A meeting of the Educational Excellence Committee was held at 10.00am on Monday 21st September in Room 4.08 Hub Link building (L07), Logan campus

### Item 1.0 WELCOME AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO COUNTRY

**Description**
The Chair welcomed members and acknowledged the traditional owners on which the meeting was held.

### Item 2.0 ATTENDANCE

**Present:**
- Associate Professor Keithia Wilson
- Dr Kevin Ashford-Rowe
- Dr Janis Bailey
- Ms Heather Cameron
- Associate Professor Rod Barrett
- Mr Sam Di Mauro
- Dr Steve Drew
- Ms Christine Grimmer
- Dr Saras Henderson
- Professor Parlo Singh
- Professor Kerri-Lee Krause
- Dr Peter Woods
- Dr Jock Macleod
- Dr Ann McDonnell
- Ms Sigrid Ryan
- Secretary: Ms Rae-Anne Locke

**Action:**
The Committee welcomed Ms Sigrid Ryan to the Committee.

### CONTENTS

#### Item 3.0 CONFIRMATION OF ACTION SHEET

**Action**
The action sheet accepted as a true and accurate record of the Committee’s 4/2009 meeting.

#### Item 4.0 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

**Description**
- The Chair reported:
  - The Committee congratulated the Working Party and Reference Group on their successful Australian Learning and Teaching Council grant. There was no meeting to report.
  - 4.2 Other Business - Griffith Grants for Learning and Teaching Reports Review
    - Further discussions regarding the schedule for report had occurred outside of the meeting. Due to resourcing concerns, it has been recommended:
      - Two year reports – drop from four reports to three – 8 and 18 month progress reports and a final report due within six months of completion of the project, so 2.5 years.
      - One year reports – progress at 8 months and a final report due within six months of
Members discussed the suggestion to hold back 50% of funding for two year reports, with the remaining funds being released upon demonstrating satisfactory progress on the project and completion of the progress report. However, members recommended adding a clause in the guidelines to indicate that funds may be clawed back if the project’s progress or report was not satisfactory.

**Action**  
Chair and Secretary to add clause to grants guidelines.

### Item 5.0  
**GRiffith Awards for Excellence in Teaching (GAET) Standing Item**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **5.1 GAET Outcomes**  
Dr Janis Bailey and Dr Steve Drew left the room while the Committee endorsed the confidential panel recommendations for awards and commendations. |
| **5.2 GAET statistics**  
When Drs Bailey and Drew rejoined the Committee, members discussed the comparative historical statistics for GAET nominations and applications and noted the slight increase in the number of applications received this year. |
| **5.3 GAET panel feedback**  
A collation of the panels’ collective feedback was tabled and discussed at the meeting. Members agreed with the panels’ judgement that the overall quality of applications was much higher than the previous year. |

The Secretary tabled an analysis of GAET outcomes against applicants that had sought peer review from GIHE. Eleven out of the 12 applicants that had received peer review had been awarded a highly commended or an award. The Chair noted that others had also received review from peers in their Schools, which would strengthen evidence of the effectiveness of this method of support. However, demand for GIHE peer review could not be sustained as the PEI Learning and Development Officer position ceased in May 2010. In line with the PEI project, local networks will be set up very soon to build capacity in Schools, Faculties and Groups. Part of the role of the networks will be to support staff in their applications for awards and grants.

Recommendations included:

- Encourage applicants to seek peer review of both their applications and their teaching practice.
- Shift the Humans Services and Social Work applications into the social sciences category in line with ALTC discipline groups. Provide guidance on website to indicate discipline groups.
- Make it more explicit that people can apply as individuals or teams in the Cultural Inclusiveness, WIL and Programs categories.
- Include a section on the use of evaluations from OUA and other universities. If an academic staff member exclusively teaches in OUA, then OUA evaluations may be submitted in lieu of Griffith evaluations. Members noted to need to speak to Professor Borbasi as negotiations were continuing regarding OUA evaluations.
- Develop an application writing checklist.
- Extend panel membership to include student representatives.

- **First Year Advisor category**
  - Require applicant to articulate the School’s position and context for the FYA role – i.e., what is the proportion of workload and the contextual variables.
  - Develop specific strategies to encourage this particular cohort to apply and to support their applications.

- **Work-integrated Learning category**
  - Mandate inclusion of SET and SEC as per other categories;
  - Retain a work-integrated learning award regardless of the change of ALTC Priority Award as WIL is an important strategic priority for Griffith.

- **Cultural Inclusiveness category**
  - Greater promotion through the Cultural Diversity and Internationalisation
Community of Practice; Deans (L&T); Heads of Schools as a strategy for recruiting applicants.

- Programs category
  - If any reference made to SET and SEC data, then it must be included as an appendix.

- Research Supervision category. Discussion of feedback on this category was deferred to the next meeting and an invitation will be extended to the Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School to attend to discuss this item.

Other discussion items included:
- If an applicants should be required to include their current workload allocation model in the practice overview and requested the Secretary follow this up with HRM and bring this back to the next meeting.
- Conducting campus-based briefings for panel members.
- Developing an evaluative framework of broad standards to assist panels to define circumstances where an award or commendation might be made.
- The relationship between the proposed option on SET and SEC for students to nominate a teacher for an award and the GAET nomination process. Concerns were raised that students might think that they may have already nominated a teacher via SET/SEC, so they may not nominate via the GAET scheme. Suggestions included trialling the SET/SEC option for one year to gauge the impact on GAET nominations, redirecting the SET/SEC option to the GAET nomination page and rewording the SET/SEC option away from ‘nominating’ a teacher to ‘commending’ a teacher.

The Chair identified the need for a quality assurance mechanism to monitor the consistency of outcomes and standards across all panels, and suggested 2 mechanisms: 1) that the same Secretary needs to be a member of all of the GAET panels, and to raise any consistency issues with the Chair of EEC; and 2) the Chair of EEC, in consultation with both the Secretary, and, the Chair of LTC will take appropriate action to ensure consistency of standards and decision-making. EEC members, including the Chair of LTC endorsed the suggestion.

### Actions

1. Secretary to forward confidential panel recommendations to Learning and Teaching Committee for final endorsement.
2. Secretary to follow up with Professor Borbasi regarding OUA evaluations.
3. Secretary to extend invitation to the Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School to attend to discuss Research Supervision category at next meeting.
4. Secretary to follow up with HRM the suggestion of requiring applicants to include their workload allocation model in the practice overview.
5. Secretary and Chair to make changes to the guidelines and return to EEC at a future meeting.

### Item 6.0 ALTC STANDING ITEM UPDATE

| Description | Deferred to next meeting. |
| Actions | Noted. |

### Item 7.0 GRIFFITH GRANTS FOR LEARNING AND TEACHING STANDING ITEM

| Description | Deferred to next meeting. |
| Action | Noted. |

### Item 8.0 PROMOTING EXCELLENCE INITIATIVE STANDING ITEM

| Description | Deferred to next meeting. |
| Action | Noted. |

### Item 9.0 STRATEGIC USE OF AWARD WINNERS AND DISSEMINATION OF BEST PRACTICE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 10.0</th>
<th>STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP – IDENTIFYING TEACHING EXCELLENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Deferred to next meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 11.0</th>
<th>OTHER BUSINESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Nil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 12.0</th>
<th>NEXT MEETING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>10.00am to 12.30pm on Monday 9th November videconferenced between N54_2.06 and G34_1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>