A meeting of the University Assessment Committee was held at 1.00 pm on Monday 4 August 2014, video-conferenced between room 2.06 Bray Centre (N54) Nathan campus and room 2.27 Information Services (L03) Logan campus.

MINUTES

PRESENT
Associate Professor Heather Alexander (Chair)
Professor Mark Brimble
Professor Lorelle Frazer
Professor Richard John
Associate Professor Wendy Loughlin
Mr Leigh Stevenson for Mr Bruce Callow
Ms Rebecca Seymour
Ms Karen van Haeringen

APOLOGIES
Mr Bruce Callow
Professor Glenn Finger
Ms Cathy McGrath
Associate Professor Ray Tedman
Professor Nicholas Buys

Ms Rachel Farnsworth (Secretary)

1.0 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of the 5/2014 meeting of the University Assessment Committee were taken as read and confirmed.

2.0 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

No members identified any conflict of interest, as outlined in the University policies on Conflict of Interest and Personal Relationships in the Workplace, which exist in respect of any of the items on the agenda.

SECTION A: REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO LEARNING AND TEACHING COMMITTEE

Nil

SECTION B: ACTION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

Nil

SECTION C: OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

3.0 GOVERNANCE OF ASSESSMENT IN OUA COURSES

3.1 Learning and Teaching Committee at its 1/2014 meeting considered University Assessment Committee’s recommendation that the transfer of OUA Assessment processes to the Schools proceed in semester 2, 2014 regardless of the delay in the Gradebook project implementation.

3.2 University Assessment Committee was asked by Learning and Teaching Committee to liaise with Examinations and Timetabling to develop a business process which
clearly outlines the workflow requirements. The Committee provided feedback to the working draft document at the last meeting. A revised document (2014/0005281) was attached for the consideration of the Committee.

3.3 The diagram shows where each section intersects and a process flow from the preparation of MESS report. The aim is to reduce risk and streamline the process. Griffith OUA Services currently publish grades through Learning@Griffith for some Schools and there is a high level of risk associated with this activity. It is proposed that the affected students are advised that their results will only be available through the OUA Student Portal and the practice of transferring grades to some Learning@Griffith sites be stopped.

3.4 Examinations and Timetabling is currently liaising with Enrolments and Fees to facilitate access to the Griffith portal for all students, to enable students to access the online assessment applications. While there is no course profiles established for OUA courses, students would still be able to manually enter this information into their applications.

3.5 The current paper based application for review of grade has the application to be lodged within 14 days of notification. It was proposed that the forms be updated to the 10 working days timeframe in line with the Assessment policy.

3.6 OUA students are currently not picked up in the normal academic standing process. If the student is a CSP student then the Academic Standing Progression and Exclusion Policy will apply. Students who have completed 4 OUA courses and meet GPA requirements can then qualify for program entry as a CSP student.

3.7 The Committee recommended the revised business process for managing grades in OUA courses and the incorporation of a minor change to view grades in the flow chart prior to sending to Learning and Teaching Committee.

Resolution

3.8 The University Assessment Committee resolved to consider the business process for governance of assessment in OUA courses, with minor amendments at its next meeting.

4.0 DATA RELATED TO SEMESTER 1/2014 ASSESSMENT PROCESSES

4.1 Each year the University Assessment Committee considers data about the implementation of assessment policies and processes to consider their impact on student learning and achievement standards. The following data for semester 1, 2014 is sourced as follows:

- **Academic standing** – failure in a designated course and failure in a course three times – data source is academic standing data
- **Academic standing** – increased the threshold GPA for academic standing in undergraduate programs to 3.5 - data source is academic standing data and GPAs of graduates
- **Deferred and Supplementary Assessment** – data source is examination sittings
- **Review and appeal of grades application processes** – data source is application data.
- **Assessment applications for special consideration, deferred assessment and review of grade**

4.2 The attached data (2014/0005295) was discussed by the Committee and the following was noted:

- The percentage of attendance of expected and attended exam sittings remains steady from semester 2, 2013 to semester 1, 2014. The attendance rate was up (10%) on semester 1, 2013. Expected exam attendance and attended
examination sittings has returned to a consistent figure following the unexpected drop in semester 1/2013 attendances.

- Expected alternate exam sittings are down on semester 1, 2013 figures and the central deferred sittings are similar to the numbers for semester 1, 2013.
- A significant increase in additional requirements for examinations, it is felt that the introduction of the disclosure statement has contributed to the increase in these figures.
- The number of supplementary exams awarded in semester 1, 2014 is higher than the same period last year. An increase in supplementary exams was expected following the removal of the PC grade. School based supplementary examinations while down on semester 1, 2013 are still higher than the same period from 2010 – 2012. The data remains fairly consistent in terms of the number of sittings and assessment. It was noted that the grading basis in the course profiles have not been updated, except in the instance of honours courses which were specifically changed by Academic Services staff. SAO/PSO’s will be reminded that as part of the course profile updates that the grading basis must be reviewed.
- Applications for deferred assessment, alternate sittings and special consideration have all increased, while review of grade applications have declined.
- The number of students with an academic standing status of excluded and probation, increased in semester 1, 2014 which was expected following the implementation of the increased GPA threshold for academic standing in undergraduate programs. There was a significant drop in the number of students with a status of warning. Graduation GPA data and data on the number of students identified as being eligible for exclusion (exclusion check) compared to those who are actually excluded will be sought for the Committee to review in an upcoming meeting.
- There was an increase in the total number of students excluded in semester 1, 2014 compared to semester 1, 2013.
- The Committee asked for the % attendance data for Semester 1 2013 end of semester examinations to be reviewed prior to providing the report to Learning and Teaching Committee.

4.3 Also attached for the information of University Assessment Committee was a summary of academic integrity breaches for each assessment type for semester 1, 2014 (2014/0005296). The data indicates:

- Of the 398 AI breaches reported for the period, approximately 75% of these were Tier 1 Level of Concern (299 breaches) and 25% (99 breaches) were Tier 2 Level of Concern.
- Breaches for Semester 1, 2014 (361 breaches) have decreased slightly compared to the reported 378 breaches for Semester 1, 2013.
- Written assignments continue to attract the highest number of AI breaches, accounting for approximately 71% of total breaches (284 breaches total).
- Breaches of the examination type of assessment have decreased slightly when comparing Semester 1, 2014 (26 breaches) and Semester 1, 2013 (30 breaches).
- Poor referencing comprises approximately 29% of all breaches (116 breaches).
- Collusion was the next highest breach type comprising approximately 14% of all breaches (58 breaches).

4.4 The Committee noted that the breach type of collusion rated highly in the report and discussed the need for ongoing professional development around what is collusion, peer learning, supported learning and approaches to assisting others. Some concerns were raised about program leaders of peer support programs sitting in on first year lectures for the courses they are providing the support programs, and the potential disruption to learning for the group. There were also questions raised around
Resolution

4.5 The University Assessment Committee resolved to obtain additional assessment data for consideration at its 7/2014 meeting and report progress on changes made to assessment policy and processes to the next meeting of Learning and Teaching Committee.

5.0 GOVERNANCE OF ASSESSMENT AND ONLINE ASSESSMENT APPLICATIONS

5.1 At the 5/2014 meeting the Committee discussed the volume of online assessment applications and a request to consider the review of delegations to manage the workload.

5.2 The Committee gave consideration as to how due care and diligence to each application could be given and handled appropriately by current delegations and systems and any business process developments required to collect and verify more detailed information.

5.3 Attached for the Committee’s consideration was the special consideration application data by School for semester 1/2014 and semester 2/2013 (2014/0005294). The School of Nursing and Midwifery has the highest number of applications followed by the Department of Accounting and Finance. The applications are spread across courses and not limited to one or two courses.

5.4 Online assessment applications currently use the Head of School group maintained by Academic Services to populate the approving authority name. The Committee initially discussed the possibility of creating two new groups for Chairs, School Assessment Boards and Chairs, School Assessment Panels, to manage the applications.

5.5 The current process has the course convenor review and make a recommendation to the Chair of the School Assessment Board. The Committee agreed that the initial decision maker was in effect the course convenor and that the review person should be the Chair of the School Assessment Board. This should apply to applications for special consideration and deferred examinations.

5.6 The Committee noted the need to reflect this change in the Governance of Assessment and Academic Achievement Standards and Assessment policies. The Senior Manager Examinations and Timetabling agreed to liaise with BSS to enable this change to existing groups in the system and Examinations and Timetabling will communicate this change to staff when approved.

5.7 The Committee expressed interest in continuing to review data in relation to special consideration and deferred examination applications.

Resolution

5.8 The University Assessment Committee resolved to make

- Changes to the business process for the management of special consideration and deferred examination applications
- Policy changes to the Governance of Assessment and Academic Achievement Standards and Assessment Policies to reflect the revised approval delegations be considered at its next meeting.
SECTION D: MATTERS NOTED, CONSIDERED OR REMAINING UNDER DISCUSSION

6.0 FEEDBACK ON STUDENT REVIEW AND APPEALS POLICY AND STUDENT COMPLAINTS POLICY

6.1 At the 5/2014 meeting the Committee discussed the Student Review and Appeals Policy and Procedure and the Student Complaints Policy and Procedure. The Committee was advised of student focus group sessions to be held at the Nathan and Gold Coast campuses. Attached for the information of the Committee was the presentation (2014/0005290) used in the focus group sessions with students in relation to the Student Review and Appeals Policy and Procedure and the Student Complaints Policy and Procedure. Also attached for the Committee’s reference were the relevant policy and procedure documents as provided at the 5/2014 meeting.

6.2 Student representatives were invited to attend focus group sessions held at Nathan and Gold Coast campuses to provide feedback in relation to the policies, procedures and forms. The student focus groups were made up of students who sit on Academic Committee, Council, Appeals Committee and advocates from Student Representative Council. Attached for the Committee’s information is:
- Summary of student focus group responses (2014/0005291)
- Student responses and comments questionnaire 1 (2014/0005292)
- Student responses and comments questionnaire 2 (2014/0005293)

6.3 Students were asked to give feedback on the policies, procedures and accompanying forms. Overall, students’ responses were very positive. The majority of students (89%) agreed, or strongly agreed that the policies and procedures clearly explained how to apply for a review or appeal of a University decision or to make a complaint.

6.4 For students the main issue has been identifying when they are seeking a review or appeal of a decision or making a complaint. A table that provides some examples of what is a decision and what is a complaint will be incorporated with the documentation. There was some concern raised about the first step in the process of resolving at the local area – there are times when a student does not wish to interact with the original decision maker and as a result of the feedback this step is likely to be discretionary.

6.5 Students were satisfied with the forms; with most students agreeing that the forms were user-friendly and all students responding that they would feel comfortable completing the forms. All students believed that the 3-step processes in the Student Review and Appeals Procedures and Student Complaint Procedures were an important safeguard for student’s rights, and that the policies and procedures effectively protected student’s rights either ‘fairly well’ or ‘very well’.

6.6 The Committee also discussed the decision table in the Student Review and Appeals Procedure:
- Academic Standing and Re-Admission the appeal body should be the Dean Learning and Teaching and not the University Appeals Committee.
- HDR Academic Misconduct – Graduate Research School is providing feedback and clarification around the role of Dean Research and Dean GGRS.
- International office is providing feedback in relation to decisions around international students.
- It was queried whether scholarships should be a reviewable decision – generally they would not be considered reviewable unless there was a review against procedure.
6.7 In addition to the feedback already received from students, Committee members were asked to contribute to the feedback by completing the questionnaires as circulated by the Deputy Academic Registrar. The Deputy Academic Registrar will amend policies and forms in line with feedback received. A mockup of a website will be created and some FAQs developed. The Chair thanked the Deputy Academic Registrar for her work in updating these important policies.

Resolution

6.8 The University Assessment Committee noted the progress of the consultation process and supported the progress of the documentation for consideration by Executive Group.

7.0 END OF SEMESTER EXAMINATION TIMETABLE AT SOUTH BANK CAMPUSES

7.1 The G20 Meeting being held in Brisbane in November has a number of safety, security and access implications for staff and students. The event falls within the semester 2, end of semester examination period and alternative arrangements will need to be considered for a number of cohorts of students.

7.2 In preparation of course profile information, QCA and QCGU contacted Academic Services in relation to arrangements for the examination period in semester 2, 2014. It was acknowledged that there will be issues with access to facilities and transport in the lead up to the summit. Students at QCGU have already received formal communication in relation to alternative arrangements which include:

- Project week remains with no lectures, but individual lessons to continue
- Observe Study Week one week earlier – Week beginning 27 October 2014
- First week of exams – Week beginning 3 November 2014 (with some exams on Saturday 1 November 2014)
- No exams in the week of the G20 – Week beginning 10 November 2014. Students are advised that it may be extremely difficult to access the campus particularly late in the week
- Second week of exams to run the same as all other central end of semester exams, Week beginning 17 November 2014
- The net result of this will be 12 lessons and 11 lectures (but same volume of learning) in second semester.

7.3 While QCA and QCGU have communicated arrangements to their students, there are other Groups who may need to consider alternative arrangements. The Director of Student Administration is seeking advice from Campus Life regarding broader arrangements for students and staff during the summit. The Committee was asked that if any individual arrangements have been made or are being made, Groups are to advise or liaise with the Director of Student Administration. The original advice given to QCA and QCGU was to not schedule examinations in the first week; no examinations will be scheduled on the public holiday at any of the Brisbane campuses. If examinations are required to be held in the first week then arrangements can be made for alternative venues at Mt Gravatt or Nathan campuses.

7.4 The Committee agreed that there should be a coordinated approach and a formal communication to all staff and students. The Committee resolved to request the Academic Registrar seek further advice and clarification from the DVC Engagement.

Resolution

7.5 The University Assessment Committee noted that the Academic Registrar is to seek further advice and clarification from the DVC Engagement, in relation to arrangements for staff and students at the affected campuses and a University wide communication to be made in relation to the matter.
8.0 SCHOOL ASSESSMENT BOARD PROCESSES FOR SEMESTER 1, 2014

8.1 The Matters of Policy and Precedent for Semester 1, 2014 was provided to School Assessment Boards to inform them of recent changes in the University's assessment practices. School Assessment Boards were asked to address and provide feedback in relation to a number of policy areas.

8.2 The School Assessment Boards SharePoint site was introduced in semester 2, 2013. Assessment Board information was managed through the site before and after the meeting, the site serves as the recordkeeping repository.

Resolution

8.3 The Committee noted that less than half the Schools had uploaded minutes and MESS reports from mid-year School Assessment Board meetings to the SharePoint site. Committee members were asked to encourage Schools to provide this information as soon as possible, to enable a report to be prepared for the next University Assessment Committee meeting.

9.0 CHAIR’S REPORT

The Chair reported on the following items of business:

9.1 Professional Development on e-assessment.
Professor Geoff Crisp (RMIT) and Dr Matthew Hillier (UQ) will be presenting two interactive workshops on online assessment. Workshops will be held in August on both the Gold Coast and Nathan campuses. All academic staff are invited to attend. Dr Hillier will also be asked to provide a peer review of teaching session for invited staff which will also include a demonstration of a plug in exam device which allows computers to be ‘locked down’ so that assessment can be undertaken. The Chair asked members to identify some key staff from their Group for invitation.

9.2 Progress on Streamlining Assessment Project
The TurnItIn support part of this project is in the process of handover to Learning and Teaching Systems. The Gradebook Project has undertaken a series of workshops to review business processes with a view to running a Summer semester 2 pilot, followed by a review process in semester 1, 2015 with implementation in semester 2, 2015. Discussions will continue with the Project Board in relation to budget and scope, the Project Board will continue to review and monitor scope.

9.3 Analysis of University Appeals Committee Data
9.3.1 University Appeals Committee provides annual data about assessment-related student appeals to University Assessment Committee for the purpose of monitoring the effectiveness of assessment policy and practices.

9.3.2 The Committee will recall the item, reporting of student appeals in relation to assessment matters which was discussed at the 5/2014 meeting. TEQSA requires as part of its core evidence for re-registration, the following in terms of Provider Standard 6.4 Grievance Processes:
- The number of complaints over the past 12 months and analysis of the nature of the complaints
- Latest report to governing body on student complaints and grievances

9.3.3 The Committee considered the student appeal data (2014/0005298); it provided an interesting piece of contextual information in relation to the new review and appeals policies and procedures that the Committee has previously considered.
9.3.4 The data indicated that when the requirement for exclusion changed there were the expected increases in exclusions but no corresponding increase in appeals. The appeals against exclusion are actually in decline. There is an assumption that the clarity around the basis for exclusion and the role of the Student Success Advisor may have contributed to the decline in appeals.

9.3.5 Cumulative Career GPA data – Course Convenors and Deans are making decision around a program GPA and making concessions or discretionary decisions rather than opting to base a recommendation for exclusion decision on the cumulative career GPA.

9.3.6 The Committee noted that a substantial number of appeals were being upheld. The University Appeals Committee takes into account a lot of other information and extenuating circumstances when arriving at their decision. The appeals of review of grade were originally sent to the University Appeals Committee but was changed to the Dean Learning and Teaching from 2014. The number of appeals continues to trend down and having clear parameters around when a student can appeal assists the process. If the new policies and processes for grievances and appeals are adopted then it is likely that the data will continue to decline.

9.3.7 There are very few appeals of academic misconduct decisions, this demonstrates that the policy is clear and provides guidelines around the process for dealing with academic misconduct issues. This is also the type of data which will be provided to TEQSA to support the integrity of grievance processes. The data provided will also be disseminated to staff via the Committees Newsletter.

9.3.8 GBS has had a number of academic misconduct issues of intentional cheating and purchasing of assignments. At least one matter has gone to the University Appeals Committee and a decision was overturned. It was asked if the wording in the policy could cover the purchase or solicitation of an assignment even if not used. It was advised that in the revisions currently with the working party that a definition of solicitation was included and that either party (those putting up the assignment or those procuring the assignment) can be in breach. Solicitation is occurring in a range of environments not just paper mills but places like online gaming environments are also popular vehicles for this type of behaviour.

9.3.9 A new business process has also been put in place that if a student has an AI issue in process then they can’t withdraw due to special circumstances. The changes that went to Academic Committee in July were in response to issues experienced in health courses. A business process is to be developed in consultation with the Deans Learning and Teaching.

9.3.10 An agenda item in relation to assessment type and AI breach data was also noted and the School of ICT has created a Learning@Griffith Organisation to provide access to tools to review computing code in a similar way that TurnItIn or SafeAssign is used for text matching.

Resolution

9.4 The Chair’s Report was noted.
10.0 OTHER BUSINESS

Nil

11.0 NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the University Assessment Committee will be held on Monday 8 September 2014 at 1.00pm in N54_2.06 / G34_1.04 / L03_2.27.

12.0 2014 University Assessment Committee Meeting Dates

Meetings are held on Mondays at the times indicated below. All meetings are video-conferenced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Venues</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 September</td>
<td>N54_2.06 / G34_1.04 / L03_2.27</td>
<td>1pm – 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 October</td>
<td>N54_2.06 / G34_1.04 / L03_2.27</td>
<td>1pm – 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 November</td>
<td>N54_2.06 / G34_1.04 / L03_2.27</td>
<td>1pm – 4pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chair's signature

Date