

STUDENT ADVISORY COUNCIL (SAC) MINUTES – TUESDAY 19 MAY 2020

Minutes of the Student Advisory Council held at 1:30pm on Tuesday, 19 May 2020 via Webex.

PRESENT:	Olivia Poate	Academic Senate - Undergraduate
	Jackson Cocks	Academic Senate - Undergraduate
	Damien Beckett	Academic Senate - Undergraduate
	Theo Totsis	Academic Senate - Undergraduate & Law Humanities and The Arts (Undergraduate)
	Henry Streamer	Business (Undergraduate)
	David Havyatt	Business (Postgraduate)
	Laura Bassaikhan	Business (International)
	Maheshika Nanayakkara	Clubs & Societies Representative
	Lucas Peers-Catt	LGBTIQ+ Representative
	Natasha Popceviski	Law, Humanities and The Arts (Postgraduate)
	Emily Nield	Shoalhaven Campus Representative
	Bryce Humphries	Science, Medicine & Health (Undergraduate)
	Sandeep Satapathy	Science, Medicine & Health (International)
	Catherine Stephen	Science, Medicine & Health (Postgraduate)
	Mahime Watanabe	Social Sciences (International)
	Hannah Dews	Social Sciences (Undergraduate)
	Yuxi Ruan	University Council (Postgraduate)
	Chuhao Liu	Wollongong University Postgraduate Association
	Alex Hall	Wollongong Undergraduate Student Association
	Kate Sharp	Mature Age Representative
	Skylar Alucia	Clubs & Societies Representative
	Thomeissa Mason	Woolyungah Indigenous Centre (WIC)
	Keval Patel	UOW Pulse Student Director
	Marg Hansen	Bega Campus Representative

IN ATTENDANCE:	Ms Ellenie Petrou	Senior Manager, Academic Administration, Student Services Division
	Mr Dominic Riordan	Director, Academic Quality Standards
	Ms Abbie Worthington	Academic Quality and Policy Specialist, Academic Quality Standards
	Mrs Debby Porter	Manager SSAF and Student Projects, Student Services Division
	Mrs Christine Mason	Student Representation Coordinator, Student Services Division

OBSERVER:

APOLOGIES:	Ms Theresa Hoynes	Director, Student Services Division
	Professor Julia Coyle	Pro Vice-Chancellor (Students) PVC(S)
	Safiye Caferoglu	Sydney Business School (Sydney CBD) Campus
	Val Sun	Women's Representative
	Daniel Bakrdanikoski	Southern Sydney (Loftus) Campus

PART 1: OFFICIAL BUSINESS

***1.1 Welcome and Introduction**

The Chair acknowledged the traditional custodians of the land and welcomed all the representatives and UOW staff in attendance. The Chair noted that the meeting was in quorum. The Chair welcomed everyone to the May Student Advisory Council (SAC) meeting for 2020. The Chair asked the SAC if they agree to recording the meeting via Webex.

The Chair welcomed:

- Keval Patel the elected UOW Pulse Student Director
- Skylar Alucia recently elected to the position of Clubs & Societies representative
- Kate Sharp recently elected to the position of Mature Age student representative

Also, in attendance, Dominic Riordan, Director Academic Quality Standards and Abbie Worthington, Academic Quality and Policy Specialist, also from Academic Quality Standards.

***1.2 Arrangement of Agenda**

1.2.1 Conflicts of Interest

No conflicts of interest were declared.

1.2.2 Confidential Items

No confidential items were discussed.

1.2.3 Starring of Items

All items on agenda were starred.

1.2.4 Meeting protocol

The SAC were asked that all items be raised through the Chair and reminded the committee to treat each other with respect and dignity. For the purpose of recording the meeting via Webex, the SAC were asked to speak loudly and clearly.

The Chair stated that they will be monitoring the time and will advise when to move on from an agenda item.

***1.3 Chair's Report**

The Chair advised that the Student Representation Coordinator (SRC) will present an update on some of the Action Items arising from the last SAC meeting on 23rd April 2020.

The Chair confirmed that the minutes of the SAC meeting held on 16th March 2020 were confirmed and signed as a true record through Circular Resolution.

The Chair noted that feedback was received from the Social Sciences Undergraduate (SSU) representative regarding the subject HAS346. The Subject Coordinator is delivering the subject effectively with the remote learning environment. The feedback is to be forwarded to the Pro Vice-Chancellor Students (PVCS).

A SAC Facebook page was created by the SAC executive to increase awareness and visibility of the SAC with the aim to encourage students to engage with the SAC. It is an efficient and effective way of directly communicating with the UOW student cohort and it allows SAC to communicate important information to the student cohort.

Feedback is still open regarding UOWx and the logging of activities and hours on Moodle. The University Council Undergraduate (UCU) representative will take feedback/comments and liaise with the Pro Vice-Chancellor Students (PVCS).

Subject feedback is still open and continual on Moodle so open to all students to provide feedback. The Deputy Chair confirmed that the subject Moodle was closed. Students can still provide feedback via the SAC.

The Chair updated the SAC regarding the remote delivery of examinations for Autumn Session 2020 and that a Frequently Asked Questions is now available on the UOW website: <https://www.uow.edu.au/student/exams/faq/>.

*1.4 Confirmation of Minutes

RESOLVED 2020/09

that the minutes of the previous Student Advisory Council meeting held on 23rd April 2020 be confirmed and signed as a true record.

*1.5 Action Items and Business Arising

Status: **NE: New** **CO: Carried Over** **OH: On Hold** **CL: Closed**

RESOLUTION ITEM	STATUS	ACTION	DUE DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON
2019/13	CO	Creation of an International Representative Working Group	May/2020	Student Representation Coordinator (SRC)
Action Item	CO	Schedule First Responder Training	June/2020	Student Representation Coordinator (SRC)

Action Item	CO	Facilitate a real-time online forum for SAC representatives.	July/2020	Activation Working Group/Student Representation Coordinator (SRC)
SAC Meeting 19/5	CO	Develop and facilitate for SAC a Communication Network with Faculty, Campus and key stakeholders.	July/2020	Student Representation Coordinator (SRC)
Operational	CL	Provide current Vacant positions for SAC Working Parties - Students as Partners, SSAF	May/2020	Student Representation Coordinator (SRC)
Action Item	CO	Investigate a platform for a real-time discussion and feedback loop for students		Student Representation Coordinator/SAC Executive
Operational	CL	Discuss schedule SAC meeting late June/July.	May/2020	Student Representation Coordinator (SRC)
Action Item	CO	Creation of Rolling Agenda 2020/2021 SAC Meetings	July2020	SAC Executive
Other Business SAC Meeting 19/5	NE	SAC Executive meeting with UOW Pulse Student Director re: UOW SAC & PULSE SAC branding	June/2020	SAC Executive
Other Business SAC Meeting 19/5	NE	Presentation - SAC regarding UOW Scholarship Offerings	July/2020	Student Representation Coordinator (SRC)
Other Business SAC Meeting 19/5	NE	2020-2025 Draft Education Strategy - Feedback	July/2020	Student Representation Coordinator (SRC)

***1.6 Election of Secretary, Student Advisory Council (SAC) Executive**

The Executive of the SAC will consist of a Chair, Deputy Chair and Secretary. The position of Secretary remained vacant following the SAC meeting on 16th March 2020.

The Chair declared that the election of the Secretary on the SAC Executive would commence with the Student Representation Coordinator (SRC) to conduct the election process. The SRC advised

the SAC that the Expressions of Interest (EOI) for the position of Secretary were available on Moodle for review prior to the meeting.

The SRC stated that there was only one Expression of Interest submitted for the position from Lucas Peers-Catt (LGBTIQ+ representative). The SRC confirmed that because there was no more than one person nominating for the single position, the protocol of declaring a candidate unopposed into a position is allowable providing there are no objections from those present at the meeting.

The SRC put to the SAC if there were any objections; no objections were received and Lucas Peers-Catt (LGBTIQ+ representative) was elected unopposed to the position of Secretary of the SAC Executive.

The Chair and the SAC congratulated the newly elected Secretary.

RESOLVED 2020/10

that the Student Advisory Council records the appointment of the position of Secretary on the Student Advisory Council.

PART 2: GENERAL BUSINESS

***2.1 Draft Lecture Recording Guidelines and Teaching Assessment Subject Delivery Policy**

The Chair welcomed the Academic Quality and Policy Specialist, Academic Quality Standards (AQPS) to the floor.

The AQPS thanked the SAC for the opportunity to provide an update on the draft Lecture Recording procedure and policy.

The AQPS provided a background summary of the Lecture Recording proposal. In October 2016 Academic Senate considered a student-led proposal for an opt-out position on lecture capture for all lectures at UOW. The matter was subsequently referred to several university committees and units before being raised at Senate in December 2018.

The University currently allows academics to opt-in for live lecture recordings and decide on live lectures availability. The draft policy proposes that academics have an opt-out process as a standard practice in recording lectures and that these lectures are available to all students in that subject cohort. The University has agreed to this proposal and a policy has been drafted for presentation at Academic Senate and University Council for approval.

A set of guiding principles were developed through the policy and procedure; and the procedures would guide how lectures are recorded, made available to students as well as copyright and privacy principles.

The AQPS asked the SAC if there were any questions regarding the guidelines and procedures.

Q1. How does the recording schedule work to ensure the maximum amount of venues are used?

R1. There are approximately 35 different venues with recording capacity across all UOW's Australian campuses. There is scope in the policy to broaden the technologies when implementing and UOW have committed to increasing venue capacity and recording capabilities. The University

would be moving towards a growth pathway; there is currently capacity and it is certainly in the vast majority of large venues.

Q2. In the case where a recording has failed, what is the protocol for students to access the lecture and lecture material if the recording fails?

R2. There is currently nothing in the draft policy to advise what the University would do if a lecture recording fails. It only outlines what would happen if a recording was made unavailable. The recommendation is that Academic staff would provide additional resources where a recording has had to be withdrawn due to reasons such as privacy or copyright purposes. This section of the policy could be expanded in the draft policy where a lecture recording has failed in the venue.

Q3. What sort of training or assistance will be provided to lecturers for recording the lecture and uploading on the ECHO360 platform?

R3. There are resources available to Academics through the University's Learning, Teaching & Curriculum Unit but it does not form as a mandatory training exercise and it is up to the individual academic staff to avail themselves of these resources.

The AQPS noted that this was a good feedback; and as the University goes forward with the Digital Teaching and Learning strategy that continual upskilling of staff and delivering with technology is important. When the draft policy was first put forward, there was a parallel conversation regarding the upskilling of Academic staff. In the last two months, additional teaching resources have been provided by using the most effective and appropriate resources for remote delivery.

Q4. Since the proposal was first put forward for compulsory lecture recordings is this still the approach the draft policy is pursuing. Is the policy asking more lecturers to record their subjects?

R4. The intent of the policy is that it is not asking for Lecturers to record their lectures the intent is that all lectures will be recorded if the venue is described as a recording enabled venue. This is unless a compelling reason is submitted and approved that the lecture should not be recorded; and the reasons must be communicated to students who are undertaking the subject lecture.

Q5. By default are all subjects intended to be recorded?

R5. If the lecture is in a recording supported venue the lecture must be recorded. The draft policy is more about a request not to record the lecture. The Learning, Teaching and Curriculum unit and Information Management and Technology Services (IMTS) have a responsibility to provide the technology to record a lecture in a particular venue.

Q6. Is the requirements for live lecture recordings extended to casual teaching staff? If the Course/Subject coordinators are employing casual staff, they should ensure that Casual staff know how to use technology such as live recording of lectures. How does the policy apply to casual teaching staff?

R6. The policy applies to the type of learning experience and the venue. If the University is moving towards a system where a lecture is scheduled in advance of the session commencing it will be recorded regardless of the person in the room. Casual staff won't affect live recordings on ECHO360; where it might make the difference is where teaching is occurring where there is no ECHO360 available. If staff would like to record the lecture, and the technology is local to the facilities, ECHO360 personal capture technology will still require individual staff to run that system.

Q7. The use of the 'delegated authority' in the draft policy may lead to 'collusion' and 'impartiality' at Faculty level regarding live lecture recordings? How does the policy prevent this?

R7. This type of terminology 'collusion and impartiality' is not used and where possible the University will state who the delegated authority is as per the University's Delegations of Authority policy. In this case, the delegated authority is the Head of the School/Unit who is also the delegated approver of subject outlines. In an earlier version of the draft policy the person's position such as Head of School was used but somewhere in the policy it was changed to delegated authority. Sometimes the University make changes to a delegated authority if there are some changes occurring in the delegations levels. This is also to ensure that the University is not continually changing names in policies affected by changes to delegations.

The AQPS said she would revisit this in the draft policy and to ensure there is clarity and transparency.

Q8. Who would enforce the delegation of making decisions on live lecture recordings, is it the faculties?

R8. The Faculty approves subject delivery including the intended delivery of subject/s. The faculty has an internal quality assurance and approval process to ensure the information in the subject outline is delivered, including live lecture recordings, which is also communicated in the subject outline. There is scope for non-compliance so the University relies on student feedback, reviews, appeals and complaints as well as internal audit processes where the University audit the subject outline process.

Q9. There are some issues that the live lecture recording cuts off at the 55 minute mark and Academic staff are unaware of this. Will the policy change this?

R9. This might be an issue that won't change, however it has been flagged with IMTS. The recording is set at 55 minutes as the schedule allows for this time for transitioning to classes and lectures. Sometimes in the final 5 minutes of a lecture if it is still being recorded there might be other actions such as questions being asked or capturing other materials. This is being reviewed and it will be highlighted again and flagged with IMTS.

Q10. When will policy be fully implemented, will it be implemented for Spring Session 2020 or next year in Autumn Session 2021?

R10. There is the potential issue with the timeframe for implementation of the policy because the University is currently operating in a period of remote delivery which means that our lectures are not currently being held in the ECHO360 enabled venues. However, there is the intention to implement the policy from Spring Session 2020 onwards. Information has been released to the Faculties and provisions are already being implemented in subject outlines.

Q11. If the Head of Academic decides there is a compelling reason not to record the lecture, is there any scope for appeal under any other policies, or can only a complaint be made?

R11. An Academic staff member may offer a compelling reason why a lecture should not be recorded via ECHO360 and the Head of Academic unit may decide that reasons provided are compelling. You as a student in the subject may be made aware that the lectures may not be recorded on any given week and you wish to contest this. There will still be avenues through the ordinary complaint and appeal process where you feel that this will unfairly impact your progress

in your subject.

The Chair asked the SAC if there were any further comments or questions.

The AQPS thanked the SAC for providing the opportunity to present the draft policy and procedures.

RESOLVED 2020/11

that the Student Advisory Council note the proposed amendments to the Teaching and Assessment: Subject Delivery Policy (Lecture Recording policy provisions and the new Lecture Recording Procedures, to effect the introduction of an opt-out model for lecture recording at UOW.

***2.2 Update - Subject Outlines for Remote Delivery**

The Chair welcomed the Director, Academic Quality Standards (DAQS) to the meeting.

The DAQS thanked the SAC for the opportunity to talk about the Subject Outline approval process, as this is something that has been highlighted in the rapid transition to remote delivery due to COVID19.

The AQS is the policy custodian for the Teaching Assessment policy suite which includes policy for subject outline approvals. The Subject Delivery Policy sets out how to prepare and distribute subject outlines and that the University has a failsafe provision that in the event of a necessary late change to a Subject Outline there is an approval process. Essentially it is only deliverable in exceptional circumstances, must be signed off by a senior delegated authority and students are able to provide feedback.

What is known from the process this session is that the University opted to go into a two-week hiatus to allow the University to shift to online or remote delivery. It was the responsibility of subject coordinators to redesign the delivery of subjects intended for face-to-face delivery in Autumn Session 2020 and if necessary to change the assessment where that was likely to be impacted. At the time of making these changes, it was unknown how long remote delivery would continue.

What the University prioritised was communicating changes to students and the view was taken to maintain remote delivery to students so that they could move forward with the work they had already completed towards the subjects they were enrolled in until the end of the session and succeed in completing the subjects in which they were enrolled.

There were different approaches to the question on whether the physical or electronic subject outlines would be reissued with changes to subject delivery and assessment consistent with the policy. It was the University's understanding that some schools and academics reissued amended subject outlines while others relied on the information they sent out advising of changes.

Recently, the University sought feedback from students on how they were experiencing subjects and the transition to remote delivery and there were 9500 responses received. Students were asked whether they received clear communications on changes to subject delivery and the response was very positive. About 85% of students 'agreed' or 'strongly agreed' with this statement. What the University takes from this is that while there were challenges implementing very significant and rapid change to remote delivery most students received significant communications that were clear in terms of the changes.

In terms of looking for the future, the University wants to avoid another situation where students are having to dealing with change in an unexpected way so this is why the University made the decision

early to continue with remote delivery in Spring Session. There will be some exceptions where possible, where situations allow for on campus delivery.

From Spring session, the package of delivery of information around assessment, content and delivery should be fully embodied in the subject outline.

Q1. The process for current subject outlines is that any changes to subject outlines, the standard is to communicate any changes to the outline through normal channels ie Moodle and/or SOLS rather than the Subject Outline. Can students expect that from Spring Session 2020 all subject information will be made available on the subject outline?

R1. For Autumn session 2020 and unlike some institutions who switched to remote delivery almost overnight, the University took the decision to take time to switch to remote delivery. Some students at other institutions had chaotic experiences and as a result the University took the decision that as long as changes to subject outlines are communicated to students this was the key issue. In some cases this meant that some subject outlines were updated and some not.

In the future, later in 2021, the University is looking to move to an automated the process of Subject outlines by obtaining information from core systems that the university maintains. If automated process were in place now we would be in a situation where all subject outlines would have be updated.

Faculties and Subject coordinators were advised that Spring session 2020 Subject outlines should be fully updated and conveyed to students.

Q2. What other standards are in place for updating subject outlines? There are instances where subject outlines were updated and not properly edited; what are the approvable procedures?

R2. The normal practice in each Faculty for approving subject outlines is that there is a series of checks and the final review and formal approval is completed by the Head of School. What inevitably happened in some instances is that the processes for curating the information on subject outlines were accurate and some not due to the unprecedented and urgent situation. Some Faculties have system-based approval so essentially the information is checked into an IT system which is the model that the University is moving towards. The subject outlines information will be stored in the system and the benefit of this is that it eliminates the risk of errors arising.

Q3. When the system model is implemented how will the model deal with changes from subjects?

R3. A lot of the information of the subject will be hard coded and academics have the responsibility of checking the information in the Subject outline electronic workflow. For any variations there will be a mark-up functionality and will allow the editor to make the necessary changes and go through a workflow process. The AQS Unit will push out the subject outline as a compendium to the information about the subject and will have the benefit of going out to students sooner.

Q4. There has been quite a bit of student feedback regarding subject outlines being updated for remote delivery? Do you have an estimate on how many Subject outlines have not been updated for remote delivery? Are those Subject outlines from a particular faculty?

R4. The subject delivery survey whose key objective was to identify and fix any problems has now closed and it gave a good view of where there were particular issues. There were many subjects that that did not require change for remote delivery ie the assessment criteria remained the same so those circumstances must be taken into account. The pragmatic approach was to not have a strong insistence on changing Subject outlines. The University wants to look into the 15% of students who seem to have reported problems to identify if there are particular subjects, faculties etc to work on solutions.

There were no further questions received from the floor and the DAQS stated that if there were any further questions regarding Subject outlines process to provide the SRC with the questions and the DAQS would be happy to provide an answer.

The Chair thanked the DAQS for attending the SAC meeting.

RESOLVED 2020/12

that the Student Advisory Council note the update provided by the Director, Academic Quality & Standards for Subject Outline approvals, amendments for remote delivery.

***2.3 Nominations Vacant Positions - Student Services & Amenities Fee (SSAF) and Students as Partners (SaP) Working Parties**

The Chair advised the SAC that there are currently two vacant positions for an International student representative for the SSAF and SaP working parties respectively. The Chair called for nominations from the International student representatives. No nominations were received for the positions.

The UOW Pulse Student Director (UPSD) nominated for the international position on the SSAF working party however the MSSAF advised that the UPSD would automatically be a member of the working party.

The MSSAF advised that the International students currently on the SAC would be contacted in the first instance after the meeting to discuss possibly nomination.

Following the call for nominations the Deputy Chair proposed that the SSAF, SaP and Activation working parties would hold their first meeting the week beginning 13th July 2020 following the examination period. There were no objections to this proposal.

RESOLVED 2020/13

that the Student Advisory Council:-

- i. note that there were no nominations received for the appointment of an International student representative for the Student Services and Amenities Fee (SSAF) and Student's as Partner's working parties and that the Student Representative Coordinator would contact the International representatives directly to discuss nominations; and*
- ii. agreed to schedule the first meeting for the Student Advisory Council (SAC), SSAF, SaP and Activation working parties for the week beginning 13th July 2020.*

***2.4 Student Representation Coordinator (SRC) Update**

The SRC asked the Chair if they could ask the SAC if there was a preference of when the first

scheduled meetings for the working parties to occur.

The Deputy Chair stated that the next SAC meeting is scheduled for the 21st July and it was hoped to get the working parties together before the meeting which would fall in the break between sessions and suggested the week of the 13th July. The Chair asked the SAC, does anyone have any objects to this week being selected to meet? There were no objections received from the SAC.

The Chair asked that the resolution be amended to include the details of the meeting schedule.

First Responder Training

It was proposed that the SAC conduct First Responder training which includes three parts:

- i. Dealing with Disclosures of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment
- ii. Bystander Intervention; and
- iii. Mental Health component

The SRC asked the SAC if they would like to provide content and/or scenarios for the Safe and Respectful Communities (SARC) team to base the Mental Health component on the requirements of SAC. The SRC also requested a timeframe in which to complete this training. The MSSAF proposed that the SAC complete the First Responder training of Disclosures and Bystander Intervention in the coming weeks and the Mental Health component would be prepared following the first two components.

Some members of the SAC also suggested that the Mental Health First Aid (MHFA) Training is also important around this time and some had undertaken the training. The Academic Senate and Law, Humanities & the Arts Undergraduate representative (ASLHAU) stated that UOW residences utilise the MHFA training and had undergone the training which was very helpful. Further, there may be existing agreements between UOW and this entity for training packages that may reduce costs. The Shoalhaven campus representative (SC) agree that the sooner some basic training was received the better.

The SRC asked the SAC if they have anything they would like included in the Mental Health training, they can provide information or scenarios to the SRC to assist the SARC team to address.

The Deputy Chair commented that the First Responder including the mental health training before the end of session.

Communication Network Plan

The SRC confirmed that they were meeting with all SAC representatives regarding their experiences as a student representative so far and to discuss interactions with their key stakeholders such as Faculties, Campus Managers, UOW wide units. The SRC acknowledged that there have been additional challenges for the SAC due to COVID-19 and hence the importance of engagement and communication with student peers, faculties and key stakeholders. The feedback from the SAC will help plan how the SRC will support and facilitate ongoing communication and engagement for the SAC.

Next SAC Meeting

The SRC confirmed with SAC that the next meeting will be held on 21 July 2020 approximately

9 weeks from this meeting.

Contact Details

The SRC advised that the SAC Executive would like to communicate directly with the SAC representatives. Student representatives are asked to provide permission to share their personal contact number and/or UOWmail username on Moodle to the SAC and SAC Executive to improve and facilitate communication channels between SAC representatives and with the SAC executive.

The MSSAF asked the Chair to note that there is another option where a shorter version of the First Responder and Mental Health training can be conducted and then deliver something more comprehensive at a later date. The MSSAF acknowledged that this might be the preferred option as changes to subject assessments and the requirement to attend make-up seminars in the university midyear break would mean students have lesser time. A communication will go out from the SRC following this meeting.

The Chair agreed that the above option may be the way to proceed.

RESOLVED 2020/14

that the Student Advisory Council note the verbal update by the Student Representation Coordinator

PART 3: OTHER BUSINESS

***3.1 Other Business**

The Chair raised with the SAC that they may have seen emails and other communications regarding the UOW Pulse Student Advisory Committee and distinguished that there is the Student Advisory Committee and that this is different to the Student Advisory Council. The SAC Executive will arrange to meet with the UOW Pulse Student Director to discuss and seek clarification on the branding of UOW Pulse SAC and UOW SAC and an update provided at the next meeting on 21st July 2020.

2020-2025 Strategic Plan - Draft Education Strategy

The Strategic Planning Unit (SPU) are seeking feedback from the SAC regarding the Draft Education Strategy that supports Goal One of the Strategic Plan **Empowering Students for their Future**. Members of SAC are being asked to consider the Draft 2020-2025 Education Strategy and provide feedback prior to the draft being submitted to Academic Senate and the University Council. There will be more details to follow.

Scholarship Offering at UOW

The Chair handed over to the Social Science International (SSI) Representative regarding the creation of more scholarship opportunities for International students within the Faculty of Social Science. There are three out of the four schools within the Faculty of Social Sciences impacted by criteria for eligibility of the UOW scholarships and would really like to know more about the scholarships offerings and more accessibility for all international students. The SSI asked for

advice on how to take this forward at the University. The Chair agree that the SAC could invite a stakeholder to provide information on Scholarship offerings at UOW. The SSI agreed that this would be good option.

The Deputy Chair would also like to seek clarification and discuss the possibility of an increase in scholarships available to all domestic students based on merit alone not on an equity basis alone.

The MSSAF asked the Chair if they could speak to the scholarship offerings and stated that there different factors between International and Domestic scholarships. The MSSAF suggested that the Office of Advancement be asked to present to the SAC about the scholarship suite, in addition that the Recruitment Unit is also a stakeholder in scholarships at UOW who may also like to present.

Additionally, the Bega campus representative would also like to have more regional scholarships for students not eligible for Austudy.

The Chair has invited a presentation regarding the UOW Scholarships program at the next available SAC Meeting.

The University Council Postgraduate representative (UCP) asked if students are not paying the Student Services and Amenities fee for this year should students expect SAFF related services being reduced or cancelled.

The MSSAF thanked the UCP representative and stated that SAF was not charged in Autumn Session 2020 and there are now discussions on the charges for the future. The University is in deficit with SAF this year, those student core services considered essential will continue to run for 2020 and the expectation for 2021 is that the University will need to revise what the anticipated income will be what the costs are for this year. The University traditionally try to expense SAF on an annual basis as there are not a lot of reserve funds. The MSSAF is hoping to have a paper to executive in second half of year regarding the allocations, amount of funds, and will then push out communications to students. The SSFAF working group will continue as there is still a requirement to provide consultation and receive feedback as a part of overall recommendations.

Part of SAF requires formal consultation however due to COVID19 and the University not charging students SAF, approval will be sought from University Council on how to conduct consultation and allocation for 2021. The university would be working from a point of deficit, so the University would like to ensure student money is spent appropriately and where it will offer the greatest benefit.

No other business was raised.

***3.2 Schedule of meetings**

The next scheduled meeting will be held on Tuesday, 21st July 2020 via Webex at 9:30am.

***3.3 Rolling Agenda Schedule**

The draft Rolling Agenda schedule will be finalised before the next meeting in July 2020.

Signed as a true record:

.....

Chair, Student Advisory Council

Draft Resolution 2020/XX

- a. *that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 19th May 2020, be confirmed and signed as a true record.*
-

<i>Drafted by:</i>	<i>Reviewed by:</i>	<i>Approved by:</i>
<i>Student Representation Coordinator, Student Services Division</i>	<i>Manager, Student Services & Amenities Fee & Student Projects</i>	<i>Chair, Student Advisory Council</i>
<i>Student Advisory Council 19th May 2020</i>		

