

CONFIRMED

**THE UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE
ACADEMIC BOARD**

TEACHING AND LEARNING QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE

MEETING 7/06

A meeting of the Teaching and Learning Quality Assurance Committee (TALQAC) was held at 2.15pm on Thursday 10 August 2006 in the Jim Potter Conference Room, Old Physics Building, The University of Melbourne, Parkville.

MINUTES

PRESENT

Committee Members

Professor L Sterling (Chair), Professor P McPhee, Mr P Fijn, Associate Professor P Bhalla , Ms J Giles, Mr P Beilby, Mr A Williams, Mr H Fong, Professor L Skene, Professor T Goodwin, Professor R James, Mr D Rizzetti, Professor P Pattison, Associate Professor J Lye, Professor A Jackson, and Associate Professor P Tregloan.

Observers

None

In Attendance

Associate Professor M Guillemin, Ms S Leigh for Item 6.3 and Ms K Menezes (Committee Secretary)

BUSINESS

1. Formal Matters

1.1 Welcome to new members

The Chair welcomed Associate Professor Guillemin, School of Population Health, who was shadowing Professor Pattison, Vice-President of the Academic Board, as part of the Headstart Program.

1.2 Membership

There was no discussion under this item.

1.3 Apologies

The Committee received apologies from Professor A Moffat, Professor J Borland, Associate Professor L Hawthorne, Associate Professor S Baker, Professor H Jackson, Ms D Harrison and Associate Professor J George.

2 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The Minutes of the previous meeting were confirmed as a true record of the meeting subject to the addition of '...the Working Group has agreed to investigate whether to allow it in separate venues.' This is in relation to concurrent two and three hour exams.

3 Matters Arising from the Minutes

3.1 Action Sheet

Items 1- 3, 5, 6 and 8 were discussed as Agenda items. Item 4, the Memo to Mr. Brett, Manager of the Disability Liaison Unit, has been deferred to September and Item 7, the University Planning Office Report is due over September/October.

4 Other Committees

4.1 Academic Programs Committee (APC)

In the absence of the Chair, Professor Sterling reported that there had been discussion on the pre-requisites for the new degrees as well as the Guaranteed Pathways Paper. For a guaranteed CSP place in the Juris Doctor Program, an Enter Score of 99.9 with an H2A average at the UG level and for a full fee place an enter score of 99.0 with an average of H2A in the UG program will be required.

4.2 Teaching and Learning (Multimedia and Educational Technologies) Committee (TaLMET)

The following points were discussed under this item:

- Approximately 600 subjects are being delivered through the LMS involving close to 20,000 students. The target for Semester I 2007 is 1800 subjects, engaging approximately 30,000 students
- Faculty online co-ordinators have been invited to a Forum hosted by TaLMET to discuss issues such as nomination of subjects, time lines and other operational issues in relation to the LMS implementation plan for 2007
- In response to Professor Pattison's query, Ms Leigh reported that the formal assessment facility in LMS will only be available in mid 2007 with the move to Blackboard 7
- Expressions of interest submitted for Faculty funded projects are being discussed by the working group and results will be announced at the September meeting of TaLMET
- Mr Som Naidu was commended on the excellent work done with the Faculty interview material in relation to the TaLMET Evaluation Strategy and this will be made available to TaLMET and TALQAC as soon as it is ready
- Webraft will operate till 2007 and then be withdrawn as staff will need to migrate to LMS. Maintenance of Webraft is a high risk strategy due to its poor disaster recovery facility and unreliability

4.3 Melbourne Experience Committee (MEC)

Professor McPhee reported that at the July meeting, MEC endorsed the Eastern Precinct Learning Hub Project Brief which was then presented to the Infrastructure Committee.

The Eastern Precinct Learning Hub, which takes in the ERC, Tate and external Plaza area, seeks to be a major attraction and focal point for students and aims to meet their learning and social needs. Commercial facilities as well as informal relaxation and meeting spaces will be available to students. As the Learning Hub is expected to attract large numbers of students, it is an opportunity to locate services of value to a wide range of students within close proximity. Professor McPhee noted that the University is sensitive to the needs of current users of all three areas.

4.4 Undergraduate Degree Working Group

Professor McPhee reported that the Working Group was considering the first draft of the final report of the Curriculum Commission. The next significant issue is consideration of the best arrangement for overarching responsibility of the undergraduate degrees to ensure that students are receiving consistent high quality advice. The Board of Undergraduate Studies (BUGS) is to examine this issue to see if a College type body is appropriate. The Heads and Deans have scheduled a one day conference which will look at the first draft of a paper and will make recommendations to PBC in September. This significant change where an undergraduate degree is no longer put up by a single Faculty also affects TALQAC which will need to liaise with BUGS to discuss Quality Assurance measures for courses and Faculties.

Professor McPhee commended the AWiL group on the quality of the *Aspirational Values or Practical Skills? Defining Graduate Attributes at the University of Melbourne*; Report of the Academic Women in Leadership Program July 2006. Associate Professor Guillemain commented that an important objective of the group in producing the Graduate Attributes had been to make them real for staff and students and to enable academic staff to use them in the design of curriculum including the degrees under the new Melbourne Model.

4.5 School of Enterprise Committee

Investigations are underway for aligning the evaluation of the School of Enterprise subjects with the University's evaluation processes. The School has been successful in using the Moodle Learning Management System, an open source alternative system to Blackboard

4.6 Student Reports

Mr. Williams reported that there were complaints of postgraduate coursework programs being essentially undergraduate programs with new codes. Professor Skene commented that this should be reported to the Postgraduate Programs Sub-Committee and will be brought to the attention of Academic Board. Student representatives suggested that through the audit of quality assurance measures performed during Course Reviews, TALQAC could ensure that Faculties regularly monitor the content of postgraduate courses. It was suggested that the QOTs could also assist with this QA process with the inclusion of a question on the appropriateness of the content of the course.

5 2006 Review Schedule

The Chair met with the Faculty of Architecture, Building and Planning (ABP) who were concerned about the workload associated with the standard review process. It was agreed to use ABP as a case study of issues to consider in moving to the new Melbourne Model.

Sue Sleep, from the Planning Office, will assist in the preparation of a report. Issues identified were:

- Transition between old and new degrees
- Internationalization. What can we say about the quality of international graduates for their own environment?
- Dealing with Professional Accreditations. (Course reviews could be better integrated with professional reviews)
- Integration issues such as common marking schemes, interpreting policies that the introduction of the Bachelor of Environments will highlight.

There will be a discussion of the 2007 review process later in 2006. In a reassessment of the Course Review process it was decided to approach Faculties that had been involved in the process. In 2003 the Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Music and Law Postgraduate Coursework Programs were reviewed as part of the annual cycle of teaching and learning quality assurance carried out by TALQAC. It was recommended that a memo be sent to the Deans of the Faculty of Science, Music and Law to ascertain:

- a) the benefits gained by the Faculties in participating in the review process
- b) ideas and initiatives from the Course Review which have fed into the new degrees
- c) advice that the Faculties can offer TALQAC for future reviews based on prior experience

6 Evaluation Cycle and Quality Measures

6.1 2007 Learning and Teaching Performance Fund (LTPF)

Professor James reported on the changes to the 2007 LTPF.

- The 2007 fund will reward universities for performance in four discipline areas namely:
 - Science, Computing, Engineering, Architecture and Agriculture
 - Business, Law and Economics
 - Humanities, Arts and Education
 - Health
- The new direction is beneficial for the system as the single award at the whole of institutional level is simplistic
- The new mode of fund distribution will enable the University to focus its efforts on areas that require improvement
- The University can spend the money received from the fund at its own discretion
- Another important change is the inclusion of full time employment and both full time and part time study as indicators of teaching and learning success in the 2007 performance measures
- In relation to the recommendation that the expert panel review results based on data with low response rates, Professor James commented there would probably be a threshold response rate which has implications for the University of Melbourne as the panel will have the ability to exclude an institution if the response rate is low. However this may be phased in with some notice given to institutions.

6.2 Australian Universities Quality Forum (AUQF)

Professor James reported that the conference centred on contemporary issues related to the QA role. Dr. Hamish Coates from ACER, addressed the growing interest worldwide

in the measurement of 'student engagement' as an important indicator of the success of university education. It is important to measure activities students are engaged in which are linked to student outcomes. This issue is currently of interest in the US and Ms Daroesman commented that the University Planning Office is looking into possible ways of bridging the gap here.

6.3 Academic Honesty

The Turnitin report was tabled at the meeting and the following discussion took place under this item:

- Six Faculties self selected to use Turnitin in the Pilot Program with another four departments experimenting with the software. Of the former group, the Faculty of Economics and Commerce and the Melbourne Law School were the heaviest users
- Turnitin is not used consistently across the University, with some Faculties/departments using the draft submission facility while others use it exclusively to submit the final assessment
- Given the current usage, a Special Single Campus Licence has been negotiated for 10,000 students at a cost of US \$10,300 with the option to top up if required
- In relation to the University website for Academic Honesty and Plagiarism <http://academichonesty.unimelb.edu.au/> Information Systems is willing to maintain this site but is looking to academic staff for leadership on direction and content
- In response to Professor Skene's comment that it would be worth examining staff reluctance to use Turnitin, Ms Leigh suggested that it may be beneficial to contact staff who had experimented with the software but decided against its use. Associate Professor Tregloan reiterated that the website designed as part of the joint Melbourne Monash Project on Academic Honesty was aimed at assisting academic staff with making accurate academic judgements in relation to plagiarism and the quality of the Originality Reports produced by software such as Turnitin
- Student representatives expressed concern that the off-site repository of Turnitin was in California under the jurisdiction of a foreign government which could legally access student work with the heavy encryption of the personal details of students no real deterrent
- The Committee reiterated the importance of creating a joint TaLMET, TALQAC and Information Systems Working Group to examine the integration of academic policy and operational issues in relation to software systems such as Turnitin

7 Working Groups

7.1 Faculty Assessment Practices

Associate Professor Lye reported that staff in the Faculty of Economics and Commerce had been interviewed and a number of issues raised:

- Large classes with a number of staff other than the Lecturer marking student papers
- The Faculty received over 1,000 applications for Special Consideration which was a concern. Professor Pattison recommended that the Faculty consult with Associate Professor Christine Brown who is chair of the Special Considerations Working Group
- It was suggested that the Examinations Working Group consider the issue of Alternative Exam Arrangements as University policy on this remains unclear
- Scheduled internet downtimes caused problems in subjects with large student numbers. Associate Professor Tregloan commented that the scheduled maintenance times are sent to Faculties in advance and are mostly conducted from 11:00 pm to

3:00 am. Mr Williams suggested that it might be useful to refer this matter to Professor Geoff Stevens, Chair of the Student Communications Working Group

7.2 Peer Review of Teaching

Funding has been received for a related activity for this working group. Further progress will be reported to TALQAC

7.3 Acquisition of Generic Skills

Funding has been received for a related activity for this working group. Further progress will be reported to TALQAC

7.4 Transition Programs and Course Advice

In the absence of the Chair, Professor Sterling tabled the TORs and reported that two more academic staff had been co-opted to the Working Group. The group will consider a phased implementation of its objectives in line with the new Melbourne Model and will continue to work beyond 2006.

7.5 Assessment Implementation Working Group

The Working Group has not met recently.

7.6 Examinations Working Group

Mr. Fijn reported on behalf of the Chair, that no errors in Exam Papers in Semester I 2006 have been reported. Professor Bhalla noted that first year students were unaware of the reading and exam start times as well as the writing tools required i.e. pen or pencil. There was also confusion as to what technology is allowed into the examination venue. Mr. Fijn commented that he would take these concerns back to the Examinations Working Group.

7.7 New Working Group

There was discussion of a name for this group which is to consist of TaLMET, TALQAC and Information Systems staff. One suggestion was **Support Technology for Academic Honesty and other QA Activities**. The formation of the TORs will give the working group the opportunity to finalise its name.

8 Other Business

There was no discussion under this item.

9 Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held from 2:15-4:15pm on Thursday 7 September 2006 in the Jim Potter Conference Room, Old Physics Building, University of Melbourne.

The meeting closed at 4:35 pm.

Chair: *R Sterling* 15th September, 2006