Te Komiti Ako| Learning and Teaching Committee



NGĀ ĀMIKI/MINUTES

| Rā/Date: | Friday, 27 January 2023 |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Wā/Time: | 10.00 am |
| Wāhi/Venue: | Council Chamber, Level 6 Matariki and via Zoom |
| Tangata i tae mai | Professor C Moran (Chair), <mark>S 9(2)(a) OIA</mark> |
| Present: | S 9(2)(a) OIA |
| Tangata i tae mai/ In attendance: | S 9(2)(a) OIA . |
| Whakapāha/Apologies: | S 9(2)(a) OIA |

Welcome: The Chair welcomed <u>S 9(2)(a) OIA</u> to the meeting on behalf of <u>S 9(2)(a) OIA</u> and <u>S 9(2)(a) OIA</u> on behalf of <u>S 9(2)(a) OIA</u>.

1. Minutes

The minutes would be circulated to members for approval following the meeting.

2. Chair's Report

The Chair welcomed everyone back to a new year. She congratulated \$ 9(2)(a) O|A from \$ 9(2)(a) O|A for achieving Fellowship \$. She also noted that at the next meeting in February, space would be set aside \$ 0 review and discuss faculty learning and teaching plans and how they map to the new Learning and Teaching Framework. Members were asked to share their plans with \$ 9(2)(a) for inclusion in the next agenda.

3. Assessment and AI Chatbots: ChatGPT

The Chair noted that ChatGPT and other technologies had existed for some time but had become more prominent due to media interest in recent months. UC's position is that we will need to adapt to the technology as it was virtually impossible to impose a blanket ban on student access to the tools. She said that the Future Learning team had sent her a suggested three step plan – step one would be to hold a workshop on 30 January to invite key people from UC to listen to some expert views on the technology's impact, they were keen to receive suggested names. Step two would be an all staff 50-minute presentation which would also be recorded on 7 February to help raise general awareness and to hold an interactive Q and A session. The final step would be to hold a repository of resources for staff to consult. **S 9(2)(a) OIA** added that the team would also be working with colleagues at other universities as this was a problem that cut across HE

institutions. The Future Learning Team would also continue to explore whether the use of locked online browsers might be a possibility to discourage students from using chatbots.

Members exchanged views on ChatGPT which they had all experimented with and suggested that being familiar with its capabilities was helpful for staff. This is a developing technology and that currently it was limited to repackaging existing content without the ability to reflect on what is reproduced or whether it is logically consistent, however that is likely to change as the technology develops. Students should understand that it is unable to include real world experiences, so the value of work-integrated learning and other activities would become even more important. Members suggested several ways ChatGPT might be positively incorporated into teaching including in a seminar asking it to explain a contested term or concept with students engaging in debate to reach a collective definition. They felt that staff wanted to see students back on campus rather than via technology to help support student wellbeing, and that setting a short written assignment towards the end of a tutorial for immediate submission would alleviate concerns around the use of ChatGPT and encourage in person attendance. **S 9(2)(a) OIA** commented that 100-level Management staff were attempting to dispense with large lectures and take more of a tutorial-based approach to teaching in 2023.

4. Academic Review Report – BA and related qualifications

S 9(2)(a) OIA took the report as read. He said that the review had been undertaken later than scheduled due to substantial changes in the BA including the introduction of specialisations. Overall, the panel had felt confident that the qualifications were meeting the requisite standards. The report had given useful suggestions for ways to continue to improve. Members commended the panel and the report.



The following points were discussed:

Moved by the Chair:

That the academic review report on the BA and associated qualifications be received and forwarded to the Academic Board and CUAP for approval.

Carried

5. Academic Review Report – PGCert Strategic Leadership

S 9(2)(a) OIA was welcomed to the meeting. **S** noted that the qualification has not been offered since 2020 and that the intention had been to teach it out and discontinue it, however colleagues at UC Online had expressed an interest in offering it online. The review report looks back at how it was being taught in 2020 as an MBA pathway which was no longer an intended

outcome. If the qualification is to be offered via UC Online, a new programme director would need to be appointed and there would be exciting opportunities to redesign some of the material. Members suggested that this context, including previous enrolment data should be clarified prior to submission to the Academic Board. S 9(2)(a) O|A was thanked for S report. S left the meeting.

Moved by the Chair:

That the academic review report on the Postgraduate Certificate in Strategic Leadership be received and forwarded to the Academic Board and CUAP for approval.

Carried

6. Erskine Programme Data Comparison Report 2022

S 9(2)(a) OIA explained that this report was normally discussed by the AAC, but as the Erskine scheme has such strong ties to teaching and as she would be away for the first AAC meeting of the year, it made sense to bring the report to this meeting.

2022 had been a challenging year with covid, with international Erskine visits resuming from July when the borders reopened. There were 26 Erskine and non-Erskine fellows in 2022, alongside 10 grants which represented about 30% of normal capacity with a pleasing 28% of normal expenditure. The AAC had commented in 2021 on the lack of diversity in the ethnicity of visiting fellows and grant recipients and the Erskine programme responded to these comments with additional data on gender and ethnicity in the 2022 report which would continue to be a work in progress in future years.

Members discussed the basis of the ethnicity data – some was gathered through visitors selfidentifying their ethnicity, others were based on passport/visa information supplied. A member suggested that reporting ethnicity to faculties on a quarterly basis would be useful to see how they are tracking. **Sig(2)** was thanked for **Sig** work on the report.

Moved by the Chair:

That the Erskine programme data comparison report 2022 be received.

Carried

7. Academic Audit Update – Teaching and Learning

Members received the draft academic audit self-review responses to the AQA guideline statements around teaching quality and recognition. **S 9(2)(a) OIA** had chaired the working group which had provided much of the evidence for the review sections and was thanked for his work. As the evidence had been gathered in late 2021, further updates were being made. It was confirmed that the recommendations around enhancing the role of student voice with the UCSA, and Te Akatoki had been retained elsewhere in the report and were now an Enhancement Initiative.

8. Graduate Profile Review

A member asked for further information about the reviews underway for the graduate attributes. **Solution** noted that the Pou Whakarae has been reviewing the roles in **Solution** portfolio $\frac{S}{S} = \frac{9}{2}$

The remaining reports in Section B were received.

The meeting closed at 11.25 am.

Professor C Moran (Chair).....

Date.....