The University of Western Australia - Faculty of Life and Physical Sciences

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
FACULTY TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE
held in Room 1.58, First Floor, Physics Building
on Tuesday 12 August 2008

Present:
Professor Geoff Hammond (Chair)
Ms Jenny Gamble (Faculty Manager)
Dr Nancy Longnecker (CATLyst)

Representatives from Schools:
Dr Jan Meyer (Anatomy and Human Biology)
Professor Don Robertson (Biomedical, Biomolecular and Chemical Sciences)
Associate Professor Ian McArthur (Physics)
Dr Vance Locke (Psychology)

Other Representatives:
Associate Professor Les Jennings (Head, School of Mathematics and Statistics)
Mr Ray White (Mathematics and Physical Sciences Library)
Ms Jacqueline McNally (Postgraduate Student Representative)

Apologies
Dr Jane Emberson (Academic Student Advisor)
Dr Peter Whipp (Sports Science, Exercise and Health)
Ms Marjan Heibloem (Representative from FNAS)
Miss Matilda Oke (Undergraduate Student Representative)
Mrs Kath Williams (Executive Officer)

1. MINUTES

RESOLVED – 10

that the minutes of the meeting of Teaching and Learning Committee held on Tuesday 8 July 2008 be confirmed.

2. DECLARATIONS OF POTENTIAL FOR CONFLICT OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No declarations of conflict were declared.

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 Adviser and Faculty Manager prepared by Ms Heather Morton</td>
<td>On hold.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. IMPROVING STUDENT LEARNING GRANTS

Members noted that the Centre for Advancement of Teaching and Learning had called for applications for Semester 2, 2008 round of Improving Student Learning (ISL) Grants, for project to be undertaken in Semester 1, 2009. The ISL Grants program provides small grants to encourage teachers to make practical and innovative changes to their units in order to improve current practice. To encourage applicants to put forward their ideas there is an option of submitting a brief Expression of Interest (EOI) paper. Following a review process, and where appropriate, applicants will be invited to submit full proposals outlining the project in more detail. Applicants who would prefer to bypass this intermediary stage and submit a full proposal are welcome to do so.

EOI’s are due on 5 September 2008.
Full proposals are due on 26 September 2008.

The guidelines and application process for the ISL Grants are available on the web at:
http://www.catl.uwa.edu.au/isigrants

5. CHAIR’S REPORT

The Chair reported as follows:

• Restructure of Teaching
  The Chair informed members that the restructure of teaching in psychology in which electives would be offered in alternate years had been approved by the Faculty Board. The gain in teaching efficiency would promote the Faculty’s goal of freeing staff time for research. Some concern was expressed on effect on student progress in the Neuroscience degree.

  ACTION The Chair to ensure that the restructure did not adversely affect progress of students in the BSc (Neuroscience) degree.

• Statement on Procedures – Academic Misconduct
  A summary statement of procedures to be followed in cases of suspected academic misconduct was tabled (Attachment A).

• English Language Support for Offshore Students
  This issue has been referred to Director of Student Services and Director of International Centre. The Chair undertook to report developments to the Committee.

• Bradley Review
  UWA Response to The Review of Australian Higher Education Discussion Paper June 2008 is available at the following URL:

• Teaching and Learning Indicators
  o Members were given a copy of the 2008 Teaching and Learning Indicators. The indicators showed that teaching in the Faculty had generally been well received although there were areas in which the Faculty could improve, including learning resources in undergraduate units, creating the sense of a ‘learning community’ in undergraduates, and the students’ experience in postgraduate courses.

  ACTION Members to consider the report for discussion at the September meeting.

  o UWA was a partner in the Teaching Quality Indicators Project which was supported by the Australian Learning and Teaching Council. The purpose of the project was to develop indicators of good teaching which would help academics (particularly new appointees) develop and document their teaching. Feedback
was sought on the draft set of indicators which was tabled at the meeting
(Attachment B).

ACTION Members to consider the draft report for discussion at the September meeting.

• Course Structures Review
  The report was due for release in the middle of September.

• Teaching and learning Operational Priorities Plan (OPP)
  At the July meeting members had before them the current Teaching and Learning priorities in the Faculty OPP. These needed to be simplified into three realistic and achievable priorities. The top Teaching and Learning priorities identified by Schools at the previous meeting has been circulated to members via email.

ACTION Schools to consider the provisional list in order to the top three priorities at the September meeting.

• Items 9 and 10 deferred until next meeting

6. SCHOOL REPORTS

Mathematics - Associate Professor Les Jennings reported that a new maths enabling course was being developed. The course was aimed at students in the Mature-age Access Program but might be suitable for other students.

Biomedical, Biomolecular and Chemical Sciences (BBCS) - Professor Don Robertson reported that unit outlines were being updated on Calliope and that the school was in the process of gathering data on English Language Competency tasks in unit outcomes.

Anatomy and Human Biology (ANHB) - Dr Jan Meyer reported that the School was discussing ways of making teaching more efficient and was revisiting unit prerequisites. The School was also examining the linkage of assessment to learning outcomes in its undergraduate units.

On a related matter, the CATLyst reported that she had been asked to give an estimate of the percentage of majors and courses in the Faculty that had specified learning outcomes. It was agreed that about 30% of majors and courses had specified outcomes, and that an audit should be done to establish what further development was required.

ACTION The CATLyst is to consult with schools to determine the specification of learning outcomes for courses and majors offered in the Faculty.

Physics - Associate Professor Ian McArthur reported that Physics was reviewing its curriculum including prerequisites and was developing third-year units to support a major in Astronomy and Astrophysics.

Psychology - Dr Vance Locke reported that the school was considering implementation of its restructured undergraduate program and was also looking into the low PSB enrolments in Psychology units.

ACTION The student representatives on the Committee would be invited to give brief reports in future meetings.

7. DEVELOPMENTS IN SCIENCE TEACHING

A discussion of the 2007 paper ‘Linking teaching and research in disciplines and departments’ by Jenkins, Healey and Zetter was foreshadowed at the July meeting. The paper looked at ways to develop scientific thinking in undergraduate students. Committee members were asked to
consider some of the innovations described in the paper with an aim to identifying simple and practicable means of strengthening the teaching-research nexus in the undergraduate curriculum.

The discussion included the following points:

- Some of the developments began by challenging students with a research problem, which gave students a context in which to learn some of the basic skills of the discipline.
- The method of having groups of students interview staff members about their research gave students an insight into research.
- The School of Physics was looking at changing undergraduate practical classes to make them less formulaic and more challenging.
- Introducing students to research early in the undergraduate curriculum allowed a graded introduction to the complexities of research, including how to read and write a scientific paper.
- The best learning outcome is not necessarily achieved by getting the correct answer but by engaging with methods of enquiry to get an answer.
- It was acknowledged that problem-based learning is very resource intensive.
- There were opportunities to capitalize on postgraduate students’ enthusiasm for research to enhance undergraduate teaching.
- The Course Structures Review might propose broad-based units, which might be an opportunity to introduce a unit on scientific thinking and the scientific method.
- The curriculum already included instances of enquiry-based learning.

**ACTION** School representatives were asked to identify instances of enquiry-based teaching in their Schools with a view to disseminating these instances more widely in the Faculty.

8. UNIVERSITY POLICIES IN RELATION TO SCALING

The issue of scaling of marks had been raised at the July meeting of the committee. A statement on scaling from the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) and an excerpt from the Guild paper on scaling policy had been distributed with the agenda to the meeting. These statements emphasised the importance of making any practice of scaling or adjusting marks clear to students enrolled in a unit.

The practice of taking marks in undergraduate units into account in allocating scholarships for postgraduate research required comparability of grading practices for fairness. It was suggested that using standardised marks to rank students would help remove any inequities.

It has been a source of discontent and has resulted in students appealing against marks that have been scaled downwards. It can be a disincentive as teaching could improve and result in improved results but be scaled downwards. The committee agreed that there was a need for some comparability so that no one school inflates their marks and this should be a key feature.

**ACTION** For the September meeting, each School is asked to identify (1) what methods of scaling or mark adjustment, if any, they implement and (2) what these methods are intended to achieve.

**ACTION** The Chair and the Faculty Manager would explore whether standardised marks could be calculated and reported in SIMS.
PROCEDURES FOLLOWED IN LPS FOR SUSPECTED BREACHES OF ETHICAL SCHOLARSHIP BY STUDENTS

The relevant forms and protocols are available on the central Teaching and Learning site here:

www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/page/59146

Guidelines for dealing with academic misconduct are here:

http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/?f=58086

The regulations governing student conduct and discipline are here:

http://www.secretariat.uwa.edu.au/_data/page/20839/Student_Conduct_and_Discipline_V4.rtf

The following outlines the steps followed in LPS to deal with suspected cases of student academic misconduct.

1. Suspected misconduct

Evidence of the suspected misconduct is documented on the Academic Misconduct form and referred to the unit coordinator (or Head of School (or nominee) if the coordinator found the apparent misconduct). If the misconduct is plagiarism, documentation must include the source of the copied material with cross-references to the student’s work to show the nature and extent of copying.

The Academic Misconduct reporting form is here:


2. Determination of the level of misconduct

The level of the suspected breach (minor, moderate, or major) should be established by following the criteria listed here:

Flow Chart of Levels, Penalties and Procedure in Cases of Academic Misconduct

and here:

http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/?f=80453

All new Level 1 students have been required to complete the Academic Conduct Essentials module from 2007. In 2008 this requirement was extended to all new students. Students who have completed the module can be assumed to be familiar with UWA’s standards of academic scholarship and the penalties for breaches of these standards.
Determination of the level of misconduct takes into account any previous finding of misconduct against the student. The Faculty Academic Conduct Adviser should be consulted to determine if any prior misconduct has been recorded on the student’s confidential file.

If the coordinator (or Head of School or nominee) is satisfied that the misconduct is only a technical breach of citation conventions, it is sufficient to meet with and counsel the student. No penalty need be applied, but completed ‘Notice of Academic Counselling’ and ‘Academic Misconduct’ forms should be sent to the Faculty’s Academic Conduct Adviser for filing and for recording on the student’s confidential file.

Students suspected of more serious academic misconduct must be offered an interview with the Head of School (or nominee) to defend the charge and to present any mitigating circumstances. Students must be given the opportunity (in writing) to be accompanied by another person. At the interview the student should be informed of his or her right of appeal against an unfavourable decision. The Head of School (or nominee) then assesses the charge and either dismisses it or finds it substantiated and determines an appropriate penalty.

The responsibilities of Heads of Schools are listed here:


3. Concluding the process

If the case is dismissed the student should be informed in writing and the Academic Misconduct form shredded.

If the charge of misconduct is substantiated, the student should be informed in writing and sent the completed Academic Misconduct form. The letter should describe the decision and the penalty to be applied, and inform the student that regulations allow for the decision or the penalty to be appealed within 10 working days of notification of the decision. (An appeal would normally be to the Dean.) The appeal process is described here:

http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/?f=58086

The student should be informed that a record of the academic misconduct will be placed on his or her confidential file and that the University procedures provide for increasing penalties when a student is found to have breached the academic conduct guidelines on more than one occasion.

A copy of the completed Academic Misconduct form is sent to the Academic Conduct Advisor for recording on the student’s confidential file.
OFFICE OF THE PRO VICE-CHANCELLOR (TEACHING AND LEARNING)

TEACHING QUALITY INDICATORS PROJECT

ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES FOR EVALUATIVE CRITERIA OF QUALITY TEACHING
BASED ON THE UK PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS FRAMEWORK

First Draft: 17th July 2008
Last Updated:
Prepared by: Jacqueline Flowers (TQI Project Officer)
File Reference: F22622
TRIM file No: 08/17225

Introduction
The following illustrative examples of aspects of the proposed framework for evaluative criteria for teaching at UWA have been prepared for a series of workshops for the Teaching Quality Indicators project with Heads of School and Deans of Faculty across UWA. These examples support the "Development of Evaluative Criteria for Teaching: Discussion Paper" and provide some initial possibilities for the development of standard descriptors for expectations in teaching, illustrative examples for sources of evidence, and guidelines for appropriate types of evidence.

The framework is based on the UK Professional Standards Framework (UK PSF), and is organised around three standard descriptors which define expectations of teaching at each of three career stages. These descriptors are supported by a number of areas of activity, areas of core knowledge, and professional values which need to be demonstrated with various levels of engagement dependent on career level.

The illustrative examples provided here have been drawn from the UK PSF guidelines to staff applying for professional recognition, UWA guidelines for the preparation of an academic portfolio, guidelines / policies used by a number of other universities in Australia, and from the Teaching Quality Indicators Framework. They are in no way exhaustive, but are provided as illustrations for the types of evidence or material which may be relevant for each area of activity in teaching.

The framework, and the examples provided here, relate to an academic's practice in teaching and are intended to encompass the full range of an
Example Sources of Evidence for the Assistant Professor

Community:
- Activities, demonstrations in original, innovative and distinguished contribution to the advancement of teaching in the discipline and/or the University
- Mentoring and leading individuals and teams in areas of activity, professional and/or professional practice into all levels of knowledge and professional values at a consistency high level, and through supports and programs of student learning in all areas of activity

Professor:
- Activities, incorporating research, scholarship and professional practice into all areas of activity, and professional values, promotes and supports student learning through meaningful and engaging student learning experiences in all areas of activity

Associate Professor:
- Demonstrates an understanding of the student learning experience through significant engagement with all areas of activity, knowledge and professional values, and supports student learning through meaningful and engaging student learning experiences in all areas of activity

Assistant Professor:
- For teaching for use at ULV level on each of the three new academic career levels
- The following descriptors are based on the three levels of descriptors used in the MLP and are provided as illustrative examples of standards

Standard Descriptors:

Guidelines will also be developed for supervisors on reviewing the criteria of service or discipline-based research, and not part of the scope of this project. Leadership and service in teaching are therefore included as the duty of such contributions is best evidenced through the same framework as that applied to the project of teaching. Academic responsibilities relating to other dimensions of academic teaching responsibilities, leadership and service in teaching are therefore included as the duty of such contributions is best evidenced through the same framework as that applied to the project of teaching.
Core knowledge and Professional Values should be demonstrated where relevant under each area of activity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Knowledge (knowledge and understanding of):</th>
<th>Professional Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The subject material</td>
<td>1. Respect for individual learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appropriate methods for teaching and learning in the subject area and at the level of the academic programme</td>
<td>2. Commitment to continuing professional development and evaluation of practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How students learn, both generally and in the subject</td>
<td>3. Commitment to development of learning communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The use of appropriate learning technologies</td>
<td>4. Commitment to encouraging participation in higher education, acknowledging diversity and promoting equality of opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Methods for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching</td>
<td>5. Commitment to incorporating the process and outcomes of relevant research, scholarship and/or professional practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The implications of quality assurance and enhancement for professional practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Area of Activity | Definition | Sources of Evidence | Examples of Evidence |
|---------------------|------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 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 | 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  
Effective unit coordination  
• effective preparation of tutors  
• organised, well prepared unit and resource materials  
Contribution to curriculum development / review | 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 |
| 2. Teaching and/or supporting student learning | Range and scope of teaching, (including teaching by flexible delivery, clinical teaching, placement supervision, studio teaching etc.)  
Supervision of honours and research higher degree students | 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  
Evidence that chosen techniques are: | 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  
Formal feedback about your role as a mentor or reviewer from peers |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Peer review of teaching materials</td>
<td>Examples from unit module, feedback from students, instructor reflections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Student feedback (e.g., surveys)</td>
<td>Feedback from students, instructor reflections, examples from unit module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Rubrics, examinations, self-assessment</td>
<td>Rubrics, examinations, self-assessment, peer review of teaching materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Peer review of teaching materials</td>
<td>Examples from unit module, feedback from students, instructor reflections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Self-assessment</td>
<td>Self-assessment, rubrics, examinations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources of Evidence**

- Peer review of teaching materials
- Student feedback (e.g., surveys)
- Assessment rubrics, examinations, self-assessment

**Definition**

- Feedback
- Assessment

**Area of Activity**

- Developing effective learning environments and student learning outcomes
- Developing effective teaching strategies to foster student learning outcomes
- Developing effective assessment and feedback strategies to enhance teaching and learning
- Developing effective feedback and assessment strategies to enhance teaching and learning
- Developing effective feedback and assessment strategies to enhance teaching and learning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Activity</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Sources of Evidence</th>
<th>Examples of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Evaluation of practice and continuing professional development</td>
<td>This area of activity may be incorporated in activities 1-4 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</td>
<td>Systematic participation in continuing professional development in teaching Self-evaluation of practice using a range of sources of evidence, particularly in relation to new or innovative practices Feedback is used to enhance teaching practice Evidence of the quality of student learning is consistently sought and acted upon</td>
<td>Teaching Qualifications or completion of other teaching development programs Self-Reflective memo/journal; teaching portfolio. Examples of changes that have been made as a result of reflection, feedback. Interpreted results from student and peer feedback and excerpts from relevant unit material where this evidence has been used to change practice Results from tests of student learning and evidence of how they were acted upon. Examples of leadership and contribution in professional development and evaluation Contributions to the professional development of others (e.g. mentoring, participation as a peer reviewer)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
informational level as an expert in some areas of expertise in teaching and learning.

This level builds on the previous two levels with a Professor expected to demonstrate level of peer review through collaborative discourse 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.

Professor

The field of review and would be engaged as a reviewer and member for higher colleagues. An Associate Professor would engage in peer review with college colleagues to the university with a national reputation and expertise in practice: colleagues (including experts in the field) within the university or in cognate disciplines. Field of study.

Assistant Professor

dealing: assessment tasks and assessment standards of the students’ work, recording and engaging with students and peers, and class room participation in moderation exercises, mentoring relationships, and scholarly contribution and research relating to teaching and learning. Peer review can encompass many aspects of collegial discourse which occur informally in most schools, as well as more formal review processes for each of the main types of evidence.

Scope of Peer Review Evidence

For each of the main types of evidence, similar guidelines will eventually be prepared. The following expanded on the examples of evidence provided (above) to illustrate how guidelines for self and assessors will provide detailed examples set of guidelines for peer review evidence.