quality and highly valued educational experience to all our students, we will need to use all of our assets - our campus facilities, our course structure, our approach to pedagogy, our excellent staff, our research performance, the abilities of our students, our institutional reputation, our international connections – to best effect. In particular, we need to ensure that our students value, and make use of, the opportunities that exist on our campus to engage in face-to-face educational and social activities.

Proposal 2: That the University develop its campus facilities and services (including residential colleges) with the explicit intention of enhancing the learning opportunities of students.

We also need to ensure that every student receives a level and quality of personal support and advice that will differentiate the student experience at UWA from that provided by other physical and virtual universities. We already do a great deal, both within Student Services, and across the Faculties and Schools, to support students in their learning. We can build on these achievements, and develop them to take account of the evolving pattern of student life which sees less engagement with lectures and more engagement with online resources. We need to ensure that all our students
engage actively with academic staff and fellow students in their learning both on and off campus, and that their UWA education provides them with the professional and personal knowledge and skills required for success in their future careers.

Proposal 3: That the University further develop structures for personalised mentoring and academic support for all, and particularly for first year, students, to enhance their engagement with the learning opportunities provided by the University.

A further element of distinctiveness which we can offer is the educational and personal benefits derived from a period of study at other overseas universities of similar standing to UWA.

Proposal 4: That the University develop its study abroad program, with the goal of doubling the participation of undergraduate students by 2020.

Although the majority of our teaching effort is currently directed towards undergraduates, we will need to develop our graduate programs to ensure that they, too, are relevant in content and style to the students of today and tomorrow. We have considerable opportunities to refresh and expand our current portfolio of taught Masters programs, and thereby tap into a growing demand for higher level qualifications. In doing so we will need to recognise and respond to the different learning needs of older and more experienced graduate students. We will also need to examine the pathways into and the content of our research programs. To ensure that we offer attractive programs to an international constituency of research students, we will need to benchmark our doctoral programs with the best on offer in Europe and North America.

Proposal 5: That the University review, revise and develop its Cycle 2 (Masters) and Cycle 3 (PhD) programs during 2013, and begin to bring new programs to market in 2015.

2 Research
UWA is internationally recognised for the quality of its research; in the latest (2012) Academic Ranking of World Universities we are ranked 96 in the world – a tremendous result, and a reflection of just what we can achieve when we commit our energy, imagination and resources to a common goal. We have additionally set ourselves the goal of being recognised as one of the world’s top 50 universities by 2050, and we are already there, or clearly on track, in our research performance in Agriculture and Life Sciences (26), in Clinical Medicine and Pharmacy (51-75), in Chemistry (76-100), and in Natural Sciences and Mathematics (101-150). We can also demonstrate national and international research excellence in many other disciplines, as demonstrated by the 2010 ERA national research assessment exercise, which recognised that UWA was performing above or well above international research standards in 11 of the 22 fields of research.

In order to further develop our research capability we need to recruit and retain the very best researchers, provide them with excellent research facilities, and ensure that the environment within which they work is intellectually challenging and exciting. Naturally, we are already providing a quality research environment, but we could do more, and do so more consistently, particularly if we are to achieve our aim of being a university ranked in the top 1% worldwide in a broad range of disciplines.

Our first step must be to determine where we wish to invest in our research capacity. Research is expensive, talent is scarce, and we cannot be excellent at everything. Universities face clear choices and trade-offs between breadth and depth of research capability. These choices are influenced by the policies of funding agencies, which increasingly are favouring universities that have developed concentrations of research expertise in clearly identifiable institutes and precincts. When research effort is concentrated into centres of excellence it leads to higher levels of academic output
and impact per unit of funding, more efficient utilisation of research equipment, and more consistent training and support for PhD students and junior academic staff.

Proposal 6: That the University further concentrate its research effort in areas of recognised national and international excellence, and in areas of demonstrable research potential.

In order to advance the University’s research capability, we should develop clear, forward-looking staff recruitment plans that are consistent with our research goals, and we should always look far and wide for the very best talent. We must ensure that we conduct a rigorous national and international search for all academic positions at level B and above, that we evaluate candidates against objective criteria with respect to performance and capability, and that we appoint only those who unambiguously meet these criteria. In order to raise the research capability of the University, new staff recruited at any level should have a research track record or potential above the average for the unit they are joining and demonstrate their capability to work with and build UWA’s existing team of researchers in that unit.

Proposal 7: That all academic recruitment at level B and above be aligned with the workforce and research plan of the relevant unit; be based on an extensive national and international search; and, be referenced against rigorous objective criteria.

We also need to ensure that we use the time, energy and skills of our existing staff to best effect. Most academic staff at the University are research-active, but some are not. This is not surprising – there are many calls upon the time of academic staff, and many ways in which really valuable contributions can be made to the University. The balance between different activities typically varies between academic units, and fluctuates over time as each individual embraces changing opportunities to make contributions in teaching, research, knowledge transfer, university administration and professional leadership. We need to ensure that every member of staff is empowered to make a full contribution to the success of the University, and that we have robust mechanisms in place to recognise and evaluate contributions of different types. And if we identify areas where the claim to excellence is not matched by the evidence, we must address this openly and honestly, and provide direct support to staff who wish to elevate their performance.

Proposal 8: That the University further refines its approach to professional development and performance management to ensure that all staff can contribute to the University’s future in an equivalent, fair and effective manner.

A further issue faced by UWA – in common with other research-intensive universities – is how to balance the teaching and research objectives of the institution, of its constituent academic units, and of individual members of academic staff. All research universities experience a degree of tension between organisational units that have primary responsibility for delivering teaching (Faculties, Schools), and those with primary focus on research (Institutes, Centres), and sometimes those with primary focus of translating outcomes (hospitals, spin-out companies, policy agencies). At UWA this tension is heightened by administrative and budgetary conventions which, in their interplay with the funding rules of external agencies, can lead to sub-optimal allocation and use of resources. We need to look closely at our organisational structure and budget principles to determine whether we need to change them, and if so how, so that we can achieve even better outcomes from our teaching and research effort.

Proposal 9: That the University review the interplay of organisational structure and budget principles in order to promote effective action and co-operation across the University in the delivery of teaching and research programs.

Finally, we need to give more thought to the way in which we relate to, and work with, other leading research universities. The international mobility of students and staff, the inter-connectedness of research teams, and the globalised nature of knowledge, are all prompting universities to consider how they can continue to be core institutions in their local environment while at the same time developing their international presence. Some universities have established overseas campuses of varying degrees of comprehensiveness, others are forging bilateral or network partnerships around teaching, or research, or both. We need to consider how, as Western Australia’s leading research
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As a public university that still, in one form or another, receives the major share of its revenue from public sources (Commonwealth funding for student places, Commonwealth and State funding of research, Commonwealth underwriting of loans to students), we have a clear obligation to provide service to the public and the communities within which we are based. We do this through our educational programs which create the skilled graduates who are the driving force of the 21st century knowledge economy. And we do this through our research activities which create the new ideas on which future scientific, economic, social and cultural progress depend. We also conduct a broad range of complementary activities of direct community benefit, such as our extension programs and public lectures and events, our support of the arts and culture, and the provision of access to University facilities to a wide range of educational and sporting bodies.

We need to develop our already strong community links in order to ensure that we continue to meet the founding objectives of the University to advance the welfare and prosperity of the people of Western Australia. In order to do this we must ensure that we continue to provide access to the University to students with limited financial resources, regardless of any changes the government may introduce to the current structure of student fees and loans.

Proposal 11: That the University review its scholarship and bursary schemes in light of possible funding and market changes to the Australian higher education sector to ensure they will continue to support the equity and access goals of the University.

We already undertake a great deal of collaborative work with external partners in business, government and the not-for-profit sector across both our educational and research programs. UWA directly supports the leading economic sectors in Western Australia through the work of, for example, the Energy and Minerals Institute and the Institute of Agriculture. We directly contribute to the future welfare of the population through our support of multiple medical research institutes as well as through the world-leading research conducted in our medical and science faculties. We support a broad public art and culture program through our stewardship of the Perth International Arts Festival, through the exhibitions shown at the University’s galleries, and through the many performances that take place each year at University venues. Yet we could do even more.

In particular, we can do more in building research links with non-academic partners, both public and private. These links will give us access to alternative sources of research funding, and will further enhance the University’s standing as a driver of innovation in Western Australia. Furthermore it is likely that the Australian government will follow international trends in moving towards broader evaluations of research that include measures of impact and adoption beyond academe, as well as measures of academic quality. Deeper research links with business and government will position us well if new targets for research impact are introduced.

Proposal 12: That the University encourage further research engagement with business and government by providing more support for staff to develop research relationships, and by giving explicit recognition to research impact in the evaluation of individual and unit performance.

4 Internal operations

As a public university we do not have to maximise shareholder value, or distribute profit, or react to hostile takeover, as we would have to if we were a public company. On the other hand, we do have to ensure that we provide educational
and research services at least commensurate with the value of the public and private dollars that we receive in grants and fees.

In 2011 UWA earned $831 million, and spent $781 million. If UWA were a public company, it would be ranked as one of the top businesses by size of turnover in Western Australia. It goes without saying, therefore, that in terms of basic business operations - finance, HR, infrastructure, and the like - the University needs to be run with the same degree of professionalism as would be expected in any company of comparable size and complexity.

Although we do not distribute profit, we do need to earn it. Every dollar of surplus that we generate is fed back into our core operations. It is from this surplus that we fund the construction and renovation of buildings, the development of new academic initiatives, and the support of students through scholarships. If we do not consistently generate a financial surplus we will become a stagnant institution, unable to sustain the high-quality educational and research environment that the best students and staff desire and expect.

Table 1 shows, in outline, where the money comes from and goes to. In common with other research-intensive universities in Australia, we earn roughly one third of our total revenue from research activities, and around half from teaching, with the remainder coming from a variety of sources, including donations and bequests, investments, and the University's substantial student accommodation service. Again in common with our Group of Eight peers, around 60 per cent of our expenditure is on salaries, with the remainder largely paying for the running and maintenance of the University's infrastructure and utilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>$ million</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic salaries</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-academic salaries</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data show that the University's financial health depends on maintaining a viable balance between teaching and research and between academic, non-academic and other items of expenditure. In order to do this we need to develop a clearer sense of how much different activities cost and earn, whether our patterns of income and expenditure differ significantly from our peers, and if so why. In 2010, the Federal Government initiated a high-level audit of research costs in all Australian universities, and last year the Government's review of base funding (i.e. the public funding for domestic undergraduate places) undertook a partial analysis of teaching costs. External audit of university costs is likely to increase, and to prepare for this, and also to support effective internal decision-making, we must develop a fuller and more transparent understanding of the cost, and the value, of all our activities.
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Proposal 13: That the University initiate a review of its academic and administrative cost structure, and use the information on costs in a transparent way to guide future resource allocation.

We also need to ensure that our costs are consistent with an appropriate density, quality and consistency of service delivery within the University. We already have comprehensive data on the scale and quality of teaching and research activity across all academic units, and we need to match this with equivalent data on the scale and quality of service delivery across all administrative and professional units.

Proposal 14: That the University use data from the UniForum benchmarking survey of service activities and quality to review the performance of our administrative and professional service, and to implement change and improvement where appropriate.

One specific area of activity to which we should devote particular attention is the way we use the physical infrastructure of the University. The buildings and grounds of the University are one of our most important assets – but they are also very expensive to operate and maintain, and we use them at capacity for only half the year. We need to think imaginatively about how we can gain even more value from the physical capital of the University – for instance by running summer schools, or by teaching in block mode during vacation periods – so that we do not become shackled by infrastructure costs that other, newer, higher education operators do not have to bear.

Proposal 15: That the University develop and implement plans for the more effective use of its physical assets.

The next steps
The higher education sector in Australia and around the world is likely to look very different in 10 years’ time. Regulatory, commercial and technological innovation, changing student expectations and behaviours, increased global interconnectivity in teaching and research, and an increasing emphasis on the relevance of universities to the broader society, will all bring pressure to bear on what we do and how we do it. Some of these likely changes we may view with concern, others with optimism about the potential for growth and development, but we can be sure that, as just one of the more than 10,000 universities in the world, we will not be able to stand aside from global trends. Instead, we will need to embrace them and turn them to our advantage.

The proposals set out in this paper represent my initial thoughts about what we will need to do to respond to the changing external environment so that we can further drive the educational and research achievements of the University. I am sure that there are many other ways, large and small, in which we can build on our current strengths and position the University for future success. Please take the time to add your thoughts and ideas to the discussion about our future. You can join the discussion forum on the University website at www.staff.uwa.edu.au/uwa-futures, or you can send comments to me at paul.johnson@uwa.edu.au. Thank you in advance for your contribution.
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INTRODUCTION

As part of the University’s New Courses curriculum approval process, all unit proposals are required to provide, among other details, the following: (i) list of learning outcomes, (ii) demonstration of how each of the outcomes is assessed and (iii) a list of the assessment items and their respective weight. While data for (i) and (ii) have been captured consistently, the way in which details, such as the respective weight of the assessment items are captured in unit proposals have changed over the last 12 – 18 months in a bid to meet the needs of a range of stakeholders.

The view of the Boards of Studies is that a breakdown of the weight attached to each assessment item is critical for pedagogical reasons. At the other end of the spectrum there is a general view that there should be flexibility to allow changes to the weighting of assessment items to occur even after approval of a unit proposal. This paper aims to reconcile both these ends: the need for the Boards of Studies to have this information for consideration at the time of approval of a unit proposal and the flexibility to enable academics to change weighting of assessment items following approval.

The paper begins with a brief description of what is meant by ‘assessment items’ and their logical and pedagogical connections with the learning outcomes of a unit. It then identifies key issues relating to the weight of assessment items. The third section presents a recommended way forward for managing assessment items in unit proposals in the future.

1. ASSESSMENT ITEMS

Assessment items refer to components used to assess students in a unit. For example, the following assessment items may be set for a unit: essay, group project, tutorial participation, and examination. Assessment items in a unit are identified and determined in accordance with the University Policy on Assessment Mechanism Statements.

Assessment items are not stand alone components of a unit proposal. They are listed in the context of how assessment has been pedagogically tied to learning outcomes of the unit. Academic Council by R23/08 approved the requirement that all new units should include a listing of intended student outcomes and that assessment should be explicitly tailored to such outcomes. In other words, a proposer is required to demonstrate how each of the learning outcomes is assessed.

It can, therefore, be inferred that assessment items must be logically arrived from the demonstration of how each outcome is assessed. Thus, changes to assessment items can only occur if there are changes to the way outcomes are assessed. Clause 4.3 of the University Policy on Changes to Units states the following:

“4.3 Where a change to unit outcomes is proposed for a unit within an undergraduate major or a postgraduate course:
(a) it must be mapped to the outcomes of the undergraduate major or postgraduate course; and
(b) the assessment must be tailored to the changed outcomes.”

Therefore, changes to assessment items cannot be dealt in isolation. Either the change in assessment is a result of the changes in learning outcomes and to the way these outcomes are assessed or a change in assessment that leads to changes in learning outcomes and to the way these outcomes are assessed. The key point here is that any change to assessment which impact on learning outcomes will require approval by the Boards of Studies.

2. DIFFERING NEEDS AND PRACTICES

Practices in regard to the weighting of assessment items, however, have varied with a view to meeting the needs of a range of stakeholders including the original proposers of the unit.

Approved details of a unit are published in both the University Handbook and unit outlines. While the Handbook is the University’s official record of the courses and units that will be offered in a given year, the unit outlines provide students with core information about their units of study. As a University requirement unit outlines must include, among other information, details such as assessment items...
and their respective weight and must be published at least one day prior to the commencement of semester or teaching period. However, the Handbook process is, and always has been, finalised during the previous year, many months prior.

Although it is a University requirement that unit outlines must align with the information published in the Handbook\(^1\), the levels of detail of information provided in the two sources may differ. For example, the Handbook may publish the assessment items for a unit but not their respective weight, to date this information has been at the discretion of the Faculty.

However, the Boards of Studies have expressed a view that a breakdown of the weight attached to each assessment item is critical for pedagogical reasons, and that they should be considered at the time of approval. Further, it helps the Boards to consider the relative weight of the assessment items that are tied to the learning outcomes.

The challenge here is to reconcile both ends of the spectrum: the Boards’ view that such details should be considered at the time of approval and the Faculty view that there should be flexibility to enable changes to the weighting of assessment items to occur following approval of a unit proposal without consequent re-approval processes.

### 3. RECONCILING DIFFERENCES

One way to reconcile both these ends is by requiring proposers to provide a range for the weight assigned to each assessment item for a unit. Consider the following example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment items</th>
<th>Weight in percentage (%) range</th>
<th>Minimum value</th>
<th>Maximum value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Essay</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the proposed range, as provided in Table 1, has been approved by relevant committees as part of the unit approval process, a unit coordinator may then set the actual weight attached to each assessment item within the agreed range for publication in unit outlines as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment items</th>
<th>Actual Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial participation</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Essay</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In so doing, the proposer will need to adhere to the following key principles:

(i) That the total value of assessment items for the unit should not exceed 100%; and
(ii) That the minimum value of weight assigned for each assessment item in table 1 should not exceed a total of 100%.

The example below (table 3), which captures related details of an actual unit, may help to further illustrate the key points discussed in this paper.

---

\(^1\) See [University Policy on Provision of Unit outlines](Attachment D3)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student learning outcomes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On successfully completing this unit, students should be able to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) identify and discuss key issues in the use and interpretation of various historical sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) locate relevant primary sources in a given area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) produce a viable research plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments tailored to outcomes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are required to write a seminar paper on a key issue in the use and interpretation of various historical sources (outcome 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A report on a primary source collection or database requires the development of skills in locating primary sources and critically engaging with the question of the relevance of different sources to different historical questions (outcomes 1 and 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are required to submit a research plan for assessment. Feedback is provided on a draft of the plan prior to assessment (outcome 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in group discussions is also assessed, to encourage and evaluate engagement with the material and learning peers (outcomes 1 - 3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment items</th>
<th>Scenario 1</th>
<th>Scenario 2</th>
<th>Scenario 3 (Recommended)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One 2500 word seminar paper, (40%); Report on a primary source collection or database, (20%); Research project proposal, (25%, comprised of 5% for a draft and 20% for the final proposal); and Participation, (15%).</td>
<td>Seminar paper; Report on a primary source collection or database; Research project proposal; and Participation</td>
<td>One 2500 word seminar paper, (30% - 50%); Report on a primary source collection or database, (15% - 25%); Research project proposal, (20% - 40%, comprised of 5% -10% for a draft and 10% - 20% for the final proposal); and Participation, (10% - 20%).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above three scenarios relating to assessment items capture the different levels of detail of information that may be provided in regard to assessment weighting. In scenario 1 the relative weighting of assessment items will be provided, but they are fixed. Faculties may choose to continue or adopt this option. The approved fixed data relating to assessment weighting will need to be reflected the same in the University Handbook and unit outlines. However, this means that there will be no flexibility to amend assessment weighting without approval by the relevant Board of Studies.

The assessment items in scenario 2 have no weighting. But as discussed earlier, this piece of information is necessary for the Boards of Studies to make any informed decision in regard to the approval of a proposed unit. Therefore, the example in scenario 2 would not be acceptable for the Boards of Studies.

### 4. BENEFITS OF SCENARIO 3

Although scenario 1 is still an option that faculties may choose to adopt, this paper offers an alternative with adoption of scenario 3 which provides for a percentage range in regard to assessment weighting. This proposed way forward (scenario 3):

1. provides adequate information to the Boards of Studies to facilitate an informed decision when considering new unit proposals;
2. provides for flexibility for changes to occur within the approved range set for each assessment item; and
3. facilitates a process whereby information published in the Handbook and unit outlines is not contradictory.

The approved percentage range for each assessment item will be published in the University Handbook. A unit coordinator may, however, set the actual weight attached to each assessment item within the approved range for publication in unit outlines. As is the current practice monitoring of information provided in unit outlines and its alignment to the Handbook, rests with the Faculty. Any proposed change to the weight of assessment items outside the approved respective range will need to be considered by the Boards of Studies as there may be an impact on learning outcomes.

**Recommendation:**

That information regarding assessment items at the time of submitting a new unit proposal be provided at the discretion of the Faculty as follows:
Scenario 1: Clarity on the assessment items with a specific percentage value, bearing in mind that any changes to the percentage value can only take place as part of the annual change process. The current deadline for change to unit information is April of the year preceding teaching of the unit.

Scenario 3: Clarity on the assessment items with a percentage range, bearing in mind that change to the percentage value within the range can be made by the faculty up until provision of the unit outline. The current deadline for provision of unit outlines is one working day prior to commencement of semester in which the unit is taught.

In both instances changes to the assessment weighting, either the specific value or outside of the range, will need to be undertaken in accordance with the annual change process, and approved by the relevant Board of Studies, as there may be an impact on learning outcomes.