Meeting 3/15
12 June 2015
For general publication

Present: Miss Melinda Ashcroft (chair), Miss Jessica Bilyj, A/Prof Joanne Blanchfield (for item 3.1 only), Dr Abigail Downie (minutes), Miss Paige Erpf, A/Prof Stuart Kellie, Dr Rachel Stephenson, Miss Sonya Tadrowski, Mr Nick Westra van Holthe, Mr Alan Zhang.

Apologies: Miss Imogen Bermingham, Ms Jill Sheridan, Prof Paul Young.

Business arising out of the minutes

SCMB Hoodies

Jessica advised members that three hoodies from the first round of orders are yet to be collected despite multiple email reminders. Abigail advised that she would contact other members of the SCMB professional staff to identify if the students are still actively enrolled.

Jessica advised that the second round of orders will close at 5pm on Friday 12th June and there are currently 51 orders.

1. Social event for Science RHD students:

Imogen provided members with the following update: The May 15th social mixer was a success with approximately 50 people in attendance, including research students, postdocs, academics and professional staff. Imogen has created a spreadsheet to track income and expenditure for each event. This spreadsheet is located in the shared drive.

The next social mixer is scheduled for Friday 19th June. Tasks are assigned as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue/Security approval</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Check with admin staff that the secret garden is booked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security approval has already been granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>Loan, Bita</td>
<td>Template poster in shared drive. Members to update for display in lifts, tea rooms and communal areas: Loan – Bldg 76, Bita – Bldg 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget &amp; Purchases</td>
<td>Jessica, Paige</td>
<td>To collect eskees, drinks, ice, snacks and petty cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>Members with RSA certification to facilitate service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pack Up</td>
<td>Loan, Melinda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Annual SCMB Research Students Symposium:

Abigail advised members that the main source of funding for the symposium should be sponsorship. However, if there is insufficient sponsorship, the School is prepared to 'underwrite' funds to a maximum budget of $9,000.

Tasks were updated as per the table overleaf:
### Job | Assigned | Progress/Next step
--- | --- | ---
Venue | Paige, Imogen | AEB - Paige has been in contact with AEB, she is awaiting a final response regarding higher/cleaning costs. Paige advised that AEB only has one large auditorium (seats ~500 people) and several smaller classrooms. Nick advised that when he attended a conference at AEB several classrooms were opened to make larger seminar rooms. Paige will investigate the feasibility further when she has a response from AEB.

Hawken - Imogen advised that Hawken Engineering building is currently booked out to examinations but as per previous years it should be possible to have the venue “released” for our symposium. A cleaning fee will be payable but Imogen is still waiting for a response from P&F regarding an exact value (anticipated to be between $200 and $400).

Finance and sponsorship | Bita | Bita advised that she has reviewed material in the shared folder and identified an existing list of companies to contact. Bita requested that members reviewed this list and emailed her with any additional suggestions. Rachael and Stuart advised Bita to begin sending out sponsorship requests now and to follow emails up with phone calls. Rachael advised that Bita should make contact with companies prior to the end of the financial year.

Plenary speaker | Saiyuri | Members voted on plenary speaker preferences. Votes were tallied and members agreed. Saiyuri will prepare a draft invitation email including clear information about the intended audience and send to Rachael and Stuart for review.

Opening and closing speakers | Jessica | Members discussed inviting 3 members of staff to deliver the opening and closing addresses and to MC the awards ceremony. Members discussed inviting the HOS and newer members of the academic staff.

Advertising/Promotion | Imogen | Members agreed to start advertising the symposium immediately after the date is finalised.

Sourcing of judges | Nick | Jessica advised that approx. 40-50 judges will be required for the symposium to run smoothly, including 3 judges per session for orals and 2 judges per poster to a maximum of 4 posters per judge. Members agreed that Nick should start preparing an invite list now so that he can begin inviting judges when the date and venue are finalised.

Catering | Paige | Paige will begin contacting companies for catering quotes.

Booklet production | Jessica | To action after the next meeting

Receipt of abstracts, speaker selection | Sonja, Alan | Members agreed to close registration earlier this year to allow a longer window of time to finalise allocations and compile the booklet.

General event logistics | | |

Collecting feedback | Melinda, Loan | |

Presentations – develop selection criteria, contact selected speakers | Imogen, Nick | Members agreed that the selection criteria need to be revisited after the number of ties in 2014.

Prizes and Award certificates | Saiyuri | |
3. Other Business:

3.1. First Year Chemistry practical marking:

Jessica advised members that she was approached by several first year chemistry tutors who had concerns regarding time allocation for marking weekly practical results. Tutors reported that it was not possible to mark and provide feedback to a full lab group (18 students) in the allocated time of one hour. Experienced tutors reported requiring a minimum of two hours to complete marking, while less experienced tutors advised that have spent up to four hours marking previously. Prior to the meeting, members of the first year teaching staff were invited to provide preliminary responses.

_Preliminary response from Andrew Allsebrook and Phillip Sharpe:_

“We propose the following actions:

- Survey tutors to investigate the extent of the issue, whether the feedback that the students receive is appropriate and whether the Pre-Lab Quizzes are effectively used by the students;
- Continue to investigate measures to speed up marking, including looking into alternatives to the current process of transcribing results from blackboard onto paper then entering them into another program.
- Continue to look at the structure of the Pre-Lab quizzes and written result sheets to facilitate marking, without losing the flexibility and academic integrity that we currently have.

We would support any increase to the paid time for marking, subject to budgetary constraints.”

_Preliminary response from Joanne Blanchfield and Gwen Lawrie (practical marking in CHEM1100) (as Jo was in attendance for this agenda item, she also spoke with members regarding their concerns and emphasised that if any tutors have concerns or suggestions regarding practicals, they should approach the relevant course coordinators or teaching staff):_

“In response to significant student feedback in CHEM1100 in 2014, deriving both from SECaTs and our own in-depth evaluation, we identified that many students were feeling anxious, stressed and reported poor learning from the CHEM1100 practicals. Since CHEM1100 is their first experience of university chemistry, the laboratory component is very different to their experiences in high school and we need to be aware of this transition.

The CHEM1100 co-coordinators (Gwen Lawrie & Joanne Blanchfield) decided, based on that feedback, that a contributing factor appeared to be the perceived lack of time to finish calculations/results and then to complete the post-lab questions which both involved summative assessment. In 2015, we have trialled moving completion of the post-lab questions from the practical session into an online post-lab format which students had to complete prior to their next experiment. We are currently unable to advise whether this has reduced student anxiety (the course SECaTs are still open) however, anecdotal feedback from both tutors and students this semester seems to indicate that this option has not been successful for the following reasons:

1. The amount of marking has substantially increased for tutors.
2. Students are not gaining the support of tutors or their peers while they answer the post-lab questions; this is not useful for learning.

We have already decided that we need to review the laboratory assessment further to address both of these issues. Andrew Allsebrook has advised that he will collect feedback from the first year tutors and we will use this to inform the assessment of CHEM1100 experiments in 2016.

We are aware that this has impacted the tutors and particularly the time they have had to devote to marking. We did not anticipate this and we apologise. It was a trial but clearly an unsuccessful one. We do value the work the tutors do as a vital part of our teaching team and are always happy to hear and discuss feedback from them. In fact, if any of the tutors have any suggestions or feedback regarding the practicals from how they are run to individual practicals please contact us well before Semester 2.”

A/Prof Joanne Blanchfield invited members to provide any additional comments or feedback.
Abigail advised committee members that this issue will now be actioned by members of the first year chemistry teaching staff. The preliminary response will be to ascertain the magnitude of the issue through surveys of tutors.

Next meeting:

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday 10th July, 1-2pm, 68-305.

* * * * *

Abigail