## Te Komiti Whakahaere Ako Academic Administration Committee

UNIVERSITY OF CANTERBURY
Te Whare Wānanga o Waitaha
christchurch new zealand

## Ngā āmiki | Minutes

 tae mai | In attendance

## 1. WELCOME

## The Acting Chair welcomed S 9(2)(a) OIA andS 9(2)(a) OIA representing Law and

 Arts to their first meetings as Associate Deans Academic. He also welcomed PS 9(2)(a) OIA2. CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING ON 8 MAY 2023

## Moved by the Chair:

That, the minutes of the meeting held on 8 May 2023 are a true and accurate record.
Carried

## 3. MATTERS ARISING

$\mathrm{S} 9(2)(\mathrm{a})$ thanked those that had provided their Faculty Moderation policies and noted these would ideally all be approved prior to the Audit Panel arriving in July. The Faculties of Law, Arts and Engineering confirmed their moderation policies were in hand and would be received soon.




S 9(2)(a) offered to complete further analysis on the impact these changes would have on each faculty and would circulate this information to committee members prior to the next meeting.

```
S 9(2)(a) OIA
noted Education typically has fewer summer school courses on offer than other faculties. She queried whether other faculties were offering teaching staff 'time-off' from teaching in semester one or two in order to focus on their research as an incentive for teaching during summer school.
```


## S 9(2)(a) responded that this was a resourcing issue handled by the Executive Dean of each faculty.

```
S 9(2)(a) OIA recalled a paper previously presented to AAC on structuring the academic year and what was equitable for staff. It was suggested this could be resurrected and return to the Committee.
```

5 g(2)(a) OIA reiterated that it was a resourcing decision specific to each faculty. If summer school attracts a lot of students, faculties can use the additional income to increasing staffing either over summer school or during semester one or two. Some faculties, like Science, are also looking at how many courses they offer across the year and whether they can reduce some teaching load.

## S 9(2)(a) OIA noted some faculties also have a slight advantage with the ability to attract Erskine visitors. An Erskine Visitor is a Professor that comes to UC to teach a course during any semester and is funded by the Erskine Programme. <br> It was also noted a math course has a 'flipped class model' so the only staffing they need to resource are tutors as the classes have been pre-recorded.

## 4. BUSINESS FROM THE ACTING CHAIR



Feedback on the credit transfer policy was due last Friday and feedback had been received from two members. $S 9(2)(a)$ asked whether this was a sign that members were happy with the proposed policy. s 9(2)(a) OIA suggested that Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) was the main area
that his staff were interested in. In principle, they were happy with the regulations but were more interested in the RPL process.

5. CUAP PROPOSAL: TO INTORDUCE A NEW MAJOR IN ST(2)(b)(ii) OIA




It was confirmed that the financials for this major had been peer reviewed.


[^0]S 9(2)(a) queried whether Mathematics and Statistics were classified separately. There had been a long debate regarding this as they are quite different subjects. Students needed to have a modicum of maths to cope with second year. It was noted that MATH110 delivered some statistics.

S g(2)(a) asked whether students would leave with a portfolio to assist them into employment. said students would be encouraged to create their own portfolio and noted that many current students have their own websites and social media pages. They had considered
$\mathrm{S} 9(2)(\mathrm{a})$ suggested the school could create a course to $\mathrm{S} 9(2)(\mathrm{b})(\mathrm{ii})$ OlA
$\mathrm{S} 9(2)(\mathrm{a})$ OIA said he would look into what they were doing however, students enrolled in digital design degrees typically have the social media pages suggested.

```
S 9(2)(a)OIA was thanked and left the meeting.
```


## Moved by the Acting Chair:

That the proposal to introduce a new major in Digital product Design in the BProdDesign be endorsed and forwarded to Academic Board, Council and CUAP for approval.

## Carried

## 6. REGULATIONS - REVISION OF PHD REGULATIONS


#### Abstract

introduced the draft revised PHD regulations and thanked S 9(2)(a) OIA and $\mathrm{S} 9(2)(\mathrm{a})$ for working on these over a long period of time. She advised that they have reviewed the regulations in comparison to other universities within New Zealand and Australia with the intention to enhance clarity for students and staff.


The revised PhD regulations now include:

- $\quad$ Suspensions which were not previously included in the regulations;
- A subject in Creative Practice as requested by the Faculty of Arts;
- The ability to award a PhD in two subject areas;
- The removal of operational details which will be moved to a procedural document;
- The addition of transfer regulations, and a clear process for discontinuations and unsatisfactory progress regulations.

S 9(2)(a) OlA noted that once the draft PhD regulations were approved, it was her intention to use them as a template for named doctorate degrees.

Members provided the following minor amendments:

- Check the numbering under 'Structure of the Qualification';
- Consider revising the wording of point 4 from "topic" to "proposal". This could indicate that student's ideas should be fairly well advanced;
- Ensure the 'Alternate Pathway' regulations are clear, particularly around point 'b' and point ' 3 ';
- Amend a typo - taken/take in
- Include Criminal Justice in the list of subjects;
- Under 4d, amend to 'additional' conditions;

It was confirmed that 4-year bachelors/honours degrees would remain a pathway to PhD as long as there was a 30 point research component. This requirement had not changed.

A member raised the maximum suspension of 12 months across the duration of studies and queried whether this discriminated against women. If a student was to take 12 months parental leave, they would only get one suspension throughout the duration of their PhD, and there may be a question of equity.
S g(2)(a) OIA noted it was necessary to limit the time students can spend on suspension however, the regulations did allow the Dean to vary the regulations under exceptional circumstances.



S 9(2)(a) OIA queried whether the maximum word count of 100,000 words was normally enforced. S 9(2)(a) OIA advised that the word count was checked by the Graduate School upon submission of the thesis however, if examiners come across any theses that exceeded 100,000 words, they could also raise this with the Graduate School.


S g(2)(a) OIA advised that confirmation was the process of agreeing the student had a good proposal. Following this, it was important that when things do arise, supervisors flag any concerns and ensure they are honest in progress reports. This is intended to give students clarity regarding what they need to do to meet the standard. It is hoped this would lift student performance but if not, following continued evidence of unsatisfactory progress students may be withdrawn from their PhD.

Under regulation 10, there was a new process called an 'Unsatisfactory Progress Process' which means if students don't meet certain conditions, they would be withdrawn from their degree after a fair process has occurred. In future, there may be an online management tool which would clearly communicate to the student that their progress was unsatisfactory and would provide them with the things they needed to do to maintain their enrolment.


S 9(2)(a) OIA advised that when a student arrives that does not appear to have the necessary background knowledge to flourish, they can be required to enrol in a relevant course, and if they cannot write a proposal within six months then under regulation 10a they can be exited from the degree.

S 9(2)(a) OIA queried the inclusion of awarding a doctorate degree in two subject areas, and asked whether this was something the Graduate School really wanted to enable. S 9(2)(a) OIA noted that this was something Academic Board had indicated they would like to see. As a general rule, degrees would be awarded in one subject area and with the permission of the Dean, a PHD can be awarded in a second subject. $\mathrm{S} 9(2)$ (a) OIA queried whether there would need to be additional regulations regarding the examination of theses where two subjects may be awarded. For example, would you need to have an examiner from each subject that was to be awarded. S 9(2)(a) OIA would reflect on the examination process and noted that any application would need to be fully supported by the relevant departments and supervisors.

Professor Moran requested the Graduate School draft a process guide for the award of a PhD in two subject areas.
A member requested a discussion on the required place of research and study. In today's connected world, there are many postgraduate students currently enrolled that are not based in Christchurch.


## Moved by the Acting Chair:

That the proposal, in principle, be approved and reported to Academic Board, Council and CUAP.

Carried

## SECTION B REPORTS:

Moved by the Chair:
That the reports in Section B were received and approved.
Carried

## 7. GENERAL BUSINESS

A member queried whether the University runs workshops for new tutors. They were advised that we do and to contact S 9(2)(a) OIA in the first instance.


The meeting closed at 2.37pm


[^0]:    S 9(2)(a) OIA
    was excited by the potential for cross-over between schools, with the example of Virtual Reality in Sport, etc.

