

**AUTC PHYSICS PROJECT - Team Meeting**  
**AIP Congress, ANU**

Friday 4 February 2005

**Present:**

David Mills	Project Leader
Manju Sharma	Project Leader
Alberto Mendez	Project Officer
Michelle Livett	Steering Committee
Judith Pollard	Steering Committee
Marjan Zadnik	Steering Committee
Susan Feteris	Working Party
David Low	Working Party
Alex Merchant	Working Party
Geoff Swan	Working Party
Kate Wilson	Working Party

**Agenda**

- Discussed report status re formatting and listing of authors in acknowledgements as well as possible publications in the future. Protocol for publishing papers on aspects of the report's findings:
  - NO need to get permission from Carrick Institute
  - need to contact team and ask for other interested authors (+ permission)
- David outlined the good comments about the report received from Elizabeth (Carrick Institute) – some of which may, in some form, be included on the cover letter to go out to HODs along with the published report.
- Have had good feedback from HODs – seemed to have gained some credibility.
- The brochure will be sent out with the report and the cover letter.
- After much discussion on the cover of the report it was decided that it will contain the main features of the brochure cover, if in a slightly different form. The official AUTC title will be topmost, with the title of the brochure second. The f = ma image will feature but may be watermarked.
- Good Practice:
  - go to departmental contacts and ask them (maybe for 3) things they do well
  - possibility – have a separate booklet with each department's listing of their good practices (book likely to be more effective than web based links on database, which are rarely used)
  - we should draw up grid with all 34 depts and areas of good practice in which ticks can be placed

dept	area1	area2	....	areaN
1	✓			
2		✓		✓
...				
34	✓	✓		

- ideas from workshop (at AIP Congress) ought to feed in with good practices – i.e. the resources people want
- Must make sure that we look at everything that workshop participants and HODs have said and asked for, and that we respond with:
  - it's a possibility and that we will look to include it as part of this year's project
  - it's a long term project which we are not able to accomplish in the current time available but that might warrant consideration for later
- A list of all suggestions for stage 2 should be drawn up (separated thematically) and circulated to the project team to reach consensus on the priorities and what is possible now, impossible now and possible later.
- A timeline for the year's tasks and activities needs to be developed.
- There is no need to have a report at the end of stage 2 BUT will have to send to Carrick Institute a document outlining ALL we have done during the year – a rolling report which includes EVERYTHING!
- In each state we need to arrange to meet (or phone up) HODs and talk briefly about the stage 1 report – it's important that once it has been received it doesn't get filed away immediately.
- There is a place for conducting both the national workshop at UniServe in September as well as state run workshops. Can give the departments within each state the choice of workshop topic (overview of project, particular areas, ...)
- At UniServe can invite people from outside project team to come and present showcase of their good practice.
- The project team (and especially the Sydney members) will organise and manage the one day presentations and workshop at UniServe to most likely be held on Wednesday 28<sup>th</sup> September. (There will be no registration fee associated with the workshop.)

### **Outcomes of the National meeting (September, Sydney)**

1. Implement what you learnt today (train the trainers)
  - e.g. tutor / lab demonstrating / projects
  - IT ... / student backgrounds / ...
2. Networking
3. Resource materials
4. Reporting back, evaluation, identify missing resources, where to from here?

*Morning* – Showcasing / Presentations (15 + 5 minutes)

*Afternoon* – 1.5 hour workshops (number of workshops, maximum of 6, dependent on number of registrations)

*Target audience:* ~60 participants

1. HODs / Co-ordinators
2. Junior staff – encouraged to try something new
3. Postgraduates – to report back at end of day???
4. Project team

*Possible follow-up:* contact participants at a later stage (several months) to see whether they have taken on some of the ideas discussed in workshops.

*2 purposes:*

1. Change agents for HODs
2. Self help network for junior staff who are “chucked in at deep end of teaching”

*Showcase Topics:*

- Promotion of careers (to students) / industry
- How (and where) to get physics education research / physics education development published
- Fostering staff development – including recognition and rewards
- Graduate attributes – do we explicitly address them in our curricula?
- Effective strategies for interactive large group teaching and learning
- Sharing of resources – where are we now?

*Workshop Topics:*

- Diverse student backgrounds – how to identify, cater for and retain them  
*(David Mills, Manju Sharma)*
- Tutor / demonstrator training *(Mario Zadnik, Susan Feteris)*
- Small undergraduate projects *(Manju Sharma, Richard Newbury)*
- Assessment / feedback as a useful learning tool (including graduate attributes)  
*(Michelle Livett, Judith Pollard, David Low, Kate Wilson)*
- Engaging with community and school students and staff (panel type workshop) *(John O’Connor, David Jamieson)*
- On-line learning – benefits and traps *(Geoff Swan, Alex Merchant)*

*[Names next to workshop indicate team members in charge of running them.]*