A meeting of the Academic Senate will be held at 9.30am Thursday 12 December 2013 in the Senate Room, Level 3, Lincoln Building.

★ This symbol indicates items that have been starred for discussion at the meeting.

Members are requested to notify the Chair of Academic Senate, Professor Dominic Verity, of any additional items which they wish to have starred, and the reason for seeking discussion of those items.

Members who are unable to attend the meeting are requested to send their apologies to Ms Amanda Phelps, University Committee Secretary (phone. 61 2 9850 7316 or e-mail senate@mq.edu.au).
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Faculty of Science Results Report to Academic Senate for Session 2, 2013

Process

All marks are collated and assigned by unit convenors. Standardised Numerical Grades SNGs and final grades are based on these marks in accordance with University policy (particularly the assessment and examination policies).

The SNGs and grades are presented to Departmental Examination meetings. These were held in the period 2\textsuperscript{nd} December to 3\textsuperscript{rd} December. After review and approval at the Departmental meetings the results were forwarded to Science FSQC, which met on December 4\textsuperscript{th}. At FSQC unit result distributions and convenor reports were considered. All unit results considered were recommended by FSQC at that meeting to Faculty Board. The Faculty Board met on December 5\textsuperscript{th}. At that meeting the results were discussed and approved.

Further information has been requested from the relevant Departments. Given the time scale not all this information has been received by this date. As is the normal procedure all such requests will be followed up and the results reported to FSQC.

General Issues

Student engagement remains a pressing issue. Problems with student engagement was highlighted in many convenor reports, across departments. It appears that this is having a significant detrimental effect on student results, with many convenors noting that lack of engagement was often correlated with poor performance. Lack of engagement being considered to correlate with lack of submission of assessment items, including assignments, weekly assessment (where the latter are employed) and failure to attend the final examination (FA). The FA results in some units significantly outweighed the F results.

While no disruptions occurred in the conduct of the final examinations or the processing of the results the short time available and the resulting load on staff involved should be noted. This also limits the oversight and review that can under taken in this period.

There were some issues noted with staff understanding of moderation of results by staff other than those involved in the unit. The Faculty plans to initiate a discussion around moderation, assurance of standards and related issues in the New Year.
For two departments the results reports, showing each individual student result had the final signature entry labelled as ‘Head of Sci’ implying the need for Executive Dean signature on the result for each unit. For all other departments this entry is obviously meant for the Head of Department (e.g. Head of Biol, Head of Eng). We are following up on this discrepancy.

Comments on Individual Departments

**Biological Sciences**

- **BBE100** This unit had a fail rate of 32%, following from 2012 (27%) and 2011 (31%). FSQC considered that this fail rate was not adequately addressed in the convenor’s report. The committee requested more discussion of this fail rate and indication of what steps will be taken in the future to reduce it. The fail rate is particularly high for a planet unit.

- **BIOL392** This unit has a high number of incompletes (5 students out of 10). This was not addressed in the convenor’s report. FSQC requested an explanation of why there is such a high level of incompletes and a forecast of when the marks will be finalised.

- **BIOL706** FSQC considered that the following quote from the convenor’s report be noted to the Board and taken into account in any evaluation of the MRes Year 1. “The MRes students need to be challenged by the higher level material. My general reflection on the year 1 MRes is that they still approach it like an undergraduate degree. They do what they are told to do rather than owning their own scholarship.”

**Chemistry and Biomolecular Sciences**

FSQC observed that a majority of the non-planet 100- and 200-level units had high fail rates, as noted below. Rather than requesting individual information from each convenor this was referred to the Faculty Board for further discussion.

- **CBMS101** The fail rate in this unit was 27% with an enrolment of 52 students. This is an external offering of the unit and the convenor’s report states that repeating students have difficulties succeeding with this mode of delivery.

- **CBMS103** The fail rate in this unit was 24% with an enrolment of 354 students. The convenor’s report notes poor time management and a high dropout rate as significant issues.

- **CBMS123** FSQC noted the issues raised by some students in regards to Certainty Based Marking and requested more information from the department on how it will ensure that students are adequately prepared for this approach to assessment.

- **CBMS208** The fail rate in this unit was 41% with an enrolment of 39 students. While this represents only 16 students FSQC considered this fail rate high for a 200-level unit.

- **CBMS215** The fail rate in this unit was 41% with an enrolment of 54 students. While this represents only 22 students FSQC considered this fail rate high for a 200-level unit.
• **CBMS303** The fail rate in this unit was 28% with an enrolment of 39 students. While this represents only 11 students the committee considers this fail rate high for a 300-level unit.

**Chiropractic**

Some units, particularly CHIR114 and CHIR214 noted higher than usual fail rates (although not particularly high by comparison across the Faculty) and increased student anxiety.

• **CHIR311** The convenor report includes the following statement: “The students find the workload in this unit challenging. The above average workload is the result of the unit’s requirements to integrate technique, research methods, neuro-science and biomechanics streams.” The department was reminded that all units have a fixed workload based on their credit points. FSQC requested a report from the department as to whether this unit currently has a higher workload than indicated by its credit points and, if so, what steps will be taken to remedy this.

• **CHIR897** This unit has a high number of incompletes (37 out of 107 students. FSQC requested a forecast from the department as to when these grades will be finalised and an assurance that the extra time given to these students will not disadvantage other students.

**Computing**

FSQC observed high fail levels across multiple units in this department. Rather than recommending individual action on each unit FSQC considered the upcoming review of this department and recommended that these issues be given full consideration as part of that review. It should be noted that the units involved include both 100-level required units offered in s2 (COMP125, ISYS114) and other central units (COMP229, COMP255, ISYS224).

• **COMP125** The fail rate was 34% which compares to 32% (2012) and 45% (2011). The ability of COMP115 to prepare students for COMP125 appears questionable. To quote from the convenors report “out of 42 students with just a P (in COMP115), 29 failed and 13 passed COMP125” and “We had more than 60 students who dropped in the first few weeks. Most of them were students who had just done COMP115 and overwhelmingly, those students received no more than a Pass”.

• **COMP229** The fail rate in this unit was 20% with an enrolment of 138 students. The convenor’s report states that no changes are planned in this unit.

• **COMP255** The fail rate in this unit was 20% with an enrolment of 163 students. The convenor’s report states that no changes are planned in this unit beyond a possible change in textbook and length of lectures.

• **COMP329** The fail rate in this unit was 27% with an enrolment of 37 students. Even though this is only 10 students failing FSQC considered this high for a 300-level unit. In the convenor’s report the only change proposed is introducing the programming language used earlier in semester.
• **COMP332** The fail rate in this unit was 20% with an enrolment of 40 students. Even though this is only 8 students failing FSQC considered this high for a 300-level unit. The committee noted the future plans mentioned in the convenors report.

• **COMP350** The unit had only one student enrolled (It is a special topic unit). That student had a cognitive disorder and it appears that the convenor had to spend considerable time to accommodate the student’s need. FSQC requested clarification of the interaction between the department and Campus Wellbeing and Support in meeting the needs of this student.

• **COMP793,794,795** No convenor’s reports were received for these units. FSQC recognised that these are shell units, and the students enrolled in each one may not have even being studying the same material, a report (even a nominal one) is still required. The department was requested to submit these.

• **ISYS100** FSQC noted the high level of high distinction and distinction grades (10% and 21% respectively out of 714 students enrolled). FSQC requested a report from the Department as to what process it follows to ensure that appropriate standards are applied in this unit.

• **ISYS114** The fail rate in this unit was 27% with an enrolment of 384 students. The convenor’s report recommends adding 1 hour tutorials each week.

• **ISYS224** The fail rate in this unit was 25% with an enrolment of 203 students. The convenor’s report recommends reconsidering the placement of material in this unit and its corresponding 300-level unit (ISYS326).

• **ISYS301** FSQC noted the high level distinction grades (4% HD, 27% D, 36% Cr and 22% P with 117 students enrolled). It also noted that this does not compare well with the incoming GPA of students (7%>= 3.5, 9%>= 3 21%>= 2.5). FSQC requested a report from the Department as to what process it followed to ensure that appropriate standards are applied in this unit.

**Earth and Planetary Sciences**

No convenor’s reports was received for many units from this Department (GEOS384, all 700- and 800-level units). FSQC requested that these be supplied. FSQC also noted many incomplete results in the 700-level units and requested a forecast for when these will be resolved.

• **GEOS125** The fail rate in this unit was 25% with an enrolment of 131 students. FSQC requested more detail on the steps to be taken to address this. While FSQC noted the convenor comments about lack of student enthusiasm and engagement, it recommends that changes to the unit consider how to improve this situation.

• **GEOS207** The fail rate in this unit was 25% with an enrolment of 51 students. While this only represents 13 students, FSQC considered this high for a 200-level unit. The committee recommends that the department reconsider the decision to make no changes to the 2014 offering and report back.

• **GEOS305 and GEOS345.** FSQC noted an apparent discrepancy between the awarding of High Distinction grades in these two geophysics units. GEOS305 has awarded no HDs in its last two offerings (total 55 students) while GEOS345 has awarded six HDs in its last three offerings (total 34 students). There was no offering of GEOS305 in
2012. The committee requests a report from the Department as to what process it follows to ensure that consistent standards are applied across these units. While noting that the units do share a convenor there appears to be little or no outside moderation of the marks beyond the departmental marks meeting.

**Engineering**

- **ELEC343** The fail rate in this unit was 20% with an enrolment of 40 students. Even though this is only 8 students failing FSQC considered this high for a 300-level unit. FSQC requested that the department report on what steps will be taken in the future to reduce it.

**Environment and Geography**

- **ENV200** The convenor report states that the fail rate is 18% but the accompanying graph shows it as 10%. FSQC requested clarification of this discrepancy from the department including, if the marks were adjusted to obtain the final grade, what steps were taken to ensure grades were awarded in line with the published standards for the unit.
- **ENV267** The convenor report states that final exam results were scaled. FSQC requested a statement from the department of what process was followed to ensure grades were awarded in line with the published standards for the unit, especially as there was no moderation of marks for this unit.
- **ENVE214** FSQC noted the high percentage of distinction and credit grades (24% and 34% respectively) compared to the incoming GPA (14%\(\geq\)3.5, 10%\(\geq\)3). FSQC requested that the department advise when the next review is scheduled for this unit and recommended that the standards being applied be particularly examined in that review.
- **ENVE301** FSQC noted the high fail rate (35% or 6 out of 17 students). It also noted the convenor comments “numeracy and computing illiteracy of the students” and “this cohort were the worst that I have taught in 15 years”. The committee requests that the Department provide a statement on the adequacy of the pre-requisites of this unit and any further information it wishes to give on future plans for this unit.
- **ENVG601** No convenor report was supplied. Even though only one student was enrolled a report is still required and the department was requested to supply one.
- **GSE816** No HDs have been awarded in the unit over the last three offerings (total enrolment in that time is 44 students). This appears unusually low for a postgraduate unit. FSQC requested a report from the Department as to what process it follows to ensure that appropriate standards are applied in this unit.
- **GSE828** This unit has awarded one HD over the last three offerings (total enrolment in that time is 45 students). This appears unusually low for a postgraduate unit. The committee requests a report from the Department as to what process it follows to ensure that appropriate standards are applied in this unit.
Mathematics

While many units (as given below) have fail rates above what would be desirable it is noted that the fail rates for most are below those from session 2 2012 and this follows on from changes the department has made to these units. As such FSQC considered that no further information was required for most units and encourages the department to continue with its development of these units. The fail rates for this semester and session 2 2012 are noted below for information. It encourages the department to adopt the change noted for MATH136, as its fail rate has not improved. MATH236 is an exception, as noted below.

- **DMTH137** s2 2013 Fail: 28% (enrolment 240) s2 2012 Fail: 39% (enrolment 222)
- **MATH130** s2 2013 Fail: 23% (enrolment 110) s2 2012 Fail: 43% (enrolment 91)
- **MATH135** s2 2013 Fail: 37% (enrolment 121) s2 2012 Fail: 44% (enrolment 94)
- **MATH136** s2 2013 Fail: 23% (enrolment 145) s2 2012 Fail: 21% (enrolment 87)
- **MATH236** s2 2013 Fail: 27% (enrolment 38) s2 2012 Fail: 31% (enrolment 23). The convenor’s report states that no changes are envisaged for this unit. While the fail rate has declined, the decline is minimal compared to other units and FSQC considered it to be still high for a 200-level unit. FSQC requested that the department rethink the status quo stance in regard to this unit and report back on what changes are envisaged.

Physics and Astronomy

- **ASTR178** 23% fail rate, 336 students enrolled. FSQC requested that the department supply more details on its plans to address the issues raised in regard to student engagement.
- **PHYS106** 21% fail rate, 29 students enrolled. FSQC noted the department’s plans for the unit and requests no further information at this time.
- **PHYS140** 28% fail rate, 185 students enrolled, down from 36% fail rate (188 students enrolled) in s2 2012. FSQC noted the department’s plans for the unit and requests no further information at this time.
- **PHYS159** The committee notes the high number of distinction grades (12 from the 30 students enrolled) and requests more information from the Department as to what process it follows to ensure that appropriate standards are applied in this unit.
- **PHYS202** This unit demonstrated a significant increase in fail rate. 36% in s2 2013 (22 students enrolled) compared to 20% (20 students enrolled) in s2 2012. While noting the low numbers involved FSQC considered this to be high for a 200-level unit. FSQC requested a response from the department as to whether the proposed change in assessment will be sufficient to address this issue.

Statistics

FSQC considered that a number of convenor reports from this department were too brief and has requested revised version to be resubmitted.
• **STAT170** Fail rate 30%, effectively unchanged from last two years equivalent offerings. While noting the planned changes for the unit the committee recommends that the Department consider broad consultation in future development of this unit and requests that the ADs L&T and Q&S liaise with the department.

• **STAT175** While the fail rate is not as high as STAT170 it is still higher than desirable at 21%. See comments for STAT170

• **STAT270** This unit has a high grade distribution (26% HD, 22% D, 26% CR, 22% P). While the committee notes the low enrolment (23 students) it requests more information from the Department as to what steps it has taken to ensure that adequate standards are applied in this unit.

• **STAT379** While the enrolment is low (35 students) the fail rate (23%) should have been addressed in the unit report. FSQC requested a revised convenor’s report, including what steps the department will take to address this fail rate in the context of a 300-level unit.

• **STAT825, STAT836** FSQC requested a forecast on when the incomplete grades for these units will be resolved and whether the time allowed for these students gives them an unfair advantage over those who have already submitted.

Prof Clive Baldock
Executive Dean of Science
9 Dec 2013
1. APOLOGIES AND WELCOME

The Chair welcomed Dr Nicole Anderson, who has been appointed Associate Dean of Learning and Teaching, Faculty of Arts. It was also noted that Dr Anderson would be on OSP from December 2013 to July 2014, and that Dr Trudy Ambler, Associate Dean of Quality and Standards – Faculty of Arts, would represent Dr Anderson at SLTC meetings during this time. A welcome was also extended to Ms Jayne Freeman, who has come on board as Manager - Quality and Compliance, A/Professor Maree Gosper, who attended the meeting in relation to
Item 5.3 Quality Assurance and Enhancement of iLearn and Mr Brad Windon, who attended in relation to Item 5.1.1 2014 Condensed Recognition of Prior Learning Policy and Schedules.

The Committee noted apologies Ms Deidre Anderson, Dr Ayse Bilgin, Dr Susan Page, Mr Benjamin Roe, Professor Nick Mansfield, Professor Judyth Sachs, A/Professor Max Tani and Ms Zoe Williams.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Committee RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 28 October 2013 as a true and accurate record, with the following corrections/additional clarification:

**Item 5.1.1 Recognition of Prior Learning Schedules**

In all cases, the student must complete a majority of the higher-level 300 level or above units of the award at Macquarie University. To ensure this, credit transfer for units at 300 level or above will only be permitted up to a maximum of 6 credit points (2 units).

**Item 5.1.3 Course Transfer Policy**

Ms Clark provided further clarification/information on the following bullet points:

*The following matter was to be progressed via CRIT. The Chair confirmed that this had been discussed by CRIT as part of Course Transfer Policy workshop:*

- Members suggested that students be required to select their major after the completion of at least 24 credit points, rather than from enrolment.

*The comment below in workload being able to handled by the student referred to whether a student was able to meet the learning outcomes:*

- Ms Clark suggested including a proviso that if a student is able to demonstrate to the relevant Program Director that the workload can be handled by the student, this should be taken into account in tandem with the student’s GPA. This channel would also require that academic advice is to be provided by the appropriate academic staff.

**Item 5.4 Senate Learning and Teaching Committee – Review of the Terms of Reference**

It had also been suggested that Alternates have voting rights.

**Item 5.6 – Re-defining Distance Education Online White Paper**

Mr Burrell clarified that the Attachment he had forwarded was in relation to Item 1.2 (Report from CoE)

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

From the meeting held on 25 November 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
<th>Comments/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Formulation of an English Language Proficiency Policy. Working Party to be set up in 2014.</td>
<td>Prof Young</td>
<td>Feb 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Formulation of a Students at Academic Risk Policy. The Chair suggested for</td>
<td>Prof Young/Associate Deans</td>
<td>Feb 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Associate Deans – Learning and Teaching to share their intelligence on Students at Academic Risk and, in liaison with other input/data gathered, SLTC would progress further discussions on student retention strategies.

Items in progress/pending from previous meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
<th>Comments/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Once the revised Terms of Reference of SLTC have been approved by</td>
<td>Ms Grewal</td>
<td>November/December 2013</td>
<td>In progress. Written status provided by A/Prof Solomonides at the SLTC meeting on 28 October 2013. A/Prof Solomonides provided further feedback at the meeting on 25 November 2013 that he is engaging student representatives on the Student Experience Committee and will report on further progress as required. In response to the Chair’s query, he also confirmed that he issues previously being addressed by the Online LEUs group (in particular response rates) would now be addressed by this Working Party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A Working Party to be set up to review the Student Feedback on Learning, Teaching and Curriculum Policy in conjunction with implementation of the recommendations that emerged from the Evaluation framework. The Provost, Professor Judyth Sachs would chair this Working Party. A/Prof Solomonides would confirm the composition of the Working Party and the time frame to finalise the review at the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee Working Party on Monday, 28 October 2013.</td>
<td>A/Prof Solomonides</td>
<td>October 2013</td>
<td>Written status provided by A/Prof Solomonides at the SLTC meeting on 28 October 2013. A/Prof Solomonides provided further feedback at the meeting on 25 November 2013 that he is engaging student representatives on the Student Experience Committee and will report on further progress as required. In response to the Chair’s query, he also confirmed that he issues previously being addressed by the Online LEUs group (in particular response rates) would now be addressed by this Working Party.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5. A/Professor Solomonides would present a report on issues identified in relation to the Learning Technologies Policy and Procedure discussed at the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee. | A/Prof Solomonides | October 2013 | In progress
Written status provided by A/Prof Solomonides at meeting on 28 October: Review work is being undertaken. A meeting of stakeholders took place on 15 October, including several iLearn Steering and SLTC Committee members. Meeting was chaired by A/Professor Gosper. A draft Policy and Procedure would be presented to SLTC when ready. |
<p>| 6. Development of expanded Academic Integrity Policy. Formation of working party, development of working paper and initial consultation. | Prof Verity | 2014 | A Chair had previously been identified and accepted the role, however has since had to withdraw. A Working Party will be formed in early 2014 and will be chaired by Prof Verity. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
<th>Comments/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Establish working party to discuss development of guidelines for supporting students part-way through a subject who become incarcerated (or otherwise unable to attend campus).</td>
<td>Ms Williams/ Mr Burrell/ Ms Freeman</td>
<td>Revised to early 2014</td>
<td>Mr Burrell provided an update that Continued Access Guidelines have been drafted, but not widely consulted yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The Provost requested that a paper on quality assurance in the iLearn implementation be compiled for review by this Committee in mid-2013.</td>
<td>A/Prof Solomonides</td>
<td>mid 2013</td>
<td>This was an Agenda item for discussion at the SLTC meeting on 25 November 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A Working Party to be formed to review the Examination Policy, with a view to determining whether closed book examinations remain valid, having regard to the international position on professional examinations.</td>
<td>Prof Verity</td>
<td>December 2013</td>
<td>Completed. Draft report considered and accepted by Academic Senate. Findings communicated to University Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It was agreed to endorse the proposed amendment to the calculation of student GPAs to be commensurate with the attainment of a High Distinction and also align it with most other Australian institutions. The Chair to investigate the practicalities of this change with the Deputy Registrar’s Office and report back to a future meeting of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee.</td>
<td>Prof Verity</td>
<td>Early 2014</td>
<td>In progress. Prof Verity provided an update that systemic legacy issues remain to resolved and that these would be investigated further in 2014 with the Deputy Registrar and Manager of Student Systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. On line provision of unit readers - refer the proposal to the Library Committee and seek a report at the end of the year on progress</td>
<td>Prof Young/ Ms Sparks/ Ms Vickery</td>
<td>November 2013</td>
<td>A report on this item is included in the Agenda for meeting of 25 November 2013 and the recommendation was carried. However, a longer-term solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Investigate a regulatory structure for MOOCs.</td>
<td>Prof Verity/ Prof Young/ Ms Freeman</td>
<td>Early 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Themes for Senate Learning and Teaching in 2014 Professor Young to draft a second theme statement and to consult on the co-option of members to represent these themes.</td>
<td>Prof Young</td>
<td>February 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Items completed/closed since last meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
<th>Comments/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. A paper on Teaching Evaluation for Development Services would be presented at a future Senate Learning and Teaching Committee meeting after consultation with Faculties.</td>
<td>A/Prof Solomonides</td>
<td>October 2013</td>
<td>A written update was provided by A/Prof Solomonides at the meeting of 28 October 2013:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Creation of a working Party to further refine the Policy document on Disruption to Studies and draw up a detailed operational plan.</td>
<td>Prof Verity</td>
<td>October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Peters would arrange for a further update later in the year, after more detailed work had been conducted on the implementation logistics of the Disruption to Studies Policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed. Discussion took place at the 28 October meeting and it was resolved to endorse in principle the removal of the satisfactory progress clause. This was approved by Academic Senate on 12 November and the policy, with this amendment, gained final approval at University Council on 5 December.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>A Working Party to be formed to formulate an Academic Integrity Policy, encompassing research issues. The draft to be presented to the Senate Learning and Teaching meeting scheduled for Monday, 25 November 2013.</td>
<td>Prof Verity/ A/Prof Young</td>
<td>November 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These issues have now been diverted to the Working Party tasked with the development of an expanded Academic Integrity Policy in line with the Discipline and Misconduct Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>A Working Party to be formed to review the Grading Policy and a draft presented to the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee at the meeting scheduled for Monday, 25 November 2013.</td>
<td>D Verity/S Young</td>
<td>November 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As a result of discussions regarding Closed/Open Book Examinations Working Party, it was agreed that Grading, Assessment, Final Examination and Unit Guide policies will be reviewed as a group in 2014. These policies now have the status of schedules to the General Coursework Rule as approved at University Council on 5 December.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>The Associate Deans to meet to agree steps on how to address gaps in the Grading Policy resulting from the abolition of the Pass Conceded (PC) Grade, which was agreed by the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee in 2010, but not subsequently actioned.</td>
<td>Associate Deans - Learning and Teaching</td>
<td>November 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Associate Deans to also discuss steps as to how outstanding cases in FBE are to be handled</td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This discussion (marks in the range of between 45-49 for a last unit) to be integrated into the review of the Grading Policy. It was flagged this as very important, due to the large number of international students it impacts. There have some suggestions of the reinstatement of a PC grade for first year students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. REPORTS

1.1 Chair’s Report

The Chair reported on the following matters:

- With the departure of the Pro Vice-Chancellor - Social Inclusion and the establishment of the Pro Vice-Chancellor - Learning and Teaching, a high level review of the portfolio had been undertaken by Professor Richard Henry (ex DVC A at UNSW) and a report with the recommendations prepared.

Some work is still underway in relation to the recommendations concerning the First Year Experience Unit (FYEU), before these can be implemented. Interim measures will be put in place to ensure academic orientation activities for Sessions 3 2013 and Session 1 2014 are undertaken appropriately and also to ensure that learning skills program maintains its usefulness and effectiveness.

The Chair noted that the Director of the FYEU had left the university.

In response to a query about the implementation timeframes the Henry Review, the Chair confirmed that the University Librarian, Ms Sparks is currently in the caretaker role. Ms Sparks added that it would be ensured existing services are maintained.

- As flagged at the last SLTC meeting, the CRIT II Committee had highlighted the need to conduct a workshop on the Internal Transfer Policy with key stakeholders and Student LifeCycle staff, in order to discuss principles and options further. This workshop was held in November and its conclusions, along with feedback given SLTC at the last meeting, have been used to inform the development of the main pillars upon which a Policy and Procedure will be founded. The headline philosophical elements of this position are:

  - **Students First**. It was agreed that:

    - Whatever internal policy framework emerges, it has to facilitate student aspirations in a realistic way, enable achievement of educational goals, and be easy to understand and implement.

    - Would probably require academic advice at a number of key points and that this needed to be provided efficiently and effectively.

    Transfers between majors must be made as simple as possible. Importantly, all transfer criteria should be based on demonstrated aptitude and ability to undertake the program of study being transferred to. Eligibility should be based upon specific competencies in the target discipline rather than general performance in the source discipline. This could involve performance in specified benchmark units rather than generic GPAs

  - **Unrestricted transfer to BA and BSc**. This would provide students with an “escape route” out of more proscribed degrees and would align well with the RPL policy. However, greater care needs to be taken with transfer into more rigid and highly structured degrees.

  - **Transfer and Load Planning**. Two principles were agreed:
Wherever possible, the practice of using appropriate transfer criteria to manage flows of student load should continue. The use of unit and program quotas should remain the exception rather than the rule.

Internal transfer criteria need not be aligned with entry requirements, such as high ATARs.

In summing up, the Chair mentioned that the guiding principles discussed would be drafted into a Policy, for consideration by SLTC at a future meeting.

Ms Clark asked whether it an unforeseen consequence of decoupling transfer criteria from factors related to entry ATARs would lead to a system that would devolve the role of load planning to individual academics. The Chair, in responding, explained that while ATARs would remain an important entry criterion it was clearly arguable that ATARs and aggregate GPAs were not, in themselves, strong predictors of future performance at University. Internal transfer decisions need to be informed by much more nuanced and contemporaneous measures of specific capabilities. So, for example, for an Advanced Science degree performance in specific Physics and Mathematics units is a much better indicator of a student’s academic potential than general GPAs or high school ATARs.

It was also suggested that this approach could be applied to HSc entrants, since demonstrated aptitude and ability in certain HSc subjects may be a better predictor of a student’s suitability for a particular course. A/Professor Donald added that an approach of this kind was being trialled this year for early offers and that it remains to be seen the quality of students it attracts.

The Chair of Academic Senate reiterated that one should not infer from discussion of transfer criteria that the University was any less than 100% committed to the ATAR as a gauge of a student’s suitability for entry. He pointed out that an ATAR of 95 or above was known to be a statistically strong predictor of future academic performance. However, it was also known that ATARs in the band between 60 and 90 were not strongly correlated to later academic performance at tertiary level. Consequently, it was his view that our subsequent internal transfer criteria should not be tied to a general measure such as the ATAR, which had not been designed for that purpose, and should instead be targeted mainly at such students’ specifically measured potential and aspirations.

Ms Clark also queried how well the University was equipped resources-wise to handle the processing of internal transfers. The Chair confirmed this had been discussed and there two schools of thought expressed, in that the process can be managed with either a simple quota or through the internal transfer utilising mechanisms, as has been the University practice in the past several years. The Chair further clarified that budgets are not necessarily Department-centric and that significant flexibilities existed at Faculty level which allowed Executive Deans to re-distribute resourcing to where it was needed. Moreover, the numbers of students seeking these internal transfers have not been huge and should be manageable.

In closing, the Chair remarked that many internal transfers would continue to be subject to rigid criteria, even if GPAs and ATAR related measures became less prevalent. There would, however, be more flexibility to accommodate students’
aspirations to pursue formal studies in disciplines in which they have demonstrated a compelling aptitude.

- The Chair informed the Committee that Policies need to be formulated in regards to English Language Proficiency and Students at Risk and work on these would commence in 2014.

1.2 Reports from the Faculties

Faculty of Arts

The Committee noted the report.

In highlighting the key points, Dr Anderson mentioned that piloting of block teaching of MAS212 Screen Production and MEC803 and in response to a query from the Chair confirmed that the duration of the first block for MAS212 would be 6 weeks. She also highlighted that the development Big History MOOC, development of video lecturing in Archaeology and Languages and a project to identify potential solutions to improve student engagement and retention.

Faculty of Business and Economics

The Committee noted the report.

A/Professor Wood mentioned that, Studio 750, a recording and broadcasting facility has been well received and has been consistently overbooked. The B/HERT Award for 2013 recently received by the PACE program was an immensely significant achievement, as there are only five awards given and the awards ceremony was a high profile event, attended by several Vice-Chancellors.

A/Professor Wood mentioned that the trialling of a block mode for 6 units in Session 3 was notable, one of these units being a Capstone unit, which involved a simulation task. Discussions were also taking place with the Deputy Registrar to run two blocks within a Session.

The Chair requested for learnings and experiences from this block mode trial be shared. The Chair of Senate commented that the information gathered could also help in facilitating Academic Senate discussions to review the semester structure, with a view to possibly lengthening the duration of Session 3 without shortening other recess periods. The semester structure was still under consideration by a Working Party of the Academic Senate and any intelligence gathered would be of help.

Faculty of Human Sciences

The Committee noted the report.

Dr Cavanagh touched on the Turning over a new LEAF (Learning Enhancement through Applied Feedback) pilot project to encourage students to engage in formative feedback in order to improve learning and instill these good practices in the first year of study. The success of the project will be evaluated and enhancements made. Dr Cavanagh also highlighted the Teaching Fellowship Program that came into being as a result of the Faculty Planning Day. The initiative would enhance teaching and help accreditation by sharing best practices, and especially the development of online learning material that can be shared
across multiple units. At the moment five academic staff in Education are collaborating in developing such online materials. The recipients of the 2014 Fellowships would be announced shortly.

Faculty of Science

The Committee noted the report.

A/Professor Donald outlined the Student Retention measures that were being effected, in coordination with colleagues from the Faculty of Arts, to investigate factors causing students to fail to complete 100 level Science units. She highlighted that it appears for many students, when issues arise, the Planet unit is first to be jettisoned. Professor Verity commented that failure in 100 level units is also an issue SLTC should look into strategies for improving student performance and make recommendations to ASQC. It appears that a significant number of students are not engaging in completing assignments for the first unit in their major. He suggested that focus groups could help to raise the level of awareness and engagement.

Professor Verity further elaborated that Academic Senate had requested SLTC to look Students at Academic Risk and this preliminary work will inform the Senate’s discussions. A/Professor Wood mentioned that the DVC (Students and Registrar) had also overseen the formation of a group to look at retention issues experienced in relation to international students. FBE had also drafted a Progression Policy. A/Professor Donald stated that the Faculty of Science had formulated a similar procedure outlining broad guidelines for staff to identify and help students at academic risk.

Ms McLean informed the Committee that student retention at Macquarie University was flagged as an issue in discussions with TEQSA and this has been noted. Student Retention data will need to be provided as part of the registration process.

Ms Clark suggested the University seriously consider encouraging more People and Planet units at 200 and 300 level rather than 100 level. Students at more advanced stages of their study will be better equipped to understand how the P&P units contribute to their 'breadth' of learning. At the moment, with the majority of P&P units at 100 level, there is a lot of anecdotal evidence that students are doing them early on in their studies, just 'to get them out of the way'. Given that P&P&P are such central parts of MQ curriculum, we should be very concerned about such a cavalier/instrumental approach.

The Chair suggested for Associate Deans – Learning and Teaching to share their intelligence on Students at Academic Risk and, in liaison with other input/data gathered, SLTC would progress further discussions on student retention strategies.

Action: Professor Young/Associate Deans – Learning and Teaching

A/Professor Donald also highlighted that the Faculty Human Sciences and Faculty of Sciences had been successful in gaining funding for a project, jointly with other universities and research institutions in Australia and USA, to deliver innovative resources to enhance the training of Mathematics and Science school teachers to inspire and motivate students through authentic inquiry-based learning.
GENERAL BUSINESS

5.1 Policies and Procedures

5.1.1 2014 Recognition of Prior Learning Policy and 2014 Recognition of Prior Learning Schedules

The Chair explained that the Recognition for Prior Learning Policy for 2015 had been approved by the Academic Senate at its meeting held on 1 October 2013. The approved RPL Policy will bring about significant change in the way the University assesses prior learning for admission and credit, especially with the introduction of the recognition of informal and non-formal learning. In particular the approved RPL Policy will replace and improve upon the current approach to applying Credit for Previous Studies (CPS).

The Chair of Academic Senate explained that the University was not in a position to implement all of this new policy in 2014 and that it therefore needed to introduce an interim RPL Policy to govern CPS and other RPL matters in 2014. This would, in particular, encompass the CPS provisions of and become a schedule to the new General Coursework Rule, which had been recommended to University Council for approval by Academic Senate on 12 November 2013.

An interim RPL Policy has now been drafted and was presented for approval by SLTC to support a phased implementation of the approved RPL Policy at the start of 2014. The draft RPL (Interim) Policy 2014 includes the following:

- Components of the approved RPL Policy which cannot be implemented in 2014 have been removed:
  - References to recognition of prior learning for ‘admission’;
  - References to the recognition of ‘informal’ and ‘non-formal’ learning
  - References to ‘block credit’;
  - References to ‘subject area’, ‘People, Planet and PACE’ designation (with the exception of Law designation which is possible in the CPS process);
  - References to the ‘Schedule of Minimum Requirements at Macquarie University’;

- Components of the current CPS process which will need to continue in 2015 have been added:
  - Reference to an ‘Interim Schedule of Maximum Credit Transfer 2014’;
  - Reference to an ‘Interim Schedule of Recognised Award Types 2014’;
  - Reference to an ‘Interim Schedule of Relative Equivalencies’;

- The ‘Appeals’ section has been retained, however this section is dependent on the approval and implementation of an Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure for 2014.

The Committee reviewed the Policy and the associated Interim Schedules. Ms Clark highlighted that in the Interim Schedule of Relative Equivalences 2014, reference needed to be made to exchange units under Schedule A: Credit Transfer at 300 level or above. Mr Windon, Manager LifeCycle – Student Administration, was asked to suggest the appropriate wording for this to be incorporated into the Schedule, prior to the review by UPRG and Academic Senate.
Subsequent to the meeting, Mr Windon’s suggestion has been incorporated as follows in the Schedule:

Approved exchange units for up to one half of program requirements at 300 level or above.

It was **RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND** to UPRG and then for approval by Academic Senate:

To formalise the current *Credit for Previous Studies* processes, and to ensure there is an active RPL Policy to which the 2014 General Coursework Rule can refer, it is recommended:

1. That the *Recognition of Prior Learning (Interim) Policy 2014*, the *Schedule of Maximum Credit Transfer*, the *Schedule of Recognised Award Types* and the *Schedule of Relative Equivalencies* be referred to UPRG for review.

2. That following the UPRG review, the Policy and Schedules referred to in (1) above be referred to Academic Senate for approval and implementation in January 2014.

5.2 Senate Learning and Teaching Committee – Revised Terms of Reference

The Chair of Academic Senate had not been in attendance at the meeting of SLTC held on the Monday the 28th October 2013, at which the Terms of Reference of the committee had been discussed. He made a number of points in regard to the amendments suggested at that meeting:

- From a procedural perspective, the review of the SLTC Terms of Reference was undertaken by a working party of Academic Senate. As such the proposed terms could not be amended by SLTC, even though its input had been very valuable.

- The current Terms of Reference of SLTC do not allow for the nomination of standing alternates, although it does allow for voting alternates to attend meeting on an ad-hoc basis. The Terms of Reference review had decided that it was not appropriate to give such alternates the right to vote. This voting right had been problematic in the past, since many alternates had not been well briefed before attending a meeting or had not been able to act with the full authority of the individual they replaced.

- The constitution and Term of Reference of the Academic Senate did not provide for voting alternates. Members of Academic Senate, whether ex-officio or not, were members of that body in their own right and were expected to exercise their Academic Governance responsibilities as members of the Academic Body rather than as representatives of sectional interests. It was Professor Verity’s view that membership of all Academic Senate Sub-Committees should observe the same principles that held at Academic Senate itself.

- It was suggested that having a provision for alternates in the revised Terms of Reference and extending full voting rights to alternate members would contribute to the quality assurance process. Professor Verity explained that the introduction of a class of members drawn from the membership of the Academic Senate was at least partly motivated by this concern. His view was that a quorum of 13 individuals was adequate to ensure robustness in SLTC’s decision making. Furthermore, if an individual/stakeholder wished to attend as an observer, this has always been facilitated.
• In response to the suggestion that certain co-opted members of SLTC should be made ex-officio, Professor Verity explained that it was important that a balance be maintained in all Academic Governance committees between ex-officio and other groups of members. He strongly commended the contributions of these particular co-opted individuals, and expressed the opinion that they should be re-appointed for the foreseeable future. However, he also explained that he was very reluctant for SLTC to become a majority ex-officio committee.

The Chair of SLTC emphasised that the structure and purpose of SLTC was very strongly skewed towards execution, in that it had the authority to approve L&T Procedures. While Policies are overarching documents it is with Procedures where the execution detail resides so the success of a Policy is highly reliant on the effectiveness of this detail. This makes it vital that all members are highly informed and remain engaged in discussions throughout the decision making process. The routine use of alternates would tend to pull against this imperative.

The Chair invited any further comments from Members prior to the conclusion of the discussion. No additional input was forthcoming and in closing the Chair confirmed that the revised Terms of Reference will be presented to Academic Senate for approval.

5.3 Quality Assurance and Enhancement of iLearn

A/Professor Gosper spoke to this paper and outlined that the discussion paper was developed based on a request from the Provost. A/Professor Gosper invited questions and solicited input in regards to any missing information and also suggestions for further enhancements.

A/Professor Gosper mentioned that the issues outlined had been identified previously and are ongoing. Information is consistently being picked up from individual stakeholders, however any additional consolidated input at Faculty level would be extremely useful. There has been a suggestion to have reviews of iLearn every six months as a more considered approach to enable more effective alignment and resource allocation.

Another issue is around the decision making, in that the boundaries of responsibilities and agency to making binding decisions at each level is lacking clarity between the iLearn Portfolio, the iLearn Steering Committee and MACALT.

A/Professor Solomonides raised the issue of limited resourcing to enhance iLearn and expressed that dedicated resources be allocated through operational budgets for routine maintenance and development, as well as support for innovation and development within the university and the broader open-source community (cf iLearn Evaluation Report). The Chair remarked that there is currently some work being done around the MACALT reporting line and in his personal opinion for iLearn Steering Committee to report to would be an effective measure for governance purposes, however resourcing is a larger strategic issue that would require to be addressed separately.

There was a discussion about using a "stick" approach to encourage faculty to use the new iShare system (rather than paper or other methods that do not support our compliance with copyright, etc) and Ms Sparks suggested the carrot and a "weaning onto the system" approach (kinder, gentler) for bringing faculty onto the new system was a better method at this stage. A few months after the system and procedures have been in place, we can revisit the statistics and measure our progress and then see if firmer measures are required.
A/Professor Solomonides mentioned that, although slightly orthogonal to the discussion, he felt some thought needed to be given to learning analytics in 2014, ie, were students engaging online, in class, are they completing quizzes and more specifically, how this information can be used.

It was proposed that the Chair of Academic Senate, Chair of SLTC and Director of the Learning and Teaching Centre discuss how the work that been undertaken thus far can be built upon.

**Action**: Professor Verity/Professor Young/A/Professor Solomonides

### 5.4 Provision of digitised Unit Readers

Ms Susan Vickery spoke to the paper and mentioned that it had been an interesting exercise in researching the issues concerning the provision of unit readers (course notes) in digital format. She outlined that limitations imposed by Australian copyright law under a statutory licence, as this licence contains a rule which prohibits the online distribution of more than 10% of one chapter of a book. Ms JoAnne Sparks further outlined that the current scanners don’t have the ‘OCR’ functionality, so even photocopying and scanning are not options. The machines installed at the inception of the new Library need to be upgraded in terms of the speed and it is hoped to have faster machines installed in the future to overcome some of the issues.

The Chair wondered if something could be done to enable more mobile friendly approach, which would encourage students to use the electronic resources. This could also lead to be less reticence on the part of unit convenors and lecturers. Ms Sparks suggested that reminders via the iShare system and adopting a gentle, pronged approach may also pay dividends.

Professor Verity reported that he had attended the National Conference of Chairs of Academic Boards (CABS) which had been addressed by the President of the National Union of Students, Ms. Jade Tyrrell. The centrepiece of her presentation had been that students were asking for a “taco” approach to education. This is a reference to a TV advert in which the protagonists express the view that they were unhappy having to make a choice between hard and soft tacos, insisting instead that they should be given both kinds. It was Ms. Tyrrell’s thesis that students too were reluctant to choose between lectures or online videos, books or e-readers, physical exams or online quizzes, and so forth, they too wanted to be afforded and to use all options.

Mr Burrell commented that CoE had progressively reduced their printing costs by offering an online download of units, or in digital format on DVD/CD or USB stick, and the majority of students had availed of these options.

The Committee agreed to endorse the recommendations as it agreed that the combination of eReserve or digital format on DVD/CD or USB stick was a workable solution for the interim, however a longer-term more tenable solutions needed to be explored.
It was **RESOLVED** that:

1. Unit Convenors be reminded of eReserve (iShare) and be encouraged to work with the Library to coordinate the online provision of course material through eReserve; and
2. Where unit readers are still required, they be provided to students digitally on DVC/CD or USB stick.

Ms Amanda Phelps departed the meeting at 11.55am  
Ms Lindie Clark departed the meeting at 11.57am

### 5.5 Review of Open and Closed Book Examinations – Progress Report presented to Academic Senate on 12 November 2013

The Chair of Senate briefed the Committee that the Review of Open and Closed Book Examinations was requested by the University Council and the Working Party had now completed its initial work, as outlined in the paper presented to Academic Senate at its meeting on 12 November.

Information from a survey of Universities (5 international, 8 Australian GO8 and 5 Australian non GO8) and professional bodies undertaken by that group indicates that none of the examined universities had policies that encouraged one form of examination over another. Most professional bodies did not provide information about their attitude towards closed book examinations. However, three of the four that did specifically stipulated that some, if not all, professional accreditation examinations must be closed book.

A survey of the academic literature on the topic of open book examination revealed that:

- Open book examinations are universally recognised to reduce student stress and anxiety.
- When open book examinations are appropriately designed to test conceptual understanding and higher order thinking, no significant difference has been found in results gained in open and closed book examinations.
- The use of open book examinations can reduce student reliance on rote memorisation and promote deeper learning, although evidence for the latter effect was not entirely compelling.

The literature was also cautious about certain aspects of the universal use of open book examination, viz:

- The use of open book examination materially influences the way that students prepare; those who expect to be able to “look it up on the day” can be persuaded to prepare less, with adverse consequences.
- Open book examinations cannot be designed in the same way a closed book ones and staff need to be retrained to apply this form of assessment effectively.
- Recent work in Educational Psychology has examined the positive value of “learning by heart” memorisation. In particular, this work has highlighted the key importance of memorisation in many scientific, technical and mathematical fields, medical disciplines and linguistics (to name a few).

The Academic Senate working group met on the 14 November 2013 to review this benchmarking and to consider next steps. Its preliminary recommendations are that it would be beneficial for the University to encourage staff members to utilise more open book and non-invigilated examinations and to provide training and mentoring to support the use of
these forms of assessment. This aligns with Academic Senate’s standing position in regard to the benefits of diversifying the modes of assessment applied in the University’s programs and units. The question of mechanisms to encourage assessment diversity, including in the use of non-traditional and non-invigilated examinations, has been referred to the SLTC working party on Assessment, Grading, Unit Guides an Examination. This will undertake a thorough review of all policies relating to assessment practice in the first half of 2014. A Working Party will be formed early in 2014 to conduct a review of the Grading, Assessment, Final Examination and Unit Guide policies as a whole.

**Action:** Professor Verity

5.6 **Report from the meeting of the Academic Senate held on 12 November 2013**

The Chair of Senate provided a verbal report that the Disruption to Studies Policy had been approved by the Academic Senate and that it will be presented for approval to the University Council meeting at its meeting on 5 December 2013. There had been some debate around the removal of the satisfactory performance clause. He expressed his viewpoint that it is the University’s duty of care to ensure that special consideration is accorded to students whose academic performance may have suffered as a result of illness or other disruptive factors, regardless of their performance to date. For example, this poor performance may have occurred as a result of the long lasting debilitating effects of a psychiatric illness that the student may have been reluctant to report. The University may not have had any prior warning of such circumstances and it needs to provide mechanisms to ensure that genuine documented disruption is addressed in a consistent equitable manner.

The purpose of this Policy is that all students should be given an adequate opportunity to engage in their assessment tasks. There was some opposition at the Senate to the removal of this clause and the Chairs of Academic Senate and Senate Learning and Teaching Committee will meet with key stakeholders, prior to the Council meeting to have further discourse on the issues raised.

The Chair of Academic Senate mentioned that Ms Freeman had made the, quite pertinent, observation that by the time Policies and Procedures made it into Policy Central they had been almost completely stripped of background information that spoke in plain language terms to their purpose and rationale. He asked that all academic policies in future should be accompanied by an information memorandum, which would provide this all important contextual information. In the first instance this would be used to aid the approval process, but then it was his intention to publish these memoranda on the Academic Senate website to assist all members of the University community in interpreting its policies.

5.7 **2014 Schedule of Meetings – Senate Learning and Teaching Committee**

The Committee noted the Schedule.

6. **OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business to be considered.
7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee will be held on Monday, 17 February 2014 at 10:00am.

\textit{NB: Agenda Items are due by Thursday, 6 February 2014.}

There being no further business, the meeting concluded at 12.11pm.

\textbf{Professor Sherman Young}  
\textit{Acting Chair}
ITEM 10.6: ANNUAL REVIEW OF SENATE LEARNING AND TEACHING COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

BACKGROUND
At the 12 July 2013 Academic Senate meeting the Chair of Academic Senate advised that the annual review of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC) Terms of Reference was scheduled to occur. The Chair advised that Associate Professor Ian Solomonides had agreed to Chair the Working Party. The other members of this Working Party were Professor Dominic Verity, Dr Michael Cavanagh and Associate Professor Leigh Wood. Secretariat support was provided by Governance Services.

ISSUE
The current SLTC Terms of Reference requires that at least once a year the Committee will review its Terms of Reference. Any subsequent changes to the Terms of Reference will be recommended by the Committee and formally approved by Senate.

A copy of the current SLTC Terms of Reference and the revised draft of the Terms of Reference were discussed at the SLTC meetings held on 28 October and 25 November 2013. The SLTC resolved to recommend the terms of reference, subject to minor changes to Academic Senate for approval.

Comments made by the Chair of Academic Senate at the 25 November 2013 SLTC meeting (refer to pages 11 and 12 of the SLTC 25 November 2013 minutes):

- From a procedural perspective, the review of the SLTC Terms of Reference was undertaken by a working party of Academic Senate. As such the proposed terms could not be amended by SLTC, even though its input had been very valuable.

- The current Terms of Reference of SLTC do not allow for the nomination of standing alternates, although it does allow for voting alternates to attend meeting on an ad-hoc basis. The Terms of Reference review had decided that it was not appropriate to give such alternates the right to vote. This voting right had been problematic in the past, since many alternates had not been well briefed before attending a meeting or had not been able to act with the full authority of the individual they replaced.

- The constitution and Term of Reference of the Academic Senate did not provide for voting alternates. Members of Academic Senate, whether ex-officio or not, were members of that body in their own right and were expected to exercise their Academic Governance responsibilities as members of the Academic Body rather than as representatives of sectional interests. It was Professor Verity’s view that membership of all Academic Senate Sub-Committees should observe the same principles that held at Academic Senate itself.
- It was suggested that having a provision for alternates in the revised Terms of Reference and extending full voting rights to alternate members would contribute to the quality assurance process. Professor Verity explained that the introduction of a class of members drawn from the membership of the Academic Senate was at least partly motivated by this concern. His view was that a quorum of 13 individuals was adequate to ensure robustness in SLTC’s decision making. Furthermore, if an individual/stakeholder wished to attend as an observer, this has always been facilitated.

**RECOMMENDATION**

For approval.

**SUBMITTED BY**

Professor Dominic Verity - Chair of Academic Senate
Senate Learning and Teaching Committee
Charter and Terms of Reference

The Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (SLTC) (the Committee) is established by the Academic Senate (the Senate).

This charter sets out the Committee’s objectives, authority, composition and tenure, roles and responsibilities, reporting and administrative arrangements.

1. Principles

The Committee promotes pedagogical excellence and encourages the adoption of good practice in scholarly learning and teaching across the University. The Committee is also tasked with identifying and responding to emerging education challenges (both internal and external).

The Committee is responsible for:

- enhancing student engagement and achievement by promoting the application of best practice in learning and teaching, curriculum design and student support;
- driving the discussion, development and approval of the learning and teaching policies of the University;
- consulting broadly within the University community on these matters;
- surveying and responding to new educational and regulatory challenges;
- disseminating the results of these activities broadly throughout the University community and providing advice on the implementation of learning and teaching policy.

2. Authority

The Committee has powers delegated to it by Senate as detailed in this Charter.

3. Role and responsibilities

The Committee is directly responsible and accountable to Senate for the exercise of its responsibilities.

The Committee is to advise the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Provost) and Senate on:

- the activities of Faculties and Offices established within the University to support learning and teaching;
- strategic planning and quality enhancement in learning and teaching;
- developments in learning and teaching;

In regard to the University's policies and procedures in learning and teaching, the Committee is to:

- drive the development of University policies, procedures and plans by consulting widely with the University community on their formulation and review;
- recommend new and revised learning and teaching policies for approval by Senate;
- approve new and revised learning and teaching procedures for adoption;
- provide advice on the interpretation and application of policies and procedures;
• monitor the implementation of policies and procedures in learning and teaching, taking action where appropriate to resolve identified issues;

• receive and respond appropriately to reports from the Faculties and Offices on their activities in learning and teaching;

• facilitate informed debate on matters of learning and teaching.

In pursuit of these terms of reference, the Committee may require any of the University’s Faculties, Offices or Units to report on their activities as they relate to the Committee objectives.

4. Composition and Tenure

The composition of this committee shall be as follows:

4.1. Appointed Members

a. The Chair, who shall be appointed by the Chair of Senate.

b. One member per Faculty, who shall be nominated by the Executive Dean.

c. Four elected or co-opted members of Academic Senate, who shall be selected by Academic Senate.

d. An Undergraduate Student Representative, who shall be appointed by the Chair in consultation with the student representatives on Senate.

e. A Postgraduate Student Representative, who shall be appointed by the Chair in consultation with the student representatives on Senate.

f. An HDR Student Representative, who shall be appointed by the Chair in consultation with the student representatives on Senate.

The Committee may also co-opt additional members as it sees fit.

4.2 Ex-Officio Members

g. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Provost)

h. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Registrar)

i. The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning, Teaching and Diversity)

j. The Chair of Academic Senate

k. The Associate Deans of Learning and Teaching of each Faculty

l. The Director of the Learning and Teaching Centre

m. The Director of the Centre for Open Education

n. The University Librarian

o. The Academic and Programs Director of PACE

4.3 Tenure

• The term of appointment of all members appointed under clauses 4.1(a) or 4.1(b) above is to be 2 years.

• The term of appointment of all members appointed under clause 4.1(c) above is to be to the end of the current term of Academic Senate.

• The term of appointment of all co-opted members is to be 1 year.

• The term of appointment of all members appointed under clauses 4.1(d), 4.1(e) and 4.1(f) above is to be 1 year.
Any such term may be renewed.

4.4 Responsibilities of members

Members of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee are expected to:
• Contribute the time needed to study and understand the papers provided;
• Apply good analytical skills, objectively and with sound judgment;
• Express opinions frankly, ask questions that go to the fundamental core of the issue and pursue independent lines of enquiry;
• Ensure that colleagues in the Faculty or Office that they represent are made aware of the activities and decisions of the Committee in a timely fashion;
• Work collaboratively with other members of the Committee to ensure that its duties are discharged in a timely fashion; and
• Attend Committee meetings and make themselves available, from time to time, to serve on working parties and sub-committees established by the committee.
• Actively contribute to driving the process of policy formation.

5. Chair

Senate will appoint a member to the Committee to Chair its meetings. In the absence of the Chair, the Committee can appoint one of its members to Chair a meeting.
The role of the Chair is:
• Leading the Committee;
• Overseeing the Committee in the effective discharge of its role;
• Efficient organisation and conduct of the Committee’s functions and Meetings;
• Facilitating the effective contribution of all Committee members;
• Developing and maintaining a relationship with appropriate members of staff and the Secretariat to ensure appropriate reporting;
• Ensuring adequate reporting to Senate
• Promoting constructive and respectful relations between members; and
• Committing the time necessary to discharge effectively his/her role as Chair.

6. Attendance at Meetings

Any member who is unable to attend a meeting of the Committee may nominate an alternate to attend the meeting on his or her behalf. The Secretary of the Committee must be informed of any such nomination at least three working days before a meeting of the Committee. Nominated alternates must gain the approval of the Chair and must be subject to agreement of the meeting in order to act in that capacity.

If an appointed or co-opted member is absent from three consecutive meetings of the Committee, of which reasonable notice has been given, and if the Committee has not approved his or her absence within six weeks of the last of these absences, he or she ceases to be a member of the Committee.

An alternate to a member must be a person who would otherwise be eligible to be chosen as a member of the Committee under the same category of membership. An alternate has the same
rights and obligations as the substantive member in whose place the alternate attends the meeting.

Acting appointments to roles that have ex-officio membership of the Committee have full Committee membership rights.

Any member of the University community may attend a meeting, or any part thereof, as an observer subject to the approval of the Chair. Individuals wishing to attend as an observer must notify the Secretary of the Committee at least three working days before a meeting of the Committee.

The Chair may confer speaking rights in respect of non-members who attend as an observer.

7. Delegation to Working groups and Sub-Committees.

The Committee may establish working groups and sub-committees, from time to time, to assist in fulfilling its functions.

A working group may be established to complete a particular task, say the revision of a Learning and Teaching Policy, over a short and pre-determined period of time. A sub-committee may be established on a continuing basis to advise the Committee on some ongoing aspect of its portfolio of responsibilities.

The Committee remains responsible for activities and decisions it delegates to working groups and sub-committees. Working groups and sub-committees will submit a report on their meetings to the meeting of the Committee immediately subsequent to those activities. The Committee will ensure each working group or sub-committee is established according to a clear terms of reference. Working groups and sub-committees will consist of members appointed by the Committee and can include persons who are not members of the Committee.

8. Administrative arrangements
8.1 Meetings

The Committee will meet as frequently as required. A meeting plan, including meeting dates and agenda items, will be agreed by the Committee each year. The meeting plan will cover all of the Committee’s responsibilities as detailed in these Terms of Reference.

8.2 Attendance at meetings and quorums

A quorum will consist of half of the total number of Committee members plus one. All questions must be decided by the majority of the voting members present. The Chair carries the casting vote only.

8.3 Observers

The Chair of the Committee can approve the attendance of observers at meetings. Any observers may only attend the meeting for non-confidential items and may not participate in the proceedings of the meeting. A request to attend as an observer must be submitted to the Secretary at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.

8.4 Attendees

The Committee also admits a class of attendees. Such individuals are not voting members of the committee, but they are invited to attend all meetings and may participate freely in the proceedings of those meetings. Attendees may gain this status on an ex-officio basis or may be co-opted by the Committee for a fixed term (generally 2 years) as it sees fit.
8.4.1 Ex-officio attendees

a. The Manager of the Policy Unit
b. The Executive Officer of the Office of the DVC (Provost)
c. The Director of Wellbeing and Support Services
d. The College Director and Principal of SIBT
e. The Principal of the Macquarie City Campus

8.5 Dispute resolution

Members of the Committee should maintain an effective working relationship, and seek to resolve differences by way of open negotiation. However, in the event of a disagreement between members, the Chair may, as a last resort, refer the matter to Senate.

8.6 Secretariat and minutes

The Registrar of University or nominee is Secretary to the Committee. The Secretary will ensure the agenda for each meeting and supporting papers are circulated, after approval from the Chair, at least one (1) week before the meeting, and ensure the minutes of the meetings are prepared, maintained and published on the Senate website.

Draft minutes must be prepared and initially reviewed by the Chair of the Committee and then circulated to members within ten (10) working days of the date of the meeting of which they are a record. A report from the Committee will be submitted to each Senate meeting following a Committee meeting. The minutes of the Committee meetings shall be confirmed as a true and correct record of the meeting.

8.7 Conflicts of interest

It is recognised that members will have an interest in some matters before the Committee. However, it is each member’s obligation to act in the best interests of the Committee and the University not in the interests of the group (faculty, department, students etc) to which they may belong. Members can present the interests of that group in the deliberations of the Committee but must make decisions in the best interests of the Committee and University. Members must declare any conflicts of interest at the start of each meeting in relation to an agenda item or before discussion of any subsequent matter arising during the course of the meeting.

Where members or observers at Committee meetings are deemed to have a real or perceived conflict of interest it may be appropriate that they are excused from the Committee deliberations on the related matter.

8.8 Review of terms of reference

At least once a year the Committee will review its Terms of Reference. Any subsequent changes to the Terms of Reference will be recommended by the Committee and formally approved by Senate.

8.9 Assessment arrangements

Senate will establish a mechanism to review and report on the performance of each Committee at least annually. The review will be conducted on a self-assessment basis (unless otherwise determined by the Senate) with appropriate input sought from the Senate, relevant management and any other relevant stakeholders, as determined by Senate. The assessment will be conducted by the Senate Secretary.