A vision of You-topia: Personalising professional development of teaching in a diverse academic workforce.

Lisa Thomas Dr
University of Wollongong, lkosta@uow.edu.au

Kathryn Harden-Thew
University of Wollongong, kathrynp@uow.edu.au

Janine Delahunty Dr
University of Wollongong, janined@uow.edu.au

Bonnie Amelia Dean
University of Wollongong, bcord@uow.edu.au

Follow this and additional works at: http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp

A vision of You-topia: Personalising professional development of teaching in a diverse academic workforce.

Abstract

The higher education (HE) sector in Australia is in a state of flux due to a range of social, political and economic factors. Increased competition, greater student diversity, tautening of industry exigencies, reduced funding, and rapid technological advances are key drivers of change in this environment. Within this period of transformation, HE institutions remain steadfast in maintaining quality teaching and learning practices. Challenges are therefore presented on the traditional role and function of the teaching academic, creating opportunities to explore how staff can be better prepared to teach into the new era of HE.

Professional development for learning and teaching is one approach that can support staff to enhance teaching practice. Professional development programs however that fail to meet the contemporary needs of HE or consider the academic's professional requirements, may be at risk of becoming extraneous. A move towards a more flexible approach to professional development may be necessary to meet these requirements to provide appropriate, timely support for teachers.

This paper problematises approaches to professional development which adopt a 'one-size-fits-all' model and introduces a new, innovative program *Continuing Professional Development (Learning & Teaching)* (CPD [L&T]) at the University XXXXXX . The CPD (L&T) model supports the professional development of *all* teaching staff – from casual teacher to professor level, academic and professional staff. The model is externally referenced and features self-nominated activities for accreditation. CPD (L&T) enables multiple, ongoing methods of engagement across a professional's teaching career, supporting a new, *You-topic* vision of professional development in learning and teaching.

A vision of You-topia: Personalising professional development of teaching in a diverse academic workforce

Introduction

The character of higher education in Australia is shifting due to a range of social, political and economic factors. The changes are not isolated to one facet of the system, but challenge the system as a whole. This situation reflects changes in higher education systems worldwide, as they increasingly move from "elite to mass systems, and beyond to universal systems" (Department of Education and Training 2015b, p.4). With a wider range of student demographics, changing pedagogies, the capabilities provided by technology for educational purposes and an increasingly diversified academic workforce, challenges abound in the support of professional development of quality teaching in higher education.

As the nature of academic work becomes more complex, the role and function of the university lecturer is continually evolving. Within their teaching role, academics can be faced with various challenges related to subject delivery, class size, student diversity, teaching-team locations and competencies, subject-related decisions, appropriate pedagogies, student expectations and limitations related to resources and learning spaces. Rarely is the teaching scenario for one academic replicated for another. However, upon appointment, many lecturers are required to complete a generic introductory learning and teaching course within their institution. Such courses which deliver on set topics, may assume that participants begin with the same level of understanding, request the same information and teach in generic contexts. We argue that this approach is outdated, as it provides academics with limited opportunity to engage in meaningful, contextually relevant professional development that keeps pace with the changing nature of higher education.

To meet the needs of 21st century higher education, institutions must explore and develop new professional development models that support staff in the evolving areas of learning and teaching. This paper presents an argument for personalised and contextualised approaches to professional development of learning and teaching for the future academic workforce. Adding to this, we present an example of how one such approach is being undertaken by an Australian university.

Background

Since the 1970s student numbers have increased due to government policy promoting increasing domestic places in higher education, as well as greater opportunities and flexibility in providing international students with access to Australian institutions. Now, with more than 1.3 million students enrolled in higher education institutions (Gardner 2016; PwC 2016), the student body is more diverse than ever before. Widening participation policies have resulted in institutions targeting students of low socioeconomic status in their drive to increase enrolments (Norton & Cherastidtham 2014) and meet OECD targets (Bradley, Noonan, Nugent & Scales 2008). This has resulted in a proliferation of groups categorised as "equity" or considered "outside the mainstream". Higher education, once predominantly a male domain, now boasts a female enrolment of almost 60% across disciplines (Department of Education 2015a) and around 25% of the student body are international students (PwC 2016). Bipartisan political mandates encourage students who are "first in family" to enter university. There are also more mature age, part-time and off-campus students. However, government policy supporting this "massification" has been

"paired with slower funding growth compared to the cost of delivery" (PwC 2016, p.12), placing further downward pressure on institutions, academics and the students themselves.

As the composition of the student body has altered, so have demands for changes in what is learned and how students engage in their learning. Students are demanding a more personalised learning experience (Coates, Kelly & Naylor 2016). Adding further complexity to the teaching environment are the various modes of attendance (e.g. face-to-face, distance, blended, online) and the continual introduction of new technologies. As student feedback filters back to the academy, curriculum, teaching and pedagogy are experiencing closer scrutiny and teaching staff face pressure to meet new or perceived student needs.

Given these changes, the roles of experienced academic staff are being redefined, making professional development in learning and teaching critical. However, teaching in higher education has been described as:

> *not deeply professionalised. In fact, when judged by the conventional characteristics of professions, higher education teaching rates poorly.... For example, unlike other professions, there is no requirement for scholarly pre-service training and there are no registration requirements for practice. Similarly, there is no code of ethics or explicit, agreed set of professional standards. There are no requirements for continuing professional development to maintain one's fitness to practice.* (James, Baik, Millar, Naylor, Bexley et al. 2015, p.2)

With no standard for professional development in higher education, academics often "opt to learn 'as they go' or by trial and error" (Ross, Carbone, Lindsay, Drew, Phelan, et al. 2016, p.2). Professional development offered to teaching staff is often voluntary rather than mandatory. It also frequently targets early career staff, neglecting the needs of experienced teaching staff and casual teachers (Ross et al. 2016). Highlighting this, statistics reveal that less than 15% of the academic staff teaching in higher education have a tertiary qualification in university teaching and less than 12% have a general education degree (James et al. 2015). Additionally, around 70% of these staff have not engaged in any form of professional development for learning and teaching at all (James et al. 2015; Ross et al. 2016).

Further complicating this picture are the changes occurring within the academic teaching body. The Grattan Institute report (Norton & Cherastidtham 2014) indicates that in 2014 there were approximately 52,600 academics with permanent or fixed-term contracts, while the full-time equivalent number of casual academic staff was stated to be 67,000 (PwC 2016). It is estimated that around 40-60% of teaching in higher education is currently conducted by these casual staff (James et al. 2015). At the same time, PwC's (2016) research indicated that between 2001 and 2014 academic teaching-only roles in universities grew by 360% to meet student demand.

As pressures mount to engage 21st century students, attention turns to how well teachers are addressing these changes and are being supported to do so in these transforming environments. Currently, professional development is not mandated at a national level, nor is it always attended to at an institutional level (James et al. 2015). For those universities that offer professional development programs at an institutional level, we argue that closer scrutiny must be paid to ensure program curriculum is meeting the contemporary needs of teachers.

Current approaches to professional development for university teaching

In Australia, many universities offer programs designed to support teaching and learning in higher education. Academics new to a university are often offered access to developmental activities

designed to promote quality teaching within the institution, known as "foundations programs" or "teaching preparation programs" (Chalmers, Stoney, Goody, Goerke & Gardiner 2012). Such programs are defined as formal courses that develop university teachers and induct them into the principles, concepts and practice of learning and teaching and "provide [academics] with the knowledge, skills and confidence to operate as effective teachers" (Hicks, Smigiel, Wilson & Luzeckyj 2010, p.66). Foundations programs are designed to orient academic staff into their new teaching contexts, including making them familiar with relevant policies and procedures. Student-centered learning is promoted, as well as collegiality and awareness of scholarly teaching practice.

Based on a systematic review of Australian universities, Hicks and colleagues (2010) highlight that while these programs can vary, they share several similar design features. Typically, foundations programs are short courses intended to meet the broad needs of early career teachers. They are often delivered through a structured set of face-to-face workshops, which begin with a one- or two-day introductory intensive program, followed by supplementary online modules or homework. Most programs include some form of assessment. Assessments can include reflective statements, teaching portfolios, book reviews, online discussions, peer observation of teaching or action-learning activities. Such programs have a distinct start and finish, with completion noted with a satisfactory submission of a task or participation in activities. Few of these programs provide opportunities to articulate into a more comprehensive training program, for example a Graduate Certificate in Teaching and Learning in Higher Education.

There are three notable concerns relating to current practices of professional development for teaching and learning. The first concern arises from a longstanding debate on the segregation of casual and full-time teachers and their unequal access to professional development opportunities (Percy, Scoufis, Parry, Goody, Hicks, et al. 2008). Despite casual academic teachers carrying out around half of all teaching in higher education, this group is often ignored in the area of professional development for teaching and learning altogether (Percy et al. 2008). Over the last decade, an increase in research and recognition of casual teaching staff (e.g. Harvey, Luzia, McCormack, Brown, McKenzie & Parker 2014), has led to an uptake of benchmarking standards to support quality learning and teaching (Luzia, Harvey, Parker, McCormack, & Brown 2013) and growth in the provision of professional development opportunities (Dean, Turbill, & Zanko 2015). However, in many cases, professional development programs are designed specifically for casual staff, limiting opportunity to build collegial networks with full-time staff. This separation for professional development potentially further increases the dichotomy between the two groups.

The second concern for foundations programs for academic teaching staff is that these programs are removed from standard aspects of academic work – research, teaching, governance – which overlap and are connected. Drawing on practice theory (Schatzki 2001), Boud and Brew (2013) argue that teaching development programs perpetuate a separation of developmental activities and everyday professional practice. Separating such activities raises questions about whether programs are being implemented with sufficient consideration for the complexity of academic work.

The final concern points to the finite nature of the completion of foundations programs. In many institutions where programs are offered, successful completion requires submission of an artefact, often "assessed" by an academic developer, which marks the conclusion of professional development activities and the relationship with the facilitators. In many cases there is little institutional incentive t continue teaching development beyond completion of the formalised short course.

Despite the literature arguing for new and improved approaches, little evidence can be found to suggest change in this area in its 40 year history. It is generally agreed that these programs have been beneficial to teachers and their students, however, the longevity and extent of these benefits

are less well researched and evidenced (Chalmers & Gardiner 2015). According to Chalmers and colleagues (2012, p.1), this is in part because "the linking of teaching preparation activities and experiences to tangible outcomes is highly contentious, complex and contingent".

Given the similarities in foundations programs across Australian universities and the limited research on the long-term impact of these short programs, Boud and Brew (2013) raise the point that professional development teaching and learning programs are at risk of adopting a deficit model. They argue that programs that start from a perceived need, in this case to maintain quality teaching standards, may become routine and institutionalised to the point of taking on structures and imperatives of their own. Where this is the case, there is often a shift from prioritising the needs of the professional to prioritising the needs of the provider. Coming to an understanding of all these considerations raises the question of how universities might support and evaluate quality teaching without conforming to a "one-size-fits-all", short-term model of teaching development

Mandate for change?

The ability to manage and embrace *change* best describes the predicted environment of 21st century higher education in Australia. However, enacting change in academia can be challenging, particularly when this entails change that is cultural or systemic. Historically, the need for change within academe has not been essential to its survival. Universities are steeped in long-established traditions, embedded in many of the practices and values of modern-day institutions (Lehmann 2009), with these traditions often being resistant to "moving with the times". Universities are often slow to alter practice to suit the shifting needs and expectations of stakeholders, despite the growing necessity to manage the uncertainties of external forces, such as funding, globalisation or industry demand. To maintain relevance into the next decade and beyond, the higher education sector in Australia must respond strategically to changes brought about by several external factors (PwC 2016).

External drivers of change affecting higher education include a number of key interdependent factors. These are identified in the report by PwC (2016, p.41) as:

- the continuing erosion of public funding (one example being Commonwealth government funding per student dropping to 2006 levels; see Universities Australia 2015, p.8)

- unprecedented competition among and increase in non-university higher education providers

- globalised competition for students, workforce and funding

- industry demand for "work-ready" graduates

- questions about the relevance and quality of higher education

- the increasing diversity of students

- the impact of technological advancements.

These drivers of change directly and increasingly affect learning and teaching in higher education, and will continue to do so.

The impact of these key factors begins with growing pressures to recognise the reduced relevance of traditional, content-heavy degrees and mounting demand for skills that are transferrable across context and sector. This movement was recently reflected in a decision made by the high-profile and multinational company, Ernst and Young (EY) UK to remove the degree requirement for

recruitment, announcing, "It's time to bust the myth that you need a degree in accounting or commerce to join EY" (EY n.d.). This stance characterises the seismic movement occurring in the workplace and in student demand. It also signals a clear call for universities to alter their focus in teaching to the development of soft skills such as problem-solving, critical thinking, effective communication and collaboration, leadership, emotional intelligence and digital literacy (PwC 2016) over the more traditional, content-laden focus.

With these significant changes across the sector, focus must now turn to the professional development of higher education staff to ensure a workforce prepared to face both current demands and future challenges. Revision of the traditional foundations program must include attention to evaluation of impact and effectiveness at multiple levels: on professional practice, students' learning and organisational culture. It demands cognisance of the diverse nature of academic practice and support for the development and recognition of quality teaching practice for both contracted and casual staff. Finally, to address ongoing change, such programs must become continuing in nature. Their design and development must keep abreast of 21st century demands, presenting exciting possibilities for "You-topia": personalised professional development in learning and teaching for academics in higher education.

Professional development of learning and teaching into the future

To keep abreast of the changing nature of higher education, the increasing numbers of casual teachers and the challenge to provide relevant and appropriate programs for all teaching staff, the University of Wollongong (UOW) has designed a personalised, professional development strategy aimed at ensuring the provision of quality learning and teaching into the future. In 2014, a Task and Finish group, convened by the Director, Learning, Teaching, Curriculum, developed a concept for a continuing, externally referenced and open-learning approach to professional development within the institution (Lawson, et.al. 2014). In 2015, UOW piloted a Continuing Professional Development, Learning and Teaching [CPD (L&T)] program for all staff (professional and academic) involved in learning- and teaching-related activity. The UOW Teaching Development Team was responsible for the design and delivery of the program. This team included two full-time and two part-time academic staff, as well as one part-time professional staff. The program became fully operational in 2016, with the former University Learning and Teaching foundations program rescinded. CPD (L&T) offers a personalised engagement strategy that is guided by a framework of seven criteria for quality teaching and four levels of standards (Appendix 1). The program has three distinguishing characteristics: it is continuing, externally referenced and open.

Continuing

The CPD (L&T) Framework identifies seven criteria related to quality teaching in higher education (Appendix 1). The Framework encourages ongoing commitment to professional development in learning and teaching by identifying four levels of standards to direct engagement with and recognition of the criteria. A pre-level option addresses the specific needs of casual tutors and PhD students involved in teaching. Each level is explained using a set of descriptors related to the overarching criteria. Using the Framework as a road map, staff may make their own choices to work towards the desired level.

Externally referenced

The CPD (L&T) Framework was developed in a rigorous process of alignment to internal and external quality-teaching benchmarks. The seven overarching criteria have been mapped to the Australian University Teaching Criteria and Standards (AUTCAS) framework (http://uniteachingcriteria.edu.au), as shown in Table 1:

Table 1. CPD (L&T) Framework: alignment of criteria to the Australian University Teaching Criteria and Standards framework (AUTCAS) (Chalmers, Cummings, Elliott, Tucker, Wicking & Jorre de St Jorre, 2014)

CPD (L&T) Criterion	Australian University Teaching Criterion
Design and plan effective learning experiences	Design and planning of learning activities
Facilitate activities that influence and motivate student learning	Teaching and supporting student learning
Facilitate assessment and feedback that fosters independent learning	Assessment and giving feedback to students on their learning
Support students' individual development and diversity	Developing effective learning environments, student support and guidance
Integrate scholarship, research and professional activities with teaching in support of learning	Integration of scholarship, research and professional activities with teaching and in support of student learning
Evaluate teaching practice and engage in continuing professional development	Evaluation of practice and continuing professional development
Demonstrate personal and professional effectiveness	Professional and personal effectiveness

Table 1 shows that the CPD (L&T) Criteria are clearly aligned to that of Chalmers and colleagues' (2014) Australian University Teaching Criteria. This alignment enables assurance that the institutional approach to addressing professional development needs is situated in the wider context of Australian higher education. In addition, the Australian University Teaching Criteria are supported by a standards framework that assists academic teachers to interpret the minimum expectations of teaching quality at the various levels of appointment (associate lecturer through to professor). These standards were also useful in developing the levels within the CPD (L&T) Framework.

There are four levels of standards in the (L&T) Framework. The level descriptors across the seven criteria of the framework are commensurate with various stages within an academic teaching career. These levels have been developed to align with the UOW internal Academic Performance Framework (used for promotion procedures) and have been mapped to national and international bodies, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. CPD (L&T) Framework: Alignment to external accrediting bodies

CPD (L&T) Level 1	HEA[1] Associate Fellow
CPD (L&T) Level 2	HEA[1] Fellow
CPD (L&T) Level 3	HERDSA[2] Fellow HEA[1] Senior Fellow
CPD (L&T) Level 4	HEA[1] Principal Fellow
[1] Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia [2] Higher Education Academy, United Kingdom	

Table 2 demonstrates where the CPD (L&T) Framework aligns nationally with the fellowship scheme offered by the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia (HERDSA) and internationally to the fellowship scheme of the Higher Education Academy (HEA) in the United Kingdom. This mapping further recognises the CPD (L&T) Framework as being embedded within the greater international context of recognition for quality teaching in higher education.

Open learning

The CPD (L&T) program is based on an open-learning approach, where each staff member prioritises their current professional development learning and teaching needs. Using the CPD (L&T) Framework as a guide, staff can identify the level of their current practice, as judged against the level descriptors for each criterion. They can then assess any criterion requiring further development and create an individualised plan to engage with professional development activities relative to their needs and interests. Staff can also request a mentor to help guide their decision-making and progress.

Staff may choose to engage with a range of activities when deciding on their engagement with professional development. A suite of online professional development modules and face-to-face master classes, related to the CPD (L&T) Framework, are available within the institution. These are designed and delivered within the UOW context by a team of academic developers working at the institution. Also, staff may wish to seek professional development beyond the institution by engaging with externally offered courses, MOOCs, conferences, topic-related literature or any other opportunities deemed suitable for meeting identified requirements. How and when an individual engages with professional development is a decision made solely by staff members themselves, offering them a degree of control over professional development choices within a robust teaching framework. This approach enables individuals to decide when, where and how they engage with professional development, ensuring a tailored learning experience to meet their current and future teaching needs.

Recognition and accreditation

The CPD (L&T) Framework provides staff members the opportunity to achieve professional recognition for good practice in teaching and in supporting learning. The framework is designed to be progressive, encouraging staff to move through the levels throughout their careers. Staff may apply for recognition at any level of the framework they feel is appropriate to them at that point in

their career path. This program is open to all staff involved in learning and teaching (professional, academic, casual, fixed-term, part-time and full-time). With successful completion of a level, the staff member is accredited within the institution. Staff may reapply for higher levels as their career progresses.

Recognition of learning and teaching practice and accreditation in the CPD (L&T) Framework is through submission of a portfolio in which staff draw together evidence of the impact of their teaching on student learning. The portfolio is an opportunity for staff to demonstrate how their teaching practice aligns to the Framework's seven teaching criteria, at the level they have selected. Applicants are encouraged to be creative with their portfolio, with no restrictions being placed on style, genre or media used. Staff are encouraged to look beyond a paper-based portfolio and explore possibilities of online portfolios, video and other media. By removing these constraints, staff have the freedom to develop a portfolio that fits with individual purposes in line with strategies for career, promotion, grant or award applications or publication aims. Engagement with any element of the program is voluntary with one exception, some academic staff are required to successfully complete a portfolio as part of their probationary requirements, as determined in their employment contract. This approach to the recognition and accreditation processes for professional development of learning and teaching encourages an individual, personalised approach: a veritable "you-topian" approach to the development of professional skills and expertise in learning and teaching in higher education.

Portfolios are assessed through a peer-review process upon submission. Two senior teaching staff within the institution are allocated to each portfolio to conduct the review. Following individual consideration against the criteria and standards, reviewers are brought together in a calibration meeting to discuss their feedback and the overall outcome of the portfolio. Possible outcomes of the review are: accept; resubmit with minor revisions; or resubmit with major revisions. Applicants receive detailed feedback to enable progression and resubmission, if required. In the first 12 months of the program (six months pilot and six months implementation), there have been 30 submissions, with 22 successful completions: 14 awarded Level 1, five awarded Level 2 and three awarded Level 3.

CPD (L&T) is still in its early phases of implementation. Important to any program is its continual evaluation and improvement. An overall evaluation strategy is currently being developed to underpin the operation of the program. This strategy aims to collect, review and reflect on evidence from the program for the purposes of sustained evaluation of the program itself and its impact on teaching practice over time. This will include collection of a range of quantitative and qualitative data, gathered at a number of points during and after participation in the program (Chalmers . 2012), with some data embedded into program activities, doubling as formative assessment (Bowie, Chappell, Cottman, Hinton & Partridge 2009). This will be to ensure the program is systematically evaluated, both in the short-term and longitudinally, and that improvements or adjustments are informed by the data. With a suite of online modules and master-class workshops available, we now look to engaging in the design and development of further opportunities to engage staff in enhancing their understanding and practice in learning and teaching.

Conclusion

In a time of rapid change, the international landscape of higher education is shifting. The Australian sector is not immune to this, and is undergoing a period of major transformation. The resulting implications for the academic workforce are many. As the traditional role of the

academic is reconceived, special attention must focus on providing high quality learning and teaching experiences to a diverse range of students.

Universities will need to ensure that they implement teaching practices that meet student needs if they are to keep up with demands. As employers increasingly seek graduates who are skilled problem-solvers, independent thinkers and effective communicators as well as being emotionally and digitally literate, institutions must look beyond the traditional teaching methods that have been a feature of a content-heavy approach. For those involved in teaching, understanding how, why and when to adopt such approaches can be challenging, with many academics feeling it sufficient simply to teach as they were taught.

In Australia, it is common for academic staff to be involved in teaching with little or no formal teaching qualification. With no standard for professional development in higher education, institutions may adopt their own approach in varying forms. The foundations program is a common approach that addresses the basic principles and practices in teaching in higher education for those early in their career, or new to an institution. What appears to be lacking are flexible programs that can be personalised to address each individual's current context and needs throughout various stages of their careers.

In a future that promises to be ever-evolving, a flexible and adaptive academic workforce is required. Professional development for learning and teaching should model and foster this. This paper provides an example of one institution's approach to realising a vision of *You-topia* through personalising professional development of teaching in a diverse academic workforce.

References

Bowie, C, Chappell, A, Cottman, C, Hinton, L & Partridge, L 2009. Bowie, C., Chappell, A., Cottman, C., Hinton, L., & Partridge, L. *Evaluating the impact of foundations of university teaching programs: A framework and design principles*. ALTC, Sydney.

Boud, D & Brew, A 2013. Reconceptualising academic work as professional practice: Implications for academic development. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 18(3), pp. 208-221.

Bradley, D, Noonan, P, Nugent, H & Scales, B 2008. *Review of Australian higher education, Final Report.* DEEWR, Canberra. Viewed at http://apo.org.au/files/Resource/higher_education_review_one_document_02.pdf.

Chalmers, D, Cummings, R, Elliott, S, Tucker, B, Wicking, R & Jorre de St Jorre, T 2014. *Australian University Teaching and Standards Project (Ref: SP12-2335) Final report 2014.* Office for Learning and Teaching, Sydney. Viewed 24 June, 2016 at http://uniteachingcriteria.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Draft-SP12-2335-Project-Final-Report-21-July-2014.pdf.

Chalmers, D & Gardiner, D 2015. The measurement and impact of university teacher development programs. *Educar*, 51(1), pp. 53-80.

Chalmers, D, Stoney, S, Goody, A, Goerke, V & Gardiner, D 2012. *Identification and implementation of indicators and measures of effectiveness of teaching preparation programs for academics in higher education (Ref: SP10-1840) Final report 2012*. Office

for Learning and Teaching, Sydney. Viewed at
http://www.worldclasseducation.uwa.edu.au/__data/assets/file/0004/2273692/Final-Report-Teaching-Preparation-Programs-Project.pdf .

Coates, H, Kelly, P & Naylor, R 2016. *New Perspectives on the Student Experience (Draft Report).* Viewed at http://melbourne-cshe.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0011/1862228/New-Perspectives-on-the-Student-Experience_240316_updated.pdf.

Dean, B A, Turbill, J & Zanko, M 2015. Mobilizing PD: Professional development for sessional teachers through mobile technologies, In Zhang, Y (ed.), *Handbook of Mobile Teaching & Learning.* Springer, Berlin, pp. 165-182.

Department of Education and Training 2015a. *2015 First half year student summaries.* Viewed at https://docs.education.gov.au/node/39331.

Department of Education and Training 2015b. *Higher Education Funding in Australia: A review of reviews from Dawkins to today.* Viewed at https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/higher_education_in_australia_-_a_review_of_reviews.pdf.

EY n.d. *A degree of difference.* Viewed at http://www.ey.com/AU/en/Careers/Students/Your-role-here/A-degree-of-difference.

Gardner, M 2016. Innovation in learning and teaching is too important to cut. *The Conversation.* Viewed at https://theconversation.com/innovation-in-learning-and-teaching-is-too-important-to-cut-58629.

Harvey, M, Luzia., K, McCormack, C, Brown, N, McKenzie, J & Parker, N 2014. *The BLASST report: Benchmarking leadership and advancement of standards for sessional teaching: Final report.* Office for Learning & Teaching, Sydney.

Hicks, M, Smigiel, H, Wilson, G & Luzeckyj, A 2010. *Preparing academics to teach in higher education, Final report.* Australian Learning and Teaching Council, Sydney. Viewed at http://epubs.scu.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1173&context=tlc_pubs.

James, R, Baik, C, Millar, V, Naylor, R, Bexley, E, Kennedy, G, Krause, K-L, Hughes-Warrington, M, Sadler, D & Booth, S 2015. *Advancing the quality and status of teaching in Australian higher education*, Office for Teaching and Learning, Sydney.

Lawson, R. et. al. 2014. Academic Senate Paper, December 2014: Continuing Professional Development (Learning and Teaching) Framework. University of Wollongong. Academic Senate. Retrieved October 2016: http://www.uow.edu.au/content/groups/public/@web/@gov/documents/doc/uow184585.pdf

Lehmann, W 2009. University as vocational education: working-class students' expectations for university. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 30(2)*,* pp. 137-149. doi: 10.1080/01425690802700164.

Luzia, K, Harvey, M, Parker, N, McCormack, C, & Brown, N R 2013. Benchmarking with BLASST sessional standards framework, *Journal of University Teaching & Learning*, 10(3), pp. 1-15.

Norton, A & Cherastidtham, I 2014. Mapping Australian higher education, 2014-15, Grattan Institute.

Percy, A, Scoufis, M, Parry, S, Goody, A, Hicks, M, Macdonald, I, Martinez, K, Szorenyi-Reischl, N, Ryan, Y, Wills, S & Sheridan, L 2008. *The RED report: Recognition, enhancement, development*, *Final Report*. Australian Learning and Teaching Council, Sydney. Viewed at http://ro.uow.edu.au/asdpapers/136/.

PricewaterhouseCoopers Australia (PwC) 2016. *Australia higher education workforce of the future: Report.* Australian Higher Education Industrial Association (AHEIA), Melbourne. Viewed at https://www.aheia.edu.au/cms_uploads/docs/aheia-higher-education-workforce-of-the-future-report.pdf.

Ross, B, Carbone, A, Lindsay, K, Drew, S, Phelan, L, Cottman, C & Stoney, S 2016. Developing educational goals: insights from a Peer Assisted Teaching Scheme. *International Journal for Academic Development*. doi: 10.1080/1360144X.2016.1189427.

Schatzki, T R 2001. Introduction: Practice theory. In Schatzki, T R, Cetina, K K & von Savigny, E (eds.), *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*. Routledge, London, p. 14.

Universities Australia 2015. *Universities Australia Pre-Budget Submission 2015-16*. Viewed at https://www.universitiesaustralia.edu.au/ArticleDocuments/726/2015-16%20UA%20Pre-Budget%20Submission.pdf.aspx.

Continuing Professional Development (Learning & Teaching)

CPD (L&T) Framework

UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG AUSTRALIA

Higher Education Teaching Criteria	Design & plan effective learning experiences	Facilitate activities that influence and motivate student learning	Support student individual development & diversity	Facilitate assessment & feedback that fosters independent learning	Integrate scholarship, research and professional activities with teaching in support of learning	Evaluate teaching practice and engage in continuing professional development	Demonstrate personal & professional effectiveness
Pre-level Descriptors	*Design sound inclusive learning experiences for students.*	*Facilitate a variety of inclusive learning experiences for students.*		*Support assessment tasks that foster learning. Provide constructive feedback to students.*		*Reflect upon feedback/data from students and colleagues, as well as personal experiences, in order to improve teaching practice.*	
Level 1 Descriptors Minimum requirement for probation and promotion	*Design sound inclusive learning experiences incorporating TEL, for students.*	*Facilitate a variety of inclusive learning experiences for students.*	*Facilitate learning environments that assist student transitions.*	*Develop a variety of effective assessment tasks that foster learning. Provide constructive feedback to students in a range of settings.*	*Apply sound, discipline relevant, L&T theoretical principles to explain their teaching practice.*	*Evaluate effectiveness of teaching practice and student learning outcomes. Reflect upon feedback/data from students and colleagues, as well as personal experiences, in order to improve teaching practice.*	*Develop effective, resilient professional practices that enhance teamwork.*
Level 2 Descriptors	*Effectively design curriculum demonstrating integration across the degree.*	*Facilitate a wide variety of inclusive learning experiences for students.*	*Support students in their choice and navigation of formal and informal learning pathways.*	*Design scaffolded assessments that foster progressive learning.*	*Demonstrate scholarship of teaching and learning through authorship of evaluations, reports and/or scholarly articles that showcase their teaching practice.*	*Using evaluation data support and mentor teaching teams. Reflect upon feedback from students and colleagues, as well as personal experiences, in order to improve teaching practice and engage in CPD.*	*Develop effective, resilient professional practices that enhance course management.*
Level 3 Descriptors	*Demonstrating appraisal of current factors impacting on the HE context in Australia lead in the delivery of effective teaching practices, demonstrating integration of curriculum with national, disciplinary and professional standards through engagement with professional bodies.*			*Design rigorous assessment practices that include sound moderation practice.*	*Demonstrate scholarship of teaching and learning through a portfolio of scholarly publications.*	*Reflect on evaluation data to improve institutional curriculum delivery. Support teaching teams through mentoring and/ or peer review.*	*Develop effective, resilient professional practices that enhance learning & teaching leadership. Demonstrate impact of your leadership in the UOW learning and teaching context and beyond.*
Level 4 Descriptors	*Demonstrating appraisal of current factors impacting on the international HE context lead in policy and guideline development relevant to teaching, learning and assessment.*			*Champion research/ scholarship of learning and teaching. Showcase a sustained scholarship of teaching and learning through a portfolio of publications and formal outputs.*		*Reflect upon feedback from peers, as well as personal experiences, in order to improve learning and teaching practices institutionally, nationally or internationally.*	*Demonstrate strategic leadership in the learning and teaching context. Demonstrate impact of learning and teaching expertise to a wide spread audience (e.g. national grants; awards; fellowships; key note invitations; decision making roles).*

LEARNING, TEACHING & CURRICULUM CPD (L&T) Framework