

WORKSHOP NOTES

Professional learning for course quality

Associate Professor Gail Wilson and Dr Sara Booth

1. What professional development do you currently offer in your institution to support staff in the areas of peer review, benchmarking, calibration, moderation?

- **Group 1:** We had four different organisations, some formal structures, ACU has a Learning and Teaching Centre, to help staff develop learning outcomes, ad hoc. There was an anomaly, including Chartered Accountants who have a formal and rigorous process but there are tensions, the technical expert/educator, recruiting people with technical and educational background, pulling resources from Uni Melbourne, looking at reflection activity and have a peer discussion. People confuse content with great learning
- **Group 2:** A lot of variety within the group, all had some level of professional development. At CSU, we are looking at integrating professional development through the software, embedded in the processes itself. Those of us doing peer review of assessment, we have used templates, down side to using the templates, it doesn't describe learning. We need to learn how to write learning outcomes, no organised professional development. These workshops could include these sessions. Important to have people together, sharing learning outcomes about what we need to achieve. Notion of nudging, apply a soft touch to move people along the way. Learning in teams is professional learning. Professional development could include a point system or micro credentials, a sense of peer recognition.
- State-based or regional based networks could be resources for sharing these skills, national networks could be difficult.
- College of peers: Should there be criteria for participation?
- There should be training for reviewers and different participants, different types of training.
- Monash has good resources internally, can these be shared?
- Allocating professional development time, how do you use that time; a lack of professional development can be taken into consideration for performance management.
- College of Peers process takes time, reciprocity in regards of peer review
- Much of the literature uses a 'College of Peers', what does it mean? Paul Ramsden in the UK used it in relation to subject benchmark statements and colleagues getting together to share standards within a discipline, also Chris Rust used the term and it is referred to in the OLT Peer Review of Assessment Network Project.
- **Group 3:** We are a very diverse group, with a variety experiences from where external accreditors come in and there is a very organised peer review process internally but not so much externally. Then there is putting in place a process with senior executives, to very small providers that are introducing new courses, peer review of design in a mentoring role.
- Institutions are offering professional development but not everyone is taking it up, such as the graduate certificate model, here is an opportunity to get involved, right down to micro credentialing, such as Peer Review.
- TEQSA Experts will have a greater role in peer review with the new standards.
- **Group 4:** We focused on Q1 at the program level, we all have professional development programs but it is ad hoc and it is not systematic, however, there are pockets of good practice. With program level thinking, the challenge around professional development, is shifting the mindset. It is an issue. It is about building communities of practice [University of Canberra], we have academic expectations to drive professional development to drive accreditation and benchmarking. We are trying to change this culture.
- **Group 5:** We talked about professional development to sessional and casual workforce, do you pay them for it? Mix of providers, we all discussed the Graduate Certificate in Assessment, ACER
- A point of view of quality of courses, how do you ensure that everyone participates?

- ACU- we basically started with a framework with policy, starting peer review of teaching process, we have used peer reviewed external benchmarks as reference points, indirect peer review
- 5 yearly course review cycle, course committees-so every course is impacted, we all have a bunch of faculty of processes
- Across all the provisions of the Learning and Teaching Centre providing all sorts of professional support. Graduate Certificate of Higher Education

2. How is this professional development made available to staff? (workshops, self-access, resource kits)

- **Group 6:** We had a mixed bag of approaches. Webinars, face-to-face presence or online ACU have 7 campuses, webinars, teleconference, recorded sessions, some synchronous and asynchronous. Curtin has supporting software for course review, we are just about to trial this, we have new software, Acari-unit to high level, opportunity to speak about that
- Macquarie- has units online units@mq.edu.au

3. If you do not currently offer professional development in your institution in relation to these areas, what resource support would you find most useful to enable you to do so?

- **Group 7:** We discussed leveraging research to feed into peer review
- How long it takes for professional development, how do you make it sustainable over time? There are national standards for some of the courses/some not, huge thing about choosing benchmarking partners. Context is very important, professional development at T&L level and subject level, some work at discipline levels, important for personal aspiration as well as improve quality
- Efficacy of professional development, that the fact that the professional capacity, someone did a study found focus on student outcomes, so how much different are we going about it? As a negative, what is it you need to do to embed the process, that there is systemic supports available?
- SCU workshops are about to be testing impact of new resources, we are going to embed support and professional learning needs to be embedded in the course review process
- We do it, to have easier access to course and unit document from other universities, get my hand on course documentation and unit documentation, oh I will poach that idea, conduct a meta-analysis of those documents. It is very hard to do this, some lock them down, very hard
- Geoff Scott suggested we develop a national Lonely Planet Guide for peer review of assessment.
- Plagiarism can occur as all the unit materials are copyright, but what do we do to protect the intellectual property of unit materials? There is a concern, of other providers lifting the information the intellectual property. This is a question for TEQSA

PARTICIPANT NOTES

Karen Swabey UTAS, Sharon Thomas, UTAS, Margaret Wallace; Sonia, Jo-Anne Kelder, UTAS, Duncan Nulty, ACU

UTAS: workshops on all those questions. They are broad workshops under the heading of peer review of assessment. The fact that the online tool fell over impeded staff participation in the pilot. The mapping over 5 years makes it more achievable. In some programs, they have decided to have a focus such as numeracy or literacy

Karen says that the mapping is important and helps with dealing with workload. Workload needs to be discussed upfront. Use of an online tool makes it more manageable. Sara Booth is helping to find partners especially speciality units. The fact that the requirement is for 3 pieces of work [not pass,

just pass, more than a pass]. Karen says units need to release it needs resourcing and a whole of cohesive whole of institution approach.

In relation to Q2, how it is made available is through workshops and some online resources. Aware of QUT and benchmarking and a holistic process. How do you get everyone on board?

Duncan (ACU). This is a fact of life- then it is away the institution and there is a way we do our business. The job requirements should specify and compel how this will be done so participants in course reviews are all made aware. Faculty policy can also play a role in this, to make it the way we do business. They get swept along with the tide. We have appointed some professors of learning and teaching in each of the faculties, as thought leaders.

Q3. Neither here or there, we do it in many ways. We do need to have better examples (annotated) so that we can see how others have done it. To enable the collaboration, there needs to be some kind of story about how we go about assuring course quality [Duncan, ACU]

The most important question is number one. We need more peer reviewed objects- we have a cascade of organisational requirements that helps demonstrate the story. ACU have a requirement that all teaching focused academics need to complete an Introductory Tertiary Teaching course and the VC said he will support ALL staff to complete it. Duncan has re-designed the Graduate Certificate.

Duncan says the unit on technology enhanced learning is especially popular. The final unit is SOTL, underpinning reflective cycles and improvement. All units are fully online- Duncan recommended that ACU embrace fully online. He thinks this Graduate Certificate is about building a culture- so need to have the students enrol in cohorts. TEQSA will be looking quite closely at the volume of work. We need to consider how unit learning outcomes are justified. It needs to be considered in real-world terms-extraction of good learning imperatives and then sequences that are in the course (using Blooms Taxonomy). Needs to explain how the unit learning outcomes fit into the whole course approach and then what about the learning and teaching strategies.

Sharon: Professional accreditation requires the provision of a course philosophy.

Reinforcing the need for constructive alignment (as opposed to just internal inconsistency).

Professional learning sessions-content, pedagogy, and assessment. 1.5 days and all course staff are involved, including learning designers. Moderation processes, evaluation data is fed into professional learning sessions. External review scheduled early 2017.

CSU-Kugi Naidoo Learning Academy

Q1: PD. Currently there are 5 Quality Learning and Teaching Assessment Leaders to focus on PD with teaching staff responsible for subject outlines. The communication of the assessment tasks to students. Guidelines are provided to write good subject outlines, including assessment. Online moderation tool—pre-during and post phases for moderator input

Q2: PD for staff through workshops and one on one consultations to improve their subject outlines and the assessment task, rubrics. PD offered to subject convenors, course directors and L&T committees.

Q3: PD Resources-needed agreement on definitions and communicating understanding of moderation/calibration institutionally with subject offerings and cohorts. Tool for matching benchmarking partners.

ACU: 1. Policy

2. Peer review of teaching PORT
3. Use of peer reviewed external benchmarks as reference points
4. Course review (5 yearly), course implementation committees for each course [operates in an ongoing way]. Faculty based QA processes
5. Professional development activities and resources provided centrally through Learning and Teaching Centre (LTC) culminating in a Grad Cert Higher Education

Q.2. In as many ways as you can think of! Get organised and strategic.

Q.3. We would like an easier way to access appropriate external reference points that are illustrative of standards.

ACU: Learning and Teaching Centre provide PD to staff including course review and assessment workshops [face-to-face and recorded webinars] as well as just in time

Grad Cert HE-course review processes

Curtin: Tool for collecting assessment data such as type, tool, moderation process so that reports at unit and course level are generated. Lots of shift from L&T on OER.

Boxhill: Grad Cert in HE via Melbourne University [developed specifically for BH HE staff]. PD around AQF.

Chartered Accountants ANZ: PD regards learning outcomes; 1: 1 training regarding constructive alignment; PD plan.

Navitas: Griffith provide QA for a fee. Accredited through TEQSA.

Participant email addresses:

Pauline.taylor-guy@acer.edu.au

hardikbv@gmail.com

michelle.muchatuta@kaplan.edu.au

abain@csu.edu.au

peter.edwards@caanz.com

abbey.murray@iru.edu.au

knaidoo@csu.edu.au

Kristina.everett@acu.edu.au

maryann.fisher@charteraccountantsanz.com

eva.dobozy@curtin.edu.au

ann.poiner@griffithcollege.edu.au

p.bray@boxhill.edu.au

f.farhadieh@boxhill.edu.au

helena.williams@acu.edu.au
georgia.clarkson@acu.edu.au
Royce.Daviss@canberra.edu.au
Felicity.orme@sibt.nsw.edu.au
j.l.burgess@cqu.edu.au
noeline@uow.edu.au
cathy.rythmeister@mq.edu.au
lawerance.altamura@holmesglen.edu.au
Gordon.bobin@excelsia.edu.au
Jennifer.Hornsay@kaplan.edu.au
jsullivan@uow.edu.au
anne-marie.chase@acer.edu.au
qurat.tariq@canberra.edu.au
e.jacobs@ecu.edu.au
bijo@ihm.edu.au
Elizabeth.beckmann@anu.edu.au
Ruth.fazakerly@unisa.edu.au
e.teo@aapoly.edu.au
tess.coughlan@aib.edu.au
T.Day@latrobe.edu.au
Janice.Dudley@murdoch.edu.au
mwallace@uow.edu.au
sharon.thomas@utas.edu.au
karen.swabey@utas.edu.au
Jo.Kelder@utas.edu.au
Duncan.nulty@acu.edu.au
Sonya.betros@qut.edu.au