MINUTES – College Representative Council (CRC) 3 2022

Wednesday, 26 April 2023

Zoom – 6:15pm

Item 1: Meeting Open and Apologies

1. Acknowledgement of Country
2. Apologies
3. Passing of previous meetings minutes (CRC 2 2023)

Moved: Harrison

Seconded Mickey

Passed

Procedural to suspend standing orders

Moved: Harrison Oates

Passed

Item 2: Executive Reports

2.1 President's Report (B. Yates) [Reference A]

BY: in the academic space key thing to report which i'm sure grace will touch on, ChatGPT isnt being grounded as an academic violation unless you say you used it.

HO: does that extend to other tools that anu may use to flag ai generated content

BY: like protection tools

HO: yes

GK: haven't explicitly said so but I do believe so, one of the issues is they don't have a definition of AI, detection tools installed, mostly useful for ChatGPT but I wouldn't know - would depend on specifics of the case but I would probably say if it's something that has similar function to ChatGPT it would be the same

BY: ANU is very much taking the approach of not saying tis enemy to be eliminated lets slow down a bit, tech is moving so fast that its beating anu's processes to change policy, taking a step back and taking it up slow

WB: reason not using the turnitin because they haven't properly consulted on how it works or is it bc they're opposed or haven't come to a position on AI content

BY: they didn't want the turnitin tool to be enabled, it was automatically on by turnitin, turnitin will say there was a chance it was AI generated but if you have students saying no I didn't there's no way to tell if you're in the 4% or not, turnitin's word against students, the AI tools will get more advanced, detection more advanced, there will be a race but they can't develop policy quickly enough which they know. I think they're thinking about how we use it rather than how we resent it

2.2 Vice President's Report (G. King) [Reference B]

GK: Just finishing the ChatGPT thing, if anybody comes to you and has issues with that, tell them to get in touch with our Student Assistance Team - if a lecturer gets upset or something escalates to make sure they dont get penalised. Had first meeting of a review of exams working group that has all of the ADEs and PVCA reviewing in particular midsems, on interesting note out of all go8 we're the only ones that have them formally which is interesting and something that they're considering reviewing as well as the future of the extent that they'll ever be in

person, kind of vibe was they're not going to be for many reasons for the foreseeable future, talk of how exams are heavily weighted or lots of exams in one day how they can work with timetabling to stop that happening reduce exams that students have and weight happening as well. Will update further. Been dealing with a lot of academic issues w students related to midsems and EAP accommodations, I think most of that is from, first being a lack of education or knowledge on behalf of instructors on what their obligations and requirements are requiring these things, and the other half is not wanting to conform to those obligations so a little bit mixed but advise people to escalate issues that are for a whole class, have been getting quite good outcomes and to direct students w individual cases to SAT but working on it and it seems particularly in science subjects that there's been issues but worth noting

2.3 General Secretary's Report (P. O'Neill) [Reference C]

PO: AQAC is tomorrow, no major concerns. The proposal to reduce the time period to remove untaught courses from three years to two years failed. Calling an SGM in Week 12 to discuss postgraduate changes. There will be changes to the College Rep structure. We will look to split COS and CHM.

Mickey: So does that mean more representatives for science?

PO: Yes, they are now two separate colleges with different CEC meetings.

Luke Harrison: why did the course removal proposal fail?

PO: there was a view it would take up extra resources. CoL AD(E) agreed that the website and course list should be different.

2.4 Education Officer's Report (B. Tucker) [Reference D]

Item 3: College Representative Reports

3.1 College of Engineering, Computing, and Cybernetics [Reference E]

Introduced Punit, the new CECC rep!

HO: not too much to go through, something interesting was COMP2420 received an email, sure people saw timetabling putting out drafts - stated EOY exam is in person and there has as of the report earlier this morning, no indication of what will be done for international students who aren't in aus, I know the college reps are working on and we haven't heard back from convener yet, if they need help here to step in just monitoring situation. If it comes to time of final

timetable and still nothing for international we will be definitely jumping in at that point. Only other thing, relatively new, school of engineering is wanting students to consult on a proposal for a new major/minor in nuclear systems. Pretty much it from us

MT: are there more details on the major/minor

HO: only got a couple line email from the person proposing this, couldn't see much detail other than that they want students to weigh in

LT: who is email from originally

HO: Think she's asking for is student feedback on a shortened feedback on proposal, finding out if these programs will be useful additions

MT: is it possible for you to share that with this group

HO: doable, haven't responded yet because neither are engineering students, would be happy to bring a couple along

BY: concern here is AUKUS, I think it's important that we don't accidentally get into an intellectual bend on this, not anti research on nuclear, cool that nuclear research happens important for medicine just don't want it to be literally weaponised, making sure that we shape our critiques really carefully around this and don't lean into it. If they're scaling their nuclear program - if they're anticipating AUKUS money I dont think thats a bad thing, they can scale it to use it for anything use it to cure cancer its the point where they sign deal with government to build bombs where it's concerning, again I think clearly articulating our critique of that

PO: cut three engineering majors a few years ago. Looking at reconsidering those cuts and why are we now looking at nuclear.

HO: it's specifically engineering and RND programs, not explicit but that slant is inside the email, they only have apparently a quite short timeframe to get it back because they need to take it to the first review in june so I can imagine they want as much nailed down as possible

3.2 College of Arts and Social Sciences [Reference F]

LT: our big thing was CEC meeting, couple of things already touched on powerpoint, one of the goals from CASS perspective that we had some . innovative outstanding large class experience, which means large class in CASS space, experienced course cuts, increasing amount of students to take a single course implies less courses available, a bit disappointing to see that in their 2025 strategic plan but also not surprising. There was a big discussion about making the honours thesis 100% of your grade which we had concerns about because if you talk to someone who did well in their thesis they'd love that but someone who may have contributed to their coursework got a

higher mark there - inaccessible system. Lots of concern amongst staff, want to make more centralised honours, each school has about 15 students who do honours and person bringing this proposal suggested that 15 is quite small cohort and some skills transferable, for them honours was an area of specialisation so some pushback. Graduate attribute framework again which became a lot clearer, a lot more confusing, didn't make sense what they were doing esp w transdisciplinary section. It was explained it's not up to an individual student but up to the course. Everyone was not super keen on that, not sure when its implemented if it will be different

3.3 College of Law [Reference G]

WC: not much to say, we have our next CEC in june or july so going off the last one its just been a few rolling issues. Suzie met with the ADE, fantastic, organising another meeting soon. Really enthused by what we want to raise but also been good for using us for feedback for what he's doing. One big thing is a forum for COL in regards to return to in person exams next sem because this sem they've organised help in tutes, discussing and agreed we'd have a forum early next sem to not confuse anyone not in first year, really keen on getting as much student perspective on what they think about the change, what they can materially help with, happy with that. Other point is one of our policies was to look at exam materials and databases, in collaboration with VP of ed for LSS, working with on that basis, initially had an exam database on our site with examples of marked final exams around a D but that wasn't updated in a while and academic faculties aren't sure what shape, took a bit of convincing, once they got the point that if it weren't official people would go to Studoco, better to have something they have control over so now developing a trial run with two courses at the moment, wayne and ron who head of law degree will be developing practice materials with a pre exam tutor who will also teach those and then they'll enter perpetuity in a database, think that's a great outcome gets students involved pays tutors gets college on board and collaborates with us.

Not much else to report in terms of the whole journey plan. I think for me I feel good points to raise in CEC to get info we don't have historically how the existing mechanisms in alw are working, hard for me to think about what we can implement without knowing what's happening I found it a bit awkward because PARSA reps also sit on our CEC which is good bc they are more involved but we also get a direct line and involvement and its hard because the lines of our engagement and our commitment and knowledge and involvement is a bit blurry for ANUSA - we have a meeting planned for next week PARSA organised happy to do it but got roped in as ANUSA automatically and LSS and I don't know, wasn't much discussion about involvement but not really sure what there is to say to COL academics regardless good important they are doing their thing and we support it more than anything my takeaway to wrap up from that meeting I really want a clear outline whats happening from college to begin with hasn't been explained what they've actually reviewed.

WC: don know if I conveyed it not to do with not supporting but more of a confusing relationship between ANUSA and PARSA on how to move forward on productive collaborative way hopefully will be realised more in the meeting

3.4 College of Sciences, Health and Medicine [Reference H]

3.5 College of Business and Economics [Reference I]

WB: our last CEC was cancelled because of lack of agenda items, next is in may, a lot to do with mid sem exams and going back off convo, CBE is horrendously inaccessible pretty well known so i'll see how the convo goes in the next meeting but I feel like a lot of headway can be made at CBE. student feedback session is happening early next month

3.6 College of Asia Pacific [Reference J]

Tess: went to cap last week - keen to do a massive cut down on courses, identifying courses w similarity and overlap and taking a look at them, i'm kind of stuck on what to do and how to engage with that - what can I do when they're pretty set on their agenda, would love to hear from other college reps on what to do about those - maybe some tips on expressing student concerns about that - also a lot of discussion about ChatGPT took place before uni's decision on plagiarism detection keen to hear how cap students are using it not to make use of it not allowed just want to see what most common ways students are using it how to provide clariity on what is acceptable and what isn't, draft survey for students to hear about that. More discussion about recording of classes, not keen to be recording language seminars, not sure how to feel, love to hear from CASS on what language courses are doing

PO: EAG is a good place to bring it

BY: a suggestion on how to approach within meetings, if you say that's a cool course they'll just say that staff member does not work here, bureaucratic reasons that are true but hard to rebut, maybe what you can say to make it easier. If you compare coded courses taught in sem 1 2016 and benchmark it for them, 20 in that sem 10 now thats not good, they might just be like we can't afford it then they're giving us pieces of info we need and we can deal with that in EAG and does a denormalizing idea that's possible in that space. Did start going thru cap degrees and making a list of all courses that were dead links or have no future offerings think I'm going to bring that up next time

MT: if you do go to EAG, there's a software where they can do that for you rather than doing it manually

LH: I know how to work, can look up code sem year so it's an easy way to figure out what's been happening

HO: any indication to what they considered similar when discussing the cuts

Tess: no at the moment it's just the ADE and then going to move it into a bigger thing, but not this semester

PO: passing on info best approach

GK: on the point regarding languages, talked a lot about in the WG on recording so CAP are really opposed to it but if it's defined as a lecture - seminar is complex but a lot of time they're doing lectures mostly instruction they have to keep recording bc for EAPs it's a requirement they have to do that. Convos more students speaking aren't required to be recorded, it's not that possible to be recorded because it's a lot of people speaking at once. I think out of that the main issue with languages in CAP is defining what a seminar is for the uni more broadly to the extent - is it more of a lecture or a convo class, really depends a lot but in terms of their complaints I wouldn't worry too much bc they cant do anything bc they have to keep recording it that's the case for all languages not just cap but I'll let u know if they make any decisions or any sentiment moving forwards

Item 4: Discussion Items

4.1 PARSA Disabilities - Hybrid discussion

See slideshow [here](#).

Ruth: Updates since last meeting, and I will put the question to you what sort of involvement can you have and do you want to have. The suggestion I put was giving an update, I leave, and let you discuss amongst yourselves and come to whatever conclusion you want.

No dissent

Ruth: In terms of what you might like to discuss is that these are the five dot points I'm thinking about at the moment - each has benefits but also costs and consequences.

University wide campaign - focusing on uni campaign priorities. That's beneficial because a lot of the accessibility issues need working together to get progress - difficult to approach specific units - this approach means we can target everyone at once. Targeting everyone at once can get them all on board. Disadvantage is some academics have different approaches to talking to student reps, if that time is taken up on accessibility issues that's less time to raise other important issues. Second point is what I've got in the campaign is an equal focus on governance and accountability asks on accessibility issues - big distinguishing features from DSA campaigns, think it's super important, ANU governance is bad in terms of accessibility which is

a big barrier holding back progress. Taking a uni wide approach - important to be having regular convos to discuss those priorities and make sure everyone is on board. Totally happy to come along for the rest of the year, as much or little discussion as you think is appropriate but I realise me coming along makes them longer so time consideration for you. Time consideration in terms of your advocacy within your college. Really powerful when we talk to academics together and have multiple students speak to why these issues are important, demonstrates not just a Ruth campaign not just DSA that it's a broad issue but takes up time to come along. Finally, if you want to be engaging students in your college how they can contribute and keep them updated - someone raised a possibility last meeting, would love it but again it's your time. Just my summary of things you might want to be thinking about.

I'll dive into it now. What I proposed to go through is a response to some of the points raised in the last meeting, update on progress so far, and proposed campaign priorities.

One of the things I took home from the last meeting was discussion about accountability, how we can praise uni if they do something right without being co opted into praising too lightly or letting one small thing outweigh all the others. Reframing the campaign away from hybrid towards the 'whole journey approach'. Starts with the idea that when people think about accessibility they do from a compartmentalised viewpoint. This could be someone building a fantastic ramp - but we look at the whole journey, there is your ramp but next to it is a flight of stairs, sand pit, tree - ramp is well intentioned but useless. Headline idea of the campaign is that ANU needs to stop wasting money telling people about inaccessible ramps and scrutinise and prioritise initiatives that will make more whole journeys accessible.

Then to back that up we've broken it down into these accessibility-ometers. The idea is we can think about what are some of those journey stages, for each stage we can give a rating for how accessible and inaccessible it is. Atm the answer is unfortunately very inaccessible

Mira: These are ratings that come from personal experiences of us and people in our collective, I'm sure uni takes a different view. One thing to note is that your experiences can differ - the fact that it's not a universal experience creates a lot of anxiety and stress that's inaccessible. Picking degrees and choosing courses - knowing if it's going to be delivered in a way that you can complete it i.e. hybrid made a lot more courses possible for lots of people. But now if you don't know or don't trust that a course is hybrid, it creates barriers to completing a degree, certain classes where hybrid is not going to be an option. Schools need to take this into consideration, put info on table, so students can make decisions in a way that's accessible to them

Ruth: What we are proposing is using the accessibilityometers as reference points for our campaign, not complete but we can get started and lobby for improvements to address these stages while we improve the framework. In terms of how we're responding to actions that the uni takes, one of the things I want to do next is break down the rationale between ratings a bit more to say to get a higher ranking here's what you would need to do. What that means is that we can

be updating this as the uni does something that improves them or makes them worse as necessary. Can be saying it's good you went from terrible to pretty bad, this is a positive step forwards but look where you are - still a long way to go. Can reward incremental progress while still putting it in the context of things still not being good overall.

The big thing we've done since the last time we met is go to a few meetings with uni staff.

HO: can I clarify what IDEA is

BY: inclusion diversity equity and accessibility, very relevant to our departments

Ruth: Oversight job

BY: the DAP review was received, it was scathing review found that about 70% of the actions required hadn't been achieved, plan expires at the end of next year. From here there will be a prioritisation exercise to see what can't be delayed and then a process to design a new one, learn from everything done terribly in this one. On the whole happy with that outcome, not going to spend 18mo only thinking about new plan to do something, actually doing things and making plan at same time

Ruth: From meeting with staff, we saw genuine concern and genuine shock at the state of accessibility, genuine in thinking about what we can do to improve this but some limits to level of engagement. There were some weaknesses in the discussion paper that were not convincing. I try to make sure I'm talking to everyone before I put things in the paper, so some were vague.

MT: What sort of areas?

Ruth: The whole journey accord, name I gave to building a uni wide consensus on doing more, from my perspective that's about good governance and I think they saw that as purely symbolic so that's what I'm hearing from them. Feedback that it was vague from multiple people reading paper.

Mira: I think perhaps there was some concerns about lack of concreteness but the idea is that we are students and we don't understand all appropriate governance structures, context uni is working with, want to present this conceptually and work together to come up w concrete stages, staff didn't seem to like that we hadn't already planned it all out

Ben: I think the discussion we had - had a discussion about how TLDC could be involved in this space and I think they're trying to work out where they can slot this work within their existing projects

Ruth: Got an email response - suggestion we could use the whole journey framework for DAP rewrite - that was rejected but a lot of other things got a reasonably positive response. I think the

next step is to go out with a public statement introducing the whole journey idea. We can go in with more concrete suggestions about what the whole journey response would mean in governance terms, and try to get media attention. Looking a bit further ahead, these are things that I'm putting out for discussion, looking at reporting of accessibility issues and some of the most negative responses students are having with professors - some of the worst experiences students have on campus, have consequences of students being unable to complete degrees, mental health conditions, changing degrees, some most significant things to improve there. Also important to acknowledge the lack of reporting processes mean that Maddi and Mira are spending about 15 hours a week providing individualised advocacy support, if that could be transferred to a staff member where it would belong, would take weight off our student reports,

Mira: hired for that job specifically in the way that A&I are

Ruth: if you had proper reporting processes, that would mean that there would be a record of the issues students are having separate from us having to raise it, helps further advocate for preventing these issues. In terms of what it would look like, I think there would be a role for having an accessibility contact in each school, someone from the top end of the dial who is good at accessibility and they could be reviewing some of the decisions made in the school in the realm of generally good intention or genuine misunderstanding they can step in, if it's a serious issue then we look at who to refer to that to - student safety and wellbeing team could be best group on campus to provide support for some of the most serious cases. What I've been suggesting is starting work, putting together proposals around this, staff members who help us develop them and seeing how we go with that, at the same time it's important to start pointing out some governance issues.

This is one issue with current DAP - in the DAP, who is responsible was unclear in previous DAP. Planning structure no way for the governance committee to review or for us as students to check the people they assigned it to can actually do in the DAP. One I'd be suggesting, every group assigned responsibilities actually accepted responsibilities. Ideally it would be communicated in a variety of ways, a memorandum of understanding for uni but we'd like to see something we can see as students to know what people's colleges have done. I think I'll leave it there

Mickey: two questions - the first being this idea of going to staff members in each of the schools, was the staff responsive

Ruth: didn't have time to raise it

Mickey: so this is the stage to present it or going straight to teaching staff

Ruth: The next stage is working it up into a proposal, for this one it's important to go to schools and colleges as well as to uni management.

Mickey: other question, do you think staff members would be adverse to taking on a bit more workload

Ruth: I think we need to be going through the schools and college education committees and getting them to agree to formally recognise this as one of their roles within their college and within their school, everyone has a different range of recognised teaching roles but a lot have coordinators so a lot are saying the accessibility contact would fit within that role, so I think that they are supportive of the idea of having a role but my experience is maybe COS skewed

Mira: I know I wasn't here to answer DSA specific questions so if people have those questions from last CRC I'd be happy to address them

Ben: just to summarise ruth can you give me the summary of what you're asking us to consider today

Ruth: I think the ask is first of all thinking of this as an ongoing campaign where we will be regularly talking about these issues, setting priorities together getting input, a lot of the other things we'll be clarifying as we go, basic proposition is that I'm offering to do a lot of the work in terms of consulting with friendly staff behind the scenes to see what's feasible and putting that together into infographics presentations discussion papers that present these issues, request from you is your time in being involved in that process and also giving a mandate to speak on behalf of students through you having been part of that process

Ben: Looking to understand how we feel we can contribute and to check that we're still on board and have our support?

Ruth: yep, I have no capacity to be manning a table in union court, selling it to students, doing that sort of direct student engagement myself, best thing I can do is to come along to things like this and have you be the student representatives feeding into what's going on in the campaign. Thank you so much for having me

Ruth and Mira left the meeting

Lara: I'm a bit confused about how this will progress after PARSA has dissolved?

Ben: Something that PARSA raised, Ruth will become a member of our DSA when our constitution changes are ratified. PARSA Disabilities and DSA have a good working relationship so I imagine in some shape through the DSA. It is totally possible for that to happen. Ownership of the campaign may naturally move to the DSA

Ben: my thoughts - find the campaign a bit confusing, I think I'm often unclear about the exact asks, I think there is some stuff in there that is eminently usable and doable like accountability, info sharing, measuring accessibility in diff spaces, I think notwithstanding that I struggle to see

the bigger picture. I think on the concrete ask of supporting them to push for it - it's a yes in my view. Are we happy to support by sharing info and working in other networks, contributing if it becomes a more mobilised campaign, again my perspective is yes. Personally I dont think its my job to micromanage strategy of campaign which is what i'm not quite picking up at the moment, I think in that sense I have no objections to asks made of us but I kind of don't know where it's headed

Mickey: also confused about how much of a campaign it is and how much of it is talking to management until it happens

Phi: concerns about time commitments?

Lara: not necessarily w time commitments but I think from our last CEC meeting, the uni is quite confused on what they want themselves - ours had a goal for hybrid learning and move from in person exams even though those were emphasised as going straight back in last meeting, staff were quite confused and hadn't had the info prior, so I think the uni is confused what they're doing

Mickey: seems to be quite a few levels of what we should do but not communicating

Ben: I think you're completely right, older views of academia as 2 hour lecture 1 hour tute, some don't agree. Bunch of projects in the uni that have really big accessibility goals, like student first and teaching learning strategy, both have a lot of money behind them so there is money and people working on stuff. My perspective, what I'm seeing from the upper level is that they think this problem will be solved by projects in the pipeline. I find this campaign kind of annoying but trying to fix it, I think that's a bit true not motivated by accessibility but rather industry learning done under the guise of accessibility. Key objectives that are adverse to accessibility. Leaning towards what are the outcomes - to reiterate, happy to give ruth what she asked for, but I think maybe what i'm saying is that what we were presented just then isn't necessarily a fix all option for accessibility and doesn't lift the onus of all of us discussing accessibility in our own spaces. I have objections to the campaigns strategy not enough to stand in the way of it but I think accessibility needs to be a priority throughout all of our standpoint

Phi: will send a draft response to slack

Item: 5: Other Business

Item 6: Meeting Close

Expected close of meeting 8pm

Meeting closed at 7:49pm

Reference A

See SRC report.

Reference B

See SRC report.

Reference C

See SRC report.

Reference D

See SRC report.

Reference E

CECC Representatives' Report

CRC 3

Harrison Oates & Punit Deshwal

Report submitted 26 April 2023

Item 1: Welcome to Punit!

Hi everyone! I'm Punit, and I use He/Him pronouns. I'm studying Bachelor of Advanced Computing (Honours), and I'm thrilled to step into the role of College Representative for CECC. I look forward to working with Harrison, along side all the college reps and CECC staff to prioritise student's interests above all else. My goal is to create a vibrant, connected CECC community and maximise engagement in every way possible. If you see me around campus, don't hesitate to come say hi - I've been told I'm quite talkative. Always up for a chat.

Item 2: Meetings

CECC rep interviews clashed with CEC2, so Harrison was unable to attend. Harrison also attended the second meeting of the University Research Committee in his capacity as the undergraduate member.

Item 3: Course Issues

COMP2420 students received an email from central timetabling stating that their end of year exam is in-person this semester, with no word about what this means for international students not currently back in Australia. Course representatives are making inquiries, although there has been no word from the convenor yet. We're monitoring the situation and are ready to step in if required.

Item 4: New BEng major consultations

We've been approached by the School of Engineering to nominate students to consult on a proposal for a new major / minor in nuclear systems.

Reference F

CRC Report 3 – College of Arts and Social Science

Mickey Throssell and Lara Johnson

1. **Introduction**

Hi everyone! With a new term, student are busy with assessments and course work, so we hope everyone is doing well and a reminder that we are both here to help with any troubles that arise with courses. We acknowledge that this time of the semester can be more stressful for students especially when trying to navigate issues arising within their courses.

2. **CASS CEC Meeting**

Lara attended the CASS College Education Meeting on the 3rd of April. The key points from the CEC were:

- Maryanne Dever gave an update on the Learning and Teaching portfolio.
- These included updates on the Graduate Attributes, Curriculum updates and the Learning and Teaching strategy updates.
- Following on from the learning and teaching strategy update, which included a series of goals, from a CASS student perspective, more information of the specific goal of "innovative for outstanding large class experience" is a priority.
- There was also confusion about the direction of in person learning and exams, as different information regarding the stance of the university was provided.
- There were conversations about the honours students and creating more generalised honours course.
- As well as a discussion about making honour thesis's 100% of an honour's year grade rather than a combination of thesis and course work.

- There were further questions surrounding the graduate attribute framework specifically in regards to the indigenous course and the transdisciplinary course.

3. **Issues with Courses**

We have received no concerns surrounding courses.

4. **ANUSA Events**
- We both attended SRC 3
- Mickey attended the EAG meetings

5. **Other Events**

From the CEC meeting we are arranging to meet with Geoff Hinchcliffe, the CASS Associate Dean of Education.

Reference G

Reference H

COS Rep Report

26 April 2023

Prepared for CRC 3 and SRC 3 of 2023.

Contacts: Isha Singhal and Yasmin Osborne
sa.science@anu.edu.au
isha.singhal@anu.edu.au
Yasmin.osborne@anu.edu.au

Inbox:

I have been monitoring the inbox since December. So far we have received a few emails, including but not limited to student inquiries and issues with courses, course rep questions, ANUSA meetings and a few other meetings.

- ### 1. The Chief Ministers Round Table
  - Isha found 2 psych reps who are attending a meeting today and we will update on how their meeting went in the next CRC.

- ### 2. The D&I Groups
  - We now have student reps for all 4 D&I task forces yay! (** include information about the different task forces**)
  - Students interested in being on these task forces can email us at sa.science@anu.edu.au

- ### 3. Student Enquires
  - Mostly around extra classes in the break, deferred exams and after access lab access. These were all addressed quite promptly thanks to quick communication from the relevant staff concerned.

Reach Out!:

For any course and/or teaching feedback, feel free to approach us. We have processed a few points of student feedback and just want to reiterate that we are always happy to relay feedback anonymously. Reach out to us via email at sa.science@anu.edu.au!

Come to us with both college wide or teaching wide changes you'd like to see, or simple issues. We're here to help.

Reference I

Reference J

College of Asia and the Pacific Report

Tess Northcott & Ioan Hastie

CRC 3 26/04/23

Summary
1 Meetings
2 Course Convenor & Class rep engagement
3 CAP clubs & societies

1. Meetings

I attended the third CAP education committee meeting last week. Key items raised included:

- Course cuts: CAP exec want to cut down on the number of CAP courses. The first stage of this involves identifying courses which are similar or have obvious overlap.

- ChatGPT & AI tools: CAP does not currently have a college-wide policy around the use of AI, which is something that they will be working on in the coming months. Many members of the CAPEC raised concerns about the use of Turnitin detection (the meeting took place before the university's decision on this). We've been tasked with collecting information on how CAP students use AI tools and any questions they have around acceptable use of this. CAPEC plans to have a more in-depth discussion about this in a month's time.

- Recording of teaching & learning activities: There was a brief discussion around recording of classes. CAP is slowly developing a plan of what they will and won't record in the future.

2. Course Convenor & Class Rep engagement

We are in the process of obtaining an email list of all CAP convenors from the CAP student centre. We've noticed that many CAP wattle pages have not been updated with our details and have incorrect Facebook page links. CAP is keen to hold a social event for CAP class reps, so we will try and assist with this.

3. CAP clubs & societies

We are planning to organise a meeting with the presidents of any CAP-associated clubs, an initiative started by last year's reps. We think it would be helpful to see if they are having any issues when engaging and seeking support from CAP.