
UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE

10:00am – 12:00pm, Tuesday 23 October 2018

Level 5 Function Room, Administration Building F23

Members Present: Dr Melissa Hardie (Chair); Dr Ross Anderson (Architecture, Design and Planning); Dr Stephen Carter (Pharmacy); Dr Anthony Dracopoulos (Arts and Social Sciences); Dr Kate Edwards (Health Sciences); Denzel Florez (Academic Board Student Representative); Edwina Grose (Deputy Registrar Nominee); A/Prof. Catherine Hardy (Business); Dr James Humberstone (Sydney Conservatorium of Music); Dr Kimberly Mathieu Coulton (Dentistry); Dr Toby Raeburn (representing Dr Lisa Conlon, Nursing); A/Prof Marjorie Valix (Engineering and Information Technologies); Dr Kevin Walton (Sydney Law School); A/Prof Nial Wheate, (Nominee of Academic Board).

Attendees: Luce Abrate (Educational Developer, Health Sciences); Jane Conway (Senior Manager Education, Medicine and Health); Dr Glenys Eddy, Committee Officer; Charlie Foxlee (Manager, Academic Model, Student Administration Services); John Hardie (Coordinator Professional Development for Graduate Qualities, Educational Innovation Team); Lilia Mantai (Academic Lead, Course Enhancement, Business); A/Prof Peter McCallum (Director, Education Strategy); Sarah Vandeppeer (Senior Policy and Project Officer, DVC Education Portfolio).

Apologies: Prof Adam Bridgeman (Director, Educational Innovation); Dr Lisa Conlon (Nursing and Midwifery); A/Prof. Tina Hinton (Sydney Medical School); A/Prof Tony Masters (Chair of Academic Board); Dr Gary Muscatello (Science); A/Prof Tim Wilkinson (Chair, Admission Sub-committee); A/Prof Bronwyn Winter (Nominee of Academic Board).

2018/7

MINUTES

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The Chair welcomed members and attendees to the first of two meetings devoted to the review of Undergraduate learning outcomes. The Chair asked faculty representatives to introduce their faculty's submission presentation by giving a brief outline of the learning outcome development process, including observations about the process, any difficulties, and how it could be improved.

The Chair noted the apologies received.

Resolution UGSC2018/7-1

The Undergraduate Studies Committee resolved to note that apologies have been received from the members above and that they be excused for their absence.

2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

2.1 Minutes of the Previous Meeting 2018/6, 4 September 2018

Under Item 6.1, the paper to be submitted to USC from Edwina Grose and Georgina Wheadon on the difference between major and minor course amendments will be submitted for the meeting on 30 October, not 23 October.

With the above correction having been made, the Minutes of the meeting held on 4 September 2018 were accepted as a true record of that meeting.

Resolution UGSC2018/7-2

The Undergraduate Studies Committee resolved that the minutes of meeting 2018/6 on 4 September 2018 be confirmed as a true record of that meeting.

2.2 Actions Arising

No discussion took place under this item.

3 STANDING ITEMS

3.1 Report of the Chair

4 ITEMS FOR APPROVAL: Undergraduate Curriculum Learning Outcome Submissions

4.1 Sydney Law School

Readers: Deren Bozdog, Dr Stephen Carter, A/Professor Catherine Hardy.

Dr Kevin Walton presented the submission for the Sydney Law School. He reported that Law had formed a working group reporting to a dedicated teaching and curriculum committee to work on the learning outcomes. Once complete, they were endorsed by the School Board for submission not USC.

Readers and committee members offered the following feedback:

- The guidelines specified that each learning outcome should ideally be expressed in one sentence for comprehensibility. For most of Law's, their derivation from the graduate qualities is visible, but each learning outcome in fact contains several, and could be re-phrased into more precise sentences.
- the dot points are meant to expand upon the main, over-arching statement and need minor amendment to ensure the correct congruity between main statement and dot points;
- some of the dot points could be usefully placed in some other documents for students' availability;
- the learning outcomes contained additional graduate qualities to those listed which could be made explicit; Dr Carter matched at least one more for each point.

Associate Professor McCallum noted that the JD learning outcomes were not for endorsement by USC and needed to meet AQF Level 9 learning outcomes. A clear distinction in terms of learning outcomes was needed between the two degrees. Law's submission to GSC at a later date needed to include how the JD learning outcomes meet the AQF Level 9 criteria.

Resolution UGSC2018/7-5

That the Undergraduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board approve the Undergraduate learning outcomes proposed by the Sydney Law School for the Bachelor of Laws Coursework program and components, contingent upon the recommended amendments having been made, with effect from 1 January 2019.

4.2 Sydney Conservatorium of Music

Readers: Dr Anthony Dracopoulos, Imogen Grant, Dr Toby Raeburn.

Dr James Humberstone presented the submission from the Conservatorium of Music. The learning outcomes had been written by program leaders, collated by their Associate Dean Education, who also wrote those for the minors. The submission was endorsed by their Education Committee.

Readers and committee members offered the following feedback:

Dr Dracopoulos observed that the course learning outcomes for the Bachelor of Music needed to articulate what students should be able to achieve on completion of the degree, and suggested some minor amendment of expression, for example, the first learning outcome should state "will be able to demonstrate" rather than "will have acquired." The Committee accepted the suggested alternative wordings offered by Dr Dracopoulos, which he agreed to circulate to Conservatorium Staff.

Component Learning Outcomes

Some contained learning outcomes related to the graduate quality of 'cultural competence' although not indicated as such.

Some grammatical refinement and clarification was suggested, for instance, the term “coherent language” could be expressed as “language”.

The matter of correct and consistent terminology was raised concerning references to accreditation processes and accreditation bodies in learning outcomes: should the concept of accreditation or the discipline-specific process be referenced; similarly, should the acronyms for the titles or the titles themselves, be used for accreditation bodies?

Learning outcomes in the Performance stream related to performance experience needed re-wording to emphasize academic outcomes beyond the practical aim of mastering the subjective aspects of music performance such as anxiety; similarly, ways of measuring “acquired experience”, learning outcome 8 in the Composition stream needed to be considered.

Resolution UGSC2018/7-6

That the Undergraduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board approve the Undergraduate learning outcomes proposed by the Sydney Conservatorium of Music for the Bachelor of Music Coursework programs and components, contingent upon the recommended amendments having been made, with effect from 1 January 2019.

4.3 Faculty of Health Sciences

Readers: A/Professor Tina Hinton, Dr Fernanda Penaloza, Dr Kevin Walton.

Dr Kate Edwards presented the submission from the Faculty of Health Sciences. The Faculty developed a checklist of what should be addressed and included in the learning outcomes based on the guidelines.

Readers and committee members offered the following feedback:

Course Learning Outcomes

- Bachelor of Applied Science (Exercise Physiology): some learning outcomes needed more contextualization;
- Bachelor of Applied Science (Occupational Therapy): needed more succinct expression; affective to be corrected to effective;
- Bachelor of Applied Science (Physiotherapy): some course learning outcomes could be combined with the total number to be reduced;
- Bachelor of Applied Science (Speech Pathology): more graduate qualities needed for no. 3.

Component Learning Outcomes: the expression of the graduate qualities could be clearer; those for the Health major were not as contextualized as those for the Hearing and Speech major, and needed more contextualization.

John Hardie had identified several graduate qualities inherent in the learning outcomes that could be made explicit, which he will convey to the Faculty.

Resolution UGSC2018/7-7

That the Undergraduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board approve the Undergraduate learning outcomes proposed by the Faculty of Health Sciences for the disciplines of Diagnostic Radiography, Exercise and Sports Science, Exercise Physiology, Occupational Therapy, Physiotherapy, Speech Pathology Undergraduate Coursework programs and the Hearing and Speech component, contingent upon the recommended amendments having been made, with effect from 1 January 2019.

4.4 Faculty of Medicine and Health

Readers: Dr Kate Edwards, Dr James Humberstone, A/Professor Tim Wilkinson.

Jane Conway presented the submission for the Faculty of Medicine and Health. The Discipline directors oversaw the development of the learning outcomes which were approved by their

Faculty Board. Dr Carter reported that the Pharmacy course learning outcomes had been previously written for accreditation purposes and that any substantial changes would need faculty board approval.

Readers and committee members offered the following feedback:

Pharmacy

- Bachelor of Pharmacy: 'cultural competence' is to be added to 6 and 7.
- Bachelor of Pharmacy and Management: writing the outcomes as single sentences was well-done, but the punctuation could be revised.

Discussion concerning the relationship between the course learning outcomes constituted according to the University's own academic standards, and those developed for accreditation purposes determined the following course of action. As the University's course learning outcomes for all courses are visible to applicants, it was thought that even if the accrediting body did not need to approve them for accredited courses, it would need to see them as an accreditor would need to know how the learning outcomes are to be achieved. It was suggested that the accreditation learning outcomes remain as they are until they are reviewed at the next accreditation cycle.

Nursing

A small number of minor amendments were suggested for the Bachelor of Nursing and Bachelor of Nursing Honours. Reviewers undertook to send their feedback to Nursing. James Hardie re-affirmed that the manner in which learning outcomes are written is meant to express what graduates will have attained through their enrolment in their award course.

Bachelor of Nursing (Singapore): these were thought to contain too many graduate qualities in each learning outcome;

Master of Nursing: Nursing was reminded, that although not strictly part of the Undergraduate submission, these learning outcomes need to meet AQF Level 9.

Component Learning Outcomes

- The International component needed more pharmacy-specific contextualization.

Associate Professor McCallum drew a distinction between professional and liberal degrees as a general principle; students enrolled in liberal studies degrees must meet the mid-level learning outcomes, for instance, those of the international and health components, as opposed to the more over-arching course learning outcomes of the professional degrees such as the Bachelor of Pharmacy or Bachelor of Nursing.

Resolution UGSC2018/7-8

That the Undergraduate Studies Committee recommend that the Academic Board approve the Undergraduate learning outcomes proposed by the Faculty of Medicine and Health for the Pharmacy, Nursing and Dentistry (Oral Health) Coursework programs and components, contingent upon the recommended amendments having been made, with effect from 1 January 2019.

4.5 Sydney Business School

Readers: Dr Ross Anderson, Dr Kimberly Matthieu Coulton, A/Professor Marjorie Valix, A/Professor Nial Wheate.

Dr Catherine Hardy presented the submission for the Sydney Business School. Development of both the course and component learning outcomes had been based on a 2-stage process. The mid-level learning outcomes for majors, had been completed and approved by their faculty board in 2017. After realizing that the major learning outcomes were too broad, they mapped the learning outcomes for units of study to majors learning outcomes, then mapped these to the course learning outcomes. This process was completed a couple of months ago.

Readers and committee members offered the following feedback:

The need for consistency in articulating outcomes related to 'cultural competence' was noted with reference to the complete UG Learning Outcomes submission from the Business School, given that some definitions include reference to indigenous Australians and some do not.

Course Learning Outcomes

Bachelor of Commerce:

- learning outcome 5 was seen as being too broad and needing more contextualization;
- the phrase in no 6 'by producing tangible outputs' needed clarification as to how this would be demonstrated;

The Chair observed that for courses that contain a large number of majors, their resultant course learning outcomes, not needing to state what is central to a disciplinary field, can be highly abstract, with the challenge being to capture all of the specificity in the component learning outcomes.

Bachelor of Advanced Studies:

- 'influence' should be moved from learning outcome 4 as it is present in 3, 7, 9, and 10.
- Associate Professor McCallum observed that the learning outcomes for the BAS have captured well the expected level for AQF 8.

BCom/LLB

It was noted that the course learning outcomes needed more work in terms of capturing those for the Law component of this combined degree. Associate Professor McCallum noted that in general the course learning outcomes for combined degrees need to meet the required level for the two component degrees as well as articulating any intended benefit of studying the two disciplines together above one component on its own. Associate Professor McCallum also stated that Law had the responsibility to articulate why Law students were required to have a partner discipline, and had suggested that this be executed through the interdisciplinary effectiveness graduate quality, noting that this was more the responsibility of Law than Commerce.

Due to time constraints, the Chair requested that the remainder of the submission from Business be held over to the next Special Meeting on 13 November.

Resolution UGSC2018/7-9

That the Undergraduate Studies Committee will review the Undergraduate Learning Outcomes submission from the Sydney Business School for the Business Coursework programs and components at its next Special Meeting on 13 November 2018.

5 ITEMS FOR NOTING

5.1 **Board of Interdisciplinary Studies:** Graduate Qualities of a Dalyell Scholar

Resolution UGSC2018/7-10

That the Undergraduate Studies Committee note the submission on Graduate Qualities of a Dalyell Scholar.

7 OTHER BUSINESS

7.1 The Chair thanked everyone for their attendance at the meeting and for their collegial engagement with the business of the meeting. The Chair also outlined the procedure to be followed for the remainder of the approval process:

With the exception of Business, all submissions were endorsed for submission to Academic Board for approval, conditional upon the amendments recommended by the meeting having

been made.

Amended submissions are to be sent to the Committee Officer for noting on the agenda for the next USC Learning Outcomes meeting on the 13th of November.

Due to the large amount of feedback offered, the Chair requested that readers send their feedback directly to the faculty for incorporation into their amended submissions. The Committee Officer is to be copied in to this correspondence.

Subsequent to the meeting, it was established for clarity that amended submissions need not have Faculty Board approval for re-submission.

There being no other business, the Meeting closed at 12.04 pm.

Date of next meeting

10:00am-12:00pm, Tuesday 30 October 2018, F23 Level 5 Function Room