

THE INSTITUTE FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

ACADEMIC BOARD REVIEW PHASE ONE

WEDNESDAY 7 MAY 2003

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONTENTS

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 2 | ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE INSTITUTE FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING | 2 |
| 3 | NATURE AND ROLE OF THE INSTITUTE FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING | 3 |
| 3.1 | STRATEGIC POSITIONING WITHIN UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE | 3 |
| 3.2 | CORE BUSINESS OF THE INSTITUTE | 3 |
| 3.3 | CULTURE AND COMMUNICATION | 4 |
| 3.4 | RECOGNITION OF GOOD TEACHING WITHIN THE INSTITUTE | 4 |
| 4 | PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS | 4 |
| 4.4 | GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN EDUCATIONAL STUDIES (HIGHER EDUCATION) | 5 |
| 4.5 | PROJECTS | 6 |
| 4.6 | COLLEGE REPRESENTATION | 6 |
| 4.7 | MARKETING OF INSTITUTE PROGRAMS TO OTHER UNIVERSITIES | 7 |
| 4.8 | ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS | 7 |
| 5 | EVALUATION AND QUALITY ASSURANCE QUESTIONNAIRES..... | 8 |
| 6 | BENCHMARKING AND QUALITY ASSURANCE | 8 |
| 7 | SYNERGY | 9 |
| 8 | CONCLUSIONS..... | 9 |
| 9 | AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE (COMMENDATIONS) | 10 |
| 10 | AREAS OF CONSIDERATION FOR IMPROVEMENT (RECOMMENDATIONS) | 11 |
| | APPENDIX ONE INSTITUTE OF TEACHING AND LEARNING SELF EVALUATION REPORT..... | 13 |

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The following Academic Board Review Team members visited the Institute for Teaching and Learning¹, as part of the review and evaluation of teaching and learning and research training in all faculties across the University.

Professor Judyth Sachs
Prof Michael Jackson
Dr Ann Poulos

Chair and Chair, Academic Board
Faculty of Economics and Business
Faculty of Health Sciences

Administrative Officer
Rachel Symons

Quality Assurance Officer (Teaching and Learning)

- 1.2 During the visit, the Team interviewed the following people:

- Assoc Michael Prosser, Director, Institute for Teaching and Learning
- Academic and general staff from the Institute for Teaching and Learning²
- Academic staff from faculties across the University who have attended programs or workshops run by the Institute³

- 1.3 This report is based on the findings of the Review Team in relation to the activities of the Institute. It is based on the Self-Evaluation Report, the Institute Strategic Plan⁴ and interviews conducted with staff and students during the visit.

2 ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE INSTITUTE FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

- 2.1 Since the current Director was appointed three years ago, the Institute has reconceptualised its role in the University. It has moved from being service oriented through the provision of advice on teaching and learning issues to individual staff members and faculties, to a more strategic involvement in issues relating to quality and teaching and learning.
- 2.2 The main focus of the work of the Institute is the provision of data regarding student centred perspectives of teaching and learning, through the use of Course Experience Questionnaires, Student Course Experience Questionnaires, Student Research Experience Questionnaires, Unit of Study Evaluations, the Graduate Certificate in Educational Studies (Higher Education), programs and workshops. The Institute has an evidence based approach to teaching and learning and surveys which is commended by the Review Team. Evaluations are used to gain perspectives on teaching for example, in providing academic staff with a better understanding of the assessment process.
- 2.3 The Institute has become one of the leading academic development units across Australia, achieved in large measure by the way in which it has instigated cultural change in teaching and learning practices across the university. International interest in the work of the Institute is indicated in no small measure by the invitation of staff to be keynote speakers and presenters at the International Student Learning Conference in Oxford in 2003 (*see also Section 6.2: Benchmarking*).
- 2.4 The Review Team commended the Director and his achievements and noted that despite limited resources and reinvention of the Institute, the response to the work of the Institute was

¹ Hereafter referred to as the Institute

² Hereafter referred to as Institute staff

³ Hereafter referred to as academic staff

⁴ Self-Evaluation Report and Strategic Plan are at Appendix One of this report

positive. However, the Review Team recommended that the Director heighten the profile of the Institute by more actively promoting its achievements within the University.

See Commendation 1 and Recommendation 1

3 NATURE AND ROLE OF THE INSTITUTE FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

3.1 Strategic positioning within University management structure

3.1.1 The Institute for Teaching and Learning is organisationally located in the Office of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning), and has close links with the Faculty of Education and Social Work in the running of the Graduate Certificate in Higher Education programs. The Director considered that location within a particular Faculty would decrease the Institute's usefulness in providing a service to all faculties and that it was important that it was seen as an independent body by the rest of the University.

3.1.2 The Institute works closely with the Academic Board in the promulgation and dissemination of Academic Board policies through workshops and projects, for example on assessment and research led teaching. The work of the Institute was aided by faculties seeing their policy, quality assurance and evaluation work as Academic Board initiatives, and not only as coming from the Office of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning). The Review Team considered that this strategic positioning within the University, and the strategic use of the Academic Board, had benefited the Institute in its work, and alleviated any tension that might be caused by the Institute being perceived to be aligned to management.

3.1.3 Institute staff are on a number of Faculty Teaching and Learning Committees, as well as the University Teaching and Learning Committee. The Director considered that membership of the latter provided the opportunity to publicise the work of the Institute, and for it to gain a better understanding across the University. The Director was of the view that this was an important part of the quality assurance and accountability processes, as it led to discussions on teaching and learning issues. The Chair of the Review Team commended the Director on the Institute's reports to the Teaching and Learning Committee, commenting that they had helped in the dissemination of information about the Institute's activities, which had not occurred in the past. Institute staff considered that participation on central committees gave the Institute legitimacy and allowed them to be successful.

See Commendations 2-4

3.2 Core business of the Institute

3.2.1 All participants in the review visit agreed that the core business of the Institute was to work with faculties to improve the student learning experience and student learning outcomes. This was achieved through a number of measures, including the running of staff development courses such as the Postgraduate Supervision Program, the Three-Day Program and the Graduate Certificate in Educational Studies (Higher Education); workshops on research-led teaching, graduate attributes, First Year Experience and assessment; and evaluation and quality assurance work. Academic staff interviewed considered that the Institute had a strong role in disseminating Academic Board policies and helping staff come to a deeper understanding of these policies.

3.2.2 Institute staff indicated that this move to university wide support of teaching and learning, as opposed to working with individual staff members and faculties, has resulted in staff development becoming more valued across the university. They had noticed a change in the culture of teaching, though this varied across faculties. In addition their own research into the scholarship of teaching, promulgated through their teaching practices, had resulted in

increasing their credibility as academics to Faculty academic staff. This more proactive focus was seen to be changing attitudes within faculties as members of working groups reported back to Faculty Teaching and Learning Committees, and influenced Faculty strategies in relation to such aspects as First Year Experience, graduate attributes and research-led teaching.

- 3.2.3 Academic staff saw the Institute as a ‘one-stop shop’ for advice on all aspects of teaching and learning; providing support for improving quality in teaching; developing leadership; and supporting and developing scholarship in teaching. Since it was centrally based, and serviced all colleges, they considered it to be an ideal venue for the discussion of teaching and learning issues across all faculties. Most importantly, they considered the Institute to be the key leaders in promoting excellence in teaching. Through participation in Institute programs, they felt confident to return to their own faculties with the necessary structures in place for their own and their Faculty’s development which would ensure that students would get the best learning experience possible.

See Commendation 5

3.3 Culture and communication

- 3.3.1 The Review Team was impressed with the development of a strong collegial culture within the Institute, as evidenced by the collaborative manner in which the Self-Evaluation Report was developed. All staff were involved in the process and felt a strong sense of ownership. They considered that the development process had been a useful and valuable exercise.
- 3.3.2 All staff are involved in decision-making processes relating to current and possible future Institute programs and projects. Regular monthly meetings, annual planning retreats, and morning teas aid the communication process and are a mechanism for sharing and celebrating teaching achievements.

See Commendation 6

3.4 Recognition of good teaching within the Institute

- 3.4.1 Institute staff considered that recognition of their teaching achievements came indirectly through the uptake and implementation of good teaching practices and student centred learning across the university. Institute courses are subject to the same evaluation processes as other courses; and programs are reviewed on a regular basis. The structure of projects in a similar fashion to Units of Study helped staff in their promotion applications. The Institute recognises that the process of reviewing how good practice is recognised has highlighted the need to do more to actively recognise and reward its own good teaching. The Review Team recommends that the Institute develop ways of recognising good teaching in its own area beyond the applications for promotion. It further recommends that the Institute should take advantage of its links with the Faculty of Education in this respect.

See Recommendation 2

4 PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS

- 4.1 The Institute has developed a number of programs and projects which will help it achieve its stated primary role of working collaboratively within the University community to enhance and help assure the quality of teaching and learning⁵. An integrated program of studies in higher education has been developed which include the Graduate Certificate and Graduate

⁵ Self-Evaluation Report: Appendix 1, page 11

Diploma in Educational Studies (Higher Education)⁶, Master of Education (Higher Education) and PhD. This report will concentrate on the Graduate Certificate program.

- 4.2 In addition, a number of projects and workshops have been designed to address teaching and learning issues and to focus Institute support for the faculties. These include the Postgraduate supervision development program, First Year Experience, Graduate attributes, Evaluation and quality assurance, and Research-led teaching. The Institute also runs a 3 day program on the principles and practices of university teaching and learning. These will be referred to as projects within the report.
- 4.3 Academic staff expressed the view that participation in Institute programs and projects had had major benefits to their work – they were more confident in approaching classes, particularly when class sizes increased without warning, their practice had improved, they were developing personally and were becoming teaching and learning leaders in their faculties. Many were members or chairs of Teaching and Learning and other Faculty committees.

See Commendation 7

4.4 Graduate Certificate in Educational Studies (Higher Education)

- 4.4.1 The Graduate Certificate is offered by the Institute through the Faculty of Education and Social Work. It is designed for university teachers with an emphasis on improving student learning. Opportunities are provided through the program for teachers to reflect on educational theory and student learning research from the perspective of their own teaching experiences through the scholarship of teaching and learning⁷. It is subject to the Faculty of Education and Social Work quality assurance processes, and is continually reviewed in relation to Academic Board policies. The team-based approach to teaching the program ensured that Institute staff learnt from each other and make changes accordingly.
- 4.4.2 The Graduate Certificate program was accepted in most faculties, and was mandated in some - for example the Faculty of Veterinary Science, which requires all new academic staff to enrol in the program within three years of appointment⁸. The program is aimed at staff who will be taking a leadership role in teaching and learning in their faculties, and who can go back to their faculties to promote a more student focussed approach to teaching and learning. Over 100 staff have graduated from the course over the eight years that it has been running. The Director considered that these graduates have had a substantial impact on teaching and learning in the university.
- 4.4.3 Academic staff who had completed the Graduate Certificate informed the Review Team that the experience had been extremely beneficial to their personal and professional development. It had changed their teaching practices considerably, allowed them become reflective practitioners, and given them an insight into the scholarship of teaching. Graduates had received TIF grants, published on their teaching, and managed to make significant changes in teaching practices within their faculties, and guided curriculum reform. Some graduates had received university teaching awards and two were finalists in the 2002 Australian Awards for University Teaching. They appreciated exposure to higher education research within their individual disciplines.
- 4.4.4 The Director acknowledged, and this was confirmed by participants, that the biggest difficulty was teaching staff who were unused to the social science manner of writing to adopt the

⁶ Hereafter called the Graduate Certificate

⁷ Self-Evaluation Report: Appendix 2, page 15

⁸ Dean, Faculty of Veterinary Science, Academic Board Phase Two review 4 June 2003

practices and standards required. Academic staff considered that they were not provided with enough support for this change from scientific to social science styles of writing. They were also concerned about the jargon used in the course, and the fact that educational databases and other resources were not available in their home faculties.

- 4.4.5 Institute staff expressed the view, and this was confirmed by academic staff that there is a misconception amongst some faculties that the kind of learning promoted by the Institute does not fit into the context of either language or clinical teaching. Institute staff considered that the Graduate Certificate needed to be better marketed to overcome this misconception.
- 4.4.6 Another cause for concern amongst the academic staff was the mentoring system within the Graduate Certificate. They considered that the role of the mentor needed modification so that the mentor is available to the student from the beginning of the program, not introduced halfway through. The Review Team recommended to the Institute that the mentoring program should be reviewed with a view to introducing it earlier in the program.

See Recommendation 3

4.5 Projects

- 4.5.1 Academic staff generally became involved in Institute projects because of an interest in the topic – for example postgraduate supervision; or as part of their professional development and a desire to improve the student experience – for example First Year Experience. Support from faculties was generally strong and grew exponentially as understanding of the crucial role and value of the project grew. Staff from faculties located away from the Camperdown/Darlington campus were provided with financial support to attend workshops and courses.
- 4.5.2 Benefits included the opportunities for research collaboration, policy and strategic planning development, improving teaching practices, and empowerment to provide teaching and learning leadership within their home faculties. Some academic staff noted that their students were impressed by the fact that they were studying to improve their learning experience and were supportive of teaching award applications.

4.6 College representation

- 4.6.1 The Review Team noted that the College of Science and Technology (CST) and the College of Health Sciences (CHS) had more participants in programs and projects offered by the Institute. The under-representation of College of Humanities and Social Sciences (CHASS) was of concern.
- 4.6.2 Partly this is explained by the misconception of the type of learning provided by the Institute as mentioned in Section 4.4.5, and partly by the fact that the other Colleges have a larger cohort of academic staff to draw on, and that some faculties have mandated the Graduate Certificate. Institute staff considered that a good strategy to attract participants from CHASS might be to advertise the fact that the Certificate is mandatory in some faculties.
- 4.6.3 An analysis of participation in the Graduate Certificate had been undertaken by the Institute and this showed that whereas from 1999 – 2001 the majority had come from either CST or CHS, 2001 had shown a beginning of interest from CHASS. This would provide a chance to promote the strategic approach to teaching and learning within these faculties, which could then act as a catalyst to get others involved. In some areas, for example the 3 day program, CHASS is the biggest customer. Institute staff considered that this would have a flow on effect to future Graduate Certificate courses.

4.7 Marketing of Institute programs to other universities

- 4.7.1 Considering the success of the Institute's programs, in particular the Graduate Certificate, and the benefits to staff and students, the Review Team was interested in ascertaining whether the Institute had ever considered marketing its skills and programs to other universities. The Director advised the Team that due to the current strong focus on internal programs and restructuring, and the interest by the university in keeping all current programs running, he had not considered the issue of external fundraising by offering Institute courses to full fee paying external students.
- 4.7.2 Overall all interviewees considered that, despite the interest displayed by external institutions, offering places to external candidates would not be a wise move on the part of the Institute. Currently the Graduate Certificate has a quota of thirty-five and is fully booked with internal applicants. The Director considered that accepting external full fee paying applicants whilst turning down internal applicants would send the wrong message to the university. Institute and academic staff endorsed this view, adding that the primary role of the Institute was to support the university, and that if external applicants were accepted this role would change.
- 4.7.3 Institute staff were concerned about the workload implications of marketing the program externally, especially if the current quota was increased by five full fee paying students. In order that the desired outcomes and quality of the program continued to be achieved, classes would need to be split and this would mean more staff and/or more teaching hours per staff member. However, staff were prepared to increase program participation if more funds became available to employ another staff member to ease the teaching load.
- 4.7.4 The Director indicated that the Institute was in the process of implementing external postgraduate supervision development programs through the Professional Development Unit of the Faculty of Education and Social Work. This would be a fee paying course.
- 4.7.5 The Review Team recommended that the Institute consider ways of generating more income, particularly through offering their programs to applicants from external institutions. This would allow for the employment of extra academic staff and would ease the workload of current staff.

See Recommendation 4

4.8 Additional programs

- 4.8.1 Academic staff expressed the view that there were gaps in the Institute's offerings and suggested that programs should be put in place to aid staff to become academic leaders, for senior management to help in the provision of support within home faculties, and for entry level (neophyte) academics.
- 4.8.2 It is suggested therefore, that the Institute consider the development of an advanced leadership program for teaching. This could include modules and workshops similar to the Graduate Certificate and thereby maintain the teaching and learning results evident in graduates of the Certificate program.
- 4.8.3 The Institute should consider and investigate the possibility of developing a program for neophyte academics which would fill the gap between the 3-day program and the Graduate Certificate. Academic staff who had completed either the Graduate Certificate or the Graduate Diploma could use their skills in mentoring participants in this program.

See Recommendations 5 and 6

5 EVALUATION AND QUALITY ASSURANCE QUESTIONNAIRES

- 5.1 The Institute is responsible for the collection and interpretation of data relating the student experiences of teaching and learning. This includes Student Course Experience Questionnaires (SCEQ), Student Research Experience Questionnaires (SREQ) and Unit of Study Evaluations (USE). The Institute employs a dedicated survey officer whose role is to provide information about surveys, and interpret and analyse the results for faculties and management. Institute staff considered that the data provided as a result of the above survey instruments is critiqued and analysed in a manner not previously undertaken in the university. The Survey Officer informed the Team that quality processes were in place for the survey instruments, with an aim of a 50% response rate.
- 5.2 Academic staff were of the opinion that resistance to survey instruments, in particular USE, stemmed mainly from more senior staff who were unable to perceive the benefits that they provided in creating a good student learning experience. USE only has an effect with those staff who have an interest in teaching, and who were willing to improve or change their practices. The Director reported that, in his experience, faculties where there was communication about the value of USE, and staff were sent explanatory notes from the Dean, were more successful in overall acceptance of this instrument.

6 BENCHMARKING AND QUALITY ASSURANCE

- 6.1 The Institute undertakes a number of formal and informal benchmarking activities both in Australia and internationally. Student data is benchmarked with Oxford, Queensland and Melbourne universities. The learning community scale is being developed in conjunction with Oxford. Benchmarking with Hong Kong Polytechnic University has led to the Institute developing, adopting and adapting grade descriptors which will help Graduate Certificate students come to terms with the social science style of writing. Graduate Certificate students are sharing assignments with students at Durham University. The academic development unit at Edinburgh University is currently working on the provision of articulated programs of professional development of academics. The development of the MEd (Higher Education) program by the Institute has resulted of benchmarking with Edinburgh and is a step towards achieving a similar level of provision for Sydney academics.
- 6.2 Informal benchmarking takes the form of conference presentations, publication and networking with other academic development units. As mentioned in *Section 2.3: Achievements*, staff from the Institute have been invited as keynote speakers and presenters at the 2003 International Student Learning Conference in Oxford. Academic staff informed the Team they are presenting six papers at a conference which only accepts forty. The unique work of the Institute in aligning evaluation with academic development is recognised internationally and staff are publishing in international journals about the processes involved. Institute staff are approached at national and regional meetings of academic development unit staff for advice on running graduate certificate and three day programs. The Institute also received a number of national and international visitors who are interested in their work.
- 6.3 The benchmarking activities of the ITL are worthy of commendation. They are focussed on a sense of organisational learning, and are strategic, developmental and reciprocal. The Institute is to be congratulated on its national and international profile. Staff have gained a lot of recognition for their work as evidenced by presentations at international student learning conferences and publication in international journals on teaching and learning.

See Commendation 8

- 6.4 The Institute has a number of quality assurance measures in place. As previously mentioned the Graduate Certificate program is subject to the quality assurance processes of the Faculty of

Education and Social Work, with each unit of study being evaluated using the USE instrument. Internal self monitoring in the form of team teaching, coordinators meeting and sharing of experiences also takes place for the Graduate Certificate. Informal quality assurance measures for the Graduate Certificate include the evaluation of the impact on faculties, and the way in which cultural change in teaching and learning has occurred. Project work is similarly evaluated. Institute staff considered that the institutional measures such as the Scholarship Index and the Teaching Improvement Fund grants were also an indication of how well they were performing.

7 SYNERGY

- 7.1 Synergy is a publication produced by the Institute as a means of discussing teaching and learning within the University of Sydney. It provides two main forums for contributors; feature articles on teaching and learning and reports on conferences, teaching exchanges, research projects, and is available on the Institute website⁹ or as hard copy. The Review Team were interested in ascertaining the effectiveness of the publication, how widely it was read, and whether a cost benefit analysis of its value to the university had been undertaken.
- 7.2 They were pleased to learn that the Institute is in the process of reviewing *Synergy* and were considering issuing it as an online version only. Institute staff considered that the value of *Synergy* lay not only in its vehicle for promoting teaching and learning issues to the whole university community, and advertising their activities; but also as the first publication in which academic staff could write about the scholarship of teaching. This often led to publications in other journals and conference presentations. They were of the opinion that even if only a few people read the publication, then it was important to those and therefore worth continuing. All academic staff interviewed read *Synergy* and considered it to be a helpful publication, enabling them to see what was happening in teaching and learning across the university.
- 7.3 The Review Team commended the Institute on its review of *Synergy* as it was important to look at the cost and provide evidence to support its perceived usefulness to the university community.

See Commendation 9

8 CONCLUSIONS

- 8.1 The Review Team considered the results of the interviews, the Self-Evaluation Report and the Strategic Plan and concluded that the Institute for Teaching and Learning was following good practices in the areas of strategic positioning, promotion and support of student learning experience approaches to teaching and learning, and benchmarking activities.
- 8.2 The Review Team recommends that the Institute give consideration to improving practices in the areas of promoting the Institute within the University, recognising the good teaching of its own staff, reviewing the mentoring component of the Graduate Certificate, and the development of programs to cater for leaders and neophyte staff.

⁹ <http://www.itl.usyd.edu.au/itl/docs/resource/frameset.asp?url=http%3A//www.usyd.edu.au/ctl/Synergy/>

9 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE (COMMENDATIONS)

Based on the Self-Evaluation Report, the Strategic Plan and the findings of the Review Team, the following areas of good practice are commended:

Commendation One

The Review Team commended the Director and his achievements and noted that despite limited resources and the process of repositioning the Institute within the institution, the response its work of was positive. *(See Section 2)*

Commendation Two

The Review Team commends the Institute for its greater visibility across the university, achieved through strategic positioning within the Office of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) and liaison with the Academic Board in the dissemination and promulgation of Academic Board policies. *(See Section 3.1)*

Commendation Three

The Review Team commends the Institute on its close liaison with the Faculty of Education and Social Work, particularly in relation to the running of the Graduate Certificate. *(See Section 3.1)*

Commendation Four

The Chair of the Review Team commended the Director on the Institute's reports to the Teaching and Learning Committee, commenting that they had they had helped in the dissemination of information about the Institute's activities, which had not occurred in the past. *(See Section 3.1)*

Commendation Five

The Review Team commends the Institute on the focus on student learning experience which has had a cascading effect on their practice. The role of the Institute was seen to be fundamental in improving perceptions of the importance of teaching across the university. There is an evidence based approach about how the Institute operates, in their presence in faculties and the availability of staff. *(See Section 3.2)*

Commendation Six

The Review Team commends the Institute on its strong collegial culture as evidenced by the collaborative process in which the Self-Evaluation Report was developed, and the sense of ownership exhibited by the staff for the report. *(See Section 3.6)*

Commendation Seven

The Review Team commended the Institute on the positive comments received from academic staff who had participated in their programs and projects. Staff were more confident in their teaching practices and had become leaders of teaching and learning within their faculties. *(See Section 4.3)*

Commendation Eight

The Review Team commends the Institute on their benchmarking activities with reputable international institutions. The Institute is to be congratulated on its national and international profile. Staff have gained recognition for their work as evidenced by presentations at international student

learning conferences and publication in international journals on teaching and learning. (See Section 6.3)

Commendation Nine

The Review Team commended the Institute on its review of Synergy as it was important to look at the cost and provide evidence to support its perceived usefulness to the university community. The fact that it is also a useful first venue for academic staff to write on the scholarship of teaching is also commended. (See Section 7.3)

10 AREAS OF CONSIDERATION FOR IMPROVEMENT (RECOMMENDATIONS)

The Review Team identified a number of areas for consideration for improvements and makes the following recommendations:

Recommendation One

The Review Team recommends that the Director heighten the profile of the Institute within the university by more active promotion of its achievements. The Team acknowledges that this is happening to some extent by conference participation and publications, but this is externally, not internally. One way that the profile could be heightened is promotion of the fact that participants in Institute programs and projects had gone on to become leaders in teaching and learning in their faculties. (See Section 2)

Recommendation Two

The Review Team recommends that the Institute develop ways of recognising good teaching in its own area beyond the applications for promotion. It further recommends that the Institute should take advantage of its links with the Faculty of Education and Social Work in this respect. (See Section 3.4)

Recommendation Three

The Review Team recommends that the Institute review the mentoring program for the Graduate Certificate in Educational Studies (Higher Education), with a view to an earlier introduction of the mentor to the student. (See Section 4.4)

Recommendation Four

The Review Team recommended that the Institute consider ways of generating more income, particularly through offering their programs to applicants from external institutions. This would allow for the employment of extra academic staff and would ease the workload of current staff. (See Section 4.7)

Recommendation Five

The Review Team recommends that the Institute consider the development of an advanced leadership program for teaching. This could include modules and workshops similar to the Graduate Certificate and thereby maintain the teaching and learning results evident in graduates of the Certificate program. (See Section 4.8)

Recommendation Six

The Review Team recommends that the Institute consider the development of a program for neophyte academics which would fill the gap between the 3-day program and the Graduate Certificate.

Academic staff who had completed either the Graduate Certificate or the Graduate Diploma could use their skills in mentoring participants in this program. (*See Section 4.8*)

Prof Judyth Sachs

Chair, Review Team
Chair, Academic Board

24 June 2003

APPENDIX ONE INSTITUTE OF TEACHING AND LEARNING SELF EVALUATION REPORT

**ACADEMIC QUALITY ASSURANCE
INSTITUTE FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING
SELF-EVALUATION REPORT 2003**

Introduction

The Institute for Teaching and Learning (ITL) is organisationally located in the Office of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning). The ITL has the primary role of working collaboratively with the University community to enhance and help assure the quality of teaching and learning. Reporting to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning), it provides support to Colleges, Faculties, Schools, Departments and individual members of academic and other staff in achieving the teaching and learning goals and objectives in the University's Strategic Plan and Faculty Teaching and Learning Plans.

In fulfilling our role, the ITL has identified a number of strategic areas for its activities from 2003-2005 (see Appendix 1). They are derived from an analysis of the University's Strategic Plan, Faculty Teaching and Learning Plans, Academic Board Reviews of Faculties (see Appendix 10) and extensive discussions with the Chair of the Academic Board, the Chair of the Teaching and Learning Committee, College Pro-Vice-Chancellors and Faculty Deans, and in consultation with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning).

National and international benchmarking of our programs and projects with research universities in Australia and overseas, invitations to present our work and lead academic development and quality assurance workshops at leading international conferences, and invitations to publish descriptions of our work in monographs edited in Australia and overseas indicates to us that we are well on the way to achieving our objective of being amongst the leading academic development units in the world.

Programs and Projects

The ITL is addressing its strategic areas through:

- accredited programs of study for academic staff within the University (subsequently referred to as **programs**)
- strategic projects across the University (subsequently referred to as **projects**).

The ITL has developed an integrated program of studies in higher education, ranging from a Graduate Certificate to a PhD. The programs of study are:

- Graduate Certificate in Educational Studies (Higher Education) (see Appendix 2)
- Graduate Diploma in Educational Studies (Higher Education)
- Master in Education (Higher Education)
- PhD

Current projects, which are designed to address strategic teaching and learning issues within the University and to focus ITL support to the faculties, include:

- First Year Experience
- Evaluation and Quality Assurance
- Postgraduate Supervision Development
- Graduate Attributes
- Research led Teaching and Scholarship of Teaching
- Flexible Learning (Information and Communication Technologies)

Appendices 2-7 summarise participation in, and participant evaluations of, programs and projects. Appendix 8 shows an example of a project plan.

In addressing quality assurance issues we focus on our teaching role in the accredited programs of study and our facilitation role in the strategic projects. In doing so, we use the term “learning” to refer both to individual learning and to institutional learning. Accredited programs focus on individual learning, while the strategic projects focus on institutional learning.

Student Profile in Programs of Study in 2002:

Graduate Certificate: 33 enrolled and 29 completed
Graduate Diploma: To begin in 2003
Master: To begin in 2003
PhD: 2 being supervised and 2 being co-supervised

Staff Profile:

Academic: 2 Associate Professors, 2 Senior Lecturers, 2 Lecturers, 1 Associate Lecturer
Administrative: 1 x Level 8, 1 x Level 7, 1.6 x Level 6, 1 x Level 5, 2 x Level 4

There are four key elements to ITL quality assurance processes and structures:

- The development of ongoing links and relationships with the University’s committees to ensure that our programs and projects continue to meet the University’s needs (see Appendix 9 for a list of committee membership).
- The embedding of the University’s teaching and learning policies within our practices to ensure that they align with present policy.
- The adoption of a research based, scholarly approach to our academic development activities to ensure that our activities are based upon the best available evidence.
- Internal collaboration and teamwork and external peer review and benchmarking.

The main quality assurance strategies used in addressing these elements are:

- Annual reports to senate.
- Regular reports to the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee.
- The maintenance of a rolling triennial strategic plan.
- Regular reports and meetings with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning).
- An annual retreat.
- Regular evaluations of our programs and projects by the participants involved.
- National and international benchmarking with research-intensive universities.

To help assure the quality of its programs and projects the ITL has appointed coordinators for each of its programs of study (one for Graduate Certificate and another for the Graduate Diploma and Masters degree) and each of its projects (one for each project). In addition, each Unit of Study in ITL accredited programs has a UoS coordinator.

1. How does the ITL ensure that each of its programs and projects have an appropriate set of aims and outcomes, clearly communicated to and understood by participants?

Program Coordinators are initially responsible for coherence amongst UoS in the ITL’s Graduate Certificate and its developing Graduate Diploma, Masters’ and PhD programs. All formal programs are approved by the Faculty of Education and Social Work and are subject to the University’s formal approval mechanisms. The program coordinators work with the UoS coordinators to ensure that learning outcomes, generic attributes, assessment procedures and learning activities are appropriately aligned. The ITL conforms to University policy in providing an outline for each UoS that articulates its learning outcomes, aims and assessment procedures, and the relationship between these and the learning activities that participants engage in. The UoS outlines are checked by ITL program

coordinators against the Academic Board policies: *The Management and Evaluation of Teaching*, and the *Assessment and Examination of Coursework*, as well as other relevant policies.

Project coordinators typically develop projects through Working Groups chaired by the Director of the ITL. To ensure the projects have appropriate aims and outcomes that are clearly communicated to and understood by participants, the ITL works with the members of the Working Group, the University's Teaching and Learning Committee and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) to develop the aims and expected outcomes of each ITL project. This ensures that the aims and objectives of the project are aligned with the University's strategic direction and are acceptable to the Faculties. Twice annually, the Director of ITL reports to the University Teaching and Learning Committee outlining the progress of the projects and seeks advice on their direction. For the life of each of the projects, notes of the meetings are kept and distributed to the members and to Deans of Faculties. The quality of ITL support to the faculties during the life of the project is evaluated annually by the members of the Working Group through a questionnaire aligned to the institutional evaluation system.

(a) Systems for informing participants about programs and projects and ensuring that they understand them

- Appointment of program and project coordinators to consult with participants, to distribute information, and to field queries about the purpose of programs and projects.
- Publication of information about programs and projects in hard copy, and on the ITL website
- Regular seminars/meetings with participants in both programs and projects.
- Publication of information about programs of study in the Faculty of Education and Social Work handbook.

(b) Ways in which relations between generic and disciplinary skills in programs and projects are monitored

- UoS outlines are compared to each other and to the Academic Board policy on Graduate Attributes to ensure alignment and development of appropriate generic and disciplinary skills.

(c) Methods for ensuring that programs and projects enable participants and projects to achieve intended outcomes

- Continual formative evaluation of programs and projects by participants and opportunities provided for them to feed in ideas to UoS coordinators.
- Regular summative evaluation of programs and projects by participants.
- Alignment of projects to the University's Strategic Goals (without alignment, intended outcomes would not be achieved).

(d) Methods for providing coherence between programs and between projects

- Internal coherence is achieved through meetings of ITL staff called by coordinators to consider implications of formative and summative evaluation outcomes.
- External coherence with institution achieved through advice sought from the University community, for example, the University Teaching and Learning Committee.
- A set of core principles underpins all units. These, and explanations of the linkages, are publicised on the ITL website.

Evaluation

University staff in regular contact with the ITL through its programs and projects probably have an appropriate understanding of the aims and objectives of the ITL's programs and projects, but those with little contact may have little understanding. Ensuring that all relevant staff, including the Deans, Associate Deans Teaching and Learning and Chairs of faculty Teaching and Learning Committees, are aware of these aims and objectives is a continuing challenge.

2. How does the ITL ensure integration of research, including both disciplinary research and evidence about effective learning and teaching, into its programs and projects?

The ITL is in a unique position in that its disciplinary research encompasses research on evidence about teaching and learning. Academic staff of the ITL are all actively engaged in research in the areas of their programs and projects and most undertake collaborative research with faculty academics on teaching and learning issues. Institutional research is also carried out as required. The overall emphasis placed on scholarship, consultation and collaboration within the ITL ensures that the research which is done informs both the processes and content of the programs and projects.

(a) How links between current disciplinary research and the research expertise of staff and the programs and projects are managed:

- Overall direction of research is coordinated with the strategic projects through consultations between the Director and the Pro-Vice Chancellor (Teaching and Learning)
- When a need for a particular strategic project is identified, a project coordinator is appointed by the ITL Director, based on the best alignment with the nominated coordinator's research interests.
- Institutional research is conducted as required by the University through consultation with the Pro-Vice Chancellor (Teaching and Learning).

(b) How links between developments in the theory and practice of university teaching and learning and the programs and projects are managed:

- Collaboration between ITL academic staff through team teaching ensures that opportunities for program and project participants to engage with the research literature on teaching and learning are maximised.
- Terms of reference of Working Groups ensure that their work is evidence-based with research literature on teaching and learning issues being fed into them.
- Series of research and development seminars and fortnightly academics' meetings provide opportunities for sharing research and discussing implications for programs and projects.

Evaluation

The ITL believes its programs and projects are well informed by the latest research and that participants are clearly informed of that research. One of our projects aims to encourage the integration of research and teaching across the University. We are mindful of the need to model this. However, perceptions of us as a 'service' unit still persist in the university and this means that justifying our research and scholarly basis and the time needed for this is an ongoing challenge.

3. How does the ITL ensure that participant assessment in accredited programs is effective and contributes to learning, and that the assessment process is well understood by participants?

In designing UoS the ITL uses the concept of constructive alignment to ensure that assessment is aligned with UoS aims and objectives and that they are clear and well related to the teaching and learning methods employed. For most Graduate Certificate participants, it is the first time they have studied education and for many it is the first time they have participated in learning a social science. Most are unfamiliar with the practices and standards expected. The ITL has recently developed a set of generic grade descriptors which it applies across all UoS, to help ensure participants develop an understanding of the standards applied. The UoS descriptions outline the processes of assessment and criteria used in assessing work. Introductory sessions in each UoS are designed to ensure that participants are aware of the processes and standards.

(a) Methods for ensuring that assessments enable participants to achieve intended learning outcomes:

- Program coordinators ensure that UoS coordinators align their assessment items with UoS aims and objectives.
- Assessment requirements including criteria and standards are clearly spelled out in unit outlines.

- All assessments in the Graduate Certificate are pass / fail and participants can resubmit until the minimum acceptable standard is attained.

(b) Methods for ensuring that assessment practices and standards are fair and equitable:

- Generic grade descriptors have been developed to help participants develop an understanding of the standards expected. They are included in the Unit of Study outline, in the file folder given to participants, and on the ITL website.
- Assessment criteria are specified in each UoS.
- In all Graduate Certificate units of study ITL staff share marking and discuss feedback prior to sending it to individual participants. In cases where there are worries about the performance of a participant, work may be double-marked

(c) Methods for ensuring that assessments provide participants with prompt and effective feedback on their progress:

- A combination of small group discussions of assignments, written feedback on assignments, peer review and whole class feedback is used to ensure prompt and meaningful feedback.
- In the second semester UoS each participant has a mentor from elsewhere in the University to provide ongoing feedback and support.

(d) How information from assessments is used to improve teaching and learning:

- Program coordinators are responsible for ensuring that UoS coordinators review the assessment outcomes and processes in each UoS shortly after the UoS is completed. This process has led to the development of grade descriptors, amended descriptions of assessment, reductions in the quantity of assessment and the introduction of processes to help all participants better understand the requirements.

(e) Methods for ensuring that participants understand the assessment processes:

- Descriptions of assessments are available in the UoS outlines and these are available to participants in print and online.
- Clear verbal explanations are given at the start of each Unit of Study and participants' questions are answered.
- Grade descriptors are used to help participants come to an understanding of standards.
- Ongoing feedback and resubmission of assignments are designed to help develop participant understanding.

Evaluation

Participants in the Graduate Certificate come from a wide range of disciplinary, professional and cultural backgrounds. One of our ongoing challenges is to ensure that as such participants are adequately inducted into the processes and standards of assessment in education, and that assessments allow participants from all disciplinary and professional backgrounds to develop the outcomes expected of the program.

4. How does the ITL ensure the quality of its programs and projects and recognise good practice?

The ITL ensures the quality of its programs and projects through national and international benchmarking activities, through regular evaluations by participants and through its own internal peer review and monitoring activities. The collaborative and team based teaching that takes place is strengthened by ITL staff's membership of relevant teaching-learning committees, projects and Working Groups. Teaching decisions are informed by the University's strategic priorities as well as by the latest scholarly higher education research. Our processes are designed to ensure that the ITL's academic development and quality assurance activities are equal to, and in most cases lead, international best practice.

- a) *Methods for monitoring the breadth, depth, pace, variety and challenge in programs and projects:*
- Under the leadership of the appropriate coordinators, ITL staff co-plan and co-teach its programs of study. Team teaching discussions and peer feedback on teaching ensure that their breadth, depth, pace, variety and challenge are continually under review.
 - Programs vary in flexibility. For all of them the ITL collects and acts on both formative and summative feedback from program and project participants (see section 7) to ensure that particular programs are appropriate to their needs.
- b) *How decisions about the selection of particular strategies in relation to program and project outcomes are monitored:*
- UoS coordinators arrange meetings of teaching staff to review and plan the phases and teaching sessions of each UoS.
 - Twice-yearly formal meetings of all teaching staff are held with the 3-day Program and Grad Cert Program co-ordinators, to discuss participant results, outcomes, processes and assessment
 - Discussions at the ITL Research and Development seminars have led to new teaching collaborations, which have resulted in changes to units of study and teaching approaches.
- c) *Methods used to enhance the quality of teaching and facilitation, including staff development, mentoring and peer review:*
- Formal and informal benchmarking with leading research intensive Universities in Australia and overseas help to ensure that ITL programs and project follow international best practice. These arrangements have resulted in, for example: benchmarking of student data with Oxford, Queensland and Melbourne Universities; visits to academic development units and provision of expert advice to parallel programs at University College, London; Edinburgh and Hong Kong Universities; ICT policy development in collaboration with The Open University; shared online learning activities with academic participants at Durham University.
 - Papers describing and analysing ITL programs and projects are presented for discussion and critical analyses at major international and national conferences and published in international journals devoted to teaching, learning & quality assurance in higher education.
 - All UoS are team taught, with more junior staff being systematically mentored by more senior and / or experienced staff.
 - ITL staff regularly review resources on teaching and learning (eg. handouts, websites, the Teaching & Learning Induction Folder for new University staff) prior to their re-publication.
- d) *How the ITL supports, recognises and rewards good teaching and facilitation:*
- Within the ITL, we share and celebrate our own teaching achievements during our annual retreat, at morning teas and occasional staff dinners.

Evaluation

Benchmarking with Hong Kong University highlighted the need for us to develop grade descriptors for our units of study and programs. This led us, in 2nd semester 2002 to pilot a set of indicators based on those used in Hong Kong. These have been evaluated and amendments made for use across all units of study. We are continuing to refine and develop these indicators. A further challenge has emanated from benchmarking with Edinburgh University where the academic development unit has worked to provide articulated programs of professional development for academics. The development of the MEd (higher education) is a step towards achieving a similar level of provision. However, providing a more varied program of professional development for the university community remains a challenge given current resource constraints.

While the team-based approach is an evident strength of the ITL, the process of reviewing how we recognise good practice has highlighted that the ITL could do more to actively recognise and reward its own good teaching and facilitation.

5. What arrangements does the ITL have in place to monitor and support ongoing participation and development in its programs and projects?

The monitoring and supporting of ongoing participation and development occurs through a combination of formal structural arrangements through the UoS, projects coordinators and the course and project administrators and ongoing personal, collegial contact with all participants. Our aim is to ensure little or no drop-out from our programs and projects.

(a) Arrangements for identifying participants at risk of non-completion or failure and the processes used to intervene in these cases

- UoS and project coordinators and administrators monitor participants' attendance and participation and personally follow-up any absences or failure to submit assessments and reports, initially by email and subsequently by phone.
- Participants in programs of study and strategic projects are encouraged to contact the UoS and project coordinators on a collegial basis if they plan to be absent, and to make arrangements which will ensure their ongoing participation.
- While UoS meeting times are relatively inflexible, project meeting times and UoS assessment submissions are flexible and dates for meetings and submissions are arranged with participants.
- Assessed work for units of study may be resubmitted if judged to be unsatisfactory. Additional support is provided where needed.

(b) The use of learning resources and academic support to assist learning outcomes

- The ITL maintains a small resource library of materials to support both the programs of study and the strategic projects.
- A substantial component of the Postgraduate Research Supervision program is flexible and Web based and can be accessed at any time to suit the participants.
- WebCT is used to support all UoS including providing fora for discussion.
- The ITL maintains a website for the programs of study and for each of the projects.
- Much of the ITL's student evaluation program is web based, with staff being able to access results of student evaluations 24 hours a day.

Evaluation

The ITL has put in place a substantial support program for its programs and projects. Judged by our ongoing participation rates, we believe these work quite well. It remains a continuing challenge to us to provide programs which appeal to busy academics from a range of disciplinary backgrounds who are perhaps the most critical of audiences. There are considerable resource implications in providing support to academic participants who need extra help and it remains a challenge to provide for them. Another of our continuing challenges is the tracking of participants as they attend for the three-day program and then take up further study in the Graduate Certificate at a later date. We are in the process of implementing a web-based database system to track participants and mentors more efficiently. In addition the maintenance and enhancement of our Web presence is an ongoing challenge. We are currently redeveloping it.

6. How does the ITL ensure the quality of research supervision and training?

The ITL works on three levels to ensure the quality of research supervision and training. First, it provides strategic level support to the University community through collecting information and interpreting broader issues of the research student experience to inform faculty-based initiatives associated with improving research supervision and training. Second, the ITL provides a comprehensive professional development framework for research supervisors through the Postgraduate Supervision Development Program. The Program supports faculties in meeting the needs of their own quality assurance processes for ensuring the quality of research supervision. Third, the Program supports individual research supervisors to assess and then address, the nature of their own supervisory practice through a process of scholarship and inquiry.

(a) Arrangements for ensuring high standards of supervision

- The Postgraduate Supervision Program embeds the University's Code of Practice for the Supervision of Postgraduate Research Students, together with the Criteria for Good Supervision Practice within it. All Program activities articulate with institutional policy and guidelines for research supervision and training.
- ITL membership on the University's Graduate Studies Committee, and a number of Faculty Teaching and Learning Committees ensures issues are reflected in the Program.

(b) Mechanisms in place for ensuring effective completion and retention

- Face to face workshops, and a Certificate of Completion provide additional incentives for research supervisors to complete the Program.
- The development of the Recognition Module provides an assessment component to the Program which articulates with the criteria for the Vice-Chancellor's Awards for Excellence in Higher Degree Research Supervision. Feedback and support is provided to supervisors during completion of this module.

(c) How the research climate for students and provision of resources to support research are monitored

- Research students attached to supervisors in the ITL are registered in the Faculty of Education and Social Work and are subject to the student progress and supervision monitoring mechanisms within that faculty.
- Research students are expected to present their work periodically in ITL research and development seminars.
- Close liaison with the Faculty through membership of its Graduate Studies Committee ensures faculty policies and practices are monitored and implemented where appropriate.

(d) The use of student and/or graduate views to improve the experiences of research higher degree students

- The incorporation of institutional data related to the student research experience (ie. the SREQ and the PREQ) is central to Program planning.
- The ITL's continuing work with SUPRA within Program workshops is evidence of our commitment to a student-centred view of research supervision development.

Evaluation

One of the key areas for development is the further utilisation of institutional data to support the University's focus on both timely completion and following the SREQ, developing opportunities for students to become further engaged in a research culture. The ITL expects to work closely with the new Dean of Graduate Studies to provide a stronger institutional support for the completion of the postgraduate supervision program. A number of faculties have already made the program mandatory for new supervisors signalling a strong institutional commitment to quality research supervision and training. Given these circumstances, the ITL will need to prepare for the program's future growth.

7. What are the ITL's arrangements for evaluation and quality improvement, including the use of participant feedback and other performance indicator data to monitor and enhance performance? How does it recognise outstanding performance?

The ITL has a number of mechanisms in place for evaluation and quality improvement. These include evaluation of programs and projects using a triangulated approach drawing on participant feedback, peer-review and self-assessment. Most programs and workshops are co-facilitated and projects are often team undertakings, as such peer review is an integral element of ITL practice. In addition all staff of the ITL meet monthly throughout the year to report on the results of such evaluations and to discuss progress on projects. The overall plan and direction of these projects is reviewed annually at the ITL Retreat during the revision of the ITL strategic plan. This internal reporting process is

summarized in external monitoring and reporting through regular meetings between the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) and the ITL Director, and in the biennial reports to Academic Board through the Teaching and Learning Committee.

b) Mechanisms in place for collecting participant feedback teaching units of study, courses and projects

- Participant feedback on ITL workshops is gathered using a standard feedback form. The data from these surveys is held by individual facilitators and also stored centrally where any member of ITL staff can access it. Results of such feedback are shared amongst the staff of the ITL at meetings and with the Director.
- Formal units of study taught by the ITL are subject to the usual quality assurance requirements of university policy and the standard USE is used each time the unit is taught. This process has been extended in 2002 to take in participants' experiences of the ITL's role in institutional learning activities such as the Working Groups.

c) Mechanisms in place for acting upon the results of participant feedback teaching units of study, courses and projects.

- Acting upon the results of feedback is an essential element of the ITL strategy. Program and UoS coordinators ensure data from participant feedback, self-evaluation is considered in a process of collaborative review, initially by the teaching team and then by the ITL as a whole.
- The ITL continually evaluates the Postgraduate Supervision Development Program in order to understand the changing experience of research supervision. Feedback from supervisors (workshop feedback, online surveys, phone surveys with Postgraduate Coordinators) provides the Program with a ready basis for improvements (see Appendix 5).

(d) Arrangements for applying the University's performance indicator data to improving educational quality

- The ITL is an active partner with the faculties in collecting and applying the University's performance indicator data to improving educational quality at an institutional level.
- The ITL is responsible for collecting much of the teaching quality assurance student evaluation data for the University. The survey systems and processes were researched and developed by the ITL in consultation with the university community through its Working Groups and interactions with Academic Board.
- The ITL is active in assuring the theoretical rigor and quality of these systems and processes. In part this is through its research and scholarship in this area. ITL staff members regularly present theoretical and research papers on teaching quality assurance processes at conferences and publish in this field internationally.
- In addition to assuring the quality of the systems through its own scholarship the ITL plays a key role in supporting the university community in using these results of evaluation. This is managed in part through the Working Groups where faculties collaborate in using this data to inform & monitor improvements as well as in the use of such data in the ITL projects.

(e) Consistency between university requirements and ITL QA and improvement mechanisms

- The ITL's integral role in the development of the university's teaching and learning quality assurance processes as well as its role in institutional learning help ensure alignment. The explicit use of a consistent and shared theoretical base is one of its key strategies.
- The ITL's processes for evaluating the institutional learning experiences targeted in ITL Projects is modelled on the mechanisms described in the university's requirements for evaluation of units of study. (A modified version of the USE was used).

(f) Methods used to monitor progress towards goals specified in the ITL's strategic plan

- The ITL sets strategic priorities on the basis of the institutional priorities identified in the University's Strategic Plan, its Teaching and Learning Plan and in consultation with the PVC T&L and the Academic Board's Teaching and Learning Committee. Each project has a project

plan with clearly identified performance indicators and achievement milestones which are used to monitor progress. Progress on projects is reviewed at the annual retreat (Appendix 8).

- The appropriateness of the indicators and progress towards their achievement is formally monitored through regular reports to the University's Teaching and Learning Committee and through a collaborative review process by the staff of the ITL at their annual retreat.
- In addition, ITL staff meet monthly to review progress on strategic projects and discuss any issues arising. This process is documented in the minutes of the ITL Business meetings.

Evaluation

While the ITL believes it has in place very well developed structures and processes for collecting and analysing quality assurance data, it continues to work with the University, faculties and staff to best use the data to improve the quality of the University's teaching and learning programs. Using evaluation instruments developed for use in Faculties to evaluate our own work is a challenge. For while our work has some similarities with work at Faculty level, it is in some ways quite different. However, we consider it important to benchmark our programs and projects with those in the Faculties so we are persisting with the increasing alignment of our evaluations with University processes.

Overall Conclusion

In conclusion, the staff of the ITL have welcomed this opportunity to review our quality assurance procedures. Given that our role is to work collaboratively with the University community to enhance and help assure the quality of teaching and learning, we set ourselves high standards. The exercise of preparing this document has highlighted to us areas where quality assurance mechanisms of an informal nature have not always been enshrined in more formal ITL policies and procedures. We continue to work towards developing appropriate indicators for the outcomes of our activities. One example, is our recent implementation of participant evaluation forms for our Working Groups.

The exercise has also highlighted for us some of our strengths and also reinforced the ongoing challenges for us. The national and international benchmarking we engage in assures us that our work is at the leading edge of international best practice. We look forward to the views of the review committee to provide further opportunities for our learning.

Appendix 1: Institute for Teaching and Learning Strategic Plan

INSTITUTE FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING Role of the Institute for Teaching and Learning

The University has set as its first goal in its 1999-2004 Strategic Plan the maintenance and enhancement of its position as an outstanding provider of high quality undergraduate and postgraduate teaching, both in Australia and internationally.

The Institute for Teaching and Learning has the primary role of working collaboratively with the University community to enhance and help assure the quality of teaching and learning. Reporting to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning), it provides support to Colleges, Faculties, Schools, Departments and individual members of academic staff in achieving the goals and objectives in the University's strategic plan and Faculty teaching and learning plans.

In fulfilling this role, the ITL has identified a number of strategic areas for its activities over the next three years. They have been derived from an analysis of Faculty teaching and learning plans and extensive discussions with the Chair of the Academic Board, the Chair of the Teaching and Learning Committee, College Pro-Vice-Chancellors and Faculty Deans. They are:

- Enhancement of the first year experience and first year progression and retention, including using methods based on best practice in other research-led universities;
- Collection, analysis and dissemination of quality assurance data relating to students' and graduates' experiences of courses and units of study, and graduate destinations (including international comparisons);
- Ways of improvement of the outcomes of quality assurance processes, including the CEQ and SCEQ results and the other teaching performance indicators;
- Support for the introduction of the centrally supported learning software (WebCT) in the University through staff and curriculum development activities and the development and implementation of the IT in Education Ventures projects;
- Implementation of academic staff development in the area of teaching and learning, including flexible postgraduate supervision development, basic training of new staff in teaching methods, an award course in university teaching and learning, and seminars and workshops to meet Faculty needs;
- Support the further development and enhancement of research-led teaching and the scholarship of teaching;
- Support to the University in the area of policy development in each of the above areas on teaching and learning, and including the University's revised teaching and learning plan, the scholarship index, and Faculty teaching and learning plans;
- Develop the ITL's research profile, including its publications, research grant applications, and ongoing research with colleagues within the University in ways which contribute to the University's research quantum.

ITL is addressing these areas by working closely with Faculties and senior officers, ensuring as much as possible that its activities are closely aligned with Faculty needs and the University's strategic priorities. Its performance will be reviewed against the achievement of these aims and the detailed outcomes specified in its own operational plan.

Strategic Plan of the Institute for Teaching and Learning (2003-2005)

| OBJECTIVES | STRATEGIES | PROGRESS |
|---|---|--|
| <p>1. Enhancement of the first year experience and first year progression and retention, including using methods based on best practice in other research-led universities.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To continue to work with a University-wide, Faculty based First Year Experience Working Group to facilitate the ITL working with Faculties to enhance the first year experience; 2. To continue to develop the First Year Coordinators meetings to support academic orientation and transition in first year Units of Study; 3. To engage in institutional evaluation activities in consultation with the Faculties on issues for first year progression and withdrawal; 4. To benchmark USyd first year experience practices against the USyd benchmarking Universities practices; 5. To continue to develop the First Year Experience web site as a resource for the University's academic staff | <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Not begun</p> <p>Ongoing</p> |
| <p>2. Collection, analysis and dissemination of quality assurance data relating to students' and graduates' experiences of courses and units of study, and graduate destinations (including international comparisons).</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To continue to collect graduate Course Experience Questionnaire and Postgraduate research Experience Questionnaire, and currently enrolled Student Course Experience Questionnaire and Student Research Experience Questionnaire data; 2. To continue to develop data collection procedures to ensure increased effectiveness in the collection and analysis of that data; 3. To analyse this data in terms of time series and cross faculty comparisons; 4. To continue to develop benchmarking relations involving the sharing of data and development practices with UCL, Oxford and UQ. | <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> |
| <p>3. Develop ways of improving the outcomes of quality assurance processes, including the CEQ and SCEQ results and the other teaching performance indicators.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To continue to convene a University-wide, Faculty based Evaluation and Quality Assurance Working Group to facilitate the ITL working with Faculties to enhance the use of the data and analyses to improve students' learning experiences; 2. To continue to develop the Evaluation and Quality Assurance system, including both the website analysis of results and suggestions and strategies for how to use the results to improve student learning experiences. | <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> |

| OBJECTIVES | STRATEGIES | PROGRESS |
|---|--|--|
| <p>4. Support for the ongoing development of Information and Communication technologies in Teaching and Learning (ICT-TL) in the University through staff and curriculum development activities and institutional strategic projects.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To work closely with the Assistant Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Information Technology) and other strategic units on the development of academic development and quality assurance programs for the introduction of ICT-TL; 2. To continue to develop a flexible learning website incorporating strategic suggestions about the use of the centrally supported ICT-TL in curricula; 3. To monitor and report to the University on successes, issues and outcomes of the use of the centrally supported ICT-TL. 4. To work with the strategic institutional projects to help them align with relevant Academic Board policies 5. To engage in benchmarking activities with participating institutions (Australian national University, Auckland University and the Open University in the United Kingdom). | <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Commenced</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> |
| <p>5. Implementation of academic staff development in the area of teaching and learning.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To continue to develop and offer the 3-day program on teaching and learning, aimed at new staff, staff new to teaching, and staff wishing to renew their teaching; 2. To continue to develop and offer an articulated graduate program of studies in Higher Education up to and including PhD's; 3. To continue to develop and offer the flexible research higher degree supervision program; 4. To continue to provide workshops, seminars and consultations on teaching and learning to Schools, faculties and the University community where appropriate. | <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> |

REPORT OF ACADEMIC BOARD VISIT TO THE INSTITUTE FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

| OBJECTIVES | STRATEGIES | PROGRESS |
|---|---|--|
| 6. Support the further development and enhancement of research-led teaching and the scholarship of teaching. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To develop (a) a web-site for staff development (b) a database of teaching strategies to disseminate good practice; 2. To offer workshops to faculties and departments to facilitate discussion of appropriate ways to develop research-led teaching; 3. To continue to convene a University-wide Working Group established to develop a set of indicators and explore strategies for further development of research led teaching initiatives in the faculties; 4. To organise a Vice-Chancellor's showcase of good practice in the scholarship of teaching; 5. Encourage the scholarship of teaching through a publication designed to provide a forum for the discussion of teaching and learning issues within the University (<i>Synergy</i>) | <p>Commenced</p> <p>Commenced</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Commenced</p> |
| 7. Support the redevelopment of the University's Graduate Attributes policy and support the faculties in the implementation of the policy | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To continue to convene a University wide Working Group to review and redevelop the University's policy on Graduate Attributes 2. To identify examples of good practice and to describe and document a range of them in terms of brief case studies 3. To use the case studies and consultations with the Colleges and the University's Teaching and Learning committee to redevelop the University's policy 4. To develop a Website including the policy, discussions about the policy and example of good practice consistent with the Policy | <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>In progress</p> <p>In progress</p> |
| 8. Diversity and Inclusiveness | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To initiate discussion within the University of issues of diversity and inclusiveness 2. To continue to analyse SCEQ data to highlight issues of diversity and inclusiveness 3. To address issues of diversity and inclusiveness in all programs and projects | <p>Commenced</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> |

REPORT OF ACADEMIC BOARD VISIT TO THE INSTITUTE FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

| OBJECTIVES | STRATEGIES | PROGRESS |
|---|---|--|
| 4. Contribute to the University in the area of policy development on teaching and learning. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To continue to provide advice to the PVC (Teaching and Learning) on the development of university policies and initiatives in teaching and learning; 2. To support when requested the Teaching Improvement Fund activities; 3. To support the application processes for the Vice-Chancellor's teaching awards and the National Awards for University Teaching 4. To contribute to the policy development of the University's Teaching and Learning Committee 5. To contribute to the activities of Faculty Teaching and Learning Committees. | <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> |
| 5. Develop the ITL's research profile, including publications, research grant applications, and ongoing research with colleagues within the University in ways which contribute to the University's research quantum. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To continue the regular research and development seminar program within the ITL; 2. To continue to support applications by ITL staff to major funding bodies to support research and development into teaching and learning in higher education; 3. To support, where possible, ITL staff in presenting results of their research at major national and international conferences. 4. To continue and develop the supervision of research higher degree students | <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> |

Appendix 2: Graduate Certificate: participation, progression and evaluation

This course, offered by the Institute for Teaching and Learning through the Faculty of Education and Social Work, focuses on teaching and learning. It is designed for university teachers. The emphasis of the course is on improving student learning rather than on instructional methods. The course aims to provide university teachers with opportunities to reflect on educational theory and student learning research from the perspective of their own teaching experiences through the scholarship of teaching and learning. It is designed to support staff in developing their professional expertise as university teachers in order to better understand and enhance the learning of their students. The curriculum and teaching of the graduate certificate is informed by a set of core principles. The Graduate Certificate consists of four units of part-time study over two semesters.

For more details see: <http://www.itl.usyd.edu.au/Programs/gradstudies.htm>

The following Table shows the number of staff completing the 3 day program since 2000 broken down by College, and their overall evaluation. More detailed evaluations are available from the ITL.

| <i>Year</i> | <i>semester</i> | <i>Unit of Study</i> | <i>enrolled</i> | <i>completed</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>Overall satisfaction on USE</i> |
|-------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------|------------------------------------|
| 2002 | 2 | EDPR 5011 | 31 | 28 | 25 | 53% Agreed , 79% broadly agreed |
| 2002 | 1 | EDPR 5001 | 32 | 31 | 28 | 85% Agreed , 93% broadly agreed |
| 2001 | 2 | EDPR 5011 | 23 | 22 | 14 | 100% Agreed, 100% broadly agreed |
| 2001 | 1 | EDPR 5001 | 25 | 23 | 20 | 95% Agreed, 100% broadly agreed |
| 2000 | 2 | IUTLA (5011) | 18 | 17 | N/A | Qualitative evaluation only |
| 2000 | 1 | IUTLA (5001) | 21 | 18 | N/A | Qualitative evaluation only |
| 1999 | 2 | IUTLA (5011) | 13 | 10 | N/A | Qualitative evaluation only |
| 1999 | 1 | IUTLA (5001) | 15 | 13 | N/A | Qualitative evaluation only |

EDPR 5011: Scholarship of University Teaching and Learning

EDPR 5001: University Teaching and Learning

IUTLA: Introduction to University Teaching, Learning and Assessment

This Table shows excellent rates of completion for a part time study program. It also shows overall high levels of satisfaction with the Units of Study within the program.

Appendix 3: 3-day program: participation and evaluation

The Principles and Practices of University Teaching and Learning program is a 3 day program aimed at staff who are new to teaching and to experienced staff who wish to review and revitalise their teaching and their students learning. From November 2002 it became a compulsory program for all new members of academic staff.

For more details see <http://www.itl.usyd.edu.au/Programs/3day.htm>

The following Table shows the number of staff completing the 3 day program since 2000 broken down by College, and their overall evaluation. More detailed evaluations are available from the ITL.

| <i>Title</i> | <i>Completion</i> | | | | <i>Evaluation: % Overall Satisfaction (ratings of 4 & 5)</i> |
|--------------------|-------------------|------------|-------------|--------------|--|
| | <i>CST</i> | <i>CHS</i> | <i>CHSS</i> | <i>Total</i> | |
| P&P February 2003 | 17 | 1 | 16 | 34 | 97% |
| P&P November 2002 | 14 | 13 | 7 | 34 | 100% |
| P&P October 2002 | 18 | 5 | 8 | 31 | 91% |
| P&P June 2002 | 14 | 9 | 8 | 31 | 90% |
| P&P February 2002 | 16 | 4 | 7 | 27 | 100% |
| P&P November 2001 | 6 | 11 | 6 | 23 | 95% |
| P&P July, 2001 | 9 | 5 | 10 | 25 | Not Available |
| P&P February 2001 | 14 | 10 | 6 | 30 | 100% |
| P&P November, 2000 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 15 | Qualitative evaluation only |
| NUT June 2000 | 17 | 2 | 2 | 21 | Qualitative evaluation only |
| NUT February, 2000 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 11 | Qualitative evaluation only |
| | | | | | |
| Totals | 137 | 69 | 76 | 282 | |

P&P: Principles and Practices of University Teaching and Learning

NUT: New University Teachers Program

Within Colleges, all Faculties are represented.

This Table shows overall good participation in the 3-day programs annually, with overall high levels of satisfaction.

Appendix 4: Postgraduate Research Supervision Program: participation and evaluation

The Postgraduate Supervision Development Program has undergone substantial and ongoing development since its move from 13 workshops to a flexible learning program in 1998. From 1998-May 2001, the Program stood alone as a set of online and completely flexible independent study modules with web-based resources, supplemented by face-to-face workshops. Supervisors themselves were given the ability to choose their own program of study, to suit their intended learning outcomes and interests in research supervision. In July 2001, the Program was re-launched with the addition of the Recognition Module - assessment module. To complete the Program requires approximately 20-25 hours of independent study, which is the equivalent of a unit of study. There is now the ability for the ITL to support supervisors through a defined program of study that leads to program completion.

For more details see <http://www.itl.usyd.edu.au/postgrad/>

The following Table shows the number of staff participating in Postgraduate Supervision Development Program since 2000, broken down by College, together with and their overall evaluation. More detailed evaluations are available from the ITL.

| <i>Postgraduate Program</i> | <i>Supervision Registrations</i> | <i>Development 2001-2003</i> | <i>Participation</i> | | | | <i>Total</i> | <i>Evaluation % Overall Satisfaction</i> |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|------------|--------------|--|--------------|--|
| | | | <i>CST</i> | <i>CHS</i> | <i>CHASS</i> | | | |
| *Online Program | | | 68 | 46 | 42 | | 156 | |
| Workshop - February 2003 | | | 22 | 15 | 17 | | 54 | 95% |
| Workshop - November 2002 | | | 2 | 1 | 2 | | 5 | 95% |
| Workshop - July 2002 | | | 20 | 13 | 8 | | 41 | 80% |
| Workshop - April 2002 | | | 13 | 11 | 11 | | 41 | 93% |
| Workshop - November 2001 | | | 10 | 3 | 2 | | 15 | 100% |
| Workshop - September 2001 | | | 15 | 2 | 4 | | 21 | 95% |
| Workshop - April 2001 | | | 22 | 8 | 3 | | 33 | 90% |
| Workshop - November 2000 | | | 17 | 7 | 10 | | 34 | 96% (Outstanding) |
| Workshop - April 2000 | | | 1 | 29 | 2 | | 32 | 84% (Outstanding) |
| Totals | | | 100 | 89 | 59 | | 276 | |

* There is no direct relationship with those who register for the online program and those who attend a workshop.

The workshop series in the overall Program are always well attended. The first two workshops focus on understanding the institutional guidelines for research supervision, together with the development of skills. The third workshop supports supervisors working towards the completion of Recognition Module. The flexible nature of the Program suggests to us that not all supervisors intend on completing the final module.

Appendix 5: Flexible Learning (Information and Communication Technologies) Portfolio: participation and evaluation in e-learning workshops

Activity in the Flexible Learning (ICT) Portfolio in ITL is divided into four areas: e-learning, videoconferencing, strategic projects and teaching on the ITL Higher Education Program. Much of this activity is aligned to the Academic Board Policy, “Quality Assurance and Online Learning”, including the other key teaching and learning policies. The aim of this activity is to promote quality assurance in ICT, scholarly and research-led approaches to the use of ICT, external partnerships to identify best practice and further the strategic goals of the institution.

For more details see: <http://www.itl.usyd.edu.au/flexlearn/Default.htm>

| E-learning Workshop * (beginner and intermediate) | Completion | | | | | Evaluation: % Overall Satisfaction (ratings of 4,5) |
|--|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|--|
| | CST | CHS | CHSS | Centre | Total | |
| Designing Communication Activities 2002/3 | 8 | 6 | 17 | 2 | 33 | 93% |
| Going Live with WebCT 2002/3 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 4 | 26 | 90% |
| Online Discussions that Work 2002 | | 1 | 3 | | 4 | 100% |
| Online Chat and Discussions 2002 | 1 | 9 | 3 | | 13 | 100% |
| Designing Communication Activities 2001 | 7 | 11 | 12 | 4 | 34 | 93% |
| Going Live with WebCT 2001 (previously Learning Outcomes Online) | 9 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 30 | 100% |
| Online Discussions that Work 2001 | 4 | 3 | 5 | | 12 | 100% |
| Online Groupwork and Presentations 2001 | 1 | 2 | 5 | | 8 | 75% |
| Totals | 38 | 46 | 61 | 15 | 160 | |

Part of a suite of workshops run in conjunction with the Flexible Online Learning Project

Appendix 6: First Year Experience Working Group: participation and evaluation

One of the goals of the University's Strategic Plan is to provide high quality undergraduate teaching to enhance student learning. The Institute for Teaching and Learning (ITL) is working with faculties, departments, staff and students across the University to ensure the quality of students' academic orientation and transition. Specifically - the ITL will collaborate with the University community in implementing four principles relating to the First Year Experience as endorsed by the Academic Board in 200.

For more details see: <http://www.itl.usyd.edu.au/FYE/index.htm>

| <i>Date of meeting</i> | <i>Number of Faculties</i> | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|----------|
| | Invited | Attended |
| 21 st February 2003 | 15 | 10 |
| 8 th November 2002 | 15 | 8 |
| 23 rd August 2002 | 15 | 11 |
| 31 st May 2002 | 15 | 10 |
| 22 nd March 2002 | 15 | 7 |
| 9 th November 2001 | 15 | 11 |
| 24 th August 2001 | 15 | 11 |
| 15 th June 2001 | 15 | 11 |
| 9 th February 2001 | 15 | 11 |
| 15 th December 2000 | 15 | 12 |
| 27 th October 2000 | 15 | 11 |

Given the very busy lives of academics, the Table shows that overall there were very good levels of attendance by faculty representatives.

The Working Group was formally evaluated by participants using a modified version of the UoS evaluation form. The results showed that the average level of agreement with the evaluation items was 86% and disagreement was 5%. Thirteen of the 15 respondents agreed with the statement that they could see the relevance of the Working Group for helping the faculty achieve its and the University's strategic plan.

Appendix 7: Evaluation and Quality assurance Working Group

The ITL offers the University community support in the evaluation and enhancement of teaching and student learning at three main levels: Institutional, Unit of Study, Individual Teachers. The ITL has established a Working Group composed of faculty representatives to work with it on development the University's student evaluation of teaching policies. The Working Group meets regularly to help develop and review the progress towards the implementation of Academic Board policies on the student evaluation of teaching.

For more details see: <http://www.itl.usyd.edu.au/Teval/overview.htm>

| <i>Date of meeting</i> | <i>Number of Faculties</i> | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|----------|
| | Invited | Attended |
| 14 th February 2003 | 15 | 14 |
| 6 th December 2002 | 15 | 10 |
| 24 th May 2002 | 15 | 13 |
| 15 th March 2002 | 15 | 11 |
| 13 th December 2001 | 15 | 6 |
| 17 th August 2001 | 15 | 12 |
| 15 th June 2001 | 15 | 12 |
| 18 th May 2001 | 15 | 10 |
| 9 th March 2001 | 15 | 14 |
| 1 st December 2000 | 15 | 15 |

The Table again shows that overall there were excellent levels of attendance by faculty representatives.

The Working Group was formally evaluated by participants using a modified version of the UoS evaluation form. The average level of agreement with the evaluation items was 84% and disagreement was 4%. Twelve of the 15 respondents agreed that they could see the relevance of the Working Group for helping the faculty achieve its and the University's strategic plan.

Appendix 8: Graduate Attributes Working Group: project plan (Version 20 March, 2003)

Aims:

1. To develop a revised statement of generic attributes of graduates of the University of Sydney which embodies the institution's scholarly values and reflects the academic community's understanding of graduate qualities.
2. To develop a set of resources to support staff in ensuring students develop these graduate attributes through their experience of the curriculum and university life.
3. To establish a Working Group to support the project and the ongoing dissemination and implementation of university graduate attributes policy within faculties.
4. To identify a process to benchmark the development and achievement of graduate attributes with comparable Australian and international research intensive universities.

Overview of plan: for annual review by Working Group

| | |
|--|---|
| Develop Project plan and employ Research Assistant | February - March 2002 |
| Establish Graduate Attributes Working Group of faculty representatives | March 2002 |
| Identify sources of potential benchmarking data from relevant institutions, gather and analyse benchmarking data | March – October 2002 |
| Collaborate with Working Group to develop a set of case studies of best practice that reflect the variety of understandings held by University of Sydney academic staff of generic graduate attributes and the teaching and learning processes by which these are developed. | March – June 2002 (first semester) August – October 2002 (second semester) |
| Prepare a discussion paper to support the case studies & establish web site to support the project | March - June 2003 |
| Consultation through Working Group representatives to revise the current University of Sydney graduate attributes to reflect higher level understandings of generic attributes in a research-intensive university. | March - June 2003 |
| Draft of revised statement of Graduate attributes from the Working Group to T&L Committee & Academic Board for discussion / revision / ratification | March – June 2003 |
| Expand Working Group faculty and other stakeholder groups | June - Dec 2003 |
| Use the case studies and faculty/unit representatives to support the identification of contextualised attributes and begin curriculum mapping and development of grade descriptors, | June – July 2003 |
| Consultation with Employer & Government Groups to interpret/gather case studies reflecting industry and broader societal applications of Graduate Attributes | June - Dec 2003 |
| Development of support processes, monitoring systems and reward incentives | 2004 |
| Audit of student learning experiences in respect to generic attributes (Semester 1 USE) | 2004 |

The Project Working Group

The role of the project working-group is to support the review of the policy and support faculties in their subsequent implementation of the revised policy. The Working Group functions as a way of sharing ideas and experiences amongst the Colleges and obtaining College and Faculty input.

The Working Group might support this project in various ways:

By providing a network of consultation and involvement of colleagues within the Faculties in each College. Liaison to help ensure the various faculty perspectives are brought into the project - this might mean that the ITL will initially need to help the Working Group members set up links with the

faculties in each member' College. Initially this could involve helping identify suitable individuals to contribute case studies.

1. Providing comments suggestions and feedback on discussion papers, drafts of documents etc. as the project progresses
2. In the later phases of the project; the college representation will be expanded to faculty representation on the Working Group. The expanded group will support liaison with discipline based employer groups, the implementation of the policy within the faculties in each College by facilitating the dissemination and discussion of the revised policy, supporting access to the case study resources by colleagues in engaging in curriculum review and development etc.

Key Points for Briefing Paper:

1. What are generic graduate attributes? How are these taught and learned? A variety of understandings – High level conceptions subsume low-level understandings of graduate attributes eg as discrete skill sets, but are not limited to these. Draw on current theory and research and awareness of best practice at other Australian and international universities.
2. What values and qualities of the University of Sydney should be embodied in a description of graduate qualities? How are Sydney graduates different and special? What are the core academic outcomes in the context of the University of Sydney? A research-intensive university – Qualities of creativity and inquiry and belonging to a community of scholars.
3. Use notions of Scholarship and inquiry, and a global perspective to frame the revised attributes with a view to benchmarking of the attributes with like universities.
4. A process of academic led revision informed by research and scholarship and the understandings of the Sydney University community.
5. Aim for a statement of half a dozen broad graduate outcomes that can be developed (and their achievement demonstrated) in a variety of ways in different disciplinary and professional contexts and can subsume the development of particular contributing skills. Use sub points as range indicators for each statement.

Appendix 9: ITL Committee Membership

University Committees / Working Groups

Academic Board
Academic Forum
Teaching and Learning Committee
Graduate Studies Committee
Information Technology Education Ventures
Information Technology Committee
Library Committee
Access and Support Working Party of the Information Technology Committee
Academic Board ICT Pedagogy Group
Teaching Venues Advisory Committee
CREO Taskforce
Public Image and Branding User Reference Group
Video Conferencing Training and Development Working Party
Staff Development Committee

Faculty Committees

Pharmacy Teaching and Learning Committee
Engineering Teaching and Learning Committee
Economics and Business Teaching and Learning Committee
Economics and Business Dean's teaching and Learning Plan Working Group
Economics and Business Strategy and Quality Team: Teaching and learning/curriculum/students
Veterinary Science Teaching and Learning Committee
Health Sciences Research on Teaching and Learning Committee
Postgraduate Education Students Association Committee
Education and Social Work Graduate Studies Committee

In addition to membership of Committees, the ITL staff make regular contributions to the work of other University and Faculty based committees through workshop and seminar presentations and submissions.

Appendix 10: Analysis of Academic Board Reports

The Academic Board Reviews of Faculty provides the ITL with additional data in which to plan its academic development activities - in both a project and program sense. Together with the Working Group structure, the Academic Board review process allows us to assess the impact and reach of our work, to engage with Faculties' perceptions of our work, and to identify the areas where we can provide further support in order to progress the University's Teaching and Learning Strategic Plan. To this end, we have undertaken a content and theme based review of the available Faculty reports in order to both celebrate and further understand the unique challenges facing individual faculties in teaching, learning and research training. We report only on the areas that are directly related to our work and role.

(a) Graduate Attributes, Aims and Outcomes

It appears that a number of Faculties are working toward the integration of the University's Graduate Attributes Policy across its curricula (Education and Social Work, SCA, Architecture etc). Some faculties have developed or are looking to develop a set of disciplinary specific attributes (Veterinary Science, SCA, Arts), while others have made considerable progress already (Rural Management's Capability Program). One of the central issues across nearly all faculties is about the clear communication of those attributes to staff and students. The ITL has already begun to work with the Academic Board on a review of the Graduate Attributes Policy and ways of supporting faculties in implementing the revised policy.

The ITL developed a Unit of Study outline (initially in the context of integrating technology) to support faculties with the clear articulation of aims, objectives and outcomes of units of study. While some faculties have expressed concern for disciplinary specificity (Arts), most faculties have found the template useful in supporting their own discussions about developing clear standards and expectations for students. For instance, Nursing favours a standard template across all its units.

(b) Teaching and Learning

Our reading of Faculty reports suggests that there are number of interesting teaching and learning innovations occurring across the University. While we work within programs and projects, the nature of the support we provide within faculties is diffuse. Some of this work occurs in the form of workshops, committee representation, curriculum development, teaching in award programs or interpretation of institutional data. We are pleased though, with the number of faculties that have drawn upon our expertise to support such innovation. The SCA acknowledges the work of the FYE project in the development of its Foundation Program, as does Arts in its Peer Mentoring and Enhancing Online Learning projects, and Rural Management in its approach to first year students generally. Some faculties have made particular mention of the 3 day-program and the Graduate Certificate as useful formal mechanisms for an introduction to the principles of teaching for student learning (Dentistry, Veterinary Science, Engineering, Science, Arts). A number of faculties were commended on their strategic use of ITL to support their initiatives (Engineering, Health Sciences, Law) through the use of institutional data (SCEQ/USE) while other faculties were encouraged to draw more specifically on the resources available within the ITL (Ag, Food and Nat. Resources, Con of Music, Architecture) to support their work. We recognise an ongoing need to support faculties in the areas of assessment (Vet Sci, Law, Science) and tutor training (SCA, Arts, Science).

A number of faculties have themselves developed Educational Support Units (Medicine, Nursing, Health Sciences), pedagogical research groups (Science), or designated teaching and learning positions (Arts, Engineering, Science - Director of FY). The ITL welcomes these initiatives and hopes to maintain productive and reciprocal working relationships.

(c) Research-led teaching

As a relatively new institutional focus, the Faculty reports indicate that there is considerable variation in what is meant by 'research-led teaching'. Some faculties have an evidence-based approach (Medicine, Dentistry) embedded within their curricula, while others are looking for support to think

about research-led teaching within their disciplinary contexts (Education and Social Work, Arts, SCA, Rural Management). With endorsement from Academic Board, a Working Group has been set up and is presently engaged in developing a set of performance indicators for research-led teaching. One of the immediate tasks of the Working Group is to begin discussions in faculties about what research-led teaching in their disciplines might look like. For those faculties with a beginning culture of research (Nursing, SCA, Rural Management, Dentistry), the challenge remains a continuing one for the ITL.

(d) Research Training

The University's emphasis on research supervision training resonates throughout all faculty reports. While the ITL's brief was to develop a program for individual supervisors, the focus on research training and the research degree experience (SREQ) has necessarily broadened out our role. Some faculties have mandated that all new supervisors complete our Postgraduate Supervision Development Program (Vet Science, Education and Social Work). Medicine is considering developing a register of supervisors while other faculties have addressed this through the adoption of the College of Science and Technology's 10 Point Plan. Our reading of this issue is that a number of faculties are now using the Program to ensure quality of research supervision training and that we can expect this area to grow significantly in the future.

Final comment

It is clear from our reading of the reports that the ITL's work is valued within faculties. We are pleased to note the good work going on across the University in teaching and learning and look forward to providing faculties with further support.