Comments on the draft UWA Student Experience Survey

Response rate

1. During September students will receive frequent emails inviting them to complete the University Experience Survey. If, immediately after the UES has closed, they are invited to complete an even longer survey, also about the student experience, they are likely to be surprised and possibly irritated, and may well decide not to participate.

2. What response rate is needed for the survey to yield the information required? The last 3 student engagement surveys conducted at UWA, in September 2007, 2008 and 2010, had response rates of 26%, 15% and 24%. Based on this experience, the response rate for a local student experience survey conducted in September/October, immediately after the UES, could be as low as 15%. This would be too low for the data to be meaningful, especially when broken down by discipline, faculty and school levels as is desired.

Items

1. The rationale states:

   “The usefulness of such an instrument is exemplified by the Melbourne Experience Surveys (MES). The University of Melbourne developed its own student experience instrument to determine some of the academic and social outcomes arising from the introduction of the Melbourne Model. The outcome of collecting this information has resulted in evidence based improvements to enhance the student experience.”

Which aspects of the student experience were changed by the implementation of the Melbourne Model? Have the items that measured these aspects at the University of Melbourne been included in the draft UWA survey?

2. At the Future Framework Implementation Committee meeting in October, 2011 it was agreed that we should not commit to questions taken from the current CEQ while its future is uncertain (the CEQ is currently under review) or before the contents of the UES are known.

3. The draft UWA instrument duplicates some draft UES items, e.g., attributes and skills acquired.

4. There are no questions in the draft instrument about actual participation in social activities arising from being at UWA, how many friends have been made, etc.

Greg Marie
23.4.2012
First Year Survey

Professor Gia Parish

I agree with the other points made so far regarding questioning students on their actual participation in/utilisation of learning activities provided by teaching staff. I also have another comment somewhat related to this. With regard to the question about paid work in the student info section, I think it would be useful to find out how many students are undertaking paid work for financial necessity as opposed to work experience/enhancement of career prospects. Anecdotal evidence indicates that many students are undertaking extra work for the latter reasons, to the detriment of their participation in the learning/enrichment activities available through their studies. It would be nice to know if this is actually true or if they are genuinely mostly working for financial necessity.

Winthrop Professor Andy Fourie
My comment relates to the first item, ‘Good Teaching’. As you know, in ENSC1002 there are 19 different ‘facilitators’. If this question is to have any use it would have to ensure the names of each facilitator are recorded. Is this the intention? It could get quite tedious interpreting the results.

Professor Rachel Cardell-Oliver

I have concerns about two areas in the proposed survey questions: good teaching and learning support. Good Teaching questions are intended to measure "student perception of teaching: feedback, motivation, attention, understanding."

In my view the 6 questions given in this section measure the (perceived) "effort" put in to teaching by the instructor rather than whether students learnt anything significant. I put a lot of time into my teaching and providing feedback, and my vanity is soothed by my students being grateful for that. But I also know that deeper learning will occur if I focus that effort into encouraging students to learn ways of solving problems on their that don't focus on "just ask the lecturer for the answers". First year students are particularly prone to this shallow learning approach, and so I am unhappy about UWA encouraging it, even if unintentionally.

There is an implicit assumption in this question set that instructors who provide all the answers, as soon as asked, are teaching better than those who manage to teach students how to analyse and solve the problems they encounter as they learn. For example, "teaching staff put a lot of time into commenting on my work" needs to be related to whether students were motivated to make use of this feedback and learn from it, for example, "I used the feedback provided to improve my work and was able to solve the problem on my own next time". Students may be more satisfied by the former (it is much easier for them) but they are likely to learn more if they are encouraged to do the latter.

Learning Support
The questions on Learning Support mention online support and the library, but nowhere in the question set seemed to ask about the learning support provided by lectures, tutorials and labs.

I agree with Nazrim that it is more useful to ask students what use, or how much use, they made of lectures, tutorials and labs, rather than just whether they were satisfied that the lectures, tutorials and labs were there. However, when I have asked about this in my surveys I found that students greatly overestimated "how many lectures did you attend" (they mostly reported 80% or so, when the reality was much lower). So I changed the question to this one:
Various learning opportunities were provided to help you assimilate the material in this unit. Please rate how you made use of these opportunities by placing a cross in the appropriate column next to each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost always (&gt;=80%)</th>
<th>Usually (&gt;50%)</th>
<th>Sometimes (&lt;=50%)</th>
<th>Hardly ever (&lt;20%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical class attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture handouts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended reading in text books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reading materials e.g. on the online bibliography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of class help from the lecturer and tutor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assistant Professor Nazim Khan**

One important aspect missing from this and most surveys is: How many lectures have you attended? 0-10% 10-20% ..How many tutorials/workshops have you attended? 0-10% 10-20% … These participation scores should be correlated with student satisfaction scores. Students who choose not to engage with the university certainly will not have score in other areas that are meaningful or based on their experience. If we do not include attendance information then the a lot of the survey results are meaningless – only to be used be administrators to target academic staff. I once made the mistake of doing a SPOT during a test – and got caned by students who never came to classes!

**Winthrop Professor Caroline Baille**

1. The question relating to research to enhance student learning is not well phrased. Students will not necessarily know that this has been done - nor will they understand the language of this question. For example all our work on thresholds in first year will be at best presented to them as thresholds in their learning but not as 'research to enhance learning'. I think this data is best taken from the course developers.

2. There are many questions which will not necessarily yield good results unless the students are somewhat educated about the importance of certain aspects. It is our experience that students will say units are disorganised when they are not in the same lecture/tutorial/lab format as they are used to. Flexibility of learning opportunities and allowing for creative and critical thinking in open ended problems often seem to the students that we are not organised - when in fact we are very structured but we are not keeping them in a straight jacket by telling them exactly what steps to take. We call this being in a 'liminal space' - an important place of some confusion and allowing the brain to sort out what to do - if we tell them everything they do not learn the required thinking skills. However they are likely to grade the unit or degree as 'disorganised' or not well planned.
Hi Kaye,

We only have a couple of comments.
1. We don't seem to see any specific questions about cohort (Major) identity for 1st yrs? Several discussions previously had highlighted it as an important issue.
2. Under Student Support Q6 (question required on student service). Maybe there could be a question around the prevention of the 'Tennis ball' as this was one the main goals set by the SS Team. Advice given by Student Services allowed me to resolve my issue through one encounter.

Regards

Asst/Prof Jeromy Harvey
Acting Associate Dean of Teaching and Learning School of Indigenous Studies
Feedback on the UWA Student Experience Questionnaire
(Draft 8 September 2011)
Collated by Siri Barrett-Lennard, Student Services

General feedback (whole document):

- Ensure consistency of end punctuation for questions/items (full stop or no full stop).
- Consider using IT terms most commonly used in student information documents, eg. LMS (vs Moodle) and MyUWA (vs Portal).

SECTION I

Generic skills

New item: Consider adding:

- The degree improves my skills in spoken communication.

Approaches to Teaching and Learning

Item 2: Simplify wording, e.g.

- My degree refers to research findings.

Item 3: Simplify wording, e.g.

- My degree encourages learning outside the classroom.

Item 4: Simplify wording, e.g.

- My degree effectively uses information and communication technology to facilitate learning.

SECTION II

General feedback (this section):

- Add more questions on general Student Support so that the focus is not mainly/exclusively on transition or change the title of this section (see suggestions for additional questions below under Student Support heading below).

Learning Support

Item 5: Change wording:

- I am generally satisfied with the online classroom environment (e.g. LMS, LCS, MyUWA)
New item: Consider adding:

- Academic learning support (STUDYSmarter, Graduate Education) is appropriate to my needs.

Student Support

Item 5: Change wording:

- MyUWA provides good access to the information I need.

Item 6: Consider inserting:

- Services that support student welfare (e.g. careers advice, counselling, medical centre, housing office, financial aid, disability services) have been adequate for my needs.

Item 8+: Consider adding further questions:

- Ask UWA provides good access to the information I need.
- I was easily able to access services that support my mental health and well-being while studying.
- When experiencing a difficulty, student services helped me get back on track.
- Student services helped me manage concerns and enjoy university more.
- Student services events made me feel optimistic about my studies.

SECTION V

General feedback (this section):

- Fix grammar of introductory sentence, i.e. This section lists...

Support Service: Consider adding:

- Childcare services
- Faculty advising
- Learning resources: ACE, CARS, ISE
- Volunteer services: UniMentor, UniSkills, Guild Volunteer Hub
- Financial aid services: Guild, Scholarships, International and Financial Aid Offices

Support Service: Change wording:

- International student support – change to International Centre support
- Student housing – change to Housing Office support or Accommodation Assistance
- English language programs and support – change to:
  - Academic language, learning and numeracy support (STUDYSmarter)
  AND
  - Graduate research education resources and training

SECTION VII
**Student Info**

**Item 3:** Consider adding:

- Is this work degree-related?

**Item 4:** Consider separating community service and volunteering activities from family and sporting commitments:

- Do you have significant community service, volunteering or pro-bono work commitments outside university?

AND

- Do you have other significant responsibilities or commitments, e.g. parenting, caring for an aged parent, sporting commitments, musical commitments?

**FIRST YEAR MEASURE OF ENGAGEMENT**

**General feedback (this section):**

- Instructions are required.
- Use consistent format (verb plus noun group) for items (see below).

**Items:** Change wording of first four items, collapsing first two:

- Undertake practicum, internship, fieldwork, industry placement or work experience.
- Do community services or volunteer work.
- Participate in study group, peer learning group, mentoring or learning community.
Hi Kaye,

We have reviewed the proposed survey and I attach the document with a few comments.

Overall there were very few comments about the questions apart from the general criticism of the CEQ questions and their bias against large classes when compared to small classes.

I have some reservations about questions like:

6. UWA uses the results of student surveys to improve learning and teaching

4. The units covered the breadth of the discipline

My reservations relate to the awareness of the student to be able to validly answer such questions.

Another comment concerns how we might interpret the results to questions which group “administrative staff or services” and “student support staff and services” into one question as respondents might not know exactly what they are being asked .. career services? Medical services? IT staff? Student Centre staff? Moodle?? Faculty level vs University level? How do we analyse responses to “The advice I received about degrees and unit offerings/choice was clear”?

Cheers,

Phil
# Teaching and Learning Committee- Expenditure and Commitments as at 1st June 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>2012 Budget Allocation</th>
<th>2012 Commitments</th>
<th>2012 actual Expenditure</th>
<th>2012 Unexpended Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Budget Allocation</td>
<td>$605,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Funds Carried Forward</td>
<td>$294,242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward and Acknowledgement of Excellence in T&amp;L Support</td>
<td>$26,250</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward for UWA Nominees for ALTC Awards 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Teaching and Learning Awards - funds to allocated to Faculties 2012</td>
<td>$57,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to Student Learning Awards 2011</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward for UWA Nominees for OLT Awards 2012-funds held in reserve</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning Development Fund</td>
<td>$188,675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Teaching Internship Scheme</td>
<td>$40,151</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500 to be held in reserve for 1 p/t 2011 payment in Dec 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Final teaching payment to schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Interns initial teaching allocation to schools (21 x 2,750 interns)</td>
<td>$57,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Interns second teaching allocation to schools Dec 2012 (21x2,750))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$57,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Interns- professional development payment to CATL x 21 interns (=3,000 additional payment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$70,830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Fellowship Scheme</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Fellowship Scheme 2011 -4 x $12,000 upon receipt of final reports</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Fellowship Scheme 2012 - 4 x 22,000</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for grants of up to $5,000 for extended fellows - funds held in reserve</td>
<td>$27,628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return S Broomhall funds from 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative, Research and Project Management Support</td>
<td>$11,077</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds committed for formatting and printing OLT submissions and Teaching Awards Certificates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Award Certificates printing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>2012 Budget Allocation/ Commitments</td>
<td>2012 actual Expenditure</td>
<td>2012 Unexpended Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished Visitors to UWA - PG 10501011 (Funds transferred to VC)</td>
<td>$23,873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Teaching and Learning Income Allocation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Support for the Educational Strategies Office (ESO)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLT Seeding Grants - E</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BURT Funding to the ESO</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Support of Teaching and Learning via the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving Student Learning Grants Scheme: Funds allocated to CATL for Scheme in 2012</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CATL - Sessional Staff Day: Funds allocated to CATL for 2012</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning Month: Funds allocated to CATL for 2012 Teaching Month</td>
<td>$17,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CATL English Language Support for Teaching Staff - Funds allocated to CATL for 2012</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Teaching and Learning Committee General Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Competence Research (Chantal Bourgault du Coudray)- Travel Grant</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Deans lunch - 19th Oct 2011</td>
<td>$266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Induction package printing (Uniprint)</td>
<td>$57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Induction Meeting catering</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Deans lunch - 14th March</td>
<td>$253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLC Meeting refreshments - 1st March</td>
<td>$127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$899,242</strong></td>
<td><strong>$337,205</strong></td>
<td><strong>$282,499</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes $18,000 transferred from the High Profile International Visitors Fund account
BACKGROUND AND MEMBERSHIP


In 2012 the Committee comprises:

Deputy Chair of the Teaching and Learning Committee, Chair (Winthrop Professor Phil Hancock)
Director, Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (Winthrop Professor Denise Chalmers)
Dean of Graduate Research School (Winthrop Professor Alan Dench)
President of the Postgraduate Students' Association, or nominee (Ms Aisling Blackmore)
Faculty representative from the University's Teaching and Learning Committee (Winthrop Professor Mark Israel)
Faculty representative from the University's Teaching and Learning Committee (Assistant Professor Elaine Sharplin)
Co-opted member (Assistant Professor Di Gardiner)
Co-opted member (Associate Professor Bonnie Thomas)
Co-opted member (Assistant Professor Lee Partridge)
Executive Officer (Ms Sally Jackson)

ROLE

The role of the Grants and Schemes Standing Committee is to:

(a) engage in processes of selection for competitive grants and schemes supporting teaching and learning and its development at UWA, including:
   • the Postgraduate Teaching Internship Scheme;
   • the Teaching Fellowship Scheme
   • Other grants and schemes that may arise from time to time;

(b) monitor and review grants and schemes guidelines and procedures, as appropriate;

(c) monitor progress of appropriate implementation strategies included in the Education Section of the University's Operational Priorities Plan;

(d) advise and make recommendations to the Teaching and Learning Committee and/or other University bodies or officers, as appropriate, on matters relating to grants and schemes in support of teaching and learning, including associated budgetary issues.

To date in 2012 the Committee has met to discuss matters relating to the proposed Post PhD Submission/ Pre-Acceptance Funding Scheme, the selection of the 2012 Teaching Fellows and budget requirements for 2012, taking each in turn;
1. **Post PhD Submission/ Pre-Acceptance Funding Scheme**

As a result of a comprehensive review into grants and schemes, the Grants and Schemes Standing Committee recommended the establishment of an additional scheme to complement the existing schemes already under its purview. This Scheme was recommended and agreed to in principle by the Teaching and Learning Committee at its 2nd June 2011 meeting. Following this in principle agreement, draft guidelines for the new scheme have been developed and endorsed by the Grants and Schemes Standing Committee. These guidelines are attached (Attachment A) for the Teaching and Learning Committee’s endorsement.

**Recommendation 1: to endorse the Post PhD Submission/ Pre-Acceptance Funding Scheme Guidelines**

2. **Teaching Fellowship Scheme - Final Reports - F22005**

**2008 Teaching Fellowship Scheme**

The outstanding reports from the following fellows are attached;

- Dr Dominique Blache (Attachment B)
- W/Prof Mohammed Bennamoun and Dr Ferdous Sohel (Attachment C)

**2009 Teaching Fellowship Scheme**

The following three fellows participated in the 2009 Scheme; reports were due in July 2011;

- Associate Professor Jill Howieson (extension till August 2012)
- Mr Malcolm Fiahlo (extension till June 2012)
- Dr Wenge Liu and Professor Andrew Deeks (both left the University)

**2010 Teaching Fellowship Scheme**

Reports for the 2010 Scheme are due before July 2012

Please note, it is anticipated that changes to the 2011 Guidelines reducing the reporting period from 12 months of completion of the Fellowship to 6 months should help alleviate the problems which have been associated with the collection of final reports and ensure a more timely and consistent provision of reports to the Committee from future Fellows.

3. **2012 Teaching Fellowship Scheme - F36298**

The Committee met on 7th May 2012 to consider twelve applications to the 2012 Teaching Fellowship Scheme. Category ranking proformas for the applications to the Scheme had been completed by each member and a consolidated ranking report was tabled at the meeting. It was agreed to award the 2012 Teaching Fellowships to the following applicants;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Co-applicant</th>
<th>Faculty/School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Sharplin</td>
<td>Robert Faulkner</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrina Stratton</td>
<td>Susan Bailey</td>
<td>MDHS/Population Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kati Tonkin</td>
<td></td>
<td>AHSS/Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Whipp</td>
<td></td>
<td>Science/Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **FUNDING REQUIREMENTS FOR 2013**

The Grants and Schemes Standing Committee have considered the 2013 Budget bid in light of the anticipated introduction of the Post PhD Submission Scheme. As it is uncertain how many successful applications the new scheme will receive, it was agreed for 2013 to request an overall pool of money which would cover all three schemes instead of the usual arrangement of requesting a set amount per Scheme. This will allow the Committee greater flexibility in allocating places for all three schemes.
dependent upon the number of applications, any uncommitted funds from a Scheme could then be rolled over to provide additional places for one of the other Schemes if required.

The 2013 budget bid for the Grants and Schemes Standing Committee is as follows (executive officers note: I have broken this down to reflect the anticipated requirements of each scheme for information, however it is requested that this money be seen as a pool which can be used flexibly):

**Postgraduate Teaching Internship Scheme – 2013**

The Committee agreed to increase the funds requested for 2013 to account for increases in the Professional Development component of the Scheme, it is recommended that the Professional Development costs be increased by $200 per intern, from $3,230 to $3,430.

The teaching component paid to Schools for Intern’s teaching costs was reviewed last year and it is not proposed that this should be increased for 2013.

CATL has not increased its monitoring and support component of the budget despite increased salary costs.

In order to fund the proposed Post PhD Submission Scheme, it is anticipated that the number of places available will be reduced from 24 to 20. However the Guidelines will continue to state that up to 24 places are available in order to provide the maximum number of places if money is available.

A full breakdown of 2013 costings for the Postgraduate Teaching Internship Scheme is attached (Attachment D).

**Recommendation 2**

To increase the funding for the professional development component of the Scheme as indicated at Attachment D.

**Teaching Fellowship Scheme – 2013**

No increase is recommended however it is anticipated that the number of fellowships offered be reduced from 4 to 3. The Guidelines will continue to state that up to four fellowships will be offered in order to provide the maximum number of places if money is available.

**Post PhD Submission Scheme – 2013**

It is anticipated that a pool of $50,000 be allocated to the Post PhD Submission Scheme, the number of places available will be dependent upon the number of successful applications made and the amount requested for each successful application which is flexible.

### Anticipated 2013 budget breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Places Available</th>
<th>Total Budget Bid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Teaching Internship Scheme</td>
<td>20 (x $8,930)</td>
<td>$178,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Fellowship Scheme</td>
<td>3 (x$22,000)</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Third’ Scheme</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$294,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sally Jackson
Executive Officer
Grants and Schemes Standing Committee

14 May 2012
1. Introduction

Guidelines

The University’s Teaching and Learning Committee will introduce in 2013 a ‘Post PhD submission/pre acceptance’ funding pool of $50,000 to fund a number of applicants to further develop and prepare for publication an existing ‘teaching and learning in higher education’ project. Up to $10,000 per applicant is available.

The Scheme is open to all UWA students who have submitted their PhD thesis for examination, however, priority will be given to applications from Post Graduate Teaching Interns. The duration will be limited to a maximum of 6 months.

Allocation of the funding is administered by the Grants and Schemes Standing Committee, a sub-committee of the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee. The Grants and Schemes Standing Committee consists of:

- Deputy Chair (Teaching and Learning Committee) as Chair
- Director, Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning
- Dean of the Graduate Research School
- President of the Postgraduate Students’ Association, or nominee
- Two faculty representatives from the Teaching and Learning Committee
- Up to 5 co-opted members

Administration

The broad administration of funding will be overseen by the Grants and Schemes Standing Committee’s Executive Officer.

Eligibility

Only UWA PhD students who remain attached to UWA are eligible, applications from UWA PhD students employed at other Universities will not be accepted.

Submissions

The applications will be considered by a small group drawn from the Standing Committee comprising

- Chair, Grants and Schemes Standing Committee
- Postgraduate Teaching Internship Scheme Coordinator and
- Director, CATL

Applications should be submitted on the application form and can be made at any time following submission of the PhD thesis for examination to the Executive Officer, Grants and Schemes Standing Committee.

Assessment

The application will be assessed on the basis of the contribution that the project will make to the teaching and learning activities of the University and will be evaluated using the following criteria:

- A ‘teaching and learning in higher education’ project has been undertaken and is largely completed
- Details of the project and its impact upon Teaching and Learning
- Strength of proposed publication
- Priority will be given to students who have completed a Postgraduate Teaching Internship
- Successful applications will show consultation with CATL
Dissemination

Successful applications will be reported at the regularly scheduled Grants and Schemes Standing Committee meetings and forwarded to the Teaching and Learning Committee. Outcomes of the teaching and learning projects and published articles will be made available at the following website …(to be developed)

It is expected that successful applicants will disseminate the project findings both within the Faculty/Section and the University (via, for example, seminars, and the publication of project descriptions and results on the UWA website). In addition, confirmation must be provided by applicants that a University-wide presentation will occur and an article will be prepared for publication in a refereed national or international journal of teaching and learning.

2. What Assistance is Available?

2.1 In 2013 the Scheme will offer a pool of funding up $50,000 in total. It is expected that this will allow a number of applicants to complete the Scheme, with exact levels of funding to each applicant to be determined dependent upon the number and quality of submissions. The budget bid should detail the number of hours anticipated to produce an article suitable for publication in a quality journal or book chapter. Hours will be paid at ORAA rate, for further information please see the UWA Casual Teaching rate at http://www.hr.uwa.edu.au/hr/salary_scales/casual_teaching_rate

2.2 The Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning will provide support, resources and advice to support the development of a teaching and learning publication. Successful applicants will be expected to attend relevant programs on publishing and similar, provided through the Research School, CATL and OSDS to support the development of their writing skills.

3. What is involved

3.1 The publication-ready document should be completed in a period of up to and not exceeding 6 months.

3.2 The nature, timing and structure of the project is to be agreed upon by the applicant, the PTIS coordinator, the applicant’s research supervisor and CATL.

3.3 On completion, successful applicants are required to submit a copy of the publication-ready document with details of the publisher where the document has been submitted (or details of proposed publisher if not yet submitted) to the Grants and Schemes Standing Committee, C/- the Executive Officer, M456.

4. How to Apply

On submission (or immediately prior to submission) of the PhD thesis for examination, applications for funding can be made at any time during the year.

Your application will consist of:

- The completed application form,
- A brief statement detailing your ‘teaching and learning in higher education’ project and any reports and/or any forum and/or conference presentation details undertaken to date
- A brief statement of the proposed publication and intended publisher
- A supporting statement from the PTIS Coordinator (if applicable).
- A timeframe to develop a publication, including a budget estimate signed by the Head of School.

The application will be assessed on the basis of the contribution that the project will make to the teaching and learning activities of the University and will be evaluated using the assessment criteria detailed above.
5. **School Responsibilities**

5.1 The strength of support offered to applicants from their School is a vital component of this Scheme. Successful applications will show close consultation between the applicant’s supervisor(s), academic staff members (Discipline Chairs, Course Coordinators, etc.) as appropriate.

5.2 The School must make available to the applicant an allocated working space, access to computing and library facilities etc.

5.3 Schools may support more than one application. If this is the case, applications should not be ranked.

5.4 Schools will be responsible for the appointment procedures – applicants must be employed on contracts, salary payments and the day-to-day management of the work of the applicant in accordance with Human Resources practices. The Head of School (in conjunction with the applicant) is expected to prepare a realistic budget proposal which must be submitted as part of the application process. This budget proposal should bear in mind the proposed cost of preparing the project for publication (including any on-costs, in accordance with current casual award rates [https://www.his.admin.uwa.edu.au/his/cas_teach.asp](https://www.his.admin.uwa.edu.au/his/cas_teach.asp)). The amount of up to $10,000 per applicant is available. Any additional funds required for this component of the Scheme should be met by the school.

5.5 A staff member from CATL will be appointed to mentor and support the applicant.

6. **Professional Development for Postgraduate Teaching Interns**

Upon acceptance, attendance at relevant workshops will be discussed and agreed upon by the applicant and CATL, the applicant will attend these as applicable. Workshops through the Research School, OSDS and CATL will be identified as appropriate to the applicant’s needs.

7. **Deadline for Submissions**

Applications can be made following or immediately prior to submission of the PhD thesis for assessment.

8. **Reporting Requirements**

Fifty percent of the total funding will be forwarded to the School of successful applicants upon commencement of the Scheme. The remaining fifty percent will be forwarded to the School upon submission of a copy of the publication-ready document with details of the publisher where the document has been submitted (or details of proposed publisher if not yet submitted) to the Grants and Schemes Standing Committee, C/- the Executive Officer, M456.

Sally Jackson, Executive Officer – Grants and Schemes Standing Committee
14 May 2012
POSTGRADUATE TEACHING INTERNSHIP SCHEME FOR 2013

COSTINGS

Based on a cohort of 20

• PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT

All Interns will complete approximately 50 hours of paid development. The most suitable rate for this work is the current rate for Other Required Academic Activity (ORAA) at the Honours Degree level (refer https://www.his.admin.uwa.edu.au/his/cas_teach.asp). There would also be a 16.04% on-cost. Thus the cost per annum (at current rates) would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Intern</th>
<th>Per Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,450 (approx)</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registration at the Teaching and Learning Forum (or funding for attendance at an equivalent forum) would normally be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Intern</th>
<th>Per Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$200 (approx)</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning will provide a monitoring and support service to Interns during the life of the scheme and also provide supporting materials related to each Intern's program of professional development. The monitoring and support will include the opportunity for Interns to discuss their progress in professional development with a member of the Centre's staff and to participate in group meetings of Interns organised by the Centre. The costs for this component of the scheme have been based on monitoring and support time equivalent to one day per Intern plus cost of materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Intern</th>
<th>Per Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$380 (approx)</td>
<td>$9,120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fees for ‘Foundations of University Teaching and Learning’ Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Intern</th>
<th>Per Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$400 (approx)</td>
<td>$9600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Professional Development component costs are thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Intern</th>
<th>Per Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$3,430 (approx)</td>
<td>$27,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• TEACHING COMPONENT

In 2012 the Postgraduate Teaching Internship Scheme will provide $5,500 per Intern for teaching costs. In accordance with clauses 5.2 and 5.5 of the Guidelines, the head of school shall submit a schedule of planned teaching work which the Intern will undertake.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Intern</th>
<th>Per Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• PROJECTED TOTAL COSTS FOR 2012 FOR A FULL INTERNSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Intern</th>
<th>Per Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$8730 (approx)</td>
<td>$209,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date Compiled: 6 August 2004
Date Updated: May 2012
BACKGROUND AND MEMBERSHIP

The Awards Standing Committee was established in early 2010 following the rationalisation of the Teaching and Learning Committee processes that took place in 2009.

The Constitution of the Awards Standing Committee is available on the web at: http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/staff/committees/awards_standing_committee

In 2012 the Committee comprises:

MEMBERS OF THE AWARDS STANDING COMMITTEE

Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education) (Winthrop Professor Jane Long) – (Chair)
Academic Director (Education Strategies Office) (Professor Sally Sandover) – Deputy Chair
Nominee, Chair of the Academic Board (Winthrop Professor Linc Schmitt)
Director, Centre for the Advancement of Teaching & Learning (Winthrop Professor Denise Chalmers)
Director, Student Services (Mr Jon Stubbs)
Associate Director, Academic Policy Services (Ms Sue Smurthwaite)
School of Indigenous Studies Representative from the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee (Assistant Professor Jeromy Harvey)
Professor Geoff Meyer (School of Anatomy and Human Biology)
President of the Guild (Mr Matthew McKenzie)

Executive Officer (Sally Jackson), Academic Policy Services

To date in 2012 the Committee has met to discuss matters relating to the nominations to the 2012 Australian Awards for University Teaching (AAUT), selection of the 2012 UWA Awards for Excellence in Teaching and selection of a winner of the 2012 Contributions to Student Learning Award.

1. 2012 Australian Awards for University Teaching (AAUT)

The following nominees (in alphabetical order) have been selected for submission to the 2012 AAUT Awards:

Citations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominee</th>
<th>Faculty/ Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Fiahlo</td>
<td>Equity and Diversity, Registrar’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Heyworth</td>
<td>Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Centre Team</td>
<td>International Centre, Registrar’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambelin Kwayumullina</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Lloyd</td>
<td>UWA Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Praeger</td>
<td>Engineering, Computing and Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Weller</td>
<td>Architecture, Landscape and Visual Arts*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching Excellence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Nominee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law, Economics and Related Studies</td>
<td>Phil Hancock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Career</td>
<td>Paul McGurgan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **2012 UWA Awards for Teaching Excellence**

The following were awarded 2012 UWA Awards for Teaching Excellence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>Winners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UWA Award for Excellence in Teaching</td>
<td>Jane Heyworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWA Award for Excellence in Early Career Teaching</td>
<td>Ambelin Kwaymullina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWA Award for Excellence in the Provision of Support to Students</td>
<td>Malcolm Fiahlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWA Award for Excellence in the Provision of Support to Students</td>
<td>International Centre team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWA Award for Excellence in the Provision of Support to Students</td>
<td>Paul Lloyd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **2012 Contribution to Student Learning Award**

The 2012 Contribution to Student Learning Award was awarded to St Catherine’s College.

4. **Distinguished Teaching and Learning Award for Schools**

The Committee agreed to retain (at least for the 2013 round) the Distinguished Teaching and Learning Award for Schools which had been placed on hold pending further review by the Awards Standing Committee in April 2011. Consequently funding for the Award would need to be requested in the 2013 budget submission, namely $45,000.

5. **Recognition and Reward of Excellence in Teaching and Teaching Support at UWA**

As a result of changes to the national awards body, a number of consequential changes have been made to the Recognition and Reward of Excellence in Teaching and Teaching Support at UWA document which was endorsed by the Teaching Learning Committee in 2009. The revised document is attached (Attachment A,) for approval by the Teaching and Learning Committee.

6. **Funding Requirements for 2013**

In total, the Committee is looking to acknowledge and reward excellence in teaching and teaching support with the provision of $133,750 in 2013 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Budget Items</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Total Bid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculties - $6,000</td>
<td>Support for Faculty/SIS Teaching and Learning Awards</td>
<td>$57,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS - $3,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Awards at $2,000 each</td>
<td>Contributions to Student Learning Awards</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biennial Award for 2013 - $45,000</td>
<td>Distinguished Teaching and Learning Award for Schools</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>UWA Awards for Excellence in Teaching</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations - $1,000</td>
<td>Unsuccessful nominees to the national (AAUT) awards</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Program Awards - $2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$133,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sally Jackson
Executive Officer
Awards Standing Committee
23 May 2012
Recognition and Reward of Excellence in Teaching and Teaching Support at UWA
(endorsed by the Teaching and Learning Committee R33/09, current draft updated to be approved by TLC in June 2012)

1. Introduction
Teaching awards give recognition to teachers renowned for the excellence of their teaching, which is supported by evidence of their broad and deep contribution to enhancing the student experience at the University of Western Australia.

By way of background, in 2005, [then] DEST announced a significant expansion of the Australian Awards for University Teaching with the objective of heightening the status of teaching and supporting the centrality of teaching in institutional missions. Since 2006 national awards have continued to gain significance and recognition with the establishment in 2006 of the Carrick Institute, later renamed the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) and more recently (November 2011) the Office for Learning and Teaching (OLT) within the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR). A range of national awards continue to be offered in the following categories;

- Citations for Outstanding Contributions to Student Learning
- Awards for Teaching Excellence
- Awards for Programs that Enhance Learning

At the University of Western Australia, Teaching Awards were first initiated by the Student Guild in 1991. Since then, they have flourished as a critical component of the recognition of good teaching at UWA. Between 1992 and 2006 the University and Guild of Undergraduates had joint oversight of UWA’s Excellence in Teaching Awards, from which the University normally selected nominees for national awards and recognition.

The University strongly supports and rewards recognition of excellence in teaching at various levels (see Appendix A). With effect from 2007 (Academic Council resolution R143/06) the centrally coordinated Excellence in Teaching Awards were devolved and embedded in the Faculties and the School of Indigenous Studies (SIS), which encourages greater faculty engagement with the process for selecting nominees for the OLT Awards. Further, this process includes University-wide adoption of national criteria for assessing excellent teaching for both the awards processes and also for promotion and professional development review as part of the academic portfolio requirements.

2. Faculty Teaching Awards

2.1. Aim and Benefits
The aim and benefits of embedding teaching awards, linked to the OLT Awards criteria, in the Faculties and the SIS is noted as follows:

- In line with the University’s philosophy of devolving decision-making locally where possible, the process of peer review and assessment of good teaching is best made at the Faculty level, with input from the student body.
- Faculty teaching awards better engage the faculties and schools with the selection process for national teaching awards under the auspices of the OLT.

2.2. Linkage to the OLT Awards criteria, which was formulated with input from the sector nationally, greatly lessens the workload on teaching award nominees both internally and nationally. In addition, streamlining a number of UWA processes, including teaching awards, Academic Portfolios and the academic promotion framework to align with common criteria also greatly reduce academic workloads.

1 For the purpose of this document reference to the “Faculty teaching awards” should include the School of Indigenous Studies unless otherwise noted.
2.3. Minimum Essentials for Faculty Teaching Awards

a. That each faculty and the School of Indigenous Studies (SIS) establish an awards process, individually or collaboratively, that is transparent, competitive, evidence based and awarded on merit.

b. That the criteria for the faculty awards be linked to the OLT awards criteria (refer OLT website at: [www.olt.gov.au](http://www.olt.gov.au)).

c. Calls for nominations for faculty awards should be established within all faculties and the SIS on an annual basis. However, some faculties may introduce a collaborative or individual awards process which could be undertaken either annually or biennially. Such faculties include:
   - Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Visual Arts
   - Faculty of Education
   - Faculty of Law
   - School of Indigenous Studies

d. That the faculty(ies) and the SIS include a range of teaching awards as deemed appropriate to the faculty(ies) /SIS and that student nomination be a component of one or more award(s).

e. That the faculties ensure a process for rewarding research supervision, either as part of the teaching awards process or in another way within the faculty. Given that the national OLT awards categories do not provide specifically for postgraduate supervision, the University has historically considered faculty nominations with a focus on postgraduate teaching/supervision within the OLT award category - Citations for Outstanding Contributions to Student Learning.

f. That the faculty(ies) and the SIS formulate a judging process inclusive of:
   - At least one student representative selected by a Faculty Society or the Guild;
   - Representation from the ‘Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education) or nominee’, to provide cross-faculty consideration. Nominees are normally Associate Deans (Teaching and Learning/Education) from another Faculty.

g. That the awards process would normally include evidence of student affirmation wider than an individual nomination. For example, SPOT, SURF or other valid survey data.

h. That each faculty and the SIS ensure that information regarding their teaching awards is current, available on a local web page and linked to the central teaching and learning site. Faculty-based promotion is encouraged (posters, flyers, emails etc.) and is at the discretion of the faculty.

i. That the value of the faculty teaching awards be at the discretion of the faculty(ies) /SIS.

j. That the faculties and SIS organise appropriate ceremonies to congratulate winners of faculty teaching awards.

2.4. Funding for Faculty Teaching Awards

The Teaching and Learning Committee will contribute to faculty teaching awards, either annually or biennially depending upon faculty award cycles.

The Teaching and Learning Committee will annually review its contribution to the faculties and the SIS.

3. Process for Consideration for UWA and OLT Awards

3.1. The Awards Standing Committee

The Awards Standing Committee, established under the auspices of the University's Teaching and Learning Committee, has delegated responsibility for the consideration and selection of nominees to the Office for Learning and Teaching for the following national awards:

- Citations for Outstanding Contributions to Student Learning
- Awards for Teaching Excellence
- Awards for Programs That Enhance Learning
Membership of the Awards Standing Committee comprises

- Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education) as Chair;
- Academic Director, Education Strategies Office as Deputy Chair;
- Chair of the Board or nominee
- Director, Student Services
- Director, Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning
- Associate Director, Academic Policy Services
- President of the Guild
- The representative of the School of Indigenous Studies from the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee
- Up to five co-opted members, if required for balance or specific expertise

The Awards Standing Committee’s constitution is available on the web at http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/staff/committees/awards_standing_committee

3.2. Tasks of the Awards Standing Committee

The Awards Standing Committee has two primary tasks:

- Selection of nominees for the national teaching awards which includes submissions received from the faculties, the School of Indigenous Studies and other appropriate sections (Library, Central Administration, Student Guild, etc.).
- Selection from the UWA nominations to OLT of the winners for the "UWA Award for Excellence in Teaching". The UWA Awards are prestigious, presented annually at the University's Teaching Awards Ceremony and have no monetary value.

3.3. Faculty Nominations

a. Faculties are annually invited to select and forward their nominees for the national award nomination selection process administered by the Awards Standing Committee. The annual deadline will be 30th June. Some Faculties (FAHSS, Education, and Law) may adopt a collaborative and/or biennial awards process, in which case nominees should coordinate with the faculty awards process and may be collaborative and/or biennial.

b. Faculty awards processes should be formulated to ensure that nominees for the three OLT awards categories can be submitted as follows (this will apply to faculties nominating candidates either annually or biennially):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award category</th>
<th>Minimum No. of Faculty nominations</th>
<th>Maximum number of Faculty nominations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citations for Outstanding Contributions to Student Learning</td>
<td>ONE</td>
<td>TWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards for Teaching Excellence</td>
<td>ONE</td>
<td>ONE per relevant category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(For example, the Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences might nominate one nominee for the categories “Humanities and the Arts”, “Social Sciences”, “Early Career”, “Neville Bonner Award” and “Priority Area”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards for Programs that Enhance Learning</td>
<td>ONE</td>
<td>ONE per relevant category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The categories are:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widening Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational partnerships and collaborations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. The School of Indigenous Studies should submit one nominee, in any category, following their biennial award process.

d. Nominations should not be ranked by the Faculty.

e. Unsuccessful nominations can be resubmitted in following years.

f. Faculties are responsible for ensuring that submissions address relevant requirements for each award category. Requirements for each award category are attached (Appendix B).

4. University Teaching Awards Ceremony

The Centre for Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL) organises an annual University Teaching Awards Ceremony during Teaching Month (May). The Ceremony is intended to:

- congratulate, at the University level, winners of faculty/SIS teaching awards, the winner of the biennial Distinguished Teaching and Learning Award for Schools, and winners of Contributions to Student Learning Awards from non-faculty areas;
- announce the prestigious UWA Awards for Excellence in Teaching; and
- Announce UWA nominees to the OLT Awards.

CATL will also liaise with the faculties and Student Guild to actively promote and raise the profile of faculty and non-faculty teaching awards. For example, promotion material, articles, web information and links, etc.

The faculties and the SIS should forward a list of their award winners to CATL no later than end of March in each year, so that invitations to the University Teaching Awards Ceremony can be circulated.

5. Associated Teaching Awards and Recognition

5.1. Distinguished Teaching and Learning Award for Schools (Biennial Award)

The aim of the Distinguished Teaching and Learning Award for Schools is to encourage, promote and reward excellence in teaching and learning at the School level, to complement the UWA Awards for Excellence in Teaching at the individual level, and the Australian Learning and Teaching Council Awards for University Teaching at the national level. The award is offered on a biennial basis the next award is due in 2013.

More information with regard to this Award is available on the website at http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/page/74872

5.2. Awards for Contributions to Student Learning

The Awards for Contributions to Student Learning were introduced in 2010 to complement the Faculty teaching awards. These Awards are aimed at staff members (professional or academic) from a central organisational unit who make a significant contribution to student learning or enhancing the student learning experience. More information with regard to these Awards is available on the website at http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/page/74626.

6. Provision of Additional Support

6.1. Academic Policy Services

Academic Policy Services (APS) administers the central awards process, in consultation with the Awards Standing Committee. Nominees selected for the OLT will, in the first instance, be contacted by APS and will be guided through the administrative requirements, including established deadlines and final submission to the OLT. Further information can be found at Contact details are at http://www.aps.uwa.edu.au/
6.2. **Educational Strategies Office (ESO)**
The Educational Strategies Office provides support to the UWA nominees for OLT Awards with any fine-tuning of their written statement and advice regarding CVs, supporting material and references. Further information about the ESO may be obtained at: [http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/page/109212](http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/page/109212)

6.3. **UniPrint**
The University's UniPrint provides assistance, in liaison with Academic Policy Services, to the UWA nominees for OLT Awards with formatting and printing of their final submissions. Costs incurred regarding this assistance is provided by the University's Teaching and Learning Committee.

9 May 2012
Appendix A

Levels of Recognition and Reward of Excellence in Teaching and Teaching Support at UWA

Recognition and Reward at the University Level

- UWA OLT Nominees
- UWA Excellence in Teaching Awards
- Distinguished Teaching and Learning Award for Schools

Recognition and Reward at the Faculty or Division Level

- Faculty Teaching Awards
- Division (Non-Faculty) Awards
Appendix B

Recognition and Reward of Excellence in Teaching and Teaching Support at UWA – Requirements from Faculties and the SIS for each award category

Citations for Outstanding Contributions to Student Learning
Your submission for a Citation for Outstanding Contributions to Student Learning must include the following:

Synopsis
The synopsis must be written in the third person and is a requirement of the nomination. The word limit is strictly 100 words. It must include the 25 word citation. The remaining 75 words should describe the nominee’s contribution to student learning and engagement and the resulting impact on students.

Written Statement
The core element of a nomination for a citation is the written statement in which nominees describe their contribution to student learning. It is essential that nominees specifically address only one or two of the selection criteria, and provide evidence in the four-page written statement to support their claims in line with the chosen criteria(ion).

The written statement should have four components, presented in this order:
1. Proposed citation (maximum 25 words) describing the distinctive contribution of the nominee
2. Summary of particular contribution and specific context for this
3. Statement addressing chosen selection criteria(ion) (only one or two). The Selection Criteria are as follows:
   - Approaches to the support of learning and teaching that influence, motivate and inspire students to learn
   - Development of curricula, resources and services that reflect a command of the field
   - Approaches to assessment, feedback and learning support that foster independent learning
   - Respect and support for the development of students as individuals
   - Scholarly activities and service innovations that have influenced and enhanced learning and teaching

The nomination will be judged against the chosen criteria on the extent to which it shows evidence (in the written statement) that the nominees contribution has:

influenced student learning, engagement and/or the overall student experience, gained recognition from fellow staff, the institution, and/or the broader community; and been sustained over time.

NOTE: At the initial submission stage additional documentation such as references is not required.

Awards for Teaching Excellence
Your submission for an Award for Teaching Excellence must include the following:

Written Statement
The core element of a nomination for a Teaching Award is a written statement in which nominees describe their teaching activities and achievements, and specifically address each of the five selection criteria. The written statement is limited to eight A4 pages in total and should include all information that might be referred to in the submission.

The written statement should be presented under the following headings, in order:
1. Synopsis (150 - 200 word, in third person) The synopsis must cover the nominee’s teaching area or discipline, teaching experience, the particular focus of their teaching and teaching
methods, and their research/teaching interests. The synopsis must be written in the third person and is a requirement of the nomination. The word limit is strictly 150-200 words.

2. Overview
3. Selection criteria:
   The remainder of the written statement should be devoted to addressing the category in which it is nominated and each of the five criteria in turn. Evidence in support of the claims against these criteria must be provided. The selection criteria are as follows:
   - Approaches to learning and teaching that influence, motivate and inspire students to learn
   - Development of curricula and resources that reflect a command of the field
   - Approaches to assessment and feedback that foster independent learning
   - Respect and support for the development of students as individuals
   - Scholarly activities that have influenced and enhanced learning and teaching

**Curriculum Vitae**
A curriculum vitae should outline the nominee’s educational qualifications, employment history, teaching positions held and teaching experience. The curriculum vitae is limited to three A4 pages for nominations from individuals. Teams may allow for one additional page per team member.

**NOTE:** At the initial submission stage additional documentation (references and supporting material) is not required.

**Awards for Programs that Enhance Learning**
Your submission for an Award for Programs that Enhance Learning must include the following:

**Written Statement**
The core element of a nomination for a Program Award is a written statement describing the program, specifically addressing each of the four selection criteria. The written statement is limited to 12 A4 pages in total and should include all information that might be referred to in the submission. The written statement should be presented, in order, under the following headings:

1. Synopsis (350 - 400 words, in third person). The synopsis must cover a description of the program and its teaching areas, the program’s contribution to student learning and engagement, and the program’s impact for students. The synopsis must be written in the third person and is a requirement of the nomination. The word limit is strictly 350-400 words.

2. Selection criteria:
   The remainder of the written statement should be devoted to addressing the category in which it is nominated and each of the four criteria in turn. Evidence in support of the claims against these criteria must be provided. The selection criteria are listed as follows:
   a. Distinctiveness, coherence and clarity of purpose
   b. Influence on student learning
   c. Breadth of impact
   d. Concern for equity and diversity

**Curriculum Vitae**
A curriculum vitae should outline the nominee’s educational qualifications, employment history, teaching positions held and teaching experience. The curriculum vitae is limited to three A4 pages for nominations from individuals. Teams may allow for one additional page per team member.

**NOTE:** At the initial submission stage additional documentation (references and supporting material) is not required.
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THE CENTRE FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING & LEARNING (CATL)

The role of CATL is to support teachers in their practice with the aim of enhancing the quality of the student learning experience and the quality of the teacher’s experience at UWA. This support is provided within a framework of principles that guide teaching and learning activities at UWA. CATL provides teaching and learning resources and assistance with these resources.

In order to continue to support teachers and enhance the quality of the student learning and teaching experience, the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching Learning (CATL) seeks financial support from the University Teaching and Learning Committee to fund specific projects (as outlined below) throughout 2013.

An overview of each project is shown below together with a brief review of the success of each program in 2011 (or 2012) together with the budget bid for 2013.

**BUDGET SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>2011 expenditure ¹</th>
<th>Unspent T&amp;L funds carried forward to 2012 ²</th>
<th>2012 allocation from T&amp;L ³</th>
<th>2013 amount requested from T&amp;L ⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA T&amp;L Forum</td>
<td>$1,117</td>
<td>$3,465</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T&amp;L Month</td>
<td>$23,839</td>
<td>$1,114</td>
<td>$17,200</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISL Grants</td>
<td>$36,400</td>
<td>$12,508</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUT</td>
<td>$12,313</td>
<td>$31,245</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessional Staff Day</td>
<td>$2,246</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engl. Lg Support for Teaching Staff</td>
<td>Funded by DIF grant</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$75,914</strong></td>
<td><strong>$48,332</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$78,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Throughout this submission there are reference numbers of either ¹, ², ³ or ⁴ that refer to the corresponding number provided in this table.

**WA TEACHING AND LEARNING FORUM**

The WA Teaching and Learning Forum has been held annually since 1992 and is a cooperative venture between Curtin University, Edith Cowan University, Murdoch University and UWA. The Forum is recognised locally and nationally as an effective mechanism to bring practising academics together to demonstrate and discuss teaching. Since 1998 the Teaching and Learning Committee has provided funds to subsidise attendance for UWA staff and postgraduate students. The subsidy is currently 50% of the registration fee per attendee.

The Teaching and Learning Committee has previously provided $5,000 per year to CATL to administer the subsidy. Since 2010 this funding has been suspended due to underspending in previous years.
The unspent funds transferred from 2011 to 2012 are $3,465. In 2011, $1,117 was reimbursed to staff. To date, $1,840 has been reimbursed, leaving a balance as of May, 2012 of $1,625. As CATL continue to reimburse University staff for their attendance at the forum, it is anticipated that by the 31 December 2012 the remaining funds will be exhausted.

Therefore, it is proposed that a funding amount of $3,000 will be required in 2013.

**TEACHING AND LEARNING MONTH** Ref: F27211

Teaching and Learning Month was introduced by CATL in 2006 as a focus for teaching and learning at UWA. Its profile has increased since its inception and continued expansion is anticipated over future years.

Refer to 2011/2012 Teaching & Learning Month Brief Report – Attachment 1.

In 2010, additional funding was received to expand the T&L research Colloquium. Those funds were not fully expended as demand for the colloquium did not increase significantly. 2010 saw an overall increase in venue hire costs and catering costs associated with the awards ceremony. Funding received in 2011 of $24,000, together with the carry-over from 2010 and additional financial assistance for the Colloquium, catered for similar catering and venue price increases seen in 2010.

In 2012 Teaching and Learning Month is being held during semester time and, as such, has restricted the availability of venues on campus. This has resulted in a greater number of events taking place at the University Club and the Water Sports facility, for which the associated costs are higher than if the events took place in other venues around the University.

In 2013 we are anticipating similar restrictions in venue availability and therefore an increase in venue and catering costs, albeit less than the increase seen in 2011.

As such the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL) requests the amount of $25,000 for Teaching and Learning Month in 2013.

**IMPROVING STUDENT LEARNING GRANTS (ISL) SCHEME** Ref: F40098


Refer to ISL 2011 Annual Report – Attachment 2.

With support from the Teaching and Learning Committee, CATL piloted in 2006 and 2007 a small grants scheme – Improving Student Learning Grants Scheme. A review of the pilot indicated a strong demand for these small grants which are aimed at encouraging teachers to make practical and innovative changes to their units to improve current practice. Consequently, the Teaching and Learning Committee agreed that the Improving Student Learning Grants (ISL) Scheme be supported by the Committee on an ongoing basis from 2008 at a cost of $30,000 per annum.

Up to 10 x $3,000 grants are offered each year, a total of 63 grants have been awarded since the program’s inception in 2006.

Further information on the Scheme and its outcomes is available on the above website.
Over the 5 years of the scheme, expenditure has averaged slightly less than the funded amount (average of $24,500 spent per year). In 2011 more grants were funded using the carry forward with a total of $36,400 being paid. The interest in ISL grants is growing therefore our request is to continue to use the unspent funds from pre 2011 towards funding more grants in 2012 and 2013.

CATL requests $30,000 for the Improving Student Learning Grants Scheme in 2013.

**INTRODUCTION TO UNIVERSITY TEACHING (IUT)**

Introduction to University Teaching (IUT) is a program for postgraduate students at UWA, who are either new to teaching or looking to improve their teaching practice. Initially targeted primarily at students who were unsuccessful in applying for the Postgraduate Teaching Internship Scheme (PTIS), IUT is now open to all postgraduates and is a condensed version of the Foundations of University Teaching and Learning Programme. IUT began as a pilot program in 2005 and was has been funded by the Teaching and Learning Committee since 2006. Due to an unexpected fall in demand in 2011, CATL requested to use the funds carried forward from 2011 to fund the 2012 programme.

Full participants are currently paid $700 in two instalments, as a set standard rate for participation in the professional development component of the programme. Where the programme is oversubscribed, or where a participant does not have teaching commitments, students may be offered a non-funded place at the discretion of CATL. A maximum of 15 funded positions per semester were available in 2011 and 2012; up to 24 students can complete the programme at any one time.

In 2011, a total of 17 postgraduate students participated in IUT across two semesters. This was a significant decrease in numbers from 2010 (when 39 students participated), and possibly reflected at the time the increasing focus on short training sessions specifically for Sessional teaching staff. Anecdotal feedback from students suggests that the information about the workshop is not well publicised in their faculties, despite CATL circulating the information about the scheme to Schools and to postgraduate students. Students were again given the option of participating in the programme without payment, if sufficient teaching could not be secured. The programme was again offered as 3 x ½ days intensive at the beginning of the semester supported by a series of follow-ups throughout the semester. The programme is designed as an abbreviated version of the internship scheme, and continues to be well received by the postgraduate student participants. The programme was facilitated for the first time in 2011 by Professor Sid Nair. Rashmi Watson is the coordinator for 2012.

A report on IUT was provided to the Teaching and Learning Committee in June 2011, and for 2012 this programme is being funded using unspent funds from previous years. In 2011 CATL recommended that in 2012 the Teaching and Learning committee funding be allocated for the English Language Support for Teaching programme and the Sessional Staff Day in place of IUT. The total allocation for these two programmes was $7,000. Separate funding bids have now been requested for these projects.

IUT participants for Semester 1, 2012 has shown an increase in interest with 18 participants, 15 funded places.

A forecasted budget of 2012 and 2013 is outlined below. Based on the 2012 carry forward and 2013 forecasted expenditure, CATL are requesting $13,000 for 2013.
### 2012 Participant Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>On-Costs</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester 1</td>
<td>$41.70</td>
<td>15.745%</td>
<td>14 hrs</td>
<td>$675.72</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$10,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 2</td>
<td>$43.78</td>
<td>15.745%</td>
<td>14 hrs</td>
<td>$709.42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$10,641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(includes 2nd Sem 2012 salary increase of 5%)**

### 2012 Forecast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance carried forward from 2011</th>
<th>$31,245</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESS Participants Costs for Sem 1 and Sem 2 <em>(as above)</em></td>
<td>$20,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS Catering</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS Office expenses</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Expenditure balance <em>(rounded up)</em></td>
<td>$21,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected balance as at 31 Dec 2012</strong></td>
<td>$9,469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2013 Participant Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>On-Costs</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester 1</td>
<td>$43.78</td>
<td>15.745%</td>
<td>14 hrs</td>
<td>$709.42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$10,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 2</td>
<td>$43.78</td>
<td>15.745%</td>
<td>14 hrs</td>
<td>$709.42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$10,641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(includes 5% salary increase of Sept 2012)**

### 2013 forecast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORECAST balance carried forward from 2012</th>
<th>$9,469</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESS Participants costs for Sem 1 and Sem 2 <em>(as above)</em></td>
<td>$21,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS Catering</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS Office expenses</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net forecasted balance <em>(rounded up)</em></strong></td>
<td>$22,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected balance as at 31 Dec 2013</strong></td>
<td>$13,013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SESSIONAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT DAY

Since its inception in 2010, the Sessional Staff Development Day has been an overwhelming success with an average of 65 sessional staff members attending each year. Feedback from the day continues to be very positive and continues to be supported by the large number of sessional staff availing themselves of the day-long information sessions.

In both its inaugural year and the following year 2011, the day was funded from Teaching Quality Indicator (TQI) project funds that were set aside for the implementation of that project, which included providing professional development support for sessional staff. Those funds were exhausted in 2011.

In 2012 CATL requested funding from the T&L Committee to the amount of $3,000. The costs of running the day are largely associated with catering and providing resources to participants. In
2012 the total cost of the event so far is $3,130 although this does not yet include potential FBT liability for the event (if any) as it has not yet been calculated/determined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2011 Actual Costs</th>
<th>2012 Actual Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catering - UWA Guild</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$2,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pads &amp; Pens</td>
<td>$56</td>
<td>$43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts for presenters</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate Bags</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Fixed priced for 2013 by purchasing in bulk in 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional items for bags</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottled Water</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USB drives and lanyards</td>
<td></td>
<td>$760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Fixed priced for 2013 by purchasing in bulk in 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>$608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (excluding FBT)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,246</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,130</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding received</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td>-$130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CATL therefore requests $3,500 from the Teaching and Learning Committee to hold the Sessional Staff Development Day again in 2013. The additional funding will assist with covering ongoing increases associated with the provision of food and beverage on a Saturday when the event needs to be scheduled to cater for availability of sessional staff members.

The event will continue to be reviewed annually to ascertain its continued need and relevance.

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE SUPPORT FOR TEACHING STAFF** Ref: F31085

In 2010, CATL piloted a program with the Centre for English Language Teaching (CELT) to provide pronunciation and presentation skills workshops for teaching staff for whom English is not a first language. This program was initiated by CATL to meet a perceived need amongst teaching staff which has become increasingly apparent in recent years.

In order to provide qualified ELICOS teachers for the program, this programme must be funded, so that CELT can recover costs.

In 2010, schools and individuals paid for their participation in the programme. In 2011, funding was secured from the Diversity Initiatives Fund to run a 2nd pilot of the programme, this time running two separate programmes – one for professional staff and another specifically for teaching staff. The teaching staff programme was open to anyone with teaching responsibilities at UWA, including Sessional / tutoring staff. Refer to Diversity Initiatives Fund report – Attachment.

The programme was offered across four weeks and was taught by Tecla Daniele, a qualified ELICOS teacher with CELT. The programme was fully subscribed, with 14 teaching staff involved.
in the program. Feedback from the staff who undertook the programme was very positive with further informal feedback from staff confirming that the programme was very well received and useful to staff many of whom were keen to do more. This feedback echoes the response received to the 2010 pilot programme. Refer to the full Diversity Initiative Fund report in Attachment 3.

Although the carry forward amount for 2012 is $3,000 the funds remaining from the DIF grant has been put aside for OSDS to run a general programme in 2012. CATL therefore requests $4,000 to run the programme for teaching staff in 2013, to fund the cost of the CELT teachers. The programme will continue to be reviewed on annual basis.

**POSTGRADUATE TEACHING INTERNSHIP (PTIS) - Report on Progress**

The PTIS budget request has been tabled at this meeting following it's submission to the Grants and Schemes Standing Committee. Therefore this section only relates to the progress report for 2011.

Twenty two internship places were allocated in 2011. Of these, twenty one interns completed the programme in 2011, one intern is undertaking the programme part-time and will complete in 2012.

All interns who participated in the Teaching and Learning project component of the programme presented their findings to their colleagues, supervisors and members of the Internship Selection Committee at an invited session held at CATL in November, 2011. A number of the interns presented their work at the 2012 Teaching and Learning Forum held at Murdoch University on February 2nd-3rd 2012. Twenty one internship places have been allocated in 2012.

The professional development programme provided to the interns continues to be well received. Scores for all SPOT items in 2011 (Intensive 3-day introduction workshops) registered in a range between 4.00 – 4.73 (5 point scale). 2012 are yet to be advised.
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Teaching and Learning Month – Review and Expenditure

‘Teaching and Learning Month’ was introduced by CATL in 2006 as a focus for teaching and learning at UWA. The theme for 2011 was “Assessment and Feedback in the New Courses” and continued the focus on valuing teaching and tied in with the discussions around the New Courses.

Teaching and Learning Month activities are designed to:

- increase the general awareness of the importance that the University places on teaching and learning activities
- celebrate excellence in teaching through the recognition of award winners
- expose UWA staff to different perspectives through presentations by visiting distinguished teachers
- provide opportunities to generate intra-faculty discussion around faculty-specific issues of teaching and learning
- provide opportunities for inter-faculty collaborations and discussions around teaching and learning aspects of common interest
- provide opportunities for staff and students to participate together in out-of-class activities.

Feedback received in 2010 that audience attendance at events would be greater if held, at least in part, during the non-teaching period was facilitated during the 2011 Teaching and Learning Month when it was held in the 1st two weeks of June (30th May – 10th June). In 2012 the timing of Teaching and Learning Month reverted back to its slightly earlier timing and commenced Monday 7th May and run until Friday 18th May 2012. The timing of the 2013 Teaching & Learning Month has not been determined but will take into account feedback from 2012 events and availability of key venues and the Vice Chancellor. The scheduling of the T&L Month program will reviewed annually.

An evaluation of the 2011 event showed an increasing awareness of Teaching and Learning Month across the University campus and agreement across participants that the events are effective in promoting excellence in teaching and learning. The review also highlighted, amongst other factors the need to:

- change venue for the awards ceremony to a space that was more appropriate for the audience size and
- ensure that appropriate recognition was provided to the faculty winners at the awards ceremony

A full evaluation of Teaching and Learning Month in 2011 was presented to the Committee as part of the CATL annual report in July 2011 by Jacqueline Flowers. A similar detailed report will be presented to the Committee following the conclusion and analysis of the 2012 Teaching and Learning Month.

Events that are currently taking place for 2012 Teaching & Learning Month include -

| Monday 7 May | Hunters & Gatherers  
|             | *Academic and Skills Staff Focus Group and Public Open Forum* |
| Tuesday 8 May | Martin Dougiamis  
|             | *A flexible LMS developed on Educational Principles* |
| Wednesday 9 June | University Teaching Awards Ceremony  
|             | *University Club* |
| Thursday 10 June | UWA Teaching Awards Winners Get-Together  
|             | *Invitation only event encouraging networking and collaboration* |
| Friday 11 June | E-Learning Expo  |
| Monday 14 May | DVC Professor Pip Pattison  
|             | *Public Seminar* |
| Tuesday 15 May | DVC Professor Pip Pattison  
|             | *Invite only seminar* |
| Wednesday 17 May | Teaching & Learning Colloquium  
|             | *University Club* |
The full calendar of events is available at: http://www.catl.uwa.edu.au/resources/month

Research Colloquium

This one day conference showcases teaching and learning research and scholarship occurring across the University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentations</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2009 and 2010 attendance at the colloquium was well populated and received very positive feedback from participants. In 2011, submissions to give presentations at the event were slightly less than in previous years and despite initial figures, attendance was comparable to the previous year. Attendance this year was expected to be slightly lower than in previous years due to the timing of colloquium taking place during semester teaching time. However, with the slightly larger than normal program for 2012 together with the keynote address by the Vice Chancellor, initial attendance numbers would indicate that the colloquium will achieve similar attendance numbers as in previous years. The colloquium’s continued relevance will be reviewed annually as part of the T&L Month evaluation.

From 2011 the funding for the Teaching and Learning Research Colloquium was incorporated into the full cost of Teaching and Learning Month events and as such increased the amount of funding requested from the Teaching and Learning Committee.

Teaching Awards

The fifth annual Teaching Awards Ceremony was held on 9th May 2012. At this annual event, outstanding teachers at the University are recognised by their peers with the announcement of several awards and recognition of other successes in teaching and learning. Awards announced include:

- 2012 University Teaching Awards
- 2012 Faculty teaching award winners (announced to the University community by each Faculty Dean)
- 2012 UWA Teaching Fellows
- Recognition of 2011 ALTC award winners and announcement of the 2012 AAUT nominees
- 2011 Postgraduate Teaching Interns (PTIS) Certificate presentation

In 2012 the Vice Chancellor’s Invitational Address was given by Ms Kerry Sanderson AO. The ceremony is traditionally followed by a reception to facilitate collegiality and provide an informal way of celebrating the success of the awardees and those nominated. It is intended that this prestigious celebration and acknowledgement of excellence in teaching continue as a major component of Teaching and Learning Month for 2013.

Distinguished Visiting Teacher Workshops

Each year, CATL uses Teaching and Learning Month events to attract distinguished visiting teachers to UWA. Previous distinguished visiting teachers include Adjunct Professor Lynne Hunt and Professor Keithia Wilson from Griffith University.

In 2012 CATL brought Professor Pip Pattison, DVC (A) from the University of Melbourne to UWA to undertake two workshops during Teaching and Learning Month. The first was the invitational seminar to have a round table discussion about the introduction of new course at the University of Melbourne. The second was a public seminar titled “Students’ experiences of the new curriculum at the University of Melbourne”.

DVTF workshops consistently receive very high levels of feedback from participants, and are an integral part of Teaching and Learning Month.
In 2011, funds provided by the Teaching and Learning Committee were expended as follows:

Significant cost increases occurred in 2010 due to increased venue hire and catering costs for the award ceremony that were seen again in 2011. Therefore the funding received from the T&L Committee in 2011 of $24,000 was to offset some of these increased costs.

In 2010, additional funding was received to expand the T&L research colloquium. Those funds were not fully expended as demand for the colloquium did not increase significantly. In 2011 CATL requested to retain unspent funds from 2010 to offset the expected over-spend of 2011 funds. Unfortunately the expenditure at the end of 2011 was higher than anticipated and as such the carry-over to 2012 was less than previously anticipated. Funding received in 2012 of $17,200 will not be sufficient to cover the costs associated with the running of the 2012 Teaching and Learning Month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>2011 Actual Costs</th>
<th>2012 Estimated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertising &amp; Stationery</td>
<td>$2,218</td>
<td>$925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Hypothetical</td>
<td>$1,427</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Professor</td>
<td>$831</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor and accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Event</td>
<td>$235</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Visiting Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Visiting Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invite only seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 UWA Award Winners</td>
<td></td>
<td>$700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Colloquium</td>
<td>$4,481</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes catering, AV, venue costs etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Events</td>
<td>$893</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room hire, AV, photography, certificate framing</td>
<td>$2,860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Awards Reception</td>
<td>$12,747</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including FBT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 e-Learning Expo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts for speakers &amp; presenters &amp; Student Sound Bit winners</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBT Charges (for all events)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL expenditure</td>
<td>$25,692</td>
<td>$26,475 estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project balance brought forward</td>
<td>(-$773)</td>
<td>(-$225)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Received from TLC</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$17,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus $2,240 contribution for colloquium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining funds to carry forward</td>
<td>(-$225)</td>
<td>(-$9,500)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are not able to provide final costs associated with 2012 Teaching and Learning Month as a number of invoices are outstanding and the FBT component is still to be determined.
The Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning therefore requests the return to funding of the full amount of $25,000 as previously allocated for Teaching and Learning Month, in 2013.
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The Improving Student Learning Grants Scheme was introduced in semester 1, 2006 as an initiative of the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning. The broad aim of the scheme is to improve the quality of the student learning experience at UWA through the initiation of curriculum revision and/or innovation in teaching and learning. It is expected that the revision/innovation will be planned to bring immediate benefit to students, as well as having potential longer-term benefit for the wider university teaching community. In addition, the program encourages engagement by staff in the scholarship of teaching and learning by requiring successful applicants to present the project outcomes in a public forum.

The scheme provides small grants, up to $3000, to encourage teachers to make practical changes to their units to improve current practice. There are no strict guidelines on what ‘changes’ might qualify, although the proposal must fall within the aims of the grants program and will ideally represent an inventive approach to teaching, with positive and identifiable impacts for student learning. This program is distinct from other teaching and learning grants programs in that these grants are intended to have immediate outcomes and are expected be implemented within a semester.

Applications: ISL Applications are called for twice a year. Applicants have the option of submitting a brief Expression of Interest paper to receive feedback on their project prior to submitting a full application.

Table 1 shows the number of expressions of interest, full applications, and successful applications since the last annual report in May 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>No. of expressions of interest</th>
<th>Total No. of full applications</th>
<th>No. of successful applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1, 2011</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2, 2011</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a significant additional interest in the scheme in the Semester 1, 2011 round of grants. It is conjectured that this coincided with the considerable amount of curriculum development work taking place in 2011 in preparation for the introduction of the New Courses in 2012. The Centre plans to use unspent funds from previous years of the scheme to support additional grants where appropriate in 2012 and 2013. For Semester 1, 2012 we have received 15 expression of interest applications.

Semester 1, 2012 grants are being finalised as at the writing of this report, and will be published on the CATL website at [http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/staff/funding/isl-grants](http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/staff/funding/isl-grants) in June.

Selection: In 2011, the selection committee comprised of:

- As Chair: Director, CATL or nominee (Professor Denise Chalmers)
- One other CATL academic staff member (Asst/Prof Shannon Johnston)
- One external member – usually a CATLyst (Assoc/Prof Eileen Thompson)
- ISL grants executive officer (Ms Jacqueline Flowers)
Selection:
In 2012, the selection committee comprised of:
- As Chair: Director, CATL or nominee (Professor Denise Chalmers)
- One other CATL academic staff member (Asst/Prof Rashmi Watson)
- One external member – (Assoc/Prof Natalie Skead)
- ISL grants executive officer (Mrs Annette Stewart)

Dissemination and Reporting:
Reports from completed projects are available on the CATL website http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/staff/funding/isl-grants/2011. Grant reports are also occasionally published in the Centre’s occasional publication, CATLyst, and recipients are encouraged to present their results at the WA Teaching and Learning Forum, and as part of UWA’s Teaching and Learning month.

Since the schemes inception, twelve recipients have presented their findings at the annual WA Teaching and Learning Forum; eleven during Teaching and Learning month activities (including the Teaching and Learning research colloquium); four to a faculty or school seminar; one recipient has presented their findings at an external conference, and two have published their results in a journal.

In 2011 Kellie Bennett, School of Psychology had a paper published resulting from work that was piloted through a CATL Improving Student Learning grant awarded to her in 2008 and CATL was mentioned in the acknowledgment.


Overall, to the end of 2009, approximately 64% of grant recipients have undertaken some sort of dissemination activity, and 7 grant recipients are yet to submit their final reports (3 of these recipients are no longer working for UWA). The Centre is actively working with grant recipients to increase the dissemination of grant outcomes beyond the publication of the final report.

Review of ISL in 2011/2012
In 2011 the purpose, relevance and impact of the ISL grant scheme was reviewed. This review has been tabled at this meeting.

Conclusion:
The Improving Student Learning Grants Scheme serves a useful purpose in supporting the initiative of UWA teachers to be innovative and make improvements to their units. A strength of this scheme over many other schemes aimed at improving learning and the student experience is that it aims to provide resources that lead to change in the very short-term. A full list of grant recipients is attached.

Annette Stewart
CATL
May 2012
Improving Student Learning Grants – Successful Applicants

Semester 1, 2006

Professor Lyn Abbott, Earth & Geographical Sciences $2444: Introducing ‘deep learning’ concepts to Level 1 students as a means of integrating teaching across discipline areas covered in ENVT 1102 Ecosystems Processes [Report Received]

Justine Leavy, Population Health $2835: The Project Management ‘Tool Box’ for Health Science Students [Report Received]

Dr Chris McDonald, Computer Science & Software Engineering $1700: Increasing student engagement in large lecture using wireless laptops

Harriet Mills, Animal Biology $1103: Replacing case studies with real life in the teaching of wildlife management - does it improve learning outcomes? [Report Received]

Dr Brad Stappenbelt, Oil & Gas Engineering $3000: Improving the communication skills of engineering students through the implementation of an English language communication stream within the professional development component of the degree [Report Received]

Semester 2, 2006

Dr Ann Tarca, Economics and Commerce $2974: ACCT 3321 - Developing online student learning resources [Report Received]

Dr Mark Pegrum, Graduate School of Education, $2566: Improving pre-service teachers’ familiarity with the changing demands of West Australian TESOL classrooms [Report Received]

Dr Kym Guelfi, Human Movement and Exercise Science, $2996.40: Implementation of a Health Risk Assessment Program by Level 3 Human Movement and Exercise Science students [Report Received]

Semester 1, 2007

Dr Andre Luiten, Faculty of Life and Physical Sciences $2,830: Evaluating electronic clickers in physics teaching [Report Received]

Dr Brad Stappenbelt, Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Mathematics $2,830: Addressing student learning-style related study difficulties through learning skills education in the professional development component of the engineering degree [Report Received]

Dr Nancy Longnecker, Faculty of Life and Physical Sciences $1,560: Resources to teach students to use Nvu, Open Source software for website development [Report Received]

Dr Peter Arthur, Faculty of Life and Physical Sciences $2,870: Introducing contemporary laboratory practicals to engage students in research methodology currently emerging in the life sciences and emphasize the relevance of classroom concepts [Report Received]

Semester 2, 2007

Coral Pepper, Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences, $2500: Development of a new handbook to assist the implementation of restructuring a level 1 unit to include problem-based learning [Report Received]

Dr Gillian Cleary, Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences, $2970: Basic life support for year 2 medical Students [Report Received]
Dr Zarrin Siddiqui, Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences, $2533: Towards authentic assessment [Report Received]

Semester 1, 2008

Dr Brad Stappenbelt, Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Mathematics, $3000: Online Plagiarism Detection as a Student Learning Tool for Written Assignment Work in Engineering

Dr Iris Ludewig-Rohwer, Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, $3000: Enhancing Communication Skills Through Online Role-Plays in Language Classes [Report Received]

Dr Kellie Bennett, Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences, $3000: The Development of Digital Film Resources to Support the Teaching of Doctor-Patient Communication and Consultation [Report Received]

Dr Mary Gee, Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences, $3000: Establishing an On-Line Rock and Mineral Collection [Report Received]

Ms Nicole Crawford, Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, $3000: Evaluation of Arts IRIS [Report Received]

Semester 2, 2008

Stuart Bunt, Anatomy and Human Biology $3000: Enhancement of CD Internal Mental Modelling in the Teaching of Anatomy [Report Received]

John Henderson, Humanities $3000: Interactive Phonetics Training [Report Received]

Jill Howieson, Law $3000: Embedding Interest-Based Negotiation Theory and Skills in Contract Law [Report Received]

Tama Leaver, Social and Cultural Studies $3000: Development of a Comprehensive Resource Giving Understandable Details of Copyright and Other Legal Issues which Students Encounter when Creating Work for, or Transferring Work to, the World Outside of Education

Michael Renton, Plant Biology $3000: Understanding Ecological Population Dynamics Using Interactive Computer Simulations [Report Received]

Semester 1, 2009

Ann Tarca, UWA Business School $3000: Improving the Quality of Student Learning: Introducing Team-Based Learning (TBL) in a Large Undergraduate Class [Report Received]

Alexandra Ludewig, Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences $3000: Improving student learning in advanced languages courses through a structured peer-assisted study programme involving international students at UWA [Report Received]

Rachel Cardell-Oliver, Computer Science and Software Engineering $3000: Automatic, Formative Assessment Tools for Timely Feedback to Support Student Learning in Software Engineering and Programming Units [Report Received]

Ryan Lowe, Earth and Environment $3000: Enhancing Student Learning in Coastal Science using Field-Based Activities [Report Received]

Jasmine Henry, Electrical, Electronic and Computer Engineering $3000: Development of an Online Laboratory Assistant [Report Received]
Semester 2, 2009

Luis Filgueira, Anatomy & Human Biology $3000: Peer Teaching, Learning and Assessment in Large Science Classes [Report Received]

John Kinder, Humanities $2700: Web-Based Template for Ongoing use of Authentic Learning Materials in Language Teaching

Herbert Ho Ching Iu, Electrical, Electronic and Computer Engineering $3000: Analogue Simulators for Hands-On Learning in the Laboratory [Report Received]

Emma Bartle, Chemistry $3650: Improving the Overall learning Experience of Students in First Year Chemistry

Zaza Lyons, Psychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences, $2363: Development of Teaching Resources to Improve Psychiatric History Taking [Report Received]

Semester 1, 2010

Dominique Blache, Plant Biology $2792: Future Farm Blog [Report Received]

Steve Johnson & Joshua Reynolds, CELT $3000: Introduction of PebblePad ePortfolio system into CELT’s Academic English and Study Skills Bridging Course [Report Received]

Barbara Loessl, Psychiatry & Clinical Neurosciences, $3000: Motivational Interviewing skills for future medical practitioners – a self learning package

Anna Parker & Helen Wilcox, $3000: Development of clinical examination videos of the major body systems for use by medical students and their teachers

Semester 2, 2010

Campbell Thomson, Research Services, $3,000: Program in Animal Welfare and Ethics in Science (PAWES) [Report Received]

Helen Keen, Medicine and Pharmacology, $3,000: Development and Piloting of a teaching OSCE to improve the student experience in the UWA Musculoskeletal Medicine Curriculum [Report Received]

Steve Su, Mathematics and Statistics, $2,552: Designing and implementing anime videos to illustrate the concepts of confidence interval and p-values in statistics [Report Received]

David Kandiah, MDHS Education Centre, $2,922: Web-Based Rheumatology Clinical Scenarios [Report Received]

Semester 1, 2011

Lisa Bell, Faculty of Education, $3,000. "Developing a simulation resource utilising problem-based learning scenarios to bridge the theory-praxis gap in preservice teacher education".

Nazim Khan, School of Mathematics and Statistics, $3,000. "Improving Student Learning through an integrated tutorial and laboratory class".

Marit Kragt, School of Agricultural and Resource Economics, $3,000. "Bringing real world decision support into Management Decision Tools".
Dianne Massoudi, UWA Business School, $3,000. “Web based interactive short answer inventory questions for ACCT1101 Financial Accounting students”.

Nicola Mitchell, School of Animal Biology, $3,000. "Developing an online journal for student research on the frontiers of biology”.

Amin Mugera, School of Agriculture and Resource Economics, $600. Improving Students’ Learning of Agricultural Marketing using Simulation Games [Report Received]

Marvin Wee and Sirimon Treepongkaruna, UWA Business School, $3,000. Enquiry-based Learning versus Teacher-centred Learning: Evidence from a simulated trading game [Report Received]

Semester 2, 2011

Chantal Bourgault, Kati Tonkin and Mark Pegrum, School of Social and Cultural Studies, $3,000. “Blogging from Stuttgart: Improving and Evaluating Cultural Competence Through Student Exchange”.

James Fogarty, School of Agricultural and Resource Economics, $700. “Screen capture recordings for data analysis in the natural sciences”.

Marco Ghisalberti and Nicole Jones, School of Environmental Systems Engineering, $2,900. “Experimental investigations in fluid mechanics”.

Ian McArthur, School of Physics, $3,000. Improving Student Laboratory Classes by Using Videos Tailored to our Specific experience

Kati Tonkin and Bonnie Thomas, School of Humanities, $2,950. “Developing a System of Online Testing for Beginners Language Units”.

Eileen Webb and Aviva Freilich, Faculty of Law, $2,250. “Using consumer credit case studies to enhance student learning”.

Helen Wright, Pam Nicol and Sandra Carr, School of Paediatrics and Child Health, $3,000. Peer Assisted Learning (PAL) in Paediatrics and Child Health
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English Language Support for Teaching Staff

Name of Initiative/Project: English Language Support for Teaching Staff

Faculty/School/Unit: Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL)

Project Co-ordinator: Denise Chalmers  Phone no: 6488 2603
E-mail: denise.chalmers@uwa.edu.au

Priority Area(s) / Target Group(s): Staff and students from culturally diverse backgrounds

Progress against Objectives:

The objective of this project was to provide relevant, tailored oral communication language support for UWA teaching staff from non-English speaking backgrounds (NESB). Teaching staff who speak with a strong accent or who are not confident in their oral communication with other staff and students have a unique set of challenges in the classroom and in supporting their students. Part of CATL’s ongoing commitment to providing teaching and learning development to UWA staff is to provide tailored support for all staff, many of whom have a variety of cultural and language backgrounds.

This project built on significant work already carried out by CATL to support teachers from Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CALD) backgrounds, and contributed to a comprehensive suite of tailored programmes providing for the needs of different cohorts of new and experienced teachers at UWA. In 2010, CATL piloted a programme in collaboration with the Centre for English Language Teaching (CELT) to provide English language oral communication support for UWA staff, and in 2009 and 2010 CATL piloted a programme for international postgraduate students who were teaching, supported through a DIF grant.

CATL offered the English Language Support for Teaching Programme in June / July 2011, across four weeks, at no charge to the participants and taught by Tecla Daniele, a qualified ELICOS teacher with CELT. The programme was fully subscribed, with 14 teaching staff involved in the program. Feedback from the staff who undertook the programme was very positive (see workshop feedback results below), with further informal feedback from staff confirming that the programme was very well received and useful to staff many of whom were keen to do more. This feedback echoes the response received to the 2010 pilot programme.
Table 1: Workshop Feedback Results for the programme ‘English Language Support for Teaching Staff 2011’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Language Support For Teaching Staff 17,24/06 &amp; 1,8/07 - 7 respondents</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>% Agreement</th>
<th>% Dis-agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The facilitator explained important concepts/ideas and answered questions in ways that I could understand.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitator stimulated my interest in the topic.</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was encouraged to participate in the workshop and/or online activities.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitator was enthusiastic about the topic.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate teaching techniques were used by the facilitator to enhance my development.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitator was well prepared.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitator treated me with respect.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the facilitator effectively supported my learning.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workshop registration process was well organized.</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information I received about the workshop was accurate.</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content will be useful to me in the future.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials/handouts (where provided) were easy to follow.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend this workshop to others</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the success of the English Language Support for Teaching Staff programme in 2011, CATL requested ongoing funds from the UWA Teaching and Learning Committee to incorporate the programme into the Centre’s annual calendar of workshops. The Teaching and Learning Committee has granted this funding for 2012 ensuring that the programme will run again.

Funding was also received for CATL to work with Organisational and Staff Development Services (OSDS) to offer an equivalent course to professional staff again, given the popularity of the original 2010 pilot with this staff cohort. Despite CATL’s best efforts, to date this professional staff programme through OSDS was not taught in 2011.

The response received for our pilot workshops indicates that there is a need for both specific T&L training (best provided in a separate program to support teachers as they work with their students) and a general English language support for all staff. The priority for CATL is to provide support in teaching and learning, and after liaison with OSDS it was agreed that they would organise the programme for professional staff, utilising teachers from CELT. The funding is still available to OSDS & CELT to teach this programme in Semester 2, 2012 if this is able to be organised.

**Outcomes**

CATL, in collaboration with CELT, successfully ran the programme “English Language Support for Teaching Staff” in 2011

Funding for the programme to continue in 2012 has been secured from the T&L Committee
Feedback has been sought and received from the 2011 participants and provided to the CELT facilitator for further refinement of the programme.

Staff participating in the programme have self-reported positive outcomes for their English language skills for teaching purposes (presentation, pronunciation and conversation) Awareness of the existence of this type of support through CATL & CELT is increasing, as evidenced by the programme being fully subscribed.

Over time, it is expected that students of these teachers will benefit from enhancing the teaching skills of teachers whose first language is not English and who have been identified through student evaluation comments or who self-identify as needing English language and accent reduction support.

**Budget / Expenditure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Expenditure as at 19/12/11</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CELT Facilitator</td>
<td>$1760</td>
<td>Fee charged by CELT for cost of facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATL administrative support</td>
<td>$481</td>
<td>15hrs * Lvl 5 admin officer incl. oncosts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous (printing etc.)</td>
<td>In Kind by CATL &amp; CELT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2241</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funds Remaining:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2359</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Funds granted were for 2 programmes to be taught in 2011 (T&L and professional); only 1 programme has been taught to date.

The remaining funds will be used to run an addition professional staff programme in 2012 for another academic teaching cohort.
Bachelor of Philosophy Undergraduate Research Training (BURT)

In 2012, UWA commenced a new degree program, the Bachelor of Philosophy (BPhil). The degree provides research training to 42 of Western Australia’s highest achieving school leavers. The only unit offered for credit with the first year of the degree is offered in semester one. It contains a summer residence, guest lectures and a Bphil undergraduate research training unit (BURT).

The primary aim of BURT is to introduce the students to the basics of academic research and help them to develop skills and attitudes and ways of thinking like researchers, components that are transferable to discipline-specific contexts. With their peers, they practice and develop team-based and project management skills to carry out and complete a research project involving the vital steps of planning, data collection and analysis, and reporting of their findings in both written and oral formats.

Funding

The UWA, T&L committee made available $5000 for staff salaries to pay for the development and remodeling of the BURT program.

BURT was modeled on the successful Undergraduate Learning and Teaching Research Internship Scheme (ULTRIS) conducted in 2009 and 2010.

The fundamental differences between ULTRIS and BURT are:

- 42 students in Burt compared with 15 students in ULTRIS
- School leavers in Burt compared with 2nd, 3rd or older students in ULTRIS
- Group work in Burt compared with individual projects in ULTRIS
- Unit for credit in BURT compared with a co-curricular activity for ULTRIS
- Unit regulations abided by in BURT compared with no unit regulations in ULTRIS.
  - Eg structured assessment in BURT, with moderation and unit rules. No assessment in ULTRIS.

Request for Funding for 2013

$5000 for ongoing evaluation and development of BURT.

Kind regards

Sally Sandover
Academic Director
Educational Strategies Office
10 May 2012

File Ref: F12152

TO: T&L Committee
RE: OLT Seeding Grants - Annual Report

**OLT Seed grants funding**

UWA, is offering two rounds of seeding grants (Office of Learning and Teaching (OLT) Seed funding grants) in 2012. The closing date for round one was April the 5th. Round two grants close in August 2012. The grants are available to provide funding to staff intending to apply for an OLT national grant (Innovation and Development, Strategic Priorities, Seed projects, Leadership, Extension Grants or Special Initiatives grants) within the following 18 months.

The seed funding will enable staff to be more competitive in applying for OLT grants. Examples of potential areas for seeding grants are: to identify whether a project idea is sustainable as an OLT grant, to complete a literature review, to complete a scoping exercise, etc. Applicants must consider evaluation and dissemination processes when they complete their grant and present a final report. The seeding funds may be used to develop a robust evaluation process for inclusion within the OLT application.

Successful seed funding grant applicants will be expected to communicate with the Educational Strategies Office during the period of the grant, concerning progress towards a national OLT grant application.

**2012 - Round One, successful applications.**

Three applications were selected for Seeding grants in the first round of 2012. The successful applicant, school, project title and amount awarded are displayed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>School of Psychiatry &amp; Clinical Neurosciences</th>
<th>Patient feedback to promote empathy in dental students: an educational intervention</th>
<th>$4978</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assoc-Professor Kellie Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor Peter Whipp</td>
<td>Science Teaching Office</td>
<td>Multifaceted Approach to Learning</td>
<td>$5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Sirimon Treepongkaruna</td>
<td>UWA Business School</td>
<td>Improving student learning in finance through financial market simulations across different time zones</td>
<td>$5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surplus grant money will be rolled over to round two.
Request for grant funding for 2013

We wish to request $50,000 for two rounds of grants for 2013. The seeding grants provide a pathway to national OLT grant applications. In addition, the projects are of significant benefit to Teaching and Learning at UWA.

Kind regards

Sally Sandover
Academic Director
Educational Strategies Office
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A Review of the Improving Student Learning Grants

Report prepared and completed by Jacqueline Flowers (Business Manager, CATL 2011, *maternity leave in 2012), and Rashmi Watson (Assistant Professor), Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL), UWA. August, 2011 to May, 2012.

Objectives

- To review the Improving Student Learning Grant (ISL) scheme and recommend any changes to the scheme to ensure its continued relevance and effectiveness
- To ensure that the outcomes of ISL Grant projects are meeting the schemes objectives

Intended Outcomes

- Review and report to provide a comprehensive overview of the ISL scheme since its inception, feedback from participants in the scheme, and commendations, implications and recommendations for approval by the Teaching and Learning Committee
- Engagement of past ISL grant recipients in the process of reviewing the scheme, and in teaching and learning issues more widely in the University

Terms of reference and mechanism

This review investigated:

- the ongoing relevance of the broad aims of the scheme
- whether the ISL scheme succeeds in its implicit role of seed funding
- the relevance and success of outcomes from funded projects
- whether funded projects have been successfully disseminated to the UWA community
- whether funded projects have been sustainable, and whether the innovations are still in use
- whether staff involvement in an ISL grant leads to further involvement in the scholarship of teaching
- the relationship of ISL grants to other T&L grant schemes within the University
- the appropriateness of the ISL guidelines & criteria
- the appropriateness of the number and size of grants offered

The review will achieve the above through the following mechanisms:

- Focus groups with the following ISL stakeholders: past and present members of the ISL selection committee & ISL grant recipients & their Heads of School; Teaching and Learning Committee members
- Audit of Review Reports
- Audit of CATL ISL database re: dissemination activities
- Independent review of guidelines, advertising and forms
- Online survey (administered via survey Monkey)
- Discussion with key staff at CATL who have been directly involved with ISL Grants

Governance and Timelines

The Director, CATL sponsored the review, and led its activities. The review was undertaken by Jacqueline Flowers (CATL Business Manager and ISL Executive Officer) and Dr Rashmi Watson (Assistant Professor, Higher Education, CATL). The current ISL selection committee served as an informal reference group for the review, providing advice and support as required. The review took place in the second half of 2011, with a report and recommendations prepared to inform the June (budget) UWA Teaching and Learning Committee meeting in 2012.

Report Data Sources

The following summary and recommendations are compiled from data analysed from:

- Improving Student Learning Grant (ISL) statistical information maintained on CATL file since 2006 *Full data available via CATL drive (access limited to CATL staff)
- An online survey (via Survey Monkey) to review the ISL sent to all ISL (109) applicants since 2006 (August to end October, 2011) with a 50% response rate (Ethics Approval no. RA/4/1/4996) *Full data available via CATL drive
• Focus Group (FG) sessions (x3) held between October and November, 2011 (conducted by Rashmi Watson). The total number of staff that attended=11)
  o *Full data available via CATL drive
• Discussion with CATL staff directly involved with ISL Grants

About the Improving Student Learning (ISL) Grants Scheme

Background

The ISL grants commenced in 2006 at UWA through the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL), with the purpose of providing small grants to encourage academic staff to consider making practical changes to their units to improve current practice with immediate outcomes for teaching and learning (i.e. the strategy will take effect within a semester). A call for applications will be made each semester for projects to be undertaken in units being taught in the subsequent semester. It is planned to award funding for three or four projects each semester to a maximum of $3000 each. However, in this first round, more grants may be awarded depending on the number and quality of applications. A committee chaired by the Director of CATL evaluates the applications and award the grants. The ISL grants program is initially funded for one year.

Aims of the Grants Program

The broad aim of the Improving Student Learning Grants Program is to improve the quality of the student learning experience at UWA through the initiation of curriculum revision and/or innovation in teaching and learning. It is expected that the revision/innovation will be planned to bring immediate benefit to students, as well as having potential longer-term benefit for the wider university teaching community. In addition, the program encourages engagement by staff in the scholarship of teaching and learning by requiring successful applicants to present the project outcomes in a public forum.

Eligibility

The Program is open to all staff (individuals or small teams) involved in teaching including full-time, part-time, sessional and affiliated staff (including postgraduate students). In categories other than ongoing staff, Heads of School must indicate that the applicant will be employed in teaching at UWA during the period of the grant.
Essential Criteria

Proposals are assessed on the extent to which the project addresses Teaching and Learning Priorities in the Operational Priorities Plan and focuses on the following:

- the innovation or strategy is integral to the total learning process for the unit or units
- the innovation or strategy can be reasonably expected to have a positive impact on student learning outcomes in the short term as well as lasting benefits for the unit/s or area
- potential for benefit to the wider university teaching community
- an achievable plan of action in a short timeframe i.e. usually one semester, but over a maximum of one academic year
- a process to disseminate the project outcomes
- a process to monitor and evaluate the project outcomes

Application process

A call for applications is made each semester for projects to be undertaken in units being taught in the subsequent semester. Projects are to be funded in sufficient time for the innovation or strategy to be incorporated in planning for the next semester. Full details and applications must be made on the form available at [http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/staff/funding/isl-grants](http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/staff/funding/isl-grants) on the UWA web page.

Applicants provide full details of the project, address the essential criteria and include a realistic budget and cost justification. The application is restricted to two pages (plus budget). One person must be nominated as the project co-ordinator and all correspondence will be with that person. Any on-going cost implications beyond the duration of the project should be accommodated within the resources of the applicant’s School/Faculty.

Applicants should seek input from their Faculty Associate Dean (Teaching & Learning) who may provide assistance in developing the project and seeking ways of embedding the project outcomes within the faculty and across faculties. CATL will liaise with grant recipients to monitor progress and provide assistance when appropriate. A short report (max. 500 words plus budget acquittal statement, with unused funds returned to CATL) must be submitted to CATL within two months of completion of the project. The report should include how the outcomes of the project have been/will be disseminated. To promote the scholarship of teaching and learning, grant recipients are encouraged to present their projects at the annual
Teaching and Learning Forum (WA combined universities event), other public forum/conference or in UWA Teaching Month, or a short article for CATL News or other teaching and learning publication.

**The report has been divided into the following sections:**

*Section 1: Demographic Information*

*Section 2: Administrative Review (Promotion & Awareness, Applications and Expressions of Interest)*

*Section 3: Dissemination*

*Section 4: Impact on Teaching and Learning*

**Section 1: Demographics of ISL recipients 2006-2011 - ISL Application numbers**

In the following section, a summary of the number of ISL applications received in every semester from 2006 has been provided (see Tables 1, 2, 3 and Figure 1). In addition, the number of applications received, the amounts requested, the number of projects funded and the total amount funded has been provided. Since 2008, Expressions of Interest (EoI) for ISL applicants were introduced; this data is reflected in Table 2 and 3. As shown in Tables 1, 2 and 3, the number of funded projects has remained constant to remain within the funding range. Between 2006-2010, 46% of males were ISL grant recipients and 58% female. Of those who responded to the online survey in 2011, 39% were male and 61% were female. The online survey (2011) data revealed that 60% of respondents were female and almost 50% of respondents indicated they had worked at UWA for less than 5 years.

The data highlights the number of applications per semester exceeds the number that can be funded (applications exceed the available funding by 50-90 per cent), indicating a positive response to the call for the ISL applications. To further highlight this point, data received via the online survey (via an open invitation to UWA academic staff members who have previously applied for an ISL grant) showed that 62% of respondents who had applied were successful and that 38% of respondents were unsuccessful in securing an ISL grant (see Figure 1). The reasons given by the 44% who stated they would not apply again were due to
the following reasons (verbatim): ‘small amount of funds; ‘less optimistic’; ‘require more Uni support for the great ideas I have to support and promote student learning’; ‘A lot of effort for little return at this stage’; ‘Too much paperwork, not enough of a return’; ‘Process seems not be clear as to what can be done and what can’t be’; ‘it’s a fair bit of work for a small amount of money’; ‘ISL grants appear to be awarded to projects with a limited focus with respect to improving student learning’ and ‘as long as the criteria for the grant were made clearer’. These comments highlight the importance of continuing to promote the benefits and the achievements of the Grants so that those who apply and are not successful are not discouraged from applying in the future.

In Table 3, a review of the number of successful and unsuccessful response data is reported based on applicants who completed an Expression of Interest form (available from 2008). It is clear from this data that those who complete an EoI prior to a full application have a higher success rate.

Table 1. Summary of applications 2006 – 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Number of full applications</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Projects Funded</th>
<th>Amount Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/2006</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>76,883</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2006</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42,692</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2007</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30,791</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2007</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16,979</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2008</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38,595</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2008</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41,217</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2009</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2009</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17,713</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2010</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2010</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2011</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33,147</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$18,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2011</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29,682</td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N.B *Compiled from ISL annual reports (full data available on the CATL shared drive)

Table 2. Summary of applications 2008 – S1 2011 (after introduction of an Expressions of Interest round round)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>No. of EoI</th>
<th>No. of full applications</th>
<th>No. of successful applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1, 2008</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2, 2008</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1, 2009</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2, 2009</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1, 2010</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2, 2010</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1, 2011</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2, 2011</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Success rate of applications with and without expression of interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. EOI received</th>
<th>No. of full applications</th>
<th>No. Successful</th>
<th>Success rate</th>
<th>No. of full applications</th>
<th>No. Successful</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1 2008*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Tables 1, 2 and 3 above, the number of funded projects has remained constant (apart from the first semester it was introduced). The number of full applications received per has remained constant at around 12 full applications. The number of applications however, outnumber the number funded each semester due to the ISL budget (5 @ $3, 000 per semester) with generally only half of the applications received being accepted for funding. The introduction of an Expression of Interest in 2008 demonstrates that these applications have a higher success rate of projects approved (Table 3).
Figure 1. Responses by online survey regarding application, success and future plans.
Focus Group Interview Responses (regarding number of applications and funding):

There was a consensus amongst all focus group participants that there would be greater benefit to UWA staff if the total funding for ISL grants were increased, rather than increasing the actual grant amount. The discussion confirmed that although the current $3,000 per grant was a small amount of funding and any increase would be welcomed, this seemed an adequate amount for the types of projects being funded. Most focus group participants felt that in most cases, the amount allowed staff to commence a project and to develop sustainable resources and that given the positive outcomes from projects, a greater number to be funded would be of greater benefit to staff and students alike.

Although there are a high number of applications received per semester, where approximately half are approved, CATL committee staff who attend to the approval of each application have commented that generally it has been found that the quality of applications is generally not high; those that are, gain funding. Increasing the number of funds will not necessarily provide a higher number of quality applications and may put pressure on funding projects that are not so good. Thus, it is better to focus on opportunities to guide staff to write quality applications that meet the ISL criteria.

Data from the online survey showed that many successful staff recipients of the ISL grants had been at UWA for five or less years. This is encouraging as it appears to meet a need for gaining access to seed funding. It would seem that staff who have been employed for more than 5 years are not accessing this source of funds to develop teaching ideas. Avenues to encourage longer term employees of UWA to apply for ISL grants should be considered.

Commendation:

- The high number of full applications received each semester recognises a positive approach towards improving teaching and learning practices
- Communication regarding the ISL grants is consistent and through a variety of formats

Implications for CATL:

- Investigate ways to promote the grants to both new and more experienced staff within Faculties
- Focus on opportunities through written/oral feedback on EoI/full applications to guide staff to write quality applications that meet the ISL criteria
Section 2: ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW

(a) Promotion & Awareness of the ISL Grant:

The online survey results showed that most staff were made aware of the ISL grants through an email invitation (85%). A smaller number (12%) were alerted by a colleague in their faculty. Awareness through the UWA web page and CATL staff was negligible (3% each). All but one of the focus group participants stated that the ISL Information Sheet was clear. Only one staff member commented that he required some clarity in how the grant funds could be used.

(b) Expressions of Interest and (c) Application process (Expression of interest and Full application)

Expression of Interest

The Expression of Interest was introduced in 2008. From the survey respondents, 70% stated they had put in an EoI and 95% reporting the feedback was ‘useful’ or ‘somewhat useful’, only 4% found it ‘not useful’. For the 30% of staff who did not put in an EoI, the highest response to the question of ‘why they did not’ was the ‘time to complete’. See Figure 2 below for data from 2011 online survey regarding the Expression of Interest (EoI).

Full application:

In regard to ease of completing the full application, 85% responded that it easy, 15% found it ‘somewhat difficult’ and none found it difficult. Some focus group participants commented that they would like more clarity in how the funds can be used (see Figure 2).

Figure 2. Online survey (2011) results regarding feedback on Expression of Interest
Additional comments from the Focus Group discussion regarding the EoI and application forms:

Feedback from the focus group was that it would be helpful if there were greater alignment between the EoI and full application, that is, the headings in the full application should mirror the EoI so staff are not re-writing sections from scratch. Most focus group participants estimated that it took approximately 6 hours to complete a full application. Most participants agreed that an exemplar of a full application which could be viewed as a guide would be helpful.

Given the high success rate of applicants who completed an EoI (50-90%) compared to those who did not complete an EoI, consideration should be given to requiring that submitting an EoI as part of the application process. Alignment of the Full Application form to match the EoI would make the process of applying for a grant considerably more efficient. Through discussion with CATL staff members who have been directly involved with the ISL Grants, one person commented that the EoI dates need to be adhered to so that those that are keen and organised are able to get their EoIs or applications in on time for feedback to be received in time for their projects.

Applications by Faculties/Schools

In the next section, a summary has been provided listing the names of Faculties/Schools who have applied for ISL grants since its introduction in 2006. The table reports on the number of applications received and the success rate by number and percentage.

Table 4. Summary of Faculties/Schools who have applied Applications for ISL Grants by School (successful and unsuccessful)*

* This table is incomplete – data is missing for S2, 2006 – in this semester, 3 grants were awarded from 16 applications, but a breakdown by school is not available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School#</th>
<th>Total applications received</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Success Rate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil and Resource Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science and Software Engineering</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth and Environment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Centre, Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and Electronic Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Systems Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Law</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Office, Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Office, Engineering, Computing and Maths</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Office, Life and Physical Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Office, Natural and Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical and Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine &amp; Pharmacology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil &amp; Gas Engineering (superseded)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paediatrics and Child Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathology and Laboratory Medicine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Biology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Health</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary, Aboriginal and Rural Health Care</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar's Office</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Cultural Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Science, Exercise and Health</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWA Business School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women and Infants Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>118</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#All schools in the University are listed, even if they have not had any ISL grants. Other areas of the University (including Faculty Offices) are only listed if they have had a successful grant application.

In summary, a number of Schools/Faculties have been proactive in applying for and receiving grants, whilst others have been less active or have never made an application for an ISL grant. To encourage all schools/faculties to take advantage of the grant scheme, it is recommended that continued promotion to encourage Faculty staff to apply and consider
projects as per recommendation (i) Investigate ways to promote the grants within Faculties/School.

**Commendations:**

- The introduction of the Expression of Interest has resulted in better quality and application success
- Communication regarding the ISL grants is consistent and through a variety of formats

**Implications for CATL regarding the application process (EoI) and full applications:**

a) Continue with current level of regular and consistent promotion though the various formats

b) Continue with the EoI and encourage all staff to complete one; consider making the EoI a compulsory component

c) Align the full application form with the EoI form

d) Review and revise ‘Information Sheet (re ISL)’ and criteria on how funds can/cannot be used

e) Provide an exemplar of successful (recent) applications (with staff approval) which could be placed on the CATL website (password protected if necessary)
Section 3: Dissemination

In the following section, a discussion on how the ISL grants’ project information has been shared both within the University and beyond (nationally or internationally within their own discipline or to a broader audience involving multiple disciplines) is reported. Whilst sharing the project information is strongly encouraged by CATL, and is promoted by reminder emails, many staff do not achieve this recommendation. One possible reason may be that there is no currently no end-of-project mechanism in place at present to ensure this occurs. The most common place venue for dissemination is at the annual Western Australian combined universities Teaching and Learning Forum (TLF). The TLF is a collaborative state university conference which attracts on average 200 academic staff from across all the WA universities. Attendees are invited to submit a full paper (refereed by the TLF committee) or submit an abstract for a presentation. As shown in Figure 2 below, a further breakdown by the type of dissemination activity is provided and the year in which information was shared.

Figure 2. *Dissemination by activity type *Data for 2011 and beyond is not represented here
*Data from semester reports compiled by CATL

In Figure 3, a breakdown of data received from the online survey is provided. The online survey asked participants to specify where they had been able to disseminate project information.
It is a requirement that successful ISL recipients present their projects at the Teaching & Learning Month at UWA. However, only 33% of survey respondents had done so to date, with a further 20% in progress in the project phase and indicated an intention to present in 2012.

Discussion from focus groups regarding ‘dissemination’ highlighted the following points:

i. Staff who had been successful and had completed their projects felt inspired by other colleagues’ projects and innovations and thus that the project information should become ‘public’ to all staff (e.g. published in as many staff and university publications)

ii. Staff requested a reminder about presenting at the T and L month at UWA

*It should be noted that in regard to point (ii) above, staff are all sent reminder emails regarding the Teaching & Learning month presentations

iii. Some staff indicated they are keen to disseminate/publish further in their field of discipline but are unsure about where to go to next, where to publish, where they can access funds etc.

iv. Staff are unsure of possibilities regarding education seminars, journals etc. and where to apply for other grants to continue projects

Commendation: Dissemination of the Projects into the wider community is over 50%.

Figure 3. Where staff have been able to disseminate information about projects (data from the online survey)
Implications for CATL regarding dissemination:

1. Although dissemination is over 50 per cent, CATL staff should consider ways to increase this figure.

2. Consider opportunities for CATL staff to become partners with Faculty individuals who are at the starting point of engaging with the Scholarship in Teaching & Learning to collaborate and assist in guiding/shaping the pedagogical development of staff. One such avenue may be through appointing a CATL staff member/s with ISL recipients to provide advice on dissemination opportunities/publications etc. to assist with guiding/shaping the pedagogical development of staff, and with the development of paper/presentations etc.

3. Consider further opportunities for communicating and disseminating the ‘success stories in teaching at UWA’ as a regular feature of university publications where possible, in order to continue promoting best teaching and learning practices across the University.
Section 4: Impact of Outcomes of Project and Teaching and Learning (Staff and Students)

During the focus group discussions, staff were asked to consider the best outcomes for students and themselves as teachers. Verbatim comments are shown in Table 6. Staff were then asked to comment on how the projects had impacted upon them as teachers (see Table 7).

Table 6. Focus group responses on the best outcomes for students and themselves as teachers (copied verbatim)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group Interview Question:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do you perceive as being the two best outcomes of your project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Greater flexibility in the labs/exams. Ability to bring the material to the student
- Ability to do the same with a larger cohort. I would never have been done without a grant. It allowed for staff to actually monitor students and when they accessed the materials and how often. It allowed for students to consolidate the material.
- Conversion from a paper-based resource to an electronic resource and objective assessment of student usage of the resource.
- Student engagement with the other students (through online communication with at least 60 other students) and also tutors/lecturers
- Relevance of material taught throughout the undergraduate course
- Students could see the relevance of the work and apply themselves to the tasks
- Demonstrated ability to introduce interim workshops that facilitated skill retention & kept students abreast of changes to guidelines (on resuscitation)
- Provided an alternative teacher/facilitator for students and an opportunity for hands-on type practice in otherwise theoretical based years of study
- The development of resources would not have been possible without the grant
- Being able to use ‘real’ classroom teachers (currently in workforce) to come in and develop problem-based scenarios that are authentic to teaching practice
- One of the problems with a course like Medicine is getting real patients in for demonstration of history taking in first year. The grant allowed the development of making a set of resources (short films) which can now be used in lectures/tutorials etc. Through this, others have been encouraged to make their own films. It has been very useful for students to view how doctors and patients interact and how to take a history with many examples.
Table 7. Summary of focus group participants’ comments (verbatim) of the impact of teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group Interview question:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Describe how the ISL grant altered/changed your perception/role/ as a lecturer in terms of ‘teaching’</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives me flexibility in lab planning, more practical in teaching and ability to wheel around a classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced me to look at the benefits of using IT in conveying teaching &amp; learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of regular liaison with IT experts. The outcome was far superior than could have been imagined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel more engaged as a lecturer. I actually got to know the students in the lab because of the less chalk and talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teaching load increased- organising times, venues, equipment, evaluations etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money seemed to disappear-placed in central fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The problem-based scenarios that have been created are very rich and offer a lot of potential, it also achieved the outcome of greater partnerships with teachers in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompted me to reflect and consider possible ways to improve the way the professional practice units are implemented with students on campus (content &amp; alternative means of delivery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through the grant, my understanding of the need and value of interactive teaching increased dramatically. My own interest in Medical Education has also increased as a result. I now need some direction about where to take it now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ISL grant allowed me to understand how to make link the synergies between tutorials-lecture-labs making it an overall ‘better’ course. It allowed me to understand better how students learn and modify my teaching accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was better student engagement across all aspects of the course, better understanding of the unit material and materials were developed that could be used in future years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact of Outcomes of Project and Teaching and Learning Summary and Commendations

**Summary**

All respondents were positive throughout the ISL review process in all of the various formats of data collection (Online Survey, End-of Year reports & Focus Group) sessions. It is evident that the projects have provided both students and staff with numerous opportunities that they would not have known were possible or have developed without the grant funds. Some of major positive points were: development of authentic materials, greater engagement for both staff and students, and generally better teaching and learning practices were established as a result of projects.

Evidence from the final reports submitted by ISL recipients (see Appendix 1 and 2) is that for the majority of grants, intended outcomes as stated in the application were realised, with many projects demonstrating the use of innovative teaching and learning practices. Secondly,
many positive outcomes for both staff and students were observed and self-reported by ISL project leaders that were not anticipated, such as the application of new teaching innovations and the ways in which students responded positively to the processes applied.

All statements by ISL recipients were analysed through text analysis software (named Wordle), see Appendix 2. The following ten words were used the most:

students; feedback; positive; student learning; developed; improved; understanding; high; resources and; satisfaction.

These key words are also used by academic developers to promote and encourage teaching staff to consider, apply, improve or increase and thus it is encouraging to see these were used in light of reporting on project outcomes.

The ‘wider’ outcomes of projects was also analysed with the following top ten words with similar, positive language being applied to refer to the teaching and learning impact of ISL projects: learning; demonstration; outcomes; students; online; improve; resources; use; experience and; communities

**Commendation:** Multiple opportunities for improvements in teaching and learning have been realised for both academic staff and their students alike.

**Implication for CATL regarding Impact of Outcomes of Project and Teaching and Learning:**

CATL staff to consider opportunities to sustain the long term success and opportunities realised within the short time frame of the grant.
Conclusion and ISL review commendations, implications and recommendations:

The ISL grants have provided a positive impact on individual staff, students, units and courses at The University of Western Australia since its introduction in 2006, as reported by the CATL ISL report outcomes by each semester; online survey data, focus group data and discussion with key CATL staff. The ISL promotion, funds allocated and application processes have all been received positively. The ISL grant process has indicated that small grants can lead to high level, high impact outcomes on both student learning, academic staff satisfaction and engagement and thus to the University as a key stakeholder. Dissemination of the projects has promoted the good work to date by individuals and the University as a whole and should continue to be encouraged. As with any review process, implications and recommendations for continued improvement are necessary and have been highlighted on the following page for consideration.

Commendations of the Review

1. The introduction of the Expression of Interest in 2006 has resulted in better application quality and higher application success rate.
2. The high number of full applications received each semester recognises a positive approach from UWA staff towards improving teaching and learning practices.
3. Communication regarding the ISL grants is consistent and made through a variety of formats and communication channels.
4. Dissemination of the Projects into the wider community has been largely successful; over 50 per cent having disseminated project outcomes in Western Australia within their discipline community and 25 per cent of staff having published their work.
5. Multiple opportunities for improvements in teaching and learning have been realised for both academic staff and their students alike.

Implications for CATL

1. Regarding the ISL promotion & awareness:
   a) Investigate ways to promote the grants to both new and more experienced staff within Faculties
   b) Focus on opportunities through written/oral feedback on EoI/full applications to guide staff to write quality applications that meet the ISL criteria
2. Regarding the application process (EoI) and full applications:
   a) Continue with the EoI and encourage all staff to complete one; consider making the EoI a compulsory component
   b) Align the full application form with the EoI form
   c) Review and revise ‘Information Sheet (re ISL)’ and criteria on how funds can/cannot be used
   d) Provide an exemplar of successful (recent) applications (with staff approval) which could be placed on the CATL website (password protected if necessary).

3. Regarding ISL Dissemination:
   a) Continue with current level of regular and consistent promotion though the various formats. CATL staff should continue to work with the ISL grant holder to identify ways to increase the dissemination of outcomes of the projects
   b) Consider opportunities for CATL staff to become partners with ISL grant holders to collaborate and assist in guiding/shaping the pedagogical development of staff. Consider further opportunities for communicating and disseminating the ‘success stories in teaching at UWA’ as a regular feature of university publications where possible, in order to continue promoting best teaching and learning practices across the University

4. Regarding Impact of Outcomes of Project and Teaching and Learning:
   a) CATL staff to consider opportunities to sustain the long term success and opportunities realised within the short time frame of the grant

Recommendation

That funding for ISL be continued and maintained at the current budget given the high success of the application, process and sustainability and outcomes for students and staff of grants as documented.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Outcomes</th>
<th>Wider relevance of outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Brad Stappenb</td>
<td>Oil &amp; Gas Engineering</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Improving the communication skills of engineering students through</td>
<td>Implementing a communication stream within the Professional Engineering Unit</td>
<td>Improved student performance &amp; English Language Ability</td>
<td>Evidence that English language communication curriculum content can improve student learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the implementation of an English language communication stream within the professional development component of the degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Harriet Mills</td>
<td>Animal Biology</td>
<td>$1,103</td>
<td>Replacing case studies with real life in the teaching of wildlife management - does it improve learning outcomes?</td>
<td>Replacing a class room based activity with a field trip to examine benefits to students in learning &amp; enjoyment</td>
<td>Increase in field-based experience for students; higher marks achieved when field-work was included (other variables consistent)</td>
<td>Evidence that fieldwork experience improves learning outcomes, led to a further increase in this component of the unit following the initial trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Justine Leavy</td>
<td>Population Health</td>
<td>$2,835</td>
<td>The Project Management 'Tool Box' for Health Science Students</td>
<td>Provide students with a comprehensive resource for project planning and implementation to deliver group projects</td>
<td>Production of a 'tool box' of templates and checklists to assist students undertaking group projects - on CD and in hard copy Positive feedback from students, with high levels of agreement that they would use the tool box for other units</td>
<td>Additional copies of tool-box requested by Medicine colleagues; provision of scaffolding materials to assist students undertaking group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Professor Lyn</td>
<td>Earth &amp; Geographical Sciences</td>
<td>$2,444</td>
<td>Introducing 'deep learning' concepts to Level 1 students as a means of integrating teaching across discipline areas covered in ENVT 1102 Ecosystems Processes</td>
<td>Introduce 'deep learning' concepts to level 1 students; integrate the disciplines in the units into a more coherent and effective teaching program</td>
<td>SOLO Taxonomy used throughout unit; used for peer assessment; teachers reported a shift in thinking to view the unit in a holistic manner</td>
<td>Use of learning frameworks explicitly to make students aware of their own learning, and create more coherent teaching programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Outcomes</td>
<td>Wider relevance of outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006, S2</td>
<td>Ann Tarca</td>
<td>Economics and Commerce</td>
<td>$2,974</td>
<td>Developing online student learning resources</td>
<td>Development of additional 'problems' online to supplement problems used in lectures and tutorials as an additional resource for students</td>
<td>High level of student satisfaction with the provision of online resources; students who made greater use of the additional problems achieved better learning outcomes overall; more competent students were more likely to use the resources</td>
<td>Demonstration that optional online resources may have a positive impact on learning outcomes, and are useful to more motivated students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006, S2</td>
<td>Kym Guelfi</td>
<td>Human Movement and Exercise Science</td>
<td>$2,996</td>
<td>Implementation of a Health Risk Assessment Program by Level 3 Human Movement and Exercise Science students</td>
<td>Implementation of a practical opportunity to develop and refine the skills of giving a health risk assessment</td>
<td>Improved student learning experience; very positive response from students to the inclusion of a practical component, described as 'practical' and 'relevant'</td>
<td>Demonstration that practical assessments can have a positive effect on the learning experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006, S2</td>
<td>Mark Pegrum</td>
<td>Graduate School of Education</td>
<td>$2,566</td>
<td>Improving pre-service teachers' familiarity with the changing demands of West Australian TESOL classrooms</td>
<td>Development of videos of TESOL teachers for use in class and as an online resource for DipEd TESOL students</td>
<td>Production of a series of videos of TESOL teachers in the classroom; high student satisfaction with the additional resources; Mentors Day where recorded teachers discuss issues with the students</td>
<td>Use of video demonstrations to provide a 'real-life' example to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007, S1</td>
<td>Andre Luiten</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>$2,830</td>
<td>Evaluating electronic clickers in physics teaching</td>
<td>Lease of clickers for use in Physics classes to evaluate their usefulness</td>
<td>Highly positive response from students in using the clickers; full potential can only be realised if the clicker can be registered to an individual student</td>
<td>Demonstration on the usefulness of clickers in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007, S1</td>
<td>Brad Stappenbelt</td>
<td>Oil &amp; Gas Engineering</td>
<td>$2,830</td>
<td>Addressing student learning-style related study difficulties through learning skills education in the professional development component of the engineering degree</td>
<td>Investigation of preferred learning styles and prevalent teaching styles, and development of resources to make students aware of their preferences and make adjustments for the teaching style</td>
<td>Data on mismatch of learning styles vs teaching styles in the unit; resources developed to teach students about their preferred styles and study techniques; improved perception of the unit and the quality of the teaching within it</td>
<td>Affect of explicit recognition of learning styles on student satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Outcomes</td>
<td>Wider relevance of outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Nancy Longneck er</td>
<td>Life and Physical Sciences</td>
<td>$1,560</td>
<td>Resources to teach students to use Nvu, Open Source software for website development</td>
<td>Development of teaching resources to support the use of Nvu and Kompozer by students learning website design</td>
<td>Nvu and Kompozer used in Science communication units and compared with the use of Dreamweaver (in Arts &amp; Previously)</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Peter Arthur</td>
<td>Biochemistry and Molecular Biology</td>
<td>$2,870</td>
<td>Introducing contemporary laboratory practicals to engage students in research methodology currently emerging in the life sciences and emphasize the relevance of classroom concepts</td>
<td>Development and implementation of a new laboratory practical in mass spectrometry</td>
<td>New laboratory introduced and run over 2 years</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Coral Pepper</td>
<td>Natural and Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>Development of a new handbook to assist the implementation of restructuring a level 1 unit to include problem-based learning</td>
<td>Restructure of a level 1 unit to a broad overview unit which incorporated problem based learning</td>
<td>Revised and comprehensive unit outlines developed for 2 units</td>
<td>Unit outline template for implementation in other similar level 1 units, including techniques for incorporate PBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Gillian Cleary</td>
<td>Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences</td>
<td>$2,970</td>
<td>Basic life support for year 2 medical Students</td>
<td>Introduction of a resuscitation workshop for year 2 students to implement annual refreshment of skills and provide students with a clinically relevant experience</td>
<td>Students reported positive benefits from the additional workshop, high levels of satisfaction with the workshop</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Zarrin Siddiqui</td>
<td>Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences</td>
<td>$2,533</td>
<td>Towards authentic assessment</td>
<td>Introduction of ‘learning contracts’ to allow students to choose a topic and supervisor rather than selecting from set available options</td>
<td>Learning contracts implemented; positive feedback from students; some changes to assessment achieved to make them more authentic - not consistent across supervisors</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Outcomes</td>
<td>Wider relevance of outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008, S1</td>
<td>Iris Ludewig-Rohwer</td>
<td>European Languages</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Enhancing Communication Skills Through Online Role-Plays in Language Classes</td>
<td>Developing and implementing a model for online role plays in language learning</td>
<td>Development of a model of role play; implementation of the model in an intermediate German class; evaluation of affect of role play on students and teachers - improved vocab and self-confidence, better use of appropriate registers; further development of model for implementation in other areas</td>
<td>Generic model for using online role-play as a language learning tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008, S1</td>
<td>Kellie Bennett</td>
<td>Behavioural Science</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>The Development of Digital Film Resources to Support the Teaching of Doctor-Patient Communication and Consultation</td>
<td>Development and implementation of videos demonstrating doctor-patient communication and consultation techniques</td>
<td>Videos produced and integrated into a series of tutorials</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008, S1</td>
<td>Mary Gee</td>
<td>Earth and Environment</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Establishing an On-Line Rock and Mineral Collection</td>
<td>Development and implementation of a virtual petrological microscope for use in level 1 geology units to provide access outside of the classroom</td>
<td>Virtual microscope and user interface developed to be trialled in 2011 (included in curriculum for 2012)</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008, S1</td>
<td>Nicole Crawford</td>
<td>Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Evaluation of Arts IRIS</td>
<td>To evaluate how successfully the aims of Arts IRIS were being achieved and identify areas for improvement</td>
<td>Evaluation completed and recommendations implemented</td>
<td>Use of generic communication skills modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008, S2</td>
<td>Jill Howieson</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Embedding Interest-Based Negotiation Theory and Skills in Contract Law</td>
<td>Develop and implement interest-based negotiation theory and skills into contract law, to meet the learning outcome statement</td>
<td>Implementation of theory lectures, practical component and assessment around interest-based negotiation; deeper understanding of interest-based negotiation achieved; students indicated that they learnt a lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Outcomes</td>
<td>Wider relevance of outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008, S2</td>
<td>John Henders on</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Interactive Phonetics Training</td>
<td>To develop a package of online interactive audio-based exercises to assist students with key concepts in phonetics and practical skills in phonetic description and transcription</td>
<td>Audio recorded and basic interface developed; full implementation delayed because of technical difficulties; students report high level of satisfaction with the online resources; no evaluation yet on student skills</td>
<td>Demonstration of effectiveness of online resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008, S2</td>
<td>Michael Renton</td>
<td>Plant Biology</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Understanding Ecological Population Dynamics Using Interactive Computer Simulations</td>
<td>Development and implementation of simulation models of ecological competition</td>
<td>Implementation of lab using the models; student responses showed high level of engagement with both the models and underlying principles; pre and post testing indicated better understanding after the labs</td>
<td>Demonstration of effectiveness of using simulation models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008, S2</td>
<td>Stuart Bunt</td>
<td>Anatomy and Human Biology</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Enhancement of CD Internal Mental Modelling in the Teaching of Anatomy</td>
<td>Introduction of 3D digital imaging into anatomy teaching to allow students to visualise the relationship between cross-sectional slices and the 3-dimensional body</td>
<td>Computer and X-Ray viewer installed with software and school’s collection of scans integrated into teaching; modern imaging techniques now able to be taught</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009, S1</td>
<td>Alexandr a Ludewig</td>
<td>Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Improving student learning in advanced languages courses through a structured peer-assisted study programme involving international students at UWA</td>
<td>Development of a voluntary peer-assisted study programme for a language programme</td>
<td>low participation rates &amp; difficulty in measuring learning outcomes as a result of the program</td>
<td>Lessons learned in relation to peer-assisted study programmes are relevant to other groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009, S1</td>
<td>Ann Tarca</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Improving the Quality of Student Learning: Introducing Team-Based Learning (TBL) in a Large Undergraduate Class</td>
<td>introduction of readiness assurance tests undertaken in teams in large business school units</td>
<td>positive feedback from students and evidence of improved and deeper learning</td>
<td>Trial of TBL techniques has led to subsequent improvements and wider take up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Outcomes</td>
<td>Wider relevance of outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009, S1</td>
<td>Jasmine Henry</td>
<td>Electrical, Electronic and Computer Engineering</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Development of an Online Laboratory Assistant</td>
<td>development of an online system for laboratory assessments, to enable overt learning of presentation of technical data; more meaningful marker feedback and time efficiencies; template for other lab reports</td>
<td>Online submission and marking system implemented; positive feedback from students; improved marking experience for teachers</td>
<td>Development of an online submission and marking system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009, S1</td>
<td>Rachel Cardell-Oliver</td>
<td>Computer Science and Software Engineering</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Automatic, Formative Assessment Tools for Timely Feedback to Support Student Learning in Software Engineering and Programming Units,</td>
<td>development of automatic marking scripts to provide immediate formative feedback on quality attributes of programmes being written by students</td>
<td>Improvement in learning outcomes for students who received automatic formative feedback compared to those from the previous year; resources developed - software quality model; beginner style rules for Java; programming exercises and Unit tests; program quality datasets; automatic marking scripts</td>
<td>Demonstrates improvement in learning outcomes with the provision of formative feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009, S1</td>
<td>Ryan Lowe</td>
<td>Earth and Environment</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Enhancing Student Learning in Coastal Science using Field-Based Activities</td>
<td>develop and introduce new field-based learning approaches into coastal science units</td>
<td>Positive feedback from students in relation to the introduction of field work and associated assessment; significant improvement in SURF results; increase in no. of students participating in the unit</td>
<td>Demonstration that field-based learning increases student engagement and improves the educational experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009, S2</td>
<td>Herbert Ho Ching Iu</td>
<td>Electrical, Electronic and Computer Engineering</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Analogue Simulators for Hands-On Learning in the Laboratory</td>
<td>Development of an analogue computer for use in undergraduate final year projects - to aid in the development of practical skills, deep learning and interest in analogue electronics.</td>
<td>Feedback from students indicates deeper knowledge and better understanding of analogue circuitry and theory in control engineering</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Outcomes</td>
<td>Wider relevance of outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>John Wojdylo</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Improving the Advanced Physics Laboratory Experience</td>
<td>introduction of online tutorial discussions &amp; video material for large 1st year physics class</td>
<td>successful use of an online discussion forum which received positive feedback from students; introduction of tutorial videos 'on demand' - intensive work required of lecturer to monitor and manage the discussion forum</td>
<td>demonstration of online tutorial tools replacing face to face teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Luis Filgueira</td>
<td>Anatomy and Human Biology</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Peer Teaching, Learning and Assessment in Large Science Classes</td>
<td>Introduction of a peer teaching &amp; assessment component in a large science unit - students recorded 'mini-lectures' for self- and peer-assessment, and had a review paper assessed by 5 peers via Turnitin</td>
<td>Evidence that the peer assessment was valid and reliable for use in the final marks</td>
<td>That peer assessment is a valid form of assessment for use in assigning final marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Zaza Lyons</td>
<td>Psychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences</td>
<td>$2,363</td>
<td>Development of Teaching Resources to Improve Psychiatric History Taking</td>
<td>development and introduction of a 'flip-chart' to assist with teaching year 4 medical students psychiatry history-taking skills</td>
<td>Positive student feedback relating to the resource, and evidence of improved learning outcomes (self-assessed) as a result of the new resource</td>
<td>Tailored and specific interactive resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Campbell Thomson</td>
<td>Research Services</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Program in Animal Welfare and Ethics in Science (PAWES)</td>
<td>Development of an online version of the PAWES Ethics &amp; Regulation module</td>
<td>Online module live on the 3/8/11; feedback positive; process simplified</td>
<td>Demonstration that modules designed to meet regulatory requirements can be effectively delivered on line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>David Kandiah</td>
<td>Education Centre</td>
<td>$2,922</td>
<td>Web-based Rheumatology Clinical Scenarios</td>
<td>Conversion of existing course materials into an interactive online resource</td>
<td>Evidence of improvement in clinical and applied knowledge after engaging in the resource activities</td>
<td>Use of interactive materials improves learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Outcomes</td>
<td>Wider relevance of outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Steve Su</td>
<td>Mathematics &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>$2,552</td>
<td>Designing and implementing anime videos to illustrate the concepts of confidence interval and p-values in statistics</td>
<td>development of an anime video to illustrate concepts in statistics</td>
<td>Evidence of improvement in conceptual understanding compared to previous years; positive feedback from students on the videos - request for more interaction</td>
<td>Use of video to explain mathematical concepts improves student learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 2: Summary of all the key words (through IT software "Wordle") from most common in largest font

The following visual representation of words below are a summary of all the focus group participant responses from most frequently used (largest font) to least frequently used (font size reduces). The visual representation is derived from an online free software program known as “Wordle” available from [http://www.wordle.net/](http://www.wordle.net/). The written text from focus group participants is copied into the program and it reproduces a visual word cloud as it is referred to analysing the text used. The top ten words used in responses and discussion during the focus groups were: positive words expressed by participants can be viewed here such as: ‘students’; ‘feedback’; ‘positive’; ‘learning’; ‘improved’; ‘assessment’; ‘unit’; ‘developed’; ‘resources’ and ; ‘satisfaction"
students
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The University of Western Australia

University Policy on: Evaluation of New Educational Technologies

Purpose of the policy and summary of issues it addresses:
This policy provides a formal process for UWA schools and faculties to propose educational technologies for evaluation and adoption as new centrally acquired and supported learning technologies at the University of Western Australia. The proposal and evaluation process aims to:

- Determine whether a solution can be supported at an institutional level with benefits of availability, sustainability, reliability and economies of scale
- Ensure minimum standards for performance, levels of availability and support at the level at which it is implemented
- Minimise duplication
- Ensure cost-effective products are acquired with the required functionality and specifications suitable for the UWA context
- Control expenditure while encouraging development or trials of new systems
- Ensure the technology has a pedagogical basis of relevance and benefit across the University

Definitions:

- CATL Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning with responsibility and business ownership of software for teaching purposes
- The University The University of Western Australia (UWA)
- IS Information Services at UWA with responsibility for information systems acquisition, support, and infrastructure
- Learning Technologies Software and online technologies used in support of teaching and learning, and associated technical infrastructure
- Educational Technologies Software and online technologies used in support of teaching and learning, and associated technical infrastructure
- Service Levels Support to UWA system and software users to be able to use the solution to an acceptable and reliable level, support is provided by IS and CATL
- Supportability That IS and CATL can support users in using the solution both technically, functionally, and educationally
- Accessibility The solution is able to be used by all applicable users
- Sustainability The solution can be reliably maintained within existing support and service levels

Policy statement:
Individuals, faculties, or central administrative areas regularly identify a need for a new educational technology for a particular purpose, and are also periodically approached by firms promoting their educational technology and other technology products. In deciding to adopt a new technology (hardware, system or software), either at the individual, school, faculty or University-wide level, it is important that the University can:
- Determine whether a solution can be supported at an institutional level with benefits of availability, sustainability, reliability and economies of scale
- Ensure minimum standards for performance, levels of availability and support at the level at which it is implemented
- Ensure the solution is relevant for teaching and learning purposes across the university and to meet University Goals
- Minimise duplication
- Ensure the solution is cost-effective and meets the required functionality and specifications is are suitable for the UWA context, and
- Control expenditure while encouraging development or trials of new systems

When considering the introduction of a new learning technology, individuals, schools, faculties or central administrative areas must ensure that the software under consideration is evaluated according to the criteria in this policy, and that mandatory conditions have been met.

**Levels of Implementation**

Approval for the implementation of new learning technologies will vary depending on the purpose, scope and impact of each proposed technology. For the purposes of this policy three levels of implementation have been identified:

1. **Individual**
   
The introduction of a relatively simple learning technology by an individual for use in his/her own teaching only. The technology will not be integrated with other UWA systems.

   When introducing a new learning technology at the individual level, teachers should consider the evaluation criteria contained in this policy and be satisfied that the technology being introduced is appropriate for its purpose. Individuals are encouraged to consult with CATL for feedback and advice on available technologies and fitness for intended purpose.

   Individuals must meet any school / faculty requirements for the introduction of new technology / software. The technology will typically not be supported by Faculty or School IT/IS staff. Refer to UWA policies and regulations covering the use of information services and systems - Section 8, Information Services Policy.

   The individual will implement the new technology, and the implementation may or may not be supported by the school, depending on agreement reached.

2. **School / Faculty**
   
The introduction of a new learning technology for implementation across a whole school or faculty. The technology may require integration with other UWA-wide systems, and will typically require the purchase of a license(s). This category includes the introduction of a learning technology by an
individual which requires integration with other UWA systems or the purchase of an enterprise license. Typically, such a technology would be made available to other individuals if desired, after licensing and integration factors are considered.

The technology will be supported by Faculty or School IT/IS staff.

Any school / faculty requirements for the introduction of new technology / software must be met, and additionally, feedback on the proposal should be sought from CATL and Information Services, with approval for integration with UWA systems provided by IS.

The school/faculty will initiate and manage a project to implement the new technologies, this may include consultation with or support by CATL or IS, depending on agreement reached.

**PROCEDURE**

For proposing a new learning technology at the school / faculty level, the following steps must be undertaken:

1. Provide a proposal addressing the evaluation criteria for new technologies to CATL for review and feedback.
2. Consult with Information Services in relation to the implementation aspects of the new technology including requirements for security, support and integration with UWA systems. Information Services will provide advice and options for implementation of the proposed technology.
3. Consult with Information Services regarding the planning, costing, timeframes for implementation and support options for the project.
4. Provide a Business Case to CATL. CATL will liaise with IS in relation to any support requirements and implications for resourcing.
5. CATL determines final decision and will communicate with proposer.

**3. University-wide**

The implementation of a new learning technology for use across the whole University. The technology will be integrated with relevant UWA wide-systems, will be supported by IS and CATL, and will be available to all staff and students of the University. Costs will typically be addressed centrally, primarily by IS and CATL in negotiation and in accordance with their responsibilities.

Consultation on the proposed introduction of a new learning technology University-wide must be undertaken with CATL and IS, who will recommend whether or not the technology should be implemented University-wide. A business case is required to be submitted to CATL by the requestor.

Approval for the introduction of the technology must be submitted by the UWA Teaching and Learning Committee, via the eLearning and Learning Spaces Standing Committee and subsequently by the funding provider. If approved,
CATL will initiate and manage a project brief to implement new technologies, in partnership with Information Services and consultation with the requesting School/Faculty. Final implementation will be dependent on Executive approval.

PROCEDURE

For proposing the introduction of a new University-wide and centrally-supported learning technology, the following steps must be undertaken:

1. Provide a proposal addressing the evaluation criteria for new technologies to CATL for review and feedback.
2. Consult with Information Services in relation to the implementation of the new software/technology, including any requirements for integration with UWA systems. Refer to the evaluation criteria below.
3. Information Services will: undertake the technical architecture review in criteria 3 Support, 1.1 below; provide general advice and feedback; advise whether the proposed technology is able to be integrated with UWA systems and whether Information Services supports its implementation University-wide.
4. Provide a proposal addressing the evaluation criteria in this policy and a Business Case for the introduction of the technology to CATL for feedback and endorsement. CATL will liaise with IS in relation to any support and resourcing requirements.
5. CATL determines if the Business case is progressed to the next level.
6. To progress, CATL will provide the business case, proposal and recommendation to the eLearning and Learning Spaces Standing Committee for consideration by the UWA Teaching and Learning Committee and subsequently by the funding provider.
7. If approved, CATL will initiate a project to consider the implementation of the technology, including planning for resourcing and budgeting, and the submission of a funding request where appropriate.

## Evaluation Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Any learning technology</th>
<th>Any learning technology to be adopted University wide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Service Levels</strong>&lt;br&gt; Availability, performance, support arrangements, reporting and review.</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
<td>Must be met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Educational Technology Guidelines</strong>&lt;br&gt; Rationale for use including educational benefit or need being met and fitness-for-educational purpose. Review of risk, cost, benefits and duplication of existing services.</td>
<td>Must be met</td>
<td>Must be met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Supportability</strong>&lt;br&gt; Review of architecture, technologies, policies, standards, disaster recovery, testing and support</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
<td>Must be met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Accessibility**
   Access and equity will be considered when making decisions on new or upgraded learning technologies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Must be met</th>
<th>Must be met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. **University Facilities**
   The associated physical implications of the introduction of new learning technologies should be considered. These include building and/or facility adaption costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Must be met</th>
<th>Must be met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1. Service Levels
All learning technologies – whether used University-wide or not – must meet these minimum requirements for service levels.

Availability

| SL 1.1 | Student-facing or public-facing aspects of the learning technology shall be designed for 99.99% availability – less than 1 hour of downtime per year, less than one minute of downtime per week | Mandatory |
| SL 1.2 | Administrative access to the learning technology shall be designed for 99% availability | Desirable |
| SL 1.3 | Availability of the services shall be monitored and logged | Mandatory |
| SL 1.4 | In the event of a disaster, the system administrator must be able to restore service within 24 hours | Desirable |

Performance

| SL 2.1 | The system shall respond to requests within half a second | Mandatory |
| SL 2.2 | For web-based systems the average render time shall be within 3 seconds | Mandatory |
| SL 2.3 | For web-based systems the render time shall be within a 6 second maximum | Mandatory |

Support

| SL 3.1 | There shall be defined contacts for all support requests (incidents, requests for change, service or information requiring action) | Mandatory |
| SL 3.2 | Support requests must be logged | Mandatory |

Reporting

| SL 4.1 | If the service falls outside, or is likely to fall outside the levels described, this must be immediately reported to the business system owner | Mandatory |

Review

| SL 5.1 | These service levels shall be reviewed at least every 3 years | Desirable |

2. Educational Technology Guidelines
All learning technologies – whether used University-wide or not – must meet these educational technology guidelines.

Inform

| EG 1.1 | The system owner shall document the expected costs and benefits of the technology, and whether there are any known UWA services with similar functionality | Desirable |
| EG 1.2 | The system owner shall provide a ‘fit-for-purpose’ rationale for the system as an educational resource and the educational need it is addressing. | Mandatory |
| EG 1.3 | The system owner shall advise the eLearning and Learning Spaces Standing Committee of the new technology, providing the document produced in EG 1.1 | Mandatory |
| EG 1.4 | The system owner shall advise the Technical Coordination Group (TCG) of the new technology, providing the document | Mandatory |
| EG 1.5 | The system owner shall ensure a risk assessment has been conducted to review:  
|        | • The confidentiality of University and student data if applicable  
|        | • The schedule, duration, and features of upgrades, and what ability the University has to influence these  
|        | • The need for customisation or integration with existing University systems, including the cost, complexity and risk of this effort  
|        | • If an external vendor is involved, the processes and contractual obligations for day-to-day communication, issue management and escalation  
|        | • If an external vendor is involved, the University’s ability to exit from the arrangements, and the vendor viability |

| EG 1.6 | Appropriate controls must be put in place to manage the risks identified in EG 1.4 |

### 3. Supportability

All learning technologies that are supported centrally or used University-wide must meet these minimum requirements.

| S 1.1 | A technical architecture review must be completed by Information Services to ensure that:  
|       | • The technology set is supportable  
|       | • The solution is compliant with University policies and standards  
|       | • The solution is scalable for University-wide use |

| S 1.2 | Appropriate Disaster Recovery measures must be in place |

| S 1.3 | There must be an adequate test environment, and appropriate testing procedures |

| S 1.4 | There must be trained staff, and funding available for ongoing support |

### 4. Accessibility

All learning technologies – whether used University-wide or not – must meet these accessibility guidelines.

| A 1.1 | The system owner shall document that access and equity issues have been considered in the selection of the learning technology for implementation, and will justify any decision to introduce a technology which does not meet Australian accessibility standards |

### 5. University Facilities

All learning technologies – whether used University-wide or not – must meet these university facilities guidelines.

<p>| UF 1.1 | The system owner shall document that consideration has been given to any physical implications of the introduction of the new technology, including any adoption of facilities, and that resources have been allocated as appropriate |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy No:</th>
<th>Approving body or position:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date original policy approved:</td>
<td>Date this version of policy approved:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date policy to be reviewed:</td>
<td>Date this version of procedures approved:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM File No:</th>
<th>Contact position:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Advancement of Teaching and Learning, Centre for (CATL) (incorporating Learning Management System and Lecture Capture System)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Related Policies or legislation:**
UWA has policies and regulations covering the use of information services and systems at the University – Section 8 – Information Services Policy
http://www.is.uwa.edu.au/staff/policies-guidelines
Report on the Independent Expert Evaluation of the English language entry standards and ongoing support for international students
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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this document is to provide a report on the outcomes of the Independent Evaluation conducted at the University of Western Australia (UWA) on March 14 and 15, 2012 in response to the DIAC requirement for an independent expert to evaluate the University's English language entry standards and ongoing support for international students.

From the outset, UWA indicated that it was seeking an objective evaluation to meet DIAC’s requirements and to validate or inform its current practices.

This report has the following structure:

1. Executive Summary
2. Background: Approach and Methodology
3. UWA Profile
4. UWA Submission to DIAC: Observations and Evaluation
5. Recommendations
6. Conclusions
7. Attachment 1: Terms of Reference
8. Attachment 2: UWA Strategies for English skills development

PROFILE OF THE INDEPENDENT EVALUATOR

Cynthia Kralik has over 20 years’ experience in the English language and tertiary sectors. In this time, she has held roles that range from teaching English, teacher training, business development and senior management. Cynthia was the Director of the English language centre which is part of RMIT University for 3 years before moving into the Academic Director role at the same institution. In that role, she managed the academic quality of all the Centre’s English language programs, led the redevelopment of print and electronic courseware for the Centre’s English for Academic Purposes publications, managed the Centre’s transnational partnerships at 7 offshore locations and provided strategic advice to RMIT University with respect to English language entry standards, testing and support.

In 2010, Cynthia was seconded to RMIT University to lead a major strategic initiative to support RMIT’s linguistically diverse student community. Over a 2 year period, Cynthia formulated, implemented and evaluated a cross-university English language strategy which reached over 7,000 students in Melbourne and offshore and over 120 academic teaching staff through its formal and informal professional development components. This project has provided RMIT with valuable data to inform an evidence-based strategic plan which the University is currently implementing.

Cynthia is currently conducting research as part of an ALTC-funded project entitled Degrees of Proficiency: Building a Strategic Approach to University Students’ English Language Assessment and Development.

She has held non-executive board director roles on the English Australia Council in 2006 and on the National English Language Teaching Accreditation Scheme (NEAS) in the period 2007-2011.

Cynthia holds a Master of Education (International Education) and a Diploma in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (known now as the Cambridge DELTA). She is currently undertaking PhD studies in the area of English language policy formulation.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An Independent Evaluation of the University of Western Australia’s (UWA) strategies to ensure that students have appropriate levels of English at the commencement of their course and strategies to ensure that students continue to develop their English language skills during their studies was conducted March 14 and 15, 2012.

The methodology for the Independent Evaluation comprised a desk audit of relevant documentation and interviews with a cross-section of relevant staff. Terms of Reference for the Independent Evaluation were agreed to in advance of the visit.

This Independent Evaluation of UWA’s English language entry requirements and provision of support services to international students highlighted the breadth, integrity and quality of UWA’s processes and practices.

The interviews conducted and documentation reviewed demonstrate strongly that UWA is committed to providing its international students with every opportunity to succeed and that it protects the education that is offered to its students.

Relevant support areas such as Student Services, STUDY Smarter, the Graduate Research and Scholarships Office and the Centre for English Language Teaching are staffed with dedicated, highly qualified and committed practitioners who take a highly student-centred approach to their activities.

Whilst many universities across Australia have an English language centre that is attached to it, there are varying arrangements in place (fully owned commercial entities, embedded in the organisational structure, for instance) which determine how operationally and functionally the English language and University work together. It is the Evaluator’s view that the example at UWA is a positive and constructive one which provides a mutually beneficial arrangement and that results in a more comprehensive English language learning and development experience for international students.

The Evaluation process enabled a number of recommendations to be raised for consideration by UWA and include the following:

1. UWA has a demonstrated commitment to supporting its international students as evidenced by the range of initiatives currently in place and the philosophy of the University enshrined in policy and practice. A broad recommendation, which is clearly embedded in current practice and policy, is that UWA continue to maintain this focus and ensure that students have ongoing and increasing opportunities for English language enhancement.

2. UWA is undergoing the initial stages of implementing its new degree structure to include the embedding of communication and research skills. As this implementation is carried out and monitored, it is recommended that UWA monitors the impact on the professional development needs of academic teaching staff and assess what further resources should be allocated to meet these needs.

3. UWA will also find it valuable to monitor the staff that is available to provide program-level support with the implementation of the embedded communication skills framework and review the relative resource allocation accordingly.

4. To further enhance UWA’s processes in setting, monitoring and reviewing English language entry standards, it is recommended that UWA consider extending its mechanisms for monitoring the English language performance of students who have articulated from an undergraduate degree where the entry requirement is IELTS 6.5 (6.0) to a postgraduate degree where the entry level may be as high as IELTS 7.5 (7.5). It would be valuable for UWA to ascertain through qualitative and quantitative research, the level at which students’ English language proficiency develops throughout their undergraduate degree in preparation for their next entry point.
BACKGROUND: APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

As part of UWA’s application to “opt-in” to the provisions for streamlined visa processing, the requirement for an independent expert to evaluate the institution’s English language entry standards and ongoing support for international students has hereby been fulfilled.

On March 14 and 15, an independent expert evaluator (“Evaluator”) visited the Crawley campus of UWA and conducted a series of interviews with key staff to evaluate the following requirements of UWA’s application to DIAC:

Requirement 4: Strategies in place to ensure that students have appropriate levels of English at the commencement of their course.

Requirement 5: Strategies in place to ensure that students continue to develop their English language skills during their studies.

In advance of the visit to the UWA campus, the Terms of Reference (Attachment 1) for the evaluation were discussed and agreed to and the following documentation was made available to the Evaluator. Additional documentation was gathered by the Evaluator or provided during the visit and is included in this list. The documentation listed below indicates the breadth of focus on English language skills that cover UWA’s entry requirements, communication to staff and students regarding the University’s expectations, services available and periodic quality assurance monitoring of English language skills requirements and services provided.

General
1. UWA ‘opt-in’ application for Streamlined Visa Processing.
2. Relevant extracts from the AUQA Performance Portfolio prepared in advance of the AUQA audit in 2009.
3. Profile information regarding UWA
4. University Policy on English language competence for admission to degree study
5. List of English language tests recognised by UWA and relevant entry scores.
6. List of English language entry requirements for UWA programs including range of requirements for specified postgraduate programs.
7. Overview of pathway or articulation agreements that are used in lieu of English language tests (eg pathways from the English language institution).

English language entry requirements
4. University Policy on English language competence for admission to degree study
5. List of English language tests recognised by UWA and relevant entry scores.
6. List of English language entry requirements for UWA programs including range of requirements for specified postgraduate programs.
7. Overview of pathway or articulation agreements that are used in lieu of English language tests (eg pathways from the English language institution).

Staff and students: Awareness and Communication
10. Postgraduate Students’ Almanac 2012
11. Statement of Learning Skills Good Practice (in accordance with an Academic Council Resolution)
12. UWA Teaching and Learning Educational Principles
14. Report conducted by Student Services and the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning entitled Perceptions and Expectations of English Language Requirements and Support.

Monitoring of English language skills
15. Process for identifying students “at risk” as a result of language difficulty.

English language support
18. Overview of English language support services available to international students including language skills support workshops, drop-in centre, individual support as well as credit-bearing programs, adjunct programs or English language skills embedded in formal programs.
19. Annual Evaluation Report 2011 outlining the activities of the STUDYSmarter unit of UWA
20. Detailed information regarding the content and structure of two credit-bearing units: English Language and Academic Communication.
21. Overview of social, mentoring or other activities where the development of English language skills occurs informally.
22. Student-staff ratio for support services such as the academic language and literacy unit.
23. Detailed information on the new course structure for undergraduate programs implemented from 2012: *Embedding Communication and Research Skills.*
24. Outlines of Communication units embedded across a range of disciplines including Business, Engineering, Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, Science, Architecture, Health and Computing

Using the documentation that was made available by UWA, and other relevant publicly available information from the UWA website, the Evaluator prepared for the visit and the subsequent probing questions that would be focussed on during the interviews.

A schedule for the Evaluator was drafted in advance of the visit with meetings arranged with the following members of staff over the 1.5 day visit. Meetings ranged in length from a minimum of 50 mins to 2 hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff member</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Jane Long</td>
<td>Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Marius Porojan</td>
<td>Admissions Coordinator, Admissions Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Garry Hendy</td>
<td>Assoc Director (Admissions), International Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Fiona Birt</td>
<td>Manager, International Postgraduate Students Admissions, International Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Sato Juniper</td>
<td>Associate Director, Graduate Research and Scholarships Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Siri Barrett-Lennard</td>
<td>Team Leader/English Language and Learning Skills Adviser, StudySmarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Judy Skene</td>
<td>Associate Director, Student Services (Student Support Services) and Equity and Diversity Adviser, Student Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Kelly Smith</td>
<td>Director International Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Anthony Turner</td>
<td>Manager, International Quality Assurance, International Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Bianca Panizza</td>
<td>Director, Centre for English Language Teaching (CELT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The combined desk audit and in-depth interviews with these key members of staff enabled the Evaluator to make a comprehensive assessment of UWA’s strategies for setting and monitoring English language entry requirements and the provision of support available to international students.

**UWA PROFILE**

UWA’s programs are located within nine faculties:
- Architecture, Landscape and Visual Arts
- Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences
- Business School
- Education
- Engineering, Computing and Mathematics
- Law
- Life and Physical Sciences
- Natural and Agricultural Sciences
- Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences

In 2011 UWA enrolled more than 23,000 students comprising just over 5,200 international fee paying students (22% of the total load). A small proportion of these students were located offshore but with the majority enrolled at the Crawley campus of the University. UWA’s international enrolments are at approximately 75% of the national average. This lower proportion of international student intake, as stated by UWA, is “consistent with its principle of focussing on quality rather than on maximising student numbers”.

In 2007-2011 the programs (excluding Exchange and Study Abroad) attracting the highest proportion of international onshore students comprised the following:

1. Bachelor of Commerce (38% of the total intake)
2. Bachelor of Engineering (29%)
3. Doctor of Philosophy (35%)
4. Bachelor of Economics (51%)
5. Master of Oil and Gas Engineering (70%)
6. Master of Commerce (69%)
7. Master of Professional Accounting (95%)
8. Master of Architecture (24%)
9. Graduate Diploma in Oil and Gas Engineering (49%)
10. Master of Manual Therapy (54%)
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1 Page 36, UWA AUQA Performance Portfolio (2009)
2 Data provided in Attachment 2B, UWA Opt-in Application for Streamlined Visa Processing, 2012
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In 2007-2011 the highest number of international onshore students was sourced from China, Singapore and Malaysia.3

UWA SUBMISSION TO DIAC: OBSERVATIONS AND EVALUATION

The following section of the report provides a summary of UWA claims in its opt-in application to DIAC and the Evaluator’s observations during the visit and an evaluation of the UWA strategies observed.

Requirement 4 (Strategies in place to ensure that students have appropriate levels of English at the commencement of their course) and Requirement 5 (Strategies in place to ensure that students continue to develop their English language skills during their studies) are considered separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement 4:</th>
<th>Strategies in place to ensure that students have appropriate levels of English at the commencement of their course.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

UWA claims

1. Admission to all degree courses benchmarked for international students against a minimum of IELTS 6.5 with no band less than 6.0 for undergraduate (UG) and postgraduate (PG) degrees. Higher levels of English competence are required for admission to courses which may be deemed more demanding, or where professional industry requirements specify a higher level of English competence (up to 7.5) for professional membership and registration.

2. Other approved tests are benchmarked against IELTS and undergo a thorough assessment process prior to being approved.

3. External organisations recognised as a means of meeting UWA’s English language requirements undergo a thorough assessment process prior to being approved.

4. UWA has access to English language test verification systems pertaining to IELTS, TOEFL and Pearson which are the English language tests recognised by UWA.

5. The Academic English and Study Skills Bridging Course (Bridging Course) delivered by the UWA Centre for English Language Teaching (CELT) is the only direct entry pathway into tertiary studies. To be recognised as a direct entry pathway, a formal submission process was undertaken by CELT. CELT monitors the quality of the Bridging Course by periodically reviewing its exit grades and tracks the academic performance of its graduates once in their tertiary programs.

6. UWA periodically reviews the English language capabilities and needs of its international students and action is taken accordingly. The most recent review was conducted in 2009 and recommendations from this review are being implemented.

7. The AUQA review in 2009 found UWA’s English language admissions standards to be robust.

Observations

There are two aspects to this requirement: the first being the processes in place to verify that students meet the English language standards; and the second the processes in place to set, monitor and review the English language entry standards used by the University to ensure they are appropriate.

In interviews with the Director International Centre, Associate Director (Admissions), Manager, International Postgraduate Students Admissions and the Director CELT (Centre for English Language Teaching), the Evaluator was able to confirm that UWA has rigorous processes to verify that students meet the English language entry standards set by the University. These entry standards are enshrined in policy (University Policy on English Language Competence for Admission to Degree Study), a copy of which was provided to the Evaluator. Verification processes include clear communication to students, staff and agents about what these entry requirements are, access to online verification systems pertaining to the three recognised English language test providers IELTS, TOEFL and Pearson, and clear and transparent processes with CELT that offers the direct entry English language Bridging Course for students on a pathway to tertiary studies.

The Evaluator’s observations combined with auditing mechanisms such as those conducted by AUQA and the state regulatory body in WA provide assurances that UWA meets any requirement that verification processes be robust.

3 Data provided in Attachment 1C, UWA Opt-in Application for Streamlined Visa Processing, 2012
With respect to setting, monitoring and reviewing English language entry standards, the Evaluator was able to consider the entry requirements for undergraduate and postgraduate programs, the processes for reviewing entry standards and reviews that have been undertaken to this regard by UWA.

Underpinning UWA’s entry (and exit) requirements for international students is the UWA Senate Resolution which is also enshrined in the University’s International Plan. Alongside the University’s commitment to maintaining diversity in its recruitment of international students; ensuring that international students have an appropriate level of English; and providing students with a high level of student support services and opportunities for social interaction with local students, is the requirement that entry and exit requirement for international students are equivalent to those for domestic students. This commitment is observable from a practical point of view in the University’s Educational Principles, Good Practice Guides, course structures, assessment practices and other related documentation with is accessible to students and staff. It is also evidenced by the entry requirements for postgraduate programs in particular, which have been calibrated to the high academic standards the University sets for different programs.

UWA’s English language entry requirements for all undergraduate programs are benchmarked against an IELTS 6.5 (no band lower than 6.0).

The Evaluator was provided with a list of postgraduate programs that have varying English language entry requirements up to IELTS 7.5. The variations in the entry requirements indicate that consideration has been given to the linguistic demands of such programs and the desired English language levels of graduates of these programs to ensure they meet the requirements of professional bodies (for registration or accreditation purposes) and prospective employers. The varying English language entry requirements that fall above the minimum 6.5 (6.0) indicate that careful consideration is given to the linguistic demands of different disciplines and the professional language skills students will need to have throughout their studies (for work placements, for instance) and to prepare them for employment on graduation.

Students are able to articulate from undergraduate to postgraduate study with no further formal English language testing including articulation to programs that have a higher English language entry requirement.

The process for increasing the English language entry requirements for postgraduate programs is usually instigated at faculty level but must go through the Faculty Board in the first instance, then the Admissions Committee that finally makes a recommendation to Academic Council. The Admissions Committee is responsible for setting and monitoring all entry standards and for assessing new English language testing regimes as they emerge. This provides a rigorous and considered process for establishing and reviewing English language requirements.

To assist with decisions about English language, the Committee seeks advice from the language experts within UWA. More recently, for instance, CELT (Centre for English Language Teaching) reviewed the recent changes to TOEFL scores benchmarked against IELTS (which would result in lowering the TOEFL score requirement) with a recommendation not to adjust the UWA accordingly as the University needed more evidence of its impact. It is conservative practices such as these that indicate that UWA has a strong focus on quality and the calibre of its students and that it maintains a level of independence in setting its entry standards.

The English language centre, CELT, which provides the only English language direct entry program to UWA tertiary studies (supplying approximately 13% of the University’s international student intake) is embedded in the organisational structure of the University. This governance arrangement results in close collaboration between the University and CELT and ultimately benefits both organisations. CELT evaluates its Bridging Course content and assessment through close communication with staff within the University and the collection of data regarding the academic performance of its graduates. It is also able to contribute to University initiatives by offering its English language expertise with respect to English language entry standards and support. More generally, this close relationship promotes a culture of good practice in the broader teaching community.

Evaluation

The Evaluator’s observations and interviews provide strong evidence that UWA has robust processes in place to set and monitor its English language entry standards and that these processes are underpinned by a strong ethos of quality and due diligence with respect to its students.

It was reassuring for the Evaluator to confirm UWA’s claims that it makes conservative and independent decisions about English language entry standards to protect the quality of the education it provides to students. Also
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reassuring was the principle, evident in practice, that there is an expectation that international students be assessed at entry and exit points in the same way as their domestic counterparts.

As for the English language entry standards themselves, UWA has demonstrated that it takes into account the linguistic demands of different disciplines and programs by setting English language entry requirements that are well above the minimum of IELTS 6.5 (6.0). This is consistent (albeit with respect to postgraduate programs only) with the recommendations provided by IELTS which stipulate that a score of 6.5 may not be adequate for linguistically demanding disciplines.5

The Centre for English Language Teaching plays a crucial and embedded role in the University’s international admission processes by offering expert English language advice to the University’s Admission Committee.

CELT’s Bridging Course for students on a pathway to the University and the inherent quality assurance processes in place to review and monitor the course’s content and assessment scores provide a valuable pathway addition to international students.

To further enhance UWA’s processes in setting, monitoring and reviewing English language entry standards, it is recommended that UWA consider extending its mechanisms for monitoring the English language performance of students who have articulated from an undergraduate degree where the entry requirement is IELTS 6.5 (6.0) to a postgraduate degree where the entry level may be as high as IELTS 7.5 (7.5) as is the case for Law and the Master of Pharmacy, for instance. Whilst it can be argued that the combination of high calibre students, an intensive English language social and academic environment and the provision of a comprehensive array of social and support services (discussed further below), should lead to progressive English language development, it would be valuable for UWA to ascertain through qualitative and quantitative research, the level at which students’ English language proficiency develops throughout their undergraduate degree in preparation for their next entry point.

### Requirement 5: Strategies in place to ensure that students continue to develop their English language skills during their studies.

**UWA claims**

1. The University places emphasis on English language skills and has ongoing strategies to assist students through their studies.
2. UWA has a process whereby students can package their tertiary studies with English language courses prior to commencement if such students do not meet the English language entry requirements.
3. UWA has a range of strategies in place to ensure students continue to develop their English language skills during their studies. These include:
   - Free online and campus services delivered by STUDY Smarter (the academic language and learning skills unit of the University). These are central services offered to all students requiring academic language, learning and acculturation assistance.
   - Discipline-specific support services involving STUDY Smarter advisers teaching into units in almost every faculty.
   - Embedded communication and research skills units delivered throughout the UWA degree structures.
   - The provision of credit-bearing English Language and Academic Communication units which international students can access.
   - An online Communication and Research Skills module which forms part of the first year program for all students.
4. UWA has a range of transition services including social networking, peer mentoring and study group programs.
5. Information about UWA’s expectations and assistance regarding English language is comprehensive and disseminated via a range of channels including the UWA Survival Guide and orientation as well as in the Good Practice Guides accessible via the UWA website.
6. The English language skills of UWA students are reviewed independently every seven years.

**Observations**

Attachment 2 provides a detailed overview of the English language development initiatives in place at UWA. During the Evaluator’s visit to the UWA campus and the associated meetings with relevant staff, each of these

---

5 IELTS Handbook, 2007, Page 5
initiatives was explored thoroughly and further evidence was provided as to their implementation. The Evaluator was also able to peruse the Annual Report written by the STUDY Smarter unit which provides a comprehensive account of its activities in 2011. The report highlights the incremental range of support services introduced at UWA in the last 7 years in particular. The University has significantly increased its resources devoted to academic language and learning in recent years with the current student:staff ratio sitting at 2,000:1 which is considered adequate by academic language and learning standards.

Without question, UWA students are able to access a range of complementary services to enhance their social and study experiences and which guide them towards their integration into tertiary study life. Whilst these services are available to all students, international students benefit from each of these and, as a result of the nature of some of these services, gravitate towards some in particular. For example, the “English language corner”, academic writing clinics, Study Skills workshops including speaking, grammar and writing, the Language and Cultural Exchange Program (LACE), pre- and post-arrival mentoring services and one-on-one consultations with the two English language skills advisors located in the STUDY Smarter unit (and funded by the Centre for English Language Teaching).

The STUDY Smarter unit also works at faculty/program level to assist academic teaching staff in specific programs with the development of academic language and literacy skills of their students. This service is usually instigated by the faculty or program and whilst resource intensive, reflects a sound pedagogical and evidence-based approach that is favoured by academic language and learning practitioners.

UWA has not implemented a university-wide post-entry English language test but on request, the STUDY Smarter unit assists with diagnostic testing to identify students who may need specific support. CELT also provides an ad-hoc English language testing service.

The UWA ethos underpinning the support services available to students is that these should not discriminate or stigmatise international students and that they be communicated and therefore perceived in positive terms (rather than remedial). This approach is consistent with current thinking and research in the area of academic language and learning skills support which considers that integrating services to reach both international and domestic students will lead to higher access rates and student satisfaction.

Communication about what services are available to students is extremely comprehensive and available in a range of locations including the website, the UWA facebook page, student handbooks, diaries, posters and promotional campaigns (in orientation and during the semester via email) with students and teaching staff by the Student Services and STUDY Smarter teams.

UWA further communicates the importance of English language skills development by referring to its importance in its Educational Principles (website), the UWA Survival Guide (student handbook) and the relevant Good Practice Guide (Teaching and Learning site) which outlines staff and student responsibilities with respect to developing the English language skills of UWA students.

Postgraduate (PG) students are supported by three Graduate Education Officers, one of whom works more closely with international students. On commencement and to assist with transition, PG research students undergo an orientation program (called FIRST). Progress reports for Higher Degrees by Research students have a clearly articulated focus on English language competency.

Undergraduate students are also offered an opportunity to undergo up to two broadening units that are credit-bearing and focus on English language and academic communication. Originally targeting Study Abroad and Exchange students, these are also taken up by international degree students. Since 2009, approximately 137 students have chosen to integrate these units into their undergraduate programs.

From 2012, UWA has begun implementing a new course structure for undergraduate degrees which progressively embeds communication and research skills throughout the degree program. This innovative change to the structure of UWA undergraduate programs and its distinct focus on communication skills in content and assessment should have a significant positive impact on the English language skills of international (and other) students at UWA. The Evaluator was provided with documentation that details the Communication Skills Framework and the various dimensions inherent in this framework (writing, oral presentations, critical information and literacy skills and interpersonal skills). The Framework clearly shows the progressive level of skills students will acquire throughout their program. All new course proposals at UWA in the future will be required to identify how the course will demonstrate the development of communication (and research) skills.
Evaluation

UWA provides its students with a comprehensive suite of academic language and learning support services that are complementary, well-considered, highly accessible and based on pedagogically sound principles. The location of the Centre for English Language Teaching, STUDYSmarter and Student Services in the same organisational unit results in a cohesive approach to supporting international (and domestic) students. These areas are staffed by highly qualified practitioners who, on behalf of the University and in their own right, publish extensively, are recipients of awards and engage in a range of professional development activities.

In 2009, UWA commissioned an independent review of the English language skills of UWA graduates and the recommendations flowing from this review are currently in various stages of implementation. This review is highly visible and has been disseminated widely; evidenced by the number of references to it during interviews.

As the new course structure which embeds communication (and research) skills is implemented in 2012, UWA will find it valuable to monitor the impact on the professional development needs of academic teaching staff and assess what further resources should be allocated to meet these needs. The new course structure constitutes a significant shift in teaching and learning practices at UWA and will require dedicated programs to support teaching staff to manage the communication (and therefore, language) skills of their students.

UWA has a dedicated and hard-working academic language and learning skills development unit (ie STUDYSmarter). It is to be expected that the implementation of the embedded communication skills framework and UWA’s ongoing commitment to supporting the English language skills of its international students will lead to an increased emphasis and therefore demand, on the services provided by this unit. The demand is likely to be within programs that require intensive support for staff. UWA will find it valuable to monitor the staff that is available to provide this level of support and review the relative resource allocation accordingly.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. UWA has a demonstrated commitment to supporting its international students as evidenced by the range of initiatives currently in place and the philosophy of the University enshrined in policy and practice. A broad recommendation, which is clearly embedded in current practice and policy, is that UWA continue to maintain this focus and ensure that students have ongoing and increasing opportunities for English language enhancement.

2. UWA is undergoing the initial stages of implementing its new degree structure to include the embedding of communication and research skills. As this implementation is carried out and monitored, it is recommended that UWA monitors the impact on the professional development needs of academic teaching staff and assess what further resources should be allocated to meet these needs.

3. UWA will also find it valuable to monitor the staff that is available to provide program-level support with the implementation of the embedded communication skills framework and review the relative resource allocation accordingly.

4. To further enhance UWA’s processes in setting, monitoring and reviewing English language entry standards, it is recommended that UWA consider extending its mechanisms for monitoring the English language performance of students who have articulated from an undergraduate degree where the entry requirement is IELTS 6.5 (6.0) to a postgraduate degree where the entry level may be as high as IELTS 7.5 (7.5). It would be valuable for UWA to ascertain through qualitative and quantitative research, the level at which students’ English language proficiency develops throughout their undergraduate degree in preparation for their next entry point.

CONCLUSIONS

This Independent Evaluation of UWA’s English language entry requirements and provision of support services to international students highlighted the breadth, integrity and quality of UWA’s processes and practices.

The interviews conducted and documentation reviewed demonstrate strongly that UWA is committed to providing its international students with every opportunity to succeed and that it protects the education that is offered to its students.

Relevant support areas such as Student Services, STUDYSmarter, the Graduate Research and Scholarships Office and the Centre for English Language Teaching are staffed with dedicated, highly qualified and committed practitioners who take a highly student-centred approach to their activities.
Whilst many universities across Australia have an English language centre that is attached to it, there are varying arrangements in place (fully owned commercial entities, embedded in the organisational structure, for instance) which determine how operationally and functionally the English language and University work together. It is the Evaluator’s view that the example at UWA is a positive and constructive one which provides a mutually beneficial arrangement and that results in a more comprehensive English language learning and development experience for international students.
ATTACHMENT 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terms of Reference: Independent Evaluation of English language entry standards and support strategies

Purpose
To provide an overview of the structure and outcomes of the Independent Evaluation to be conducted at the University of Western Australia

1. Context
There are two elements to this Independent Evaluation required by DIAC:
1. Strategies in place to ensure that students have appropriate levels of English at the commencement of their courses.
2. Strategies in place to ensure that students continue to develop their English skills during their studies

2. Evaluation Approach
Whilst DIAC has not prescribed how the Independent Evaluation is to be conducted or the structure of the evaluation report, these Terms of Reference suggest that the outcomes of a desk audit and interviews at the University be aligned, albeit in broad terms, to the Good Practice Principles endorsed by DEEWR in 2009 (http://www.deewr.gov.au/HigherEducation/Publications/Pages/GoodPracticePrinciples.aspx).

The University’s response to DIAC in February 2012 will be evaluated via a desk audit of information and documentation and face-to-face interviews with key staff at the University. UWA’s application to DIAC relating to Streamlined Visa Processing has been made available and will be referenced in the report (ie points 4 and 5 which refer to English language).

The desk audit will include an analysis of the following documentation:
1. Profile information regarding UWA: i.e number of international students as a proportion of total
2. List of English language tests recognised by UWA and relevant entry scores.
3. List of English language entry requirements for UWA programs.
4. Pathway or articulation agreements that are used in lieu of English language tests (eg pathways from the/an English language institution).
5. List of English language support services available to international students. These may include language skills support workshops, drop-in centre, individual support as well as credit-bearing programs, adjunct programs or English language skills embedded in formal programs. This may also include conversation classes.
6. List of social, mentoring or other activities where the development of English language skills occurs informally.
7. Student-staff ratio for support services such as the academic language and literacy unit.
8. Process for identifying students “at risk” as a result of language difficulty.
9. Tools used (if any) to measure English language proficiency post-commencement. These may include a commercially available English language tool or ones that have been internally developed.
10. Data that provides information on the academic performance of international students compared to the domestic cohort.

Interviews with key staff at the University will also be used to gather further information. Staff participating in interviews include:
- Associate Director (Admissions), International Centre and/or Admissions Coordinator
- Team Leader/English Language and Learning Skills Adviser, Study Smarter
- Associate Director, Student Services
- Manager, International Postgraduate Students
- Director International Centre
- Manager, International Quality Assurance, International Centre
- Director, Centre for English Language Teaching (CELT)

3. Evaluation Visit and Report
The Evaluation Report will provide an outline of the Terms of Reference used to conduct the evaluation, an overview of the aforementioned elements, conclusions and recommendations.

The Evaluation will take place week beginning 13 and 14 March and will comprise a 1.5 day visit to the UWA campus. The Final Evaluation Report will be submitted to UWA by no later than Monday 19 March with a draft ready for discussion during the Evaluation visit.
UWA strategies to ensure students continue to develop their English skills during their studies include:

1. Explicitly communicating English language development expectations and support to incoming students
2. Providing a diverse range of free STUDY Smarter learning, language and research skills services on-campus and online
3. Offering credit-bearing, adjunct and English language skills embedded in formal programs
4. Continuing to support academic and learning language proficiency throughout students’ study, including at Honours and postgraduate levels
5. Assisting student transition through targeted friendship programs, social networking, peer mentoring and study groups
6. Developing English language skills through online social networking and through on-campus speaking clubs and events
7. Regularly reviewing and adjusting staff-student ratio for support services devoted to academic language and learning
8. Requiring all UWA staff who have direct contact with students to assist in identifying students “at risk” as a result of language difficulty
9. Monitoring international research postgraduate students’ English language skills and providing early intervention where appropriate
10. Requiring UWA students to successfully complete a communication and research skills online quiz in their first semester of studies

These strategies are outlined below.

1. The University communicates English language development expectations and support through the:

   UWA Educational Principles
   Good Practice Guide for Developing the English language skills of UWA students
   Learning Skills Good Practice Guide
   UWA handbook unit descriptors
   UWA Survival Guide distributed to all new students
   Studying at UWA webpage
   Studying at UWA Orientation Week sessions for each degree

2. The University provides a diverse range of free STUDY Smarter language, learning and research skills services on-campus and online:

   Workshops
   Workshop podcasts
   Consultations
   Daily drop-in advice sessions
   Self-access resource area and Survival Guides
   Academic writing clinics
   Jump Start
   Critical thinking corner
   Plagiarism portal
   English language corner

   These services assist all students in developing English language skills, and in transferring these skills within and beyond their areas of study.

3. The University offers credit-bearing, adjunct and English language skills embedded in formal programs:

   Two accredited units (HUMA1901 and HUMA1902) develop the English language and academic communication skills of international students with English as an additional language.
The University has embedded communication and research skills throughout its degree structures, with students in all majors completing units that develop the speaking, writing, critical information literacy and interpersonal skills required for their studies and their profession:

- New major proposal form
- Embedding Research Working Party Report
- Communication Skills Working Party Report
- Curriculum development guide for UWA staff
- Communication skills framework and Communication skills guide

STUDY Smarter academic language and learning advisers teach into units in almost every faculty, assisting students to develop English language skills as part of their studies.

(4) The University continues to support, academic language and learning proficiency throughout students’ study, including at Honours and Postgraduate levels:

- The Honours hub
- MasterMine
- Graduate Research School research skills and thesis writing workshops
- Facilitated writing groups and research retreats
- The Research Journey

(5) The University offers comprehensive transition services that encourage students from outside Perth to form social connections on campus pre-arrival, and to participate in social activities, peer mentoring and study groups once they have commenced their studies:

- ConnectMe@UWA
- UniMentor
- Befriending program
- Skillshops
- Peer assisted learning (Science)
- Peer assisted study sessions (Business)
- UniSkills
- Language and Cultural Exchange program

(6) The University develops English language skills through online social networking and through on-campus speaking clubs and events:

- UWA Students Facebook page
- Get Smart electronic newsletters
- UniSpeakers club
- UWA Toastmasters Club
- UWA’s three minute thesis competition

(7) The University regularly reviews and adjusts its staff-student for support services devoted to academic language and learning.

The University has significantly increased it resources devoted to academic language and learning in recent years. The relative proportion of staff full-time equivalents (FTEs) in academic language and learning compared to student equivalent full-time study loads (EFTSLs) changed dramatically in the five year period between 2006 and 2011 (see University Statistics).

In 2006, the staff-student ratio for support services devoted to academic language and learning was approximately 3,000:1. Staffing FTE was 5.0, including 3.0 FTE Language and Learning Advisers and 2.0 FTE Graduate Education Officers. These staff supported 17,275 students with an EFTSL of 14,648.

In 2011, by comparison, the staff-student ratio for support services devoted to academic language and learning was approximately 2,000:1. Staffing (10.4 FTE total) included:

- The STUDY Smarter team (6.6 FTE)
- The Graduate Education Officers (3.0 FTE)
- The Business School Postgraduate Student Centre (0.8 FTE)
In 2011, these staff supported 23,292 students with an EFTSL of 19,939.

(8) The University requires all staff who have direct contact with students to assist in identifying students “at risk” as a result of language difficulty:

These requirements are outlined in The Good Practice Guide for Developing the English language skills of UWA students (excerpt below).

**Responsibilities of UWA staff**

All professional and academic staff members who have direct contact with students are normally expected to:

- identify students who may require additional English language skills development when they are interacting with students
- know where additional English language skills training is available and provide details of facilities available, and
- advise students of their responsibilities for English language development (see over page).

Some simple ways of determining whether additional English language training is required include asking students about their studies, getting them to repeat information, checking how well they have completed forms, seeing how well they follow instructions, observing their interaction with others, and listening for gaps in their communication.

University staff members who develop curricula and co-ordinate academic programs are normally expected to:

- ensure curricula, teaching and assessment practices develop English language communication skills as part of the normal academic program
- ensure that each level of a major requires students to demonstrate English language communication skills
- apply increasing standards of satisfactory communication in English progressively during the course, and
- include in all unit outlines the following statement or similar:

  Assistance with study skills, including English language skills, is available free of charge to all enrolled students from Student Services.

  - Website: [www.studysmarter.uwa.edu.au](http://www.studysmarter.uwa.edu.au)
  - Location: Student Services, First Floor, Social Sciences South
  - Telephone: (+61 8) 6488 2423.

University staff members who teach academic programs are normally expected to:

- integrate English language development with teaching practices, for example by modelling the discourse of the discipline and indicating appropriate standards
- identify students who may require training in additional English language skills through informal means, for example by engaging students in dialogue and monitoring in-class activities and discussions
- integrate English language development with assessment practices so that students’ English language development needs can be detected early
- provide students with reasonable levels of feedback to assist them to improve their skills or to remedy deficiencies
- know where additional English language skills training is available and provide details of facilities available to assist English language development, and
- know where staff development support is available for integrating, assessing and providing feedback on English language communication skills and access such support as required.

(9) The University monitors international research postgraduate students’ English language skills of and provides early intervention where appropriate:

  [FIRSTatUWA](http://www.firstatuwa.uwa.edu.au) (Facilitating International Students Research Transition)

(10) Undergraduate students are required to successfully complete a communication and research skills online quiz in their first semester of studies:

The [Communication and Research Skills](http://www.firstatuwa.uwa.edu.au) (CARS1000) quiz is based on a series of modules on starting assignments, finding evidence, writing assignments, delivering oral presentations and working in teams.