

THE UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE

TEACHING AND LEARNING QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE

Meeting 8/08 — 11 September 2008

The Minutes of Meeting 8/08 of Teaching and Learning Quality Assurance Committee held on Tuesday, 11 September 2008, at 2.15 pm in the Jim Potter Conference Room, Old Physics Building.

**PRESENT:** Professor Leslyanne Hawthorne (Chair)  
Professor Ron Slocombe  
Professor Pip Pattison  
Professor Ron Slocombe  
Professor Sue Elliott  
Professor Alistair Moffat  
Professor Gillian Wigglesworth  
Professor Camille Cameron  
Associate Professor Kim Watty  
Associate Professor Mary Wlodek  
Associate Professor Nick Haslam  
Ms Suzanne Daroesman  
Ms Judith Heron  
Mr Bill Jones  
Ms Sue Sleep  
Ms Tammi Jonas  
Ms Shaun Khoo  
Mr Paul Fijn

**Observers**

Ms Diana Harrison

**In Attendance**

Ms Leanne Fisher (Committee Secretary)

**1. FORMAL MATTERS**

**1.1 Apologies**

Professor Peter McPhee  
Professor Prem Bhella  
Professor Richard James  
Professor Richard Huggins  
Professor Lynn Meek  
Professor Ken Gelder  
Associate Professor Ray Misson  
Associate Professor Su Baker  
Associate Professor Steven Holloway  
Associate Professor Jenny George  
Associate Professor Marilys Guillemain

Dr Marion Campbell  
Dr Tony Weatherley  
Ms Onagh Bishop  
Ms Sarah Quek  
Mr Shaun Ewen

## 2. MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of Meeting 7/08 held on 14 August 2008, were confirmed subject to the following amendments:

- Minute 4.1            Matters from the Provost's Office**  
Page 3     Add "Learning" to "Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC).
- Minute 7.6            Quality of Teaching Survey Working Group (QoTSWG)**  
Page 7     First dot point replace the word "All ..." with "Many of the ...".

## 3. ACTION SHEET AND MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

- Minute 4.2            Academic Programs Management Committee (August Meeting)**  
It was noted that Academic Programs Management Committee has been replaced with the Melbourne Model Committee.
- Minute 4.5            Teaching and Learning Development Committee (July Meeting)**  
It was noted that a revised paper titled *Steering Committee on Integrating Language and Disciplinary Teaching* will be submitted to the October meeting of TaLDEC.

Professor Hawthorne advised that the University has been approached by the Canadian Government requesting information with regard to summaries and analysis for AUQA.

## 4. TALQAC EVALUATION PRIORITIES IN THE FORTHCOMING PERIOD

- 4.1     Finalisation of Course Evaluation Guidelines and Review Priorities to Address the Melbourne Model**  
This item was discussed under Item 4.3.
- 4.2     Factoring the AUQA 2010 Thematic Review of the University of Melbourne into TALQAC's Evaluation Planning and Timelines**  
This item was discussed under Item 4.3
- 4.3     Policy, Procedures and Processes to be Implemented to Ensure Quality of University of Melbourne Graduates**  
The Chair provided a briefing on the paper which had been distributed to members. The University is currently undertaking a broad programme of activities to reform University governance and management. Updating the University's accountability framework which sets out Melbourne's annual cycle of planning, budgeting, reporting and quality assurance has been part of this work.

The quality assurance component of the accountability framework sets out the broad policy and evaluation mechanism for ensuring high quality outcomes and fair and systematic processes.

Professor Sue Elliott advised that she is the responsible officer for the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) audit of the University which will take place in 2010. The University's report is required to be submitted by the end of 2009. AUQA has changed its focus in its second cycle of audits from processes to outcomes and standards. Criteria for this cycle require institutions to select two themes, together with related sub-themes, based on an institution's assessment of academic risk. have been identified for consideration as The suggested two themes for consideration are:

- Melbourne Model, with sub-themes including, for example,
  - new generation degrees
  - Internationalisation
  - student services and enrichment
  - breadth studies
- Research Training, with sub-themes including, for example,
  - supervision
  - internationalisation
  - quality of PhD graduates, student outcomes

Ms Sue Sleep spoke further to the paper, proposing that TALQAC has an important role in helping the University prepare for the AUQA audit. Some of the issues the Committee needs to consider further are:

- identifying the gaps that exist in Melbourne's QA and evaluation processes;
- articulating how the University can demonstrate that there is consistent application of academic policies and practices;
- identifying ways, and documenting how, the University can demonstrate that its graduates are of high or excellent quality;
- how to determine and demonstrate how graduate attributes are acquired;
- how can the University demonstrate that the goals of the Melbourne Model are being achieved;

In discussion the following points were made:

- there would be value in finding out across the University what professional accreditations are in place (national and international). Professor Elliott agreed to investigate further on the need for any central co-ordination of accreditation;
- the need to take a longer view of outcomes; how to measure acquisition of skills, and graduate outcomes over time;
- the need, if the University is measuring the quality of outcomes, to have validated external reference points. It is important for the University to re-develop a program of international benchmarking activities at discipline level to help provide evidence of standards and outcomes;
- there may be an opportunity for exchange of data and information with institutions participating in a conference of the Association of Pacific Rim Universities next March. Work undertaken as part of U21 fellowship awards could also provide further opportunities for collection and exchange of relevant data.

The Committee agreed to bring this item back to its October meeting to be discussed further.

#### **4.4 Discussion (Defining the Decisions to be Taken by TALQAC in October 2008)**

The following points were considered to be a priority focus for October:

- Highlight research training aspect.
- Distinguish professional courses from other courses.
- Conformity with professional bodies.

### **5. OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND OTHER COMMITTEES**

#### **5.1 Matters from the Provost's Office**

Professor Sue Elliott advised that a paper has been submitted to *Senior Executive* outlining responsibilities of Deans and Custodial Deans. This paper will be submitted to Council.

Faculties are being encouraged to collaborate to avoid duplication and competition, i.e. one course being shared across a number of Faculties instead of a number of versions of the same course in a number of Faculties.

#### **5.2 Academic Programs Management Committee**

It was noted that Academic Programs Management Committee has been replaced by the Melbourne Model Committee. There was no report on this item.

#### **5.3 Undergraduate Programs Committee (UGPC)**

Professor Ron Slocombe reported that UGPC was looking at the definition of a breadth subject in comparison with a University subject. A large number of programme proposals have been submitted through UGPC and PCPC. The Faculty of Arts has submitted a proposal for an extended programme for Indigenous students which has gained wide support.

#### **5.4 Postgraduate Coursework Programs Committee (PCPC)**

This item was discussed under Item 5.3.

#### **5.5 Teaching and Learning Development Committee (TaLDEC)**

Professor Pip Pattison provided a report and advised that the following matters were discussed:

- Steering Committee on Integrating Language and Disciplinary Teaching  
An Advisory Group will be established, and will report to the Provost through TaLDEC, to monitor English language pathways and programs and to offer advice to the University on these issues.
- Australian Higher Education Graduation Statement  
A Working Group will be established to examine the implications of the development and implementation of the initiative.
- Evaluation Strategy Working Group  
A report from Professor Peter Tregloan on the evaluation of the impact of ICT on teaching and learning programmes at the University was submitted.

- Turnitin

A report was provided to on Turnitin, which is used by a number of Departments and Faculties to monitor the use of the 'third party' content in submitted work.

With the integration of Turnitin into LMS, statistics are recorded within Turnitin, but it is now in a form that is not as useful to the University for analysis. It is not possible to breakdown data by Department/Faculty/staff. There are no resources to manually obtain the data. TaLDEC has requested further information about SafeSubmit and TaLDEC will discuss this further in addition to academic honesty policy.

## **5.6 Policy and Procedures Working Group (PPWG)**

Professor Pip Pattison advised that a number of draft policies were being considered by the Working Group:

- Special Consideration and Extensions.
- A new policy on handling student grievances.
- Consideration of what should be included on academic transcripts and graduation certificates.

## **5.7 Reports from Student Representatives**

The Chair advised the Committee that the student representation on the various Panels is outstanding.

Mr Shaun Khoo raised a number of matters:

- He had been approached by a student who expressed concern at the large waiting time in order to see a Student Adviser.

## **6. EMERGING INNOVATIONS**

There was nothing to report under this item.

## **7. EVALUATION CYCLE**

### **7.1 Evaluation Cycle**

#### **(a) Melbourne Experience Survey (MES) 2007**

Ms Suzanne Daroesman provided an overview on the MES. The MES was developed to help the University evaluate students' experiences over the period of transition into and during the introduction of the Melbourne Model, with particular emphasis on student perceptions of the quality of their course, support services and the social dimensions of the University experience.

As measured by the MES, usage of services by students appear to be modest, with only two areas reporting use by more than one-third of students either online or in person over the previous 12 months. Overall the report was positive.

The results need to be seen in the context of the changing needs of students over time. More students are spending time in paid work and appear to be less present on campus.

There has also been a lot of technological change in the past few years, and development of web-based services which have changed the way students access a range of services and administrative processes.

**(b) Student Feedback on the Quality of Teaching**

Mr Bill Jones provided the Committee with an overview. The Quality of Teaching results show that there were no significant changes in students' perceptions of their subjects compared to the previous semester or with the longer term trend that students continue to be satisfied with most, but not all aspects of their subjects.

Approximately three-quarters of students are satisfied overall with the quality of the learning experience in their subjects, but some areas of concern identified by previous surveys continue to persist. These include students' perception of the feedback they receive on their progress, their learning community, the use of ICT in their subjects, subjects which are frequently rated low, and Faculties which have outcomes persistently below the University mean.

Mr Jones drew the Committee's attention to Attachment 1 — Report on Low Scoring Subjects. Analysis of undergraduate subjects identified four factors associated with an increased likelihood of a subject receiving a low rating on Question 2 (well taught). These factors include: discipline (using faculty as a proxy), subject size, year level, and response rate. The findings again emphasised the need to take into account a range of factors in the interpretation and application of QoT survey results. Discussion ensued on the impact of Lectopia on lecture attendance and the effect this may have their perceptions of their learning community and satisfaction with their subjects.

The Committee agreed that this item should be included on the Agenda for its October meeting for further discussion.

**7.2 Quality Measures**

There was nothing to report under this item.

**8. WORKING GROUPS**

**8.1 Course Evaluation Strategy and Design Working Group**

There was nothing to report under this item as yet.

**8.2 ABP Review Group**

There was nothing to report under this item as yet.

**8.3 Dental Science Review Group**

There was nothing to report under this item as yet.

**8.4 VCA Review Group**

There was nothing to report under this item as yet.

**8.5 Engineering Review Group**

There was nothing to report under this item as yet.

**8.6 Quality of Teaching Survey Working Group (QoTSWG)**

There was nothing to report under this item.

**8.7 Examinations Working Group (EWG)**

There was nothing to report under this item.

**8.8 TALQAC/TALDEC Working Group on Support Technology for Academic Honesty and Other QA/IT Activities**

There was nothing to report under this item.

**9. FOR INFORMATION**

There was nothing to report on this item.

**10. OTHER BUSINESS**

There was nothing to report on this item.

**11. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Teaching and Learning Quality Assurance Committee will be held on **Thursday, 9 October 2008**, at 2.15 pm in the Jim Potter Conference Room, Old Physics Building.