ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The continuation of meeting of the Senate Executive Committee (Special Meeting 09:05) will be conducted via email circulation. Responses are to be returned to Greg Wheatley by Monday 1 June 2009.

For enquiries/apologies: Greg Wheatley telephone (02) 9678 7820 or email g.wheatley@uws.edu.au

E-AGENDA

1  PROCEDURAL MATTERS

1.1 Attendance and Apologies
Your electronic participation will indicate attendance. A no response will be considered an apology.

2  INSTRUCTIONS
Members are requested to consider items for decision, then vote either for or against the recommendation by placing an X in the table, as indicated below. The ‘Comments’ section is available if any amendments are required or to provide additional information for further discussion. Please email your response to g.wheatley@uws.edu.au no later than close of business on Monday 1 June 2009.

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 2 Recommendation</th>
<th>For X</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3  TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR REVIEW OF GRADE PROCESS

Purpose
Following the initial circulation of papers and responses received, comment was received from a Member that requires consideration by the Committee.

The Senate Executive Committee is requested to consider an alternative recommendation featuring revised wording to clause 17 of the Review of Grade Policy, to that agreed to at the meeting conducted by rotary circulation on 15 May 2009. The revision provides greater flexibility for the Head of School when convening the School committee that considers Reviews of Grade.

Background
The Senate Executive Committee recently endorsed a transitional arrangement for Review of Grade process sponsored by the Chair of Academic Senate, the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) and the Academic Registrar.

The recently introduced academic governance changes were intended to dissolve the former School Assessment Committees that are still referred to in the current version of the Assessment Policy. Until Executive Committee and Senate have fully considered the proposal for amendments to the Policy that are based upon a revised, expeditious review
of grade process, some kind of transitional process for reviews of grade was considered necessary for Badanami Centre and all of the Schools.

The recommendation recently endorsed by the Committee (as a temporary process), provided amended wording to clause 17 of the Review of Grade Policy, as follows:

**Recommendation approved by Senate Executive Committee on 15 May 2009:**

*That the Executive Committee of Academic Senate approve, on behalf of Senate, as a matter of urgency, the following amendment to the Review of Grade Policy to allow the transitional process for reviews of grade at the School (or Badanami) level, pending determination by Academic Senate of more permanent revisions of the Review of Grade Policy and of the relevant term of reference for School/Badanami Academic Committees:*

("17) Where the Head of School accepts the application, she or he, together with the Unit Coordinator and a member of the School Academic Committee, chosen by the Head of School from members of the School Academic Committee (or, as appropriate, by the Dean of Indigenous Education, from members of the Badanami Academic Committee) who have not been involved in assessment of work by the student for the unit, will review the grade awarded and determine whether or not to amend the grade. The Head of School will advise the Assessment and Graduation Unit, Office of the Academic Registrar, of the outcome, for communication to the student. [Where the Unit Coordinator has been involved in assessment of work by the student for the unit, the Head of School will choose a substitute for the Coordinator to participate in the review.]")

**Revised recommendation based on suggested wording provided by Associate Professor Wormell:**

Associate Professor Paul Wormell, in his response to the recommendation cited above, provided the following comment: "I agree with the overall recommendation, but not the text in square brackets; i.e. "[Where the Unit Coordinator has been involved in assessment of work by the student for the unit, the Head of School will choose a substitute for the Coordinator to participate in the review.]" This would substantially change the process for many reviews of grade. This change may be desirable, but it should not be done without consultation at the School level."

Associate Professor Wormell has provided the following suggested wording (amendment identified by track changes), that accommodates his concerns, and is submitted for the consideration of the Committee:

**Recommendation:**

*That the Executive Committee of Academic Senate approve, on behalf of Senate, as a matter of urgency, the following amendment to the Review of Grade Policy to allow the transitional process for reviews of grade at the School (or Badanami) level, pending determination by Academic Senate of more permanent revisions of the Review of Grade Policy and of the relevant term of reference for School/Badanami Academic Committees:*

("17) Where the Head of School accepts the application, s/he will obtain from the Unit Coordinator a written response to the grounds for the review of grade. The application and the response will be considered by a School committee, chosen by the Head of School or, for Badanami, by the Dean of Indigenous Education. The committee shall comprise [no more than three academic staff, including at least one member of the School or Badanami Academic Committee, as appropriate. None of whom these staff should have been involved in teaching the units which are the subject of review]. The committee will review the grade awarded and determine whether or not to amend it. The Head of School will advise the Assessment and Graduation Unit, Office of the Academic Registrar, of the outcome, for communication to the student. Any change of grade that may result from the determination will be processed under clause (60) of the Assessment Policy – Criteria and Standards-Based Assessment. The School committee..."
will then submit recommendations to the School Assessment Committee. The School Assessment Committee will confirm or review the recommendations and advise the Assessment, Progression, Graduation and Awards Unit, Office of the Academic Registrar.”

Decision

Please indicate your decision by marking an X in the appropriate box below and return to g.wheatley@uws.edu.au by Monday 1 June 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 3 Recommendation</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequences of the proposed amendment

Such a process removes the role of the now defunct School Assessment Committees, but, in line with the suggestion in the agenda paper for Executive Committee meeting of 1 May 2009, locates scrutiny and determination of applications for reviews of grade with a small, defined, expert school panel [i.e. not a single individual] that is convened by the Head of School and that has an additional member from the School Academic Committee.

The amendment also provides for suspension of the term of reference requiring School/Badanami Academic Committees themselves to determine reviews of grade and does not burden those larger committees with a task which, given the numbers of reviews to be considered, could be beyond their capacity and inappropriate for a large committee. The process would be a temporary, transitional process, pending a decision by Senate about a more permanent process (and, if Executive Committee and Senate agree, a process that includes a limited appeals provision and a re-defined monitoring role for School Academic Committees).

4 NEXT MEETING OF SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The next meeting of the Senate Executive is scheduled for 24 July 2009 in meeting room 3, Building AD, Werrington North, commencing at 9:30am.