

# Te Komiti Ako | Learning and Teaching Committee



## NGĀ ĀMIKI/MINUTES

**Rā Date:** Friday, 28 July 2023  
**Wā Time:** 10.00 am  
**Wāhi Venue:** Council Chamber Level 6 Matariki and via Zoom

**Tangata i tae mai Present:** Professor C Moran (Chair), S 9(2)(a) OIA  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]

**Tangata i tae mai In Attendance:** S 9(2)(a) OIA [Redacted]

**Whakapāha Apologies:** S 9(2)(a) OIA [Redacted]  
[Redacted]

**Welcome:** The Chair welcomed S 9(2)(a) OIA and S 9(2)(a) OIA to the meeting.

### 1. Minutes of the previous meeting

**Moved by the Chair:**

That the minutes of the LTC meeting held on 30 June are a true and accurate record.

*Carried*

### 2. Matters Arising

(i) *Minute 5: Lecture Recording Policy*

S 9(2)(a) OIA asked about the timeline for the lecture recording policy, and when it might be ready for its next steps. The Chair noted that S 9(2)(a) will update members after further discussion with the audio-visual team and other consultation.

### 3. Chair's Report

(i) *Academic audit update*

The Chair thanked those met the audit panel over the 10<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> July, especially given the timing of the audit just one week before the start of the second semester. The panel met with over 100 staff and students, which was excellent to see. While we don't yet have the details of the panel's recommendations and affirmations, we don't expect any surprises based on what we've been told so far.

(ii) *UC Teaching Awards*

The deadline for the UC Teaching Awards has been pushed back to Friday 25<sup>th</sup> August to allow further time for applications and nominations. (It was noted that the original deadline for

applications was 28<sup>th</sup> July, which overlaps with the deadline for promotions.) Members are encouraged to identify those who would be good candidates for an award, and suggest that they apply.

Currently the planned sub-committee that will review the Teaching Awards includes **S 9(2)(a) OIA** [REDACTED]. It was recommended that a representative of the Pacific Development Team be added to the sub-committee.

#### 4. Faculty Learning and Teaching Plans – Update from Members

Members’ efforts on Faculty Learning and Teaching Plans continue. In response to a question from **S 9(2)(a) OIA** [REDACTED], the Chair noted that no particular format would be required.

**S 9(2)(a) OIA** [REDACTED] noted that the Faculty of Science has been setting up working groups and confirming a timeline. The Faculty of Science LTC has approached schools about representatives, and a first draft is planned for late September, with the goal of reporting back to LTC at the end of November.

**S 9(2)(a) OIA** [REDACTED] noted that a qualitative version of the Faculty of Education plan has been completed, with a quantitative version underway.

#### 5. LTC Working Groups – updates and future direction

With **S 9(2)(a)** [REDACTED] recently taking over coordination of the committee’s working groups following the departure of **S 9(2)(a)** [REDACTED] in March, the committee considered the status of the groups, what changes needed to be made, and what the focus of each group would be for the rest of the year.

##### *Teaching Quality Metrics Working Group*

Previous membership: Catherine Moran, **S 9(2)(a) OIA** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

The Chair noted that the goal of this working group was to put in place a framework for measuring Teaching Quality, which would allow faculties to monitor their teaching, aid in career development, and be used in academic staff promotions. The group is now in the final stages of wrapping up its planned outputs. Two workshops have been run for academic staff, along with drop-in sessions for Heads of Schools and Departments, and meetings with Executive Deans to ensure everyone is familiar with the new metrics. The Chair noted that she would also sit on promotions panels to ensure consistency. The group is meeting again this week to offer some initial feedback on the draft Student Evaluation of Teaching policy.

**S 9(2)(a) OIA** [REDACTED] and **S 9(2)(a) OIA** [REDACTED] noted that there was some concern among academic staff about being limited to just a single page in a promotion portfolio to discuss their teaching, because there are a wide range of things that need to be addressed. The Chair noted that promotion panels will be trained, and that this could be addressed outside of the promotion portfolio itself through Heads of Schools and Departments requesting more information or evidence during their initial review of the portfolio. Members noted that concision can be a benefit too, and briefly discussed other ways to manage promotion portfolios, including software

systems such as Profiler and Elements, or even the use of a video. S 9(2)(a) OIA and S 9(2)(a) suggested that it is important that these systems would not create extra work, and suggested that an interview would be more appropriate than a video because it would offer staff the chance to respond to questions or concerns.

#### *Assessment Working Group*

Previous membership: Catherine Moran, S 9(2)(a) OIA

The chair noted that the primary focus of this group was assessment design, as well as reviewing the Assessment Policy and Principles. That policy was approved at the end of 2022, and the next step for the Working Group is to work on improving assessment design at UC through other measures, such as an ‘assessment best practice’ document, workshops, or a teaching forum. The chair noted that due to some recent departures from UC, there may be a need to reorganise the group to some degree, and S 9(2)(a) OIA noted that due to a lack of awareness, good academic leadership is required in this area.

Concerns from members included that there is a wide variety of assessment across the university (so it is important to develop consistency in assessment practice across faculties), and that it is essential that the university is delivering high quality assessments, particularly because assessment is very important to students. S 9(2)(a) noted that workshops are frequently attended by the same people repeatedly (many of whom need little help), so some form of top-down influence may be needed. S 9(2)(a) OIA noted that some other universities require academic staff to take courses or workshops in assessment design and constructive alignment in order to receive promotions, however S 9(2)(a) S 9(2)(a) OIA

S 9(2)(a) OIA

The chair noted that delivery of the working group’s outputs is open for discussion, and will be a focus for the group.

S 9(2)(a) OIA suggested that the group consider student workload issues, including standardised assessment hours – anecdotally, there were some issues with clumping of major assessment items in a very short period this semester. It was noted that the Faculties of Law and Engineering do make some efforts to coordinate their cohorts. Disability in assessment design is also a possible topic; S 9(2)(b)(ii) OIA

#### *Employability Working Group*

Previous membership: Catherine Moran, S 9(2)(a) OIA

The primary task of this working group was to review the Graduate Attribute, S 9(2)(b)(ii) OIA. The group has met just once so far, but will be restarted with S taking over as Chair of the group. The Chair also mentioned that of the other attributes, S 9(2)(a) OIA is managing the review of the ‘Globally Aware’ attribute, which will return to the committee at a future meeting. The review of the ‘Bicultural Competence & Confidence’ attribute was previewed at the committee last month. The review of Community Engagement is still to be determined. S 9(2)(a) OIA suggested that in addition to the review of each attribute, it could be helpful to have a conversation about the graduate profile as a whole, not just the individual attributes, and perhaps also about differences at postgraduate level. S 9(2)(a) OIA suggested that this might take place at an Academic Board meeting.

The Chair noted that building awareness of the profile is also important, and that UCount addresses whether students feel they have gained the knowledge required for each attribute.

*Engagement and Blended Learning Working Group*

Previous membership: Catherine Moran, S 9(2)(a) OIA

Leading the discussion, S 9(2)(a) noted that this group had met several times, and held a workshop at the end of 2022. The group had several main goals, including addressing cohort building, equity and access interventions, formal or informal ways that staff can experience students' perspectives, and community engagement. The group is re-evaluating membership, and planning a report to the committee at a meeting in the coming months. S 9(2)(a) OIA volunteered to be involved. S 9(2)(a) OIA observed that the group was partially created out of concerns from academic staff about low student attendance, and asked whether there is data on how this may have changed. S 9(2)(a) noted Kia Angitu and ACE are looking at attendance data. Some anecdotal feedback has been received (mostly positive) but not a lot of hard data has been gathered (although some does exist for specific courses due to the efforts of S 9(2)(a) OIA in Evaluation and Student Insights). S 9(2)(a) OIA S 9(2)(b)(ii) OIA

S 9(2)(a) also argued that attendance is just one piece of engagement, along with a range of other factors; the two are connected, but shouldn't necessarily be conflated.

*Timetabling/Delivery Working Group*

This will be a new working group, requested by the Vice Chancellor. Its task will be to look at a wide range of factors related to the delivery of courses across the university, including enrolments, room usage, timetabling of classes and assessments, streamed lectures and teaching contact hours. Members noted that the group needs to be academically-driven, and observed that there are some intersections between this group and other groups (e.g. on assessment) which will need to be coordinated. Membership of the group is still to be confirmed, but Professor Catherine Moran will be involved, along with Academic Deans (or delegates) from each faculty.

6. S 9(2)(b)(ii) OIA

The Chair welcomed S 9(2)(a) OIA to the meeting to discuss the One Year On updates to the S 9(2)(b)(ii) OIA Academic Reviews.

S 9(2)(a) OIA noted that the reviews of the S 9(2)(b)(ii) OIA may look somewhat different to those of other degrees due to the need for external accreditation. The S 9(2)(b)(ii) OIA was successfully reaccredited, and not given clear action points for change – rather, the School was encouraged to continue to develop its work in these areas.

S 9(2)(a) OIA asked whether the proposed outreach events S 9(2)(b)(ii) OIA S 9(2)(a) OIA noted that it could be valuable to improve awareness about both these degrees among secondary schools, because in some cases, students look ahead towards S 9(2)(b)(ii) OIA even before they have a Bachelor's degree.

**Moved by the Chair:**

That the One Year On updates to the S 9(2)(b)(ii) OIA Academic Reviews be approved.

*Carried*

The Chair thanked S 9(2)(a) OIA for her contributions; she left the meeting.

## 7. Mid-Year Examinations 2023 – Discussion Paper

This discussion paper from S 9(2)(a) OIA was originally sent to AAC, but redirected to LTC for discussion among members. It considers some of the key issues that arose in the recent mid-year examination period, and suggests some possible solutions. It was noted that along with the changes that the document proposes to the examination period, there has also been some discussion about whether the mid-year Review of Academic Progress will continue in its current form.

S 9(2)(a) OIA introduced the paper, noting some of the key proposed action points. One of these is that all those who are approved in advance as distance students should be able to sit their exams as distance students – i.e. that the current rule, mandating that those who live within 90 minutes' drive of campus are required to sit their exam in person, should be removed.

S 9(2)(a) OIA also noted that the University's increase in FTE has put additional pressure on staff, and asked how the extra work required to create and administer additional exams for distance students might be managed. S 9(2)(a) noted that the Academic Development team is currently advising academic staff in the design of their courses to ensure that they are able to meet distance students' needs in assessment. Those running on-campus examinations and online examinations for a course should approach Academic Development about how best to manage this.

S 9(2)(a) OIA asked about how distance students are approved in courses for which there is no separate (D) course occurrence (distance version of the course). S noted that that this approval would typically come from Faculty ADAs. S 9(2)(a) noted that staff concerns about Chat GPT may have driven up the use of invigilated examinations in the most recent exam period, and about how the special accommodations arranged by the University's Student Accessibility Service compare to special accommodations in NCEA. It was noted that UC is fully aligned with the accommodations used in NCEA, which are based on documented disabilities and must be approved by SAS.

S 9(2)(a) OIA left the meeting.

S 9(2)(a) OIA also noted that the University's increase in FTE has put additional pressure on staff, and asked how the extra work required to create and administer additional exams for distance students might be managed. S 9(2)(a) OIA observed that the use of exams has doubled. Effective resourcing of exams is a concern, including ensuring that the University has sufficient reader-writers and capacity to accommodate students in their use of speech-to-text/text-to-speech capabilities. The scheduling of exams has also become more difficult because students can enrol in whatever courses they choose, and there is only a two-week period to develop the exam timetable based on students' choice of courses.

In discussion about the suggestion to extend the exam period by abbreviating study week, it was noted that changes are made to the mid-year Review of Academic Progress, that might also allow more time for marking and examiners' meetings after exams are administered. S 9(2)(a) OIA also noted that anecdotally, he had heard that some students would prefer a longer exam period so that exams are more spread out. S 9(2)(a) OIA asked whether it might be possible to poll the students on this question, noting that a clear student voice could aid the University's decision-making process in this area, and that there can be a difficult balance between what is good for students and what is good for staff. S 9(2)(a) OIA noted that discussion at AAC included the possibility of having a shorter mid-semester break in Semester 1 (i.e. two weeks rather than three). The Chair noted that it wouldn't be possible to change the semester dates for 2024, but it might

be possible from 2025 onwards. It was suggested that it might be best to take the proposed changes to Faculty LTCs for further feedback, although ultimately, the University LTC would need to provide approval for the changes.

S 9(2)(a) OIA and S 9(2)(a) OIA left the meeting.

Members noted that the scheduling of meetings, classes, and other commitments in study week could see some discussion at the LTC Working Group on Assessment.

S 9(2)(a) OIA asked about whether approval was needed from Academic Development in order to run both on-campus and online exams. S 9(2)(a) noted that when course coordinators indicate the nature of the exams for their courses, Academic Development can contact them to discuss the nature of exam; in most cases, any issues with the design of assessment (e.g. capacity, the use of electronic devices, etc.) can be resolved at that time. S 9(2)(b)(ii) OIA

S 9(2)(a) OIA noted that there are a range of issues around students bringing their own devices, and that tech support may be needed if devices are provided by the University. However, while some students may cheat, the vast majority will not. The University might need to think further about the nature of the invigilation that is required for exams, given that the use of electronic submission can have real benefits as well, such as making exam scripts more legible, allowing students to easily change their answers during the exam, allow examiners to provide feedback more easily, etc. It was noted that digital exams were trialled for NCEA, but not implemented.

S 9(2)(a) OIA left the meeting.

S 9(2)(a) noted that in 2022, 33% of exams were online, and not invigilated in person. In 2023, only 16% of exams took this form.

The Chair thanked the committee for their contributions to a great discussion and noted that there would be a lot of work for the committee and its working groups over the coming months.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 11:51am.

Professor C Moran (Chair).....

Date.....