

## **ACADEMIC QUALITY AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE Meeting No. 12**

---

Unconfirmed minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 5 May 2025 by videoconference.

## 1. Welcome and Apologies

The Chair opened the meeting at 10.00am with an Acknowledgement of Country and welcomed members and attendees.

### Members Present

Professor Janelle Wheat	Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) (Chair)
Associate Professor Jenny Kent	Deputy Dean, FOBJBS
Dr Brendon Hyndman	Acting Associate Dean, Academic, FOAE (ADA, FOAE)
Associate Professor Rachel Whitsed	Associate Dean, Academic, FOSH (ADA, FOSH)
Associate Professor Julia Lynch	Associate Dean, Academic, FOBJBS (ADA, FOBJBS)
Associate Professor Mark Bassett	Director, Academic Quality and Standards and Academic Lead (AI)
Professor Sarah O'Shea	Dean, Graduate Research
Ms Heather McGregor	Pro Vice-Chancellor (Student Success)
Ms Lisa Campbell	Academic staff member from FOAE with responsibility for workplace learning
Dr Prue Laidlaw	Academic staff member from FOSH with expertise in learning and teaching
Ms Jilly Taylor	Professional/general team member with expertise in grade administration
Associate Professor Narelle Patton	Academic staff member from FOSH with responsibility for workplace learning
Ms Louise Skilling	Academic staff member from FOBJBS with expertise in learning and teaching
Ms Emma Marshall	Student representative

### Attendees

Ms Kate Hayden	Manager, Governance (Minutes)
Associate Professor Koshila Kumar	Sub Dean, Academic Development
Ms Bec Acheson	Education Design Lead
Ms Reagan Petzel	Executive Officer, DLT
Ms Stephanie Daskein	Course and Subject Accreditation Officer
Mr James Elibank Murray	Manager, Course and Subject Accreditation
Associate Professor Christopher Orchard	Acting Head of School, School of Indigenous Australian Studies

### Apologies

Mr Mike Bryant	Academic Director, Education Strategy
Mr Mike Ferguson	Pro Vice-Chancellor (International)
Mr Carlo Iacono	University Librarian
Professor Will Letts	Acting Deputy Dean, FOAE
Associate Professor Susan Mlcek	Academic staff member from FOAE with expertise in learning and teaching
Professor Tony Dreise	Pro Vice-Chancellor (First Nations Engagement)

## 2. Declaration of Interests

There were no interests raised or declared by members.

## 3. Confirmation of Agenda

The Committee agreed to vary the agenda after item 8, to consider items 10, 11 and 9, prior to returning to the order of the agenda.

#### 4. Previous Minutes

**RESOLUTION AQSC12/1** The Academic Quality and Standards Committee resolved to **approve** the minutes of the meeting held on 10 March 2025 as a true and accurate record.

#### 5. Action Sheet

Item Ref	Action	Update
AQSC11/1	Meet to consider how future Annual Course Health Checks should be presented to the AQSC.	The item was marked completed. Members noted that the paper included at Item 9 satisfied the requirements for reporting on the Annual Course Health Checks.
AQSC11/3	Convene a meeting with the Dir, Risk and Compliance, Assoc Dir, Compliance, the Manager, Academic Quality Enhancement, the Deputy Deans (FOAE and FOBJS), the ADA (FOSH) and Dir, AQS and AL (AI) to consider reporting and recommendations in relation to third-party arrangements.	Item to remain in progress. Members noted a meeting was scheduled to be held on 7 May 2025, and an update on the outcome would be provided to the July 2025 meeting.

#### 6. Faculty of Science and Health Courses

There were no course reviews from the Faculty of Science and Health to be considered at the meeting.

#### 7. Faculty of Arts and Education Courses

There were no course reviews from the Faculty of Arts and Education to be considered at the meeting.

#### 8. Faculty of Business, Justice and Behavioural Sciences Course Reviews

There were no course reviews from the Faculty of Business, Justice and Behavioural Sciences to be considered at the meeting.

#### 9. Faculty of Arts and Education – Annual Course Health Checks

The ADA, FOAE reported on the following Faculty's Annual Course Health Checks:

- 3408TS01 Bachelor of Teaching (Secondary)
- 1022TH01 Undergraduate Certificate in Theology
- 1022EC01 Undergraduate Certificate in Early Childhood Education
- 1022CR01 Undergraduate Certificate in Creative Writing

The ADA provided the following additional updates in relation to the Faculty's ACHCs:

- The Bachelor of Teaching (Secondary) was at the discontinuation stage, and the proposal would be submitted to the May 2025 meeting of Academic Senate.
- The Undergraduate Certificate in Theology was activated in 2023, but enrolments were suspended in 2024 pending a decision by the Department of Education on whether undergraduate certificates could continue as an award. Given it was not possible to make a judgment on the course at this stage, the Course Director had decided to run the course for 2 – 3 years before deciding on its future.

- The review of the Undergraduate Certificate in Early Childhood Education identified that the certificate was not recognised in the early childhood workforce, and therefore, the target market was unknown. Consideration was given to reframing the certificate for primary education as a pathway, however, there was already a Bachelor of Educational Studies. It was likely that the certificate would be discontinued.
- The Undergraduate Certificate in Creative Writing had great potential, as it was a flexible, short-term, entry-level qualification in creative writing, and the Course Director and the School anticipated that there would be a lot of interest in the course.

The Manager, Course and Subject Administration highlighted the need to ensure the rationale section was completed in the reviews to allow for reporting out of the system and to reduce duplication, and further that where actions were required, the responsible people and due dates were to be added.

**RESOLUTION AQSC12/2** The Academic Quality and Standards Committee resolved to **approve** the Annual Course Health Checks for the Faculty of Arts and Education.

#### 10. Charles Sturt University Sydney and Melbourne Campuses – Verbal Update

The Deputy Dean, FOBJBS reported on the Charles Sturt University Sydney and Melbourne campuses and updated members on the following:

- Navitas Limited's (Navitas) request for online exams for its students. During 2024, the Navitas students at the Sydney campus completed their exams on campus, however, the logistics for the Melbourne students were problematic as the campus premises were shared with another Navitas organisation, the Australian College of Applied Psychology (ACAP) University College, and the timing of the ACAP sessions was different to the University's.

Following Discussions with key FOBJBS staff, it was agreed that the exams would be moved online for all Navitas students and a review would be undertaken after the 30 June 2025 exam session to assess how the processes had worked and to identify any issues.

Consideration had been given to the number of invigilators required and the validation of student identification to ensure the right student was completing the exam.

Navitas students had previously raised concerns around equity, as other University students were allowed to do their exams online, hence, the change would address the issues of inequity.

- The University's contract with Navitas included a clause stipulating that the Navitas students were to have a regional experience on one of the University's regional campuses at least once a year. The logistics of this had been challenging; however, the Executive Director, Student Experience, was working on an opportunity for the Sydney students to travel to Bathurst for the Bathurst Regional Council's career expo in July 2025, which the University was sponsoring. Another planned initiative was to connect the students on the Student Representative Councils in Bathurst and Sydney, to allow for peer-to-peer interaction and mentoring. The University would arrange for the appropriate stakeholders to work with both groups on skills building activities.
- The ADA, FOAE and relevant Head of School for the Faculty of Arts and Education would be invited to become involved in the Academic Management Committees going forward, given the commencement of the social work degree.
- The Sub Dean, Learning and Teaching, FOBJBS, was working with Navitas to establish their staff within the Charles Sturt Research Output (CRO) for reporting on scholarly activity. While the University's staff would no longer be using CRO to record scholarly activity as the Performance, Planning, Development and Review (PPDR) process would be used, it had been determined that CRO was appropriate for Navitas.

- The strategy was to focus on the postgraduate students for the metropolitan campuses for the time being, due to the high attrition rates for the undergraduate programs, with other organisations poaching the Navitas undergraduate students.

Members discussed the following in relation to the move to online exams for Navitas students:

- Concern over the potential for risk to academic integrity in moving the exams online.
- The ADA, FOBBJS advised that the change would equate the Navitas and the University's domestic cohorts, and the risks would not be increased. The mitigations against cheating would include that the exams would be open book, and the same identity checks as for the University's domestic cohorts would apply.
- Noting the work underway towards programmatic assessment, which aimed to improve the University's assessment practices, there was concern that the move would lower the quality of exams for the Navitas students, noting that, regardless of whether an exam was open book, it was difficult to verify the integrity of online exams.
- It was confirmed that the Navitas students attended classes on campus, as did the CSU domestic students for whom the exams were held online. But there were complexities with there not being exam centres for some of the online students to attend.
- The different practices across the faculties, with FOBBJS using online exams since COVID and validating its learning with touchpoints throughout the subjects.
- The view that while there were some accredited courses for which online exams were permitted by the accreditation body, that did not necessarily mean it was a high-quality way of assessing a student; and the University needed to focus on assessing students in line with pedagogy and curriculum during the interim period until the implementation of the Models of Engagement was completed.
- The appointment of a new Associate Director, Academic Quality, who would focus on assessment integrity as a priority, and would work with all relevant stakeholders across the University to look at the best way forward in terms of assessment integrity for online exams.

**RESOLUTION AQSC12/3** The Academic Quality and Standards Committee resolved to **note** the verbal report on the Charles Sturt University Sydney and Melbourne Campuses from the Deputy Dean, Faculty of Business, Justice and Behavioural Sciences.

## 11. Scholarly Activity Changes in 2025

The Sub Dean, Academic Development (SDAD), Division of Learning and Teaching (DLT) reported on the summary of scholarly activity changes in 2025. Members noted the following:

- The lifting of the requirement to record scholarly activity in CRO by the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Academic, with reporting on scholarly activity planning and completion to move across to the PPDR process.
- Staff and supervisors had welcomed the change, given the challenges raised in the past around recording all types of scholarly activity in CRO.
- The change provided an opportunity to reinforce the University's expectations and the communication around scholarly activity, noting that while the expectations had not changed, the framework was being strengthened in line with the University's obligations as a higher education provider and the University would be able to assure TEQSA on the quality of its scholarly activity.
- The paper included the recommendations for the expectations around setting scholarly activity objectives, completing and reporting on scholarly activity for the different types of staff, including continuing, fixed term and casual staff and staff employed by third-party providers.

- In terms of what the change would mean for schools, faculties, and business units, including DLT and the Research Office, there was still work to be done to ensure the appropriate mechanisms were in place and that across the University, the expectations were collectively understood.
- Discussions were being held between DLT, Governance, the Risk and Compliance Unit, the Office of Academic Quality, Standards and Integrity, the Deputy Deans (FOBJBS and FOAE) and the ADA (FOSH) to ensure a consistent approach to reporting on scholarly activity, including for third party providers from the faculty boards to the Committee and Academic Senate.
- The Manager, Academic Quality Enhancement, was working with DLT to create system templates to enable the process, so the responsibility would not be left to individual schools, and to develop a shared narrative around scholarly activity.

Members discussed the following points in relation to reporting on scholarly activity:

- The source of the data, including whether it would be extracted from TINA, as the repository for the PPDR process and provided by the Teaching Academy to the faculties.
- The timing of the data, noting the challenges in retrieving the data as the PPDR process was mid-cycle. The SDAD confirmed the first report would be based on retrospective data, however, the reporting timeline going forward would be aligned through the various committees to ensure the correct flow of information and that Academic Senate was receiving up to date information.
- The SDAD noted the different reporting mechanisms for scholarly activity, with the faculty boards being responsible for looking at the data from the schools and third-party providers to report directly to the Committee and Academic Senate; and DLT scholarly activity reporting to be focused on the macro-level, looking at what was occurring across the entire University ecosystem. It was noted this was the first time DLT would create the report, and the SDAD would engage with the PPDR data to assess what it provided on scholarly activity within the schools; however, going forward, the schools would be responsible for highlighting what was happening with the PPDR data to report to the faculties.
- Querying what roles within the schools would be responsible for creating the report and the purpose of the data in terms of whether the schools would be using it for another purpose or solely to report to the faculty boards, and if that was the case, whether the faculties should create the reports.
- The potential privacy issues concerning the PPDR data, noting similar issues had been raised in relation to the QUASAR reporting, as this included information on individual course performance.
- The need to be clear about how the PPDR data would be used, agreeing it was a better option than CRO in terms of reducing the workload for reporting, as staff had to complete the PPDR anyway, and everyone had a scholarly activity allocation.
- Seek feedback from the schools and faculties, as the faculties may be better suited to do the reporting rather than having schools navigate the personal nature of the PPDR data, noting that schools still needed to take responsibility for the scholarly activity of their staff.
- Conversations needed to be started to set the expectations early on.

The Chair agreed to liaise with the Faculty Leadership Team on the strategy for communicating to the schools on the scholarly activity changes and reporting requirements.

**ACTION AQSC12/1:** Liaise with the Faculty Leadership Team to determine a strategy for setting the expectations regarding the scholarly activity reporting requirements with the schools. [PVCLT]

**RESOLUTION AQSC12/4** The Academic Quality and Standards Committee resolved to:

1. **endorse** the proposed changes to scholarly activity; and
2. **request** feedback on any further actions that could be taken to improve scholarly activity, goal setting and completion, reporting and governance.

## 12. Work Integrated Learning as Programmatic Assessment

The ADA, FOSH spoke to the report, which outlined the proposal designed to address the issues with capturing work-integrated learning (WIL) experiences appropriately in non-professionally accredited science courses, and which could potentially be used for other non-science courses.

The ADA, FOSH advised that the Faculty of Science and Health Faculty Board had requested the FoSH Guidelines for Calibrating Student Workload in Work-Integrated Learning Subjects (Guidelines) accompany the report to the Committee; however, due to the timing of the meetings, the Guidelines would be submitted to the July 2025 meeting.

The ADA, FOSH noted:

- The proposal sought to allow students to complete practical work experience throughout their course, scaffolded within a 0-point subject.
- The initiative would work similarly to programmatic assessment in terms of having the placement run throughout the course, with the experience and learnings to be scaffolded in subjects along the way to ensure the student was on track.
- Students would then build a portfolio based on the work undertaken, and this work would be assessed in a capstone subject.
- The model was already being used by other institutions, and the practice was being used in a number of the University's courses, but it was currently occurring outside of policy.

Members discussed:

- The possible risks to students in terms of well-being, supervision, and the number of hours of placement and what the oversight would look like.

The Associate Dean, Partnerships and Work Integrated Learning confirmed that all WIL placements would be held in InPlace, which was in line with current practice and that it would still be possible using a 0-point subject.

It was noted that the Guidelines had been updated to include Principle 3, which stipulated that 'All WIL placement records should be held in InPlace, including for example, placement dates, location, approvals and hours completed. This facilitates student tracking of their completed placement hours and university risk management of student placements during natural disasters'.

In addition to using InPlace, WIL coordinators checked in with students to see how they are doing and to confirm their placements were appropriate.

- The model would solve the issue of students not officially being enrolled, reaching the 3<sup>rd</sup> year, but they have not done the required number of placement hours and therefore cannot be enrolled as they have not met the prerequisites.
- The placements would still be WIL, but students would not be asked to check off a list of skills, it would be more about work experience in industry, and there would not be an immediate assessment, as mentioned, the student would reflect on their work experience and their learnings in a capstone portfolio.
- The issue with the current practice of embedding placements through the subjects and the course and then having a capstone, meant some subjects were constrained in time for example they were made up of 1 quarter placement and 3 quarters content, which made it

hard for the placements to be completed in the time available and these often ended up in whole cohort TAs, which was an administrative burden. It had become clear that the placement subjects needed to be separated from the content subjects.

Alternative options were discussed, including creating 3-point subjects to match with 2-point subjects, but these would reduce flexibility for students.

- The model would provide students with ultimate flexibility in terms of how they complete their placement and having the 0-point subject as a scaffold for the whole course would allow the students to access Brightspace at any time to get information on what they needed to do for their placement, what assessments were coming up and what the touch point subjects were.
- The model would ensure that every hour of a student's placement was captured, removing the risks associated with modern slavery.
- Students often provided feedback that they do not like paying for placements, and the model would remove the perception that students were paying to do the placements and then working for free.
- The need to ensure the learning outcomes were explicit and progressive across their years of learning, so the students were aware of what was required for each year, noting the concern that some students may complete their placements in large blocks, and they may not get what they need from the experience.

The ADA, FOSH confirmed the model was not being used instead of having WIL subjects, and there would be courses where WIL needed to be embedded in the subjects to ensure strong scaffolding. There were different ways this could be done, including setting up the scaffolding in the introductory subject in the first session and outlining the core subjects in which students would be assessed, what experience they would need to draw on and at what stage.

- Consideration of the HESF standards in terms of ensuring the proposal meets the compliance obligations and that the 0-point subject clearly states learning outcomes and valid assessment approaches.
- In response to a comment on the need for a greater common understanding of capstones, it was noted that the Models of Engagement project would pick up on this in terms of having clear guidelines around the capstone piece, what the touchpoints are and how these were aligned to the learning outcomes.
- Further consideration needed to be given to enrolling international students in 0-point subjects.

The Chair requested the ADA, FOSH, to meet with the team working on the Models of Engagement and Assessment Practices (MEA) to see if the proposal could be built into the pathfinder courses to look at the implications of the proposal, noting it should not only be looked at from the course review perspective. The proposal would also need to be discussed with OAQS to allow the quality and standards team to look at it from a policy perspective.

It was agreed that a report on the outcomes of the consultation would be brought to a future meeting of the Committee.

**ACTION AQSC12/2:** Submit the FoSH Guidelines for Calibrating Student Workload in Work-Integrated Learning Subjects to the July 2025 meeting. [ADA, FOSH and AD, Partnerships and Work Integrated Learning]

**ACTION AQSC12/3:** Report to the Committee on the outcomes of the consultation with the MEA and Quality and Assurance teams on the Work Integrated Learning as Programmatic Assessment proposal. [ADA, FOSH]



**RESOLUTION AQSC12/5** The Academic Quality and Standards Committee resolved to:

1. **note** the Work Integrated Learning as Programmatic Assessment proposal; and
2. **request** further consultation be undertaken on the proposal before reporting back to the Committee.

### 13. Annual Plan

The Annual Plan was noted.

**RESOLUTION AQSC12/6** The Academic Quality and Standards Committee resolved to **note** the Academic Quality and Standards Committee Annual Plan.

### 14. Other Business

There was no other business.

### 15. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee will be held from 10.00am to 1.00pm on Monday, 21 July 2025 by videoconference. The agenda for this meeting closes on Thursday, 3 July 2025.

There being no further business, the meeting concluded at 11.06 am.

Signed as a true and accurate record:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date