MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
FACULTY TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE
held in Room 1.58, First Floor, Physics Building
on Tuesday 12 May 2009

Present:
Professor Geoff Hammond (Chair)
Associate Professor Nancy Longnecker (Teaching and Learning Co-ordinator)

Representatives from Schools:
Professor Geoff Meyer (Anatomy and Human Biology)
Professor Don Robertson (Biomedical, Biomolecular and Chemical Sciences)
Dr Peter Whipp (Sport Science, Exercise and Health)
Professor Ian McArthur (Physics)
Dr Vance Locke (Psychology)

Other Representatives:
Dr Des Hill (Mathematics and Statistics)
Dr Thomas Martin (Director, Faculty Offshore Programs)
Dr Jane Emberson (Academic Student Advisor)
Mr David Enright (Senior Administrative Officer/Offshore Programs)
Ms Felicity Renner (Biological Sciences Library)
Mrs Vickie Falcetta (Representative from FNAS)
Ms Rachel Owens (Postgraduate Student Representative)
Miss Lauren Hollier (Undergraduate Student Representative)

Apologies
Ms Jenny Gamble (Faculty Manager)
Mrs Kath Williams (Executive Officer)

1. MINUTES

RESOLVED – 4

that the minutes of the meeting of Teaching and Learning Committee held on Tuesday 14 April 2009 be confirmed.

2. DECLARATIONS OF POTENTIAL FOR CONFLICT OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No conflicts were declared.
3. **ITEMS/BUSINESS IN PROGRESS FOR NOTING SINCE PREVIOUS MEETING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item/Business in Progress</th>
<th>Progress Update</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning Guide for Faculty Staff.</td>
<td>Draft to be checked by Faculty Student Advisor and Faculty Manager prepared by Ms Heather Morton</td>
<td>On hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The specification of learning outcomes for courses and majors offered in the Faculty.</td>
<td>Audit to be undertaken by Teaching and Learning Co-ordinator. School to recommend major/s sequence</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of each major sequence to determine whether English Language Competency Skills are shown in at least one unit in each year level.</td>
<td>Audit to be undertaken by Teaching and Learning Co-ordinator. School to recommend major/s sequence</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Operational Priorities Plan (OPP) implementation strategies and targets.</td>
<td>Faculty Manager has updated implementation strategies and targets and distributed them to members for consideration</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New grade for failed component (FC); is it appropriate to have a supplementary assessment in all components of a unit.</td>
<td>School representatives to report</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Science Thesis – Faculty positional statement on completion by papers.</td>
<td>Representative from the Graduate Research School unable to attend meetings because of prior engagements. However, update to be provided by the Sport Science, Exercise and Health representative</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **BSC (SPORTS SCIENCE) DEGREE AT PSB ACCREDITED BY THE AUSTRALIAN ASSOCIATION FOR EXERCISE AND SPORTS SCIENCE (AAESS)**

Members were advised that PSB would like to have the BSc (Sports Science) degree program currently running at PSB accredited by AAESS. This required replacing the unit HMES3387 (Human Performance in Industry Ergonomics and Occupational Biomechanics in Industry) with HMES3301 (Exercise Prescription for Health and Fitness). No curriculum or practical issues would arise as a result of the substitution. The Chair recommended that the proposal be accepted.

**RESOLVED – 5**

Members agreed that in the BSc (Sports Science) degree the unit HMES3387 should be replaced by HMES3301.
5. **CHAIR’S REPORT**

The Chair reported as follows:

- Members were reminded that School submissions for the Learning and Teaching Performance Fund (LTPF) were due into the Faculty by 22 May 2009.
- A flyer (Attachment A) for the National Uniserve Science Annual Conference to be held on 1st – 2nd October was distributed.
- The Chair briefly described the AUQA interview of member of the Teaching and Learning Committee.

6. **MASTER OF SCIENCE THESIS – FACULTY POSITIONAL STATEMENT ON COMPLETION BY PAPERS**

A discussion on whether the Faculty should take a position on submission of papers for a Master of Science by research was foreshadowed at the March meeting. There had been some doubt as to what would be expected of a Masters student who chose to be examined by a paper or series of papers. Prior to the meeting members were provided with guidelines, prepared by the Sport Science, Exercise and Health representative. Members were asked for their views.

During discussion the following points were made:

- Advice on the guidelines should be sought from the Graduate Research School;
- members agreed the guidelines were useful;
- the work done by the student and others must be clearly indicated;
- the paper/s did not need to be published;
- there were integrative skills in writing a thesis that would be examined by the proposed General Discussion.

**ACTION** To forward the proposal to the Faculty Research Committee noting the support of this Committee for the proposed process in which students demonstrate integration of the material contained in the paper or papers submitted for examination.

7. **FRAMEWORK FOR PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING AT UWA**

A proposal to implement peer review of teaching had been discussed at the May meeting of the UWA Teaching and Learning Committee. Prior to the meeting members were provided with an extract from the Agenda of the UWA Teaching and Learning Committee; the agreed principles of peer review, and an extract from the Minutes of the May 2008 meeting of the UWA Teaching and Learning Committee. Members were informed that an important issue under discussion was whether peer review of teaching would be mandatory or voluntary. Members were asked for their views.

Member’s comments included:

- Peer review was built on the view that the reviewer would be an expert in the field, and this would not normally be the case;
- peer review would be more effective in addressing important aspects of teaching such as unit structure and assessment than classroom performance;
- peer review would be most effective in addressing issues identified by student evaluations and by the PDR process;
- early career teachers would benefit from peer advice on supervision of research students;
- professional and credible peer review would require a small number of trained reviewers, which would be very time consuming;
- it is a process best done informally, as many now do, especially in large team-taught units;
- it should remain a collegial process to maintain the frankness of the reviewers’ appraisals;
- it is important that a process of peer review not impose uniformity of teaching styles across the Faculty.

The Committee was unanimous that, in a collegial structure, peer review of teaching should be voluntary, with uptake encouraged by identifying its value in promoting teaching excellence and in developing individuals’ teaching portfolios.
8. SCHOOL REPORTS

Psychology – Dr Vance Locke reported that the School were piloting a tool for giving student feedback on assessed work. The Committee would be advised of the outcome of the trial.

Anatomy and Human Biology (ANHB) – Professor Geoff Meyer reported that the School had recently had a staff/student meeting that discussed flexible delivery of teaching. There was support for some level of flexible delivery.

Biomedical, Biomolecular and Chemical Sciences (BBCS) – Professor Don Robertson reported that the School had been working on the LTPF proposal. A whole School meeting had taken place to discuss the Future Framework. Working Parties had been set up to discuss majors, including cross disciplinary majors. A survey of students who had completed Honours under the new uniform structure had shown acceptance.

Physics – Professor Ian McArthur reported that School had looked into simplifying honours units. They had also looked at the feasibility of running parallel lectures, with one group receiving a video feed of the live lecture. Students in the ‘video’ lecture would be able to interact in the same way as students in the ‘live’ lecture. Other Schools with large-enrolment units expressed interest in this development, and it was noted that unit enrolments are likely to increase when the new course structure is adopted. Professor McArthur agreed to inform the Committee of developments.

9. TEACHING AND LEARNING CO-ORDINATOR REPORT

The Teaching and Learning Co-ordinator provided an update on the Communication Skills working party related to Recommendation 12 for the Course Review which stated “that every undergraduate major include at least one unit with an explicit focus on oral and written communication skills”. She had also been looking into two new tools:

- Calibrated Peer Review (CPR), a process for peer review of student assignments, which has been developed by the National Science Foundation in the United States;
- a project on the use of new media in teaching, which was supported by the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC).

ACTION CPR and ALTC tools to be put on the next Agenda.

10. STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE REPORT

The student representatives had nothing to report.

11. FUTURE FRAMEWORK – SCIENCE COMMUNICATION MAJOR

The Teaching and Learning Co-ordinator was concerned about representation for the science communication major under the Future Framework.

ACTION The Teaching and Learning Co-ordinator would send a proposal to the Chair of the Majors Working Party.
National UniServe Science Annual Conference

1st – 2nd October 2009

Discipline Day 30th September

The University of Sydney
Eastern Avenue Lecture Complex, Eastern Avenue

Motivating Science
Undergraduates: Ideas and Interventions

Keynote Speakers
Richard Walker, University of Sydney
Karen Burke da Silva, Flinders University

Streams
Research experiences in undergraduate science
First Year University or Year 13?

Abstracts
Deadline 15th May

Full details are available at

For further information please contact
Hazel Jones, Manager Uniserve Science
Email: uniserveconf@usyd.edu.au