1. Business arising from the Minutes of 17th May 2004

Weighted Average Mark
The consensus of this group in relation to WAM was reported back to SIMS and I was asked to speak to this at the SSRG meeting of 17th November. I indicated that the Group’s views were that:

i) A WAM should be calculated for each academic year.
ii) The weighting applied in the WAM should be unit points and not unit level
iii) A GPA should be calculated for each course.

and the SSRG meeting resolved that:

- a WAM be applied for each academic year and the total course and that unit points values be used as the weighting factor;
- that a GPA be applied to each course.

There was no support for using unit levels as a weighting factor.

Special Approval form
As agreed, the updated SA form was forwarded to Harvey.

Combined Degree Rule deadlines
In response to confusion about submission deadlines of combined degree rules, I contacted Sylvia who provided the following guidelines which were then forwarded to each faculty:

Existing Combineds
Publications asked this year that changes to existing combined courses be submitted by the date for submission of the "second" faculty's rules eg for a combined course which included a Bachelor of Arts the date for submission of changes to the Secretariat would be the date for submission of the AHSS rules ie 26 July. It may be very difficult in some cases for the faculties concerned to submit both faculties' changes (assuming both faculties are making changes) on the same document so it is ok for each faculty to submit its own changes on a separate document - remembering that changes to combined courses must have
the approval of both faculties. Because we could receive changes to the same document from two different faculties, could faculties please indicate in the electronic document name, after the version number, what faculty the document has come from eg xxx V1 AHSS or xxx V1 LPS or xxxV1 LAW etc.

New Combineds
Many new combineds have already been through Academic Council and Leg. We will sort out any queries with the relevant faculty/faculties and send a copy of the finally agreed version to both faculties as version 1. Faculties should then return the document to the Secretariat with all other course rules by the due date for their faculty. If any changes have occurred since version 1 was agreed between Leg and the faculties these should be included and the document called V2. The name of the faculty should be included in the title of all electronic versions of combined courses submitted to the Secretariat so xxx V1 AHSS or xxx V1 LPS.

Postgraduate Orientation
A reminder to send information on Postgraduate Orientation activities to Daniel Renton. Daniel may be attending Monday’s FAO meeting.

FAO Group website
Jannette has commenced work on the website and will provide feedback.

FAO Executive Committee
Following a suggestion at the May meeting of the possible formation of a strategic lobby group from within the FAO Group, members were asked to email the Chair indicating expressions of interest. Subsequent to the meeting, and with the benefit of hindsight, I emailed members and indicated that as well as expressions of interests for the Executive, comments were also invited about the suggestion itself. Comments are attached (A). The comments do seem weighted against the idea of an Executive group, and it seems we need to discuss this further with these comments in mind at Monday’s meeting.

2. SECRETARIAT
Trudi, Sylvia and Christine will attend the meeting to present a very preliminary sketch of a new layout for Course Rules in order to get feedback from the Group.

3. SIMS
Jenny Gamble and Lisa Howard will attend to talk about:
  o Cross-institutional and exchange changes. The document (attached to this email) was circulated about a month ago and needs to go to the SSRG July meeting. Your feedback is sought.
  o Prerequisites and time limits
  o HESA: Maz will try to provide some feedback!
4. **PRIZE LIST**

Elizabeth would like to discuss the prize list that Harvey circulated after the last FAO/Sub-Dean’s meeting. In particular she would like to address the issue of combined prizes. I have also asked Trudi to stay for this item.

5. **ENGLISH LANGUAGE COMPETENCY**

Felicia would like to discuss how individual faculties have interpreted and implemented Academic Council Resolution 151 regarding setting minimum English Language competency entry requirements for postgraduate students. **R151/03** reads:

> Although faculties may set higher English language competency entry requirements, the minimum requirement for University courses is:
>
> - Qualification through WA TEE or equivalent (pass in English, English Literature or English as a Second Language)
> - GCE Ordinary Level English: C6 or higher
> - TOEFL (paper based): 550
> - TOEFL (computer based): 213
> - IELTS: 6.5, with no individual band under 6.0
> - Cambridge Certificate of Proficiency in English: B
> - Other qualifications considered on an individual basis.

For discussion.

6. **BEST PRACTICE**

7. **NEW BUSINESS**
COMMENTS RECEIVED REGARDING FAO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

❖ Would not like to see the FAO group split into another group, even though the thinking behind such a move is understood.

❖ A sub committee could be formed to lobby or deal with a specific issue when the time arises, dependent upon members’ availability/workload at that point in time. This approach would then allow for members who have a particular interest in the issue to be involved - or not volunteer

❖ All items for discussion/lobbying etc should appear on the one FAO agenda/minutes and not have another group discussing an item without all members’ involvement.

❖ If there are problems or issues that need to be discussed immediately, or if memberships of main uni committees are under discussion, we should involve the Secretariat in this matter. The relationship/understanding with the Secretariat since the introduction of the Sub Dean/FAO meetings is terrific and we could possibly use this forum more if required.

❖ Really dislike a split of membership that looked like SFAO in an executive group and then FAO's in another .... would the executive group look at the agenda for the FAO meeting and not come if the items were of routine nature?

❖ Support the idea of having an executive group dealing with strategic matters only; would assume that each Faculty has one representative; this group could liaise with the University Secretariat, Student Services, SIMS etc on strategic issues, forward planning, etc.

❖ being part of the current group is extremely beneficial; don’t want exclusion; the FAO group does seem a little small for an executive, however a strategic focus is a good idea.

❖ Suggestions
  • Is it possible to include this focus at the end of existing meetings?
  • Make the meetings 1/2 hour longer
  • People who are not interested could leave at that point
  • Never close a meeting early. Always use the allocated time to focus on strategic issues
  • Working parties can be set up as required
  • Raise the profile of the group with a web site - but a poorly maintained or boring site is bad publicity

❖ No need to set up a group separate to the one we already have. In its current form our group is working very well and our profile has certainly improved since we began to conduct our discussions in a more formal manner. Also unsure of the idea of an 'executive' group that looks at issues that are more important than the work we do in Faculties. Agree entirely that we should always look to involve ourselves in the bigger picture issues across the university but would imagine that this could be done just as well by discussing such issues within the FAO group and then perhaps nominate representatives, if the need arises, to act on our behalf in other forums.