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The next meeting of the Teaching & Learning Committee will be held in the Faculty Meeting Room 158 on Monday 3 November 2008 at 2pm. All members are expected to attend or ensure that a representative from the School will attend on their behalf.

1. MINUTES  
Confirmation of the minutes of the meeting of the Teaching and Learning Committee held on Tuesday 14 October 2008.

2. DECLARATIONS OF POTENTIAL FOR CONFLICT OR PERCEIVED CONFLICT OF INTEREST  
The Chair invites members to declare interest in relation to any item on the agenda.
### 3. ITEMS/BUSINESS IN PROGRESS FOR NOTING SINCE PREVIOUS MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item/Business in Progress</th>
<th>Progress Update</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning Guide for Faculty Staff.</td>
<td>Draft to be checked by Faculty Student Advisor and Faculty Manager prepared by Ms Heather Morton</td>
<td>On hold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal request to SIMS for standardised marks. Request has been submitted for the position in cohort (percentage) which is easier to calculate.</td>
<td>Chair and Faculty Manager to report</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakdowns of the destinations of students who do not complete their course from the Institutional Research Unit.</td>
<td>There is no reliable data.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The specification of learning outcomes for courses and majors offered in the Faculty.</td>
<td>Audit to be undertaken. School to recommend major/s sequence</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of each major sequence to determine whether English Language Competency Skills are shown in at least one unit in each year level.</td>
<td>Audit to be undertaken. School to recommend major/s sequence</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Operational Priorities Plan (OPP) implementation strategies and targets</td>
<td>Faculty Manager has updated implementation strategies and targets and distributed them to members for consideration</td>
<td>To be considered at November meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should students at PSB be offered a 1) BSc Science and Technology or 2) BSc with selected majors.</td>
<td>Academic Student Advisor to report</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New grade for failed component (FC)</td>
<td>Academic Student Advisor to set up small group to discuss the implications</td>
<td>Members wishing to volunteer to be in group should email Academic Student Advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part I – Items for Communication to be dealt with en bloc**
There are no items for inclusion Part I

**Part II – Items for Decision to be dealt with en bloc**
There are no items for inclusion Part II

**Part III – Items for Discussion and Decision**

### 4. CHAIR’S REPORT
The Chair will report on Teaching and Learning issues of interest to members.

### 5. TEACHING AND LEARNING OPERATIONAL PRIORITIES PLAN (OPP)
The top Teaching and Learning priorities indentified by Schools at the July meeting had been circulated to members via email.
At the September meeting it was agreed that the top three objectives for the Faculty were:

- Sustainable and efficient teaching
- The Teaching-Research nexus
- Enhance the student experience.

The Faculty Manager has provided implementation strategies and targets for the three objectives and the first draft report was tabled at the October meeting (Attachment A). Members are asked to consider the report and provide feedback to the Faculty Manager.

6. PSB ISSUES RELATING TO FAILING THE SAME UNIT TWICE AND SUBSTITUTE FOR DEAN’S CONGRATULATIONS

The issue of whether students undertaking studies through PSB be allowed to undertake a core unit for a third time within the BSc course was foreshadowed at the September meeting. Members agreed that the current practice of requiring students to complete these units on a ‘Not-for-Degree’ basis continue. Further related issues have been raised.

- The Science Rules state that a student who has failed the same unit twice will not be permitted to enrol in any unit of the same or higher level in the same subject. This is problematic for PSB students who may have no feasible alternatives. For instance, a student has failed GENE2204 twice in the BSc (Biomedical Science) program. This program requires GENE2230 and GENE331/2. At Crawley the student would be able to complete the BSc (Biomedical Science) without any genetics.

- The University Rules allow substitution of up to 12 points in any program. Where a student has failed a unit twice, and it is not a core unit a substitution could be allowed. However, should the substitute unit be at the same level? At Crawley both the Biomedical Science and Molecular Biology require 48 points at level three. Members are asked if a student fails CHEM3305 twice, should we allow a substitute at level two.

The Academic Student Advisor has raised the issue of a substitute letter for Dean’s congratulations. PSB students are never eligible for the Dean’s congratulations, because the rules require forty eight points be taken in single year, with HD in all units; PSB students can only ever take forty two points (thirty points for entrants from September 2008 onwards). A substitute letter was written for 2004-2005, but none have been written since. Members are asked to consider the following:

- For the university term B7 2008 (15/11/08 – 16-01-09) should students who had HD in all units in the previous calendar year, regardless of how many units the student took be sent a Dean’s congratulations letter. This would require a change in policy for Dean’s congratulations.

- What about 2006? There were a few students with straight HD’s. Do we congratulate them now?

7. TEACHING QUALITY INDICATORS (TQI) PROJECT

UWA is a partner in the Teaching Quality Indicators Project which is supported by the Australian Learning and Teaching Council. A copy of the draft framework for evaluating teaching quality was tabled at the August meeting. The purpose of the project is to develop indicators of good teaching which would help academics (particularly new appointees) develop and document their teaching. Following feedback received the TQI project team are now seeking further comment on the proposed “UWA Teaching Criteria Framework” and the final draft of the proposed framework is attached (Attachment B). Members are asked to consider the final draft and forward any further comments by 19 December 2008.
8. **LENGTH OF EXAMS**  
The question of whether the length of exams could be shortened now that continuous assessment is also used as part of the assessment process was raised at a meeting of the Faculty Administrative Officers/Sub Deans’ group held on 3 October 2008. Faculties have been asked to discuss this issue.

9. **SCHOOL REPORTS**  
Representatives will report on Teaching and Learning activities in their Schools.

10. **CATLYST REPORT**  
CATLyst will report on current Teaching and Learning issues.

11. **STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE REPORT**  
Postgraduate and Undergraduate representatives will report on any issue or concerns from the student body.

12. **OTHER ITEMS OF BUSINESS**
## 1. TEACHING AND LEARNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To achieve sustainable and efficient teaching</td>
<td>Reduction in teaching costs, including staff time.</td>
<td>Streamline unit offerings</td>
<td>Reduction in number of units</td>
<td>Dean, HOS, Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rationalize assessment of units within majors</td>
<td>Decrease time spent on assessment and repetition</td>
<td>HOS, Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning), Program/Unit Coordinators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve teaching infrastructure</td>
<td>Identify and set infrastructure priorities</td>
<td>Greater efficiency in teaching</td>
<td>University, Dean and HOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify sources of funding for improving infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use a proportion of LTPF funds to improve teaching infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationalization of generic skills</td>
<td>? Nancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To achieve sustainable and efficient teaching (cont)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement in CEQ</td>
<td>Improvement in CEQ in the first year of study by 1% each year</td>
<td>Dean, HOS, Associate Dean (Learning)</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve the teaching-research nexus</td>
<td>Increase in number of students entering honours</td>
<td>Extend research experience to second- and first-year students by introducing research opportunity unit</td>
<td>Increase Honours enrolments by X% each year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement in the preparedness of students to undertake honours and their intention to continue with research at higher levels</td>
<td>Dean, HOS, Associate Dean (Learning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase numbers of students entering UWA Science to undertake a Science degree with a research focus</td>
<td>Establish a research program with specific secondary schools, Perth Modern School in the first instance</td>
<td>Increase enrolments in the Advanced Science program by 20% each year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance the student experience</td>
<td>Improve interaction between students</td>
<td>Introduction of Peer-Assisted Learning Program</td>
<td>Improve CEQ Overall Satisfaction Index (OSI) by 1% each year</td>
<td>Project Manager, Faculty Manager, Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning)</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve PREQ Overall Satisfaction Index by 1% each year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work with the Science Union to identify opportunities in which students can participate in University/Faculty activities</td>
<td>??</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve learning experience of students</td>
<td>Ensure that units are well co-ordinated</td>
<td>Reduce number of units that receive an overall satisfaction score of less than 3.0</td>
<td>HOS, Program/Unit Coordinators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure that assessment is linked to unit outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>HOS, Program/Unit Coordinators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve completion rates in postgraduate degrees, both research and coursework</td>
<td>Establish a project to look into ways in which the experience of postgraduate students can be improved</td>
<td>Improve retention and completion rates by X%</td>
<td>Project Manager, Faculty Manager, Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance the student experience (cont)</td>
<td>Improve work readiness of students</td>
<td>Make students more aware of the skills that they acquire through their degree that makes them 'work ready'</td>
<td>Greater employment of graduates</td>
<td>HOS, Program/Unit Coordinators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for students to work on campus</td>
<td>Encourage Faculty Office and Schools to employ students to complete lower level tasks</td>
<td>Increase in numbers of students agreeing to be Study Group Leaders for PAL; Greater employment of students in the Faculty</td>
<td>Faculty Manager, School Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Teaching & Learning and then Executive.

From: deans-of-faculty-bounces@maillists.uwa.edu.au
On Behalf Of Jacqueline Flowers
Sent: Wednesday, 15 October 2008 11:18 AM
To: deans-of-faculty@uwa.edu.au; heads-of-school@uwa.edu.au
Subject: [Deans-of-faculty] (no subject)

TO: Faculty Deans
Heads of School

Dear All,

Following feedback received from Deans and Heads of School throughout the workshops held in August, and subsequent feedback from some faculty and school teaching and learning committees, the proposal for a new teaching criteria framework at UWA has been revised and further developed.

We are now seeking further comment on the proposed “UWA Teaching Criteria Framework” - attached is a final draft of the proposed framework, along with a summary of the changes which have been made to the proposal following feedback from schools and faculties. This final draft has been endorsed by the TQI Project's steering group, and will hopefully be discussed at the November meetings of the Academic Promotions Committee and the UWA Teaching and Learning Committee. Human Resources, Organisational and Staff Development Services, and the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning have also been asked for feedback, and it has also been sent to Faculty T&L representatives.

We are hoping to release the final draft proposal to all university staff around the 17th November for comment and feedback. Should you have serious concerns about the framework and its use it would be appreciated if you could provide feedback before this date. Otherwise, we will be seeking feedback up until the 19th December and would welcome any further comments you or your faculty / school may have on the framework.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns regarding the Teaching Criteria Framework or the TQI project at UWA.

Kind Regards

Jacqueline Flowers
Project Officer, Teaching Quality Indicators Project
Office of the Pro-Vice Chancellor (Teaching & Learning)
M009, Cafeteria Building, Nedlands Campus
University of Western Australia
35 Stirling Hwy, Crawley WA 6009
CRICOS Provider No. 00126G
Tel: + 61 8 6488 4241
Fax: + 61 8 6488 1053
Email: Jacqueline.Flowers@uwa.edu.au

28/10/2008
OFFICE OF THE PRO VICE-CHANCELLOR (TEACHING AND LEARNING)

TEACHING QUALITY INDICATORS PROJECT

TEACHING CRITERIA FRAMEWORK – FINAL DRAFT

Last Updated: 3rd October 2008

Prepared by: Jacqueline Flowers (TQI Project Officer)
File Reference: F22622
TRIM file No: 08/24335

The following document sets out the proposed new Teaching Criteria Framework for UWA based on the UK Professional Standards Framework (UK PSF). This proposal has been developed through extensive consultation with teaching and learning stakeholders across the university including Deans, Heads of School, School Teaching and Learning Committees, Associate Deans (Teaching and Learning), the University Teaching and Learning Committee, the Academic Promotions committee, with input from Human Resources, the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL), and other relevant stakeholders. This final draft proposal has been developed on the basis of the discussion paper "Development of Evaluative Criteria for Teaching", and from the illustrative examples that accompanied that paper. These have been subsequently revised and expanded following feedback and input from a wide range of interested parties. The proposal is set out as a series of web-pages, which is how it would be published to staff – the horizontal lines represent new pages in the web-site. An implementation plan for the framework will be prepared following its endorsement.

Website: Teaching Criteria at UWA

Front Page (Pre-amble)

The UWA teaching criteria framework has been developed to underpin the teaching component of the academic portfolio, and form the basis for developmental and evaluative discussions around teaching and learning. Academic teaching staff will use the teaching criteria framework as a tool to assist in sourcing and collecting evidence relevant to teaching development, quality and leadership in order to subsequently determine developmental priorities, and/or make a claim for performance based rewards. The framework is designed to be primarily developmental in nature, although it will also underpin evaluative processes.

Click here for the full Teaching Criteria Framework

The teaching criteria framework consists of

- Standard descriptors for each career level of the university – these are university-wide expectations for teaching staff, and also the basis for teaching and learning promotion criteria.
- A framework of six areas of activity: six areas of core knowledge and six professional values which staff will use to evidence their practice.

Staff evidence their practice in each area of activity (and in so doing demonstrate their understanding of and commitment to the core knowledge and professional values). There are numerous sources of evidence available to academic staff in order to demonstrate the quality...
of their teaching, more substantial evidence is expected of staff as they move up career levels.

Examples of sources / types of evidence which may be appropriate at each level have been provided under each area of activity in the guidelines for academic staff. These examples are illustrative, and provide guidance to staff on the types of evidence appropriate to each area of activity. It is not expected that staff will address each of the nominated examples and nor do these examples encompass the full range of possibilities. These examples should be used as a guide only and staff should identify sources of evidence appropriate to them. Advice about using evidence is also provided.

Exemplar teaching portfolios for each faculty / discipline under each area of activity for each level will be developed over time and will be available from this site in due course.

Guidelines for supervisors / evaluators who will use the framework to evaluate performance and provide development and feedback opportunities will also be developed in due course.

Introduction
The framework
The standard descriptors
Guidelines for Academic Staff
Examples of Sources and Types of Evidence
Using Evidence
Professional Development [link to CATL]
Teaching Award Nominations

Introduction
The University of Western Australia is committed to the enhancement of the student learning experience through high quality teaching at all levels. Key to the development of academic teaching staff is the setting out of clear expectations in relation to teaching, including criteria against which staff can develop and be evaluated. The UWA Teaching Criteria framework provides a single set of criteria to underpin all relevant reward and recognition processes, so that expectations for academic staff in relation to teaching are clear and consistent with the University’s stated strategic goals, and supported by a comprehensive framework which can be systematically and consistently implemented.

The teaching criteria are designed to assist individual academic staff in clarifying expectations and to make the process of developing an academic portfolio more efficient, as well as providing guidelines to assessors and supervisors to assist in the process of evaluation and ensure consistent decision making and advice.

The criteria will be used by academic staff and their supervisors as a formative development tool to identify career objectives, and development needs, in addition to forming the basis for summative evaluative purposes where required (e.g. promotion).

Discipline and Individual Contexts
The teaching criteria framework developed for use at UWA is designed to be broad and flexible, whilst providing a robust and valid definition of effective teaching which is suited to the UWA context.

Interpretation of criteria and workload balance issues remain a matter for the supervisor and the individual academic, with significant direction and support from schools and faculties in relation to priorities and expectations. Faculties and Schools would be expected to define the types of teaching roles and expectations which exist in their disciplines and establish relevant emphasis and standards.
The Framework
Click on the hyperlinks for examples of sources and types of evidence which are appropriate in each area of activity. The evidence you present will also demonstrate your understanding of the core knowledge, and your commitment to the professional values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Design and planning of learning activities and/or programmes of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teaching and supporting student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assessment and giving feedback to learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Developing effective environments and student support and guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Integration of scholarship, research and professional activities with teaching and supporting learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Evaluation of practice and continuing professional development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core Knowledge
Knowledge and understanding of:
1. The subject material
2. Appropriate methods for teaching and learning in the subject area and at the level of the academic programme
3. Student learning processes, both generally and in the discipline
4. The use of appropriate learning technologies
5. Methods for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching and learning
6. The ways that self-reflective practice, professional development, and ongoing evaluation of teaching can enhance professional practice

Professional Values
1. Respect for individual learners
2. Commitment to incorporating the process and outcomes of relevant research, scholarship and/or professional practice
3. Commitment to the development of communities of learning
4. Commitment to encouraging participation in higher education, acknowledging diversity and promoting equality of opportunity
5. Commitment to continuing professional development and evaluation of practice
6. Commitment to extending understanding of cultural diversity and the global environment including understanding of indigenous knowledge.

University-wide Standard Descriptors
These descriptors represent general expectations for an academic established at the relevant level; new staff entering at each level will not be expected to meet all expectations for the level, but would be expected to develop a career plan which sets out the development required to meet the level of the descriptor. These descriptors also form the basis of promotion criteria at each level – a staff member applying for promotion would be expected to be able to make a case for substantially meeting the descriptor at the level for which they are applying.

Lecturer (Level A)
A Lecturer develops an understanding of the student learning experience through contributions to teaching which include implementation of effective teaching practices, a commitment to improvement and innovation in response to feedback and the provision of support for students in the learning context
Assistant Professor (Level B)
An Assistant Professor demonstrates an understanding of the student learning experience through a commitment to high quality effective teaching practice, including the ability to incorporate research, scholarship and/or professional practice into teaching activities and a commitment to improvement and innovation in response to feedback.

Associate Professor (Level C)
An Associate Professor demonstrates an understanding of the student learning experience through high quality effective teaching practice, including the incorporation of research, scholarship and/or professional practice into teaching activities. An Associate Professor promotes and supports student learning through mentoring and leadership roles (formal or informal), including a commitment to the development of learning and teaching communities and ongoing improvement and innovation in response to feedback both personally and across the discipline.

Professor (Level D/E)
A Professor supports and promotes student learning through a significant contribution in a leadership role, including a demonstrated contribution to the development of learning and teaching communities within the university and more widely and a significant role in peer review and mentoring. A Professor demonstrates an original contribution to the advancement of teaching and learning in the discipline and/or university community, including the incorporation of research, scholarship and/or professional practice into teaching activities.

GUIDELINES FOR ACADEMIC STAFF

Example Sources and Types of Evidence
The following examples apply to all levels of academic staff; sources and examples of evidence in bold may be more appropriate for staff at the associate professor or professor level, and may not be relevant for early career staff; however, this will differ between disciplines.

These examples are illustrative to provide guidance to staff on the types of evidence appropriate to each area of activity. Staff should identify sources of evidence appropriate to them; there is no expectation that staff will be able to draw on all of the sources of evidence for each activity, however it is expected that levels of evidence will increase for more senior staff.

Staff should gradually build a suite of evidence, which shows engagement in each of the areas of activity contained in the framework, but to varying extents. This process is cumulative, and the emphasis placed on different activities may change over time. When staff engage in activities outside the scope of the framework, these should also be reflected in the teaching portfolio.

Where staff are designated as ‘teaching-only’ or where they negotiate a workload which emphasises teaching activities for a time, they will be expected to engage more significantly with the framework to evidence the quality of their teaching – the exact balance of activities for such staff will be negotiated at the school / supervisor level.
1. **Design and planning of learning activities and/or programmes of study**

[Development and preparation of learning resources and materials for a unit of study; Unit coordination; Involvement in curriculum development for larger programs/majors and courses]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Sources of Evidence</th>
<th>Example Types of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Unit materials (or other relevant resources) which demonstrate:  
  • appropriate and varied use of learning activities  
  • a creative and innovative approach to teaching  
  • effective structuring of learning  
  • an understanding of how the content fits in to a wider curriculum/course  
  • a scholarly approach to curriculum design  
| Peer review of learning materials, learning activities, and curriculum  
Benchmarking of a unit or program against similar units or programs  
Use of learning materials by others (either within the university or externally)  
Letters from Chairs of relevant curriculum committees or equivalent detailing contribution  
Formal student feedback (e.g. SPOT, SURF) relating to the unit design, learning activities, and organisation in the unit of study  
Nomination for a teaching award for a program or curriculum  
Feedback from members of teaching teams (clinical teachers; tutors) relating to management; student feedback relevant to the management of a teaching team  
Feedback from staff who you have had a significant role in mentoring |
| Effective unit coordination including:  
  • effective preparation of tutors  
  • organised, well prepared unit and resource materials  
  • effective management of teaching teams  
| Contribution to curriculum development / review |
| Contribution to leadership in the design and planning of learning activities through one or more of the following activities:  
  • Leadership of curriculum development / review  
  • Peer reviewer or mentor to a colleague in the area of unit development  
  • Program or course (or equivalent) coordination  |

2. **Teaching and supporting student learning**

[Quality of teaching, (including teaching by flexible delivery, clinical teaching, placement supervision, studio teaching etc.); Supervision of honours and research higher degree students]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Sources of Evidence</th>
<th>Example Types of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Range, level, and type of teaching (including supervision)  
Evidence of:  
  • the use of a student centred learning approach  
  • a creative and innovative approach to teaching  
  • collaborative teaching approaches  
  • self-reflective teaching practices  
| Peer feedback on teaching and supervision practices  
Formal student feedback (e.g. SPOT, SURF) relating to class room/supervision/teaching practice  
Workplace feedback on students' preparation and performance on placement /clinical settings  
Nomination for a teaching award  
Formal feedback about your role as a mentor or reviewer from peers  |
| Evidence that chosen techniques are:  
  • successful in supporting student learning  
  • appropriate to the learning context  |
| Evidence of contribution to the development of staff through mentoring relationships, peer review or teaching teams |
3. Assessment and giving feedback to learners
[Design and execution of assessment tasks, aligned with student learning outcomes; and the provision of appropriate feedback to students]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Sources of Evidence</th>
<th>Example Types of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the development of reliable and valid assessment tasks</td>
<td>Formal student feedback (e.g. SPOT, SURF) relating to assessment tasks and feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment tasks are clearly aligned with learning outcomes of the unit, course and UWA educational principles</td>
<td>Examples of students’ work; examiners’ reports for postgraduate students; independently marked or moderated student work and/or data which demonstrates student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of:</td>
<td>Research student completions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clear criteria and guidance on assessment tasks</td>
<td>Tests of student learning which show evidence of students adopting a deep approach to learning eg SSQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• timely, explanatory, diagnostic feedback</td>
<td>Excerpts from unit materials relating to assessment and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered use of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a variety of assessment tasks (formative and summative)</td>
<td>Formal feedback from the course coordinator or equivalent about your role as a mentor, reviewer, moderator of assessment etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• types of assessment to facilitate students’ full demonstration of their learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• flexibility for individual students and sensitivity for diversity, disability</td>
<td>Peer review of the quality of assessment tasks and level of learning specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of academic leadership in assessment through one or more of the following activities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contribution to the development of capstone experiences; student learning outcomes for a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major/program; graduate attribute statements etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contribution to or leadership of a moderation exercise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acting as a mentor or peer reviewer in relation to assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Developing effective environments and student support and guidance
[Activities relating to the creation of an engaging learning environment for students, including the development of learning communities and strategies used to account for and encourage student diversity]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Sources of Evidence</th>
<th>Example Types of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated effective practice (in curriculum development and class room practice) in:</td>
<td>Formal student feedback (e.g., SURF, SPOT, AUSSE) relating to engagement and diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural diversity</td>
<td>Informal, unsolicited student feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Principles of equity</td>
<td>Feedback from members of learning communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Indigenous studies</td>
<td>Contribution to wider student, course, faculty, university and community based activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promotion and support of student engagement</td>
<td>Contribution to student advising, mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of learning communities</td>
<td>Feedback from students and peers relating to role as a student advisor or equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Respect and support for the development of students as individuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supporting students with special needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing guidance and support outside of the formal classroom environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated engagement with a number of learning and teaching communities (formal or informal) within or external to the university, academic leadership of such communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal role in relation to the provision of student advice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **Integration of scholarship, research and professional activities with teaching and supporting learning**

a. Teaching and Learning research incorporated into teaching practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Sources of Evidence</th>
<th>Example Types of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching and learning scholarship in the practice of teaching and curriculum development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Publication in teaching and learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-reflective practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Classroom research</td>
<td>Publications, conference participation relevant to teaching and learning research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research indicators relating to research in teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership on a successful team, or individual success, in applying for Awards, Grants, Competitive funding related to teaching and learning (eg. ALTC and UWA teaching awards, fellowships, grants); outcomes of projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Inclusion of discipline based research into curriculum

| Evidence of the use of innovative and recent research in curriculums and teaching activities | Excerpts from unit materials relevant to the incorporation of current research in to teaching activities |
| Contribution to the development of new curriculum which incorporates recent research across a course / program | Peer Review of teaching materials which demonstrate engagement with the teaching/research nexus |
| Promotion of the teaching/research nexus within the discipline | Peer review of curriculum materials |

c. Research-led teaching (incorporating authentic research experiences)

| Evidence of Research-led teaching in curriculum design and teaching practice | Excerpts from unit materials demonstrating the use of research techniques in undergraduate teaching |
| Undergraduate honours supervision | Peer Review of teaching materials |
| Coordination of honours programs | Honours student completions / grades |

d. Incorporation of professional activities into teaching

| Work-based learning activities | Feedback from industry partners |
| Integration of industry partnerships in to teaching | |
| Coordination of discipline / program based programs in work-based learning | |
| Development of partnerships with industry at the discipline / school level | |

6. **Evaluation of practice and continuing professional development**

[Evaluation including: reflective self evaluation, assessment moderation, other evaluations of student learning; Use of student surveys and peer review to inform personal and professional development; Systematic evaluation of curriculum; Professional development activities]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Sources of Evidence</th>
<th>Example Types of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systematic participation in continuing professional development in teaching</td>
<td>Teaching Qualifications or completion of other teaching development programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation of practice using a range of sources of evidence, particularly in relation to new or innovative practices</td>
<td>Self-Reflective memo/journal; teaching portfolio. Examples of changes that have been made as a result of reflection, feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback is used to enhance teaching practice</td>
<td>Interpreted results from student and peer feedback and excerpts from relevant unit material where this evidence has been used to change practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of the quality of student learning is consistently sought and acted upon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Contributions to the professional development of others  
| (e.g. mentoring, participation as a peer reviewer) | Results from tests of student learning and evidence of how they were acted upon.  
| Examples of leadership and contribution in professional development and evaluation |

**Using Evidence**

Academic staff will use the different types of evidence, drawing from the examples provided above, or from different sources, to demonstrate the way in which they meet the standard descriptors for teaching expectations at each level. The framework allows this evidence to be collected and organised systematically and coherently.

Depending on the purpose for which the framework is being used a synthesis of the evidence collected may need to be presented in the portfolio (e.g. the portfolio may not contain all of the evidence you have collected in relation to your teaching) to make a specific claim in relation to performance or development needs.

**Range and scope of teaching**

The teaching portfolio should contain evidence of the range and scope of teaching undertaken in the period under review including summaries of:

- contributions to curriculum development, including size and significance of contribution (e.g. member of team, leader of committee, substantially revised a course, wrote a new course etc.)
- units in which you have undertaken teaching or coordination, including the number of students, and the percentage of teaching
- research students supervised
- activity as a peer reviewer, assessment moderator or mentor
- formal professional development

The range and scope of activities is expected to change throughout an academic's career and general expectations for the scope of teaching appropriate for a teaching/research academic will be made at a discipline / school level depending on the teaching load of the department and its strategic goals. Teaching-intensive academic staff could reasonably be expected to be undertaking a wider range and scope of teaching activities, and in particular may be expected to have a greater role in scholarship and evaluation. The range and scope of teaching will also change as staff progress throughout their career, with more senior staff expected to have a greater leadership and development role – see standard descriptors.

Details of any specific expectations for teaching staff within a school / faculty, and/or any negotiated balance of activities between a supervisor and staff member should be detailed in the range and scope of teaching statement in the teaching portfolio.

The Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL) will develop a program and resources to assist staff to demonstrate quality and level of attainment in relation to each available type of evidence.

**Self-Assessment / Self-Reflection**

Self-reflection is an important aspect of quality teaching and should be reflected in your portfolio. In particular, the way in which the core knowledge and professional values contained in the framework are reflected in your teaching activities should be made explicit, and the reasons for decisions in relation to your teaching methods made clear. However, claims about the quality of your teaching need to be supported by external evidence.
Student Surveys

Staff can use student evaluations of teaching to show improvement in teaching quality over time, and to demonstrate the way in which student feedback has been used to enhance subsequent practice (development).

There are two main student survey instruments at UWA:
- SURF – unit organisation, learning resources, assessment and learning outcomes.
- SPOT – evaluations of teaching. Rating Interpretation Guides available for three global items (effective instructor, organisation, clarity of instruction).

Other student surveys can be used where appropriate. Survey results should always be interpreted and placed in context.

Unsolicited informal student feedback may be submitted as evidence of student satisfaction but in most cases this type of feedback will not be considered as highly by evaluators as survey results which are more systematic.

Student Learning

Evidence of student learning should take the form of formal assessments by external moderators; accepted tests of student learning; or official university statistics (e.g. for research student completions). All staff should be able to demonstrate student learning as a consequence of their teaching.

Pre- and post-testing, external moderation of assessment tasks, external marking/moderation of student work (including of the quality of student attainment of understanding of key discipline concepts), and data on completions of research and honours students are all potential ways to demonstrate student learning as a result of your teaching.

Peer Review

Peer review is the main way in which staff provide evidence of leadership in teaching and learning, and of the quality of their teaching practices.

Peer Review can encompass many aspects of collegial discourse which occur informally in most schools, as well as more formal review processes undertaken for specific purposes. For the purposes of these criteria, peer review can encompass – planning materials and scheduled teaching and learning activities, curriculum content and design; learning materials / resources; observation of class room practice; assessment tasks and participation in moderation exercises; mentoring relationships; and scholarly contribution and research relating to teaching and learning.

Where feedback is sought from a peer in relation to a contribution to a committee / curriculum development / mentoring program etc. it should be in the form of a formal reference, and the colleague must be made aware of the purpose of the reference, and the activity which you are seeking to provide evidence for.

Assistant Professor

At this level, it would be expected that the academic staff member would undertake a developmental process of systematic peer review of a broad range of their teaching practices over a period of time. These might include a review of their teaching materials; unit/curriculum content and design; assessment tasks and assessment standards of the students' work; relationship and engagement with students and peers; and class room practice; by colleagues (including experts in the field) within the university or in cognate disciplines/field of study.
**Associate Professor**

At this level it would be expected that the academic staff member would have engaged in a developmental process of peer review as an Assistant Professor. An Associate Professor would seek and engage in peer review with colleagues external to the university with a national reputation and expertise in the field of review and would be engaged as a reviewer and mentor for junior colleagues.

**Professor**

This level builds on the previous two levels, with a Professor expected to demonstrate engagement in peer review with national and international experts in their various fields, regularly participate in reviewing others at a similar level, and contribute at the national and international level as an expert in some areas of expertise in teaching and learning.

---

**Teaching Award Nominations**

Staff who are nominated for a teaching award will need to prepare a synthesis of their teaching portfolio which may be quite different to that used for other purposes. A teaching award nomination will usually draw on very specific examples of your work in a particular area in order to demonstrate excellence.

Many UWA teaching awards will have criteria based on the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) Award for Teaching Excellence Criteria. Staff will be able to draw evidence that they have gathered under the UWA teaching criteria framework to respond to each of the ALTC Criteria. Support is available to staff nominated for an ALTC award through the ALTC Support Office and from the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL)
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REVISIONS MADE TO THE TEACHING CRITERIA FRAMEWORK
PROPOSAL
3rd October 2008

This document will accompany the revised proposal for new teaching criteria at UWA, and summarises the minor changes made to the framework following feedback from Deans, Heads of School, School teaching and learning committees and the TQI steering group. This document will allow schools and faculties to see how their comments have been incorporated in to the revised framework.

The feedback received on the proposal has been positive; with most stakeholders welcoming a tool which will provide clarity to the development and evaluation of teaching and learning practice within the university. The revisions which will be made are therefore relatively minor and centre on changes to the structure to clarify the purpose of the framework and the ways in which it can be used. The feedback received has shaped the development of the proposed framework from a series of illustrative examples in to a complete framework for implementation.

Consultation and Development
The original proposal for the development of criteria for measuring teaching quality had wide consultation with sections and committees responsible for teaching and learning and was endorsed by the following groups:
- TQI steering group
- University Executive
- Human Resources
- Organisational and Staff Development Services
- Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning
- UWA Teaching and Learning Committee
- Academic Promotions Committee
- Faculty teaching and learning representatives

From the feedback received from these groups, and further research a discussion paper for the Development of Evaluative Criteria was developed and accompanied by a series of illustrative examples based on the UK Professional Standards Framework. A further consultative period was then undertaken in which this paper and examples were discussed in detail by the following groups:
- Human Resources
- Faculty Deans
- Heads of School
- School Teaching and Learning committees
- TQI Steering Group

Following this second round of consultation a final proposal for the introduction of a teaching criteria framework has been prepared. This document sets out the small changes from the discussion paper / illustrative examples which have been incorporated in to that final proposal.
Revisions
The illustrative examples presented at the workshops have been re-formulated in to a finished teaching criteria framework document. The following features have been revised from the illustrative examples:

1. Inclusion of introductory statement to the framework describing its purpose, intended use, and the ways in which the teaching criteria can be contextualised by discipline and for individual staff.
2. Revised standard descriptors for each of the three career levels to better account for current expectations (see below), and the addition of a descriptor for the non-career grade lecturer level
3. Revised format for the areas of activity/core knowledge/ professional values to better emphasise the exemplar nature of the sources of evidence provided
4. Addition of example sources / types of evidence for senior staff (see below)
5. Division of area of activity 5. (integration of scholarship, research and professional activities with teaching and supporting learning) in to four sub-areas of activity to better represent different ways that staff may be integrating research, scholarship and professional activities in to their teaching.
6. Additional descriptions and guidelines for using evidence to build a case
7. Explicit inclusion of cultural literacy and awareness, including indigenous content and ways of knowing
8. Minor changes to the wording of some of the framework to better reflect the UWA context.

There are some aspects of the framework which still need to be developed:

9. Guidelines for evaluators (supervisors and reviewers) in assessing the evidence provided in a portfolio will be prepared following endorsement of the framework as part of implementation.
10. It is intended to gradually develop Exemplar Teaching Portfolios to be available electronically.

Differentiation by Level:
The illustrative examples prepared for the workshops and consultations were designed to represent the sources and types of evidence that an Assistant Professor might use to support a claim. The standard descriptors for each level were differentiated by leadership, and by the level of engagement with the areas of activity / core knowledge / professional values.

There was some concern about the use of the standard descriptors, and developing such descriptors which are relevant for all discipline groups is proving difficult. There is little consensus amongst faculties / schools regarding common expectations.

However, the descriptors have been revised in an attempt to develop such university-wide expectations that are applicable to all. The reference to the number of teaching activities in which staff engage has been removed, and the descriptors are now focused around three core levels - quality, development and leadership, with the emphasis now on an expectation that more senior staff will have greater leadership and mentoring roles (formal or informal), and greater involvement in the contribution to teaching and learning communities both within and external to the University. Further feedback is sought on this issue.

The original intention was to develop framework tables for each of the other two career levels (Associate Professor and Professor) with example sources / types of evidence specific to each stage. However, it has become clear that this may not be appropriate, for the same reasons surrounding the difficulties in formulating the standard descriptors - there is little agreement about expectations of different levels of staff between disciplines.

Therefore, a number of extra sources / types of evidence have been added to the original table (in bold) as activities which may be relevant to more senior staff in leadership roles. These extra examples may also be relevant to assistant professor staff, and they may not be relevant for more senior staff in some faculties, but they provide examples of the types of evidence which may be appropriate for those staff in leadership roles to include.