**Meeting**  
School of Media and Communication, Learning and Teaching Committee  

**Date**  
Friday 12 August 2011  

**Time**  
12.30 – 2.00 pm  

**Location**  
94.4.47  

**Attendees**  
Fiona Peterson (Chair), Karen Cullen (minutes), Glenn Blair, Leo Berkeley, Ruth Moeller, Saskia Hansen, Peter Ling, Adrian Miles, Bernadette Mazzarella, Francesca Rendle-Short (for Peter Horsfield), Jeremy Parker (for Stefan Greuter), Marianne Sison, Terry Johal (for Bruce Berryman), Eveline Fallshaw (visitor)  

**Apologies**  
Bruce Berryman, Peter Horsfield, Stefan Greuter, Bronwyn Clarke

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Discussion/Outcomes</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiona welcomed the Learning &amp; Teaching Committee and introduced new members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous minutes</strong></td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matters Arising from previous minutes</strong></td>
<td><strong>CES and work placement checklist to be discussed at Sept meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology and Pedagogy working party to report – Leo reported that the group had held an initial meeting and intended to meet monthly until the end of the year. Terry had identified the difference between teaching the use of technology and using technology to teach. The group have decided to focus on the latter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES feedback – delayed until next meeting as Bronwyn is not present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work placement checklist – nothing to report at this stage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC to check that late submission of Notice of Intent is acceptable to College – Karen spoke with Barbara Russell and Phil Craig about this, they are both happy to accept late papers and this has now been submitted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskia to provide School’s actions to the first page of the SSCC reports and KC circulate to PMs/PDs – to follow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft process for minor changes to courses, KC to update paper and put on Portal, to be advertised via the newsletter – Karen reported that this would be advertised in the next newsletter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderation, KC to collate feedback. Policy to be studied to determine if a key discipline rep can undertake moderation – KC reported that no feedback was received, extracts from policy were sent out in the draft minutes. Initial reading of this indicates that the course coordinators must undertake this role.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate use of images, BC to revise and send to SJT for review – delayed until next meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters implementation – KC to collate comments – no comments received.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP to arrange a discussion about assessment – Fiona reported that this would be arranged in September.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1. CES data
Fiona reported that for semester 1, 2011 the GTS was 66.2% for HE (down 3% on semester 1 last year) and 81.3% for TAFE (same as semester 1 last year) and she intends to drill down into the figures to explore the movement – although GTS is typically lower in semester 1 than in semester 2. Karen provided a summary of response rates according to HE only:

- 4 HE courses received 100% for GTS and OSI (although the number of students who completed the survey was in single digits in each case)
- 30 HE courses received 100% for OSI, 4 HE courses received 100% for GTS
- 44 HE courses received less than 50% for GTS, the lowest being 2.3%
- 45 HE courses received less than 50% for OSI, the lowest being 2.8%
- Out of 301 courses, 54 had a response rate of less than 10% of the enrolment numbers. 153 courses had response rates of less than 50%. Only 2 courses had 100% response rates, in both cases only 1 student was enrolled.

Fiona reported that the question remained regarding who was allowed to see the CES data and that she is proposing that PMs/PDs and Associate Deans/TAFE Director are given access to the relevant data. Karen has packaged the data up so that it can be distributed in this way if approval is granted. In the future the Survey Centre send the data directly to these individuals if a list is provided by the Dean to the Survey Centre. The key aim is that a collegiate discussion of the data is achieved, to make improvements where needed and to acknowledge strengths. Fiona stated that she would also like to encourage program team meetings where each lecturer would identify a key strength and a key area for improvement based on the feedback.

Leo stated that he has never had feedback that individual staff are opposed to this type of proposal.

Glenn agreed that this had to be undertaken the way in which Fiona suggested. He highlighted a couple of points for consideration. 1, investigate the privacy policy since this is a change in culture, 2, it would be good to have in place a procedure that outlines who will see the data and how it will be used.

Adrian agreed with Glenn’s suggestions.

Leo also highlighted that there is a change in the data since we can no longer separate individual tutorials – although Marianne pointed out that sometimes individuals can be identified via the qualitative feedback.

Ruth suggested that a one page document outlining the conclusions of the L+T committee be sent to Associate Deans/TAFE Director to speak to clusters about this and then feedback.

4.2 New Program Developments – paper 1
4.3 Program Proposals - papers 2 and 3
Karen reported that Policy and Planning Group have circulated a revised program proposal document (paper 1) and a new timeline for submitting this. Two drafts are to be submitted via College to P+PG for comment and feedback due 8 September and 6 October before the final submission is made in November and approval granted by VCE in December. Revisions to come to the next L+T and then be submitted to College Exec.

Karen asked all members to comment on the 2 Associate Degree proposals (papers 2+3) by using track changes to update the documents on the I drive.
### 4.4 Prof Comm SIM update

Marianne reported that only 9 applicants had been received for the September start of the new program and as such the School had decided to postpone the launch until July 2012. This was in part due to delayed CPE approval which left insufficient time for marketing and also the continued competition from the outgoing Mass Communication (which has 187 students). This will lead to a reduction in income of about $55,000.

Fiona asked about the impact on SIM’s request for a first year. Terry replied that this will go ahead next year and that he was working with Karen on the academic submission. He also requested a review of entry requirements as currently students with non-VCE qualifications need to do a written test – other universities have equivalent entry requirements for eg A level qualifications.

### 4.5 PAR – paper 4

Fiona reported that we used to be asked to do a PAR in August, but now PAR will take place in March to align with profile. In March this year we had to report on our actions highlighted in the last PAR. A further progress report will be submitted in September. Fiona will contact TAFE Director and Associate Deans about the reporting process and documentation.

Section 1.1 relates to WIL and Fiona would like to check again that every program has a WIL component in line with the WIL policy. What emerged last year was that some advanced standing students may miss taking the designated WIL course. Terry pointed out that this policy is under review and may be removed.

Marianne asked if we could include an additional matrix in the PAR template regarding overseas activities to avoid PMs/PDs submitting an additional report. This could be done by adding a table to the relevant section when the template is circulated.

Francesca asked if further direction could be give, eg a model PAR. Glenn countered that if you make it too prescriptive you risk creating problems and missing information.

Ruth offered her assistance to PMs/PDs.

### 4.6 Process to work with Vietnam and SIM colleagues to work on course guides

### 4.7 Procedure for offshore campus including moderation at SIM and Vietnam

Fiona introduced Dr Eveline Fallshaw, Director of International Academic Policies.

Eveline reported that consideration was being given to adding an extra checklist to the PAR regarding thinking about running the same program in multiple locations. How do we in Melbourne take responsibility for the quality of programs, as what is being done in Vietnam or offshore must be equivalent to that of Melbourne? Given the projected growth in offshore a number of policies are under review. Three draft papers were circulated Policy: Awards offered at a wholly owned campus, Procedure: Awards offered at a wholly owned campus and Policy: Partnered delivery of coursework awards policy.

Eveline reported that the latter was designed to increase growth offshore (eg SIM) by permitting more flexibility. TAFE would be most likely to come under the 3rd model of delivery (Quality Assured). Currently most programs are delivered under model 2 (Jointly Delivered), but model 1 (RMIT delivered) was most likely to be relevant to Masters programs. The aim of the policy is to allow Schools to find appropriate partners and come up with a model that will work within minimum standards to ensure the quality of an RMIT program.
Fiona asked about the campus L+T committee in the procedure for a wholly owned campus. How would this impact on the current amendments to Prof Comm?
Eveline replied that proposals for amendments could come from Vietnam as well as from Melbourne, but that everything would have to go to College Board. Vietnam staff would probably submit paperwork to the Melbourne L+T Committee and attend via Skype/telephone. However, the program should be the same in all locations and the Melbourne L+T Committee has the steer for this.

Fiona asked how we could ensure that a dialogue is held regarding course guides for courses in SIM, Vietnam and Melbourne.
Eveline felt that it was very important that PMs/PDs go to Vietnam and that Vietnam staff come to the School for key events.

Marianne asked whether RMIT could sustain 3 semesters in Vietnam as difficulties were posed by the lack of alignment in the academic calendars.
Eveline reported that there is no current suggestion to change this due to business arrangements.

Peter L asked if many Vietnam students travelled to Melbourne for postgrad studies.
Eveline reported that there is currently very little choice in Vietnam for postgrad studies.

Peter L asked if there were opportunities for double degrees, but Eveline replied that it was very difficult to get market research in Vietnam.

4.8 Advanced Standing – paper 5
Marianne reported that the aim was to have a School approach to Advanced Standing to increase the catchment of students. A major issue is the number of exemptions that could be provided and a working party of the School’s International Committee has outlined a set of broad principles in this paper.
Eveline reported that a similar process took place in business and that visits to the Singapore polys were undertaken. The top student in Ngee Ann Diploma program is given a semester 1 fee waiver and this has been very successful in terms of boosting numbers. She offered to forward Business’s procedure to Marianne.

Glenn asked whether opportunities exist for Associate Degrees.
Eveline replied that these are currently better known in Singapore and Hong Kong than in Melbourne. Although there might not be a lot of financial return by offering these offshore, there was the possibility to generate income through pathways as a feeder to a Melbourne degree. These are attractive because students can gain entry to Associate Degrees with lower English qualifications.
Glenn asked how a 2+2 arrangement would be perceived
Eveline felt that this would not be an issue.

Fiona asked if a program could now be offered in Vietnam that was not run in Melbourne.
Eveline reported that although it was possible it was highly unlikely and difficult to achieve Ministry of Education approval.

Marianne asked why we handle moderation for Vietnam, since it is a campus.
Eveline reported that this is because the School in Melbourne is responsible for quality.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Business</th>
<th>Next Meeting</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friday 16th September, 12.30-2pm, 94.4.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>