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1. Benchmarking against other universities

- UQ’s aim is to be one of the top 3 GO8 institutions
- How do we know…
  - What to improve?
  - Where do we stand in relation to others?
  - What’s the UQ Advantage?
1.1 Using cross institutional data

• National external auditing organisations
  - Quality Audits (AUQA)
  - Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) and Compacts

• Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF)

• National data
  - Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ)
  - Graduate Destinations Survey (GDS)
  - Australasian Survey of Student Engagement (AUSSE)
1.2 Australasian Survey of Student Engagement (AUSSE)

- based on the US National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
- conducted nationally by the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER)
- can be used for benchmarking within and across universities
- assesses dimensions of students’ engagement in their university education and students’ learning outcomes
- used with first- and later-year bachelor degree students
Your university experience

1. In your experience at your institution during the current academic year, about how often have you done each of the following? Mark your answers in the boxes. Leave blank if the item does not apply.

- Asked questions or contributed to discussions in class or online
- Sought advice from academic staff
- Meditated a class or online presentation
- Worked hard to master difficult content
- Prepared two or more drafts of an assignment before handing it in
- Used library resources on campus or online
- Worked on an essay or assignment that required integrating ideas or information from various sources
- Used student learning support services
- Blended academic learning with workplace experience
- Included diverse perspectives (e.g., multicultural, gender, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or written assignments
- Gave or received feedback from or on class assignments
- Kept up to date with your study
- Worked with other students on projects during class
- Worked with other students outside class to prepare assignments
- Put together ideas or concepts from different subjects when completing assignments or during class discussions
- Toured or taught other university students (paid or voluntary)
- Participated in a community-based project (e.g., volunteering) as part of your study
- Used an online learning system to discuss or complete an assignment
- Used email or a forum to communicate with teaching staff
- Discussed your grades or assignments with teaching staff
- Talked about your career plans with teaching staff or advisors
- Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with teaching staff outside class

2. During the current academic year, how much has your coursework emphasized the following intellectual activities?

- Repeated prompt oral or written feedback from teachers or tutors on your academic performance
- Worked harder than you thought you needed to meet a teacher or tutor's standards or expectations
- Worked with teaching staff on activities other than coursework (e.g., committees, orientation, student organizations, etc.)
- Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with other students or colleagues (e.g., students, faculty, peers, co-workers, etc.)
- Had conversations with students of a different ethnic group than yourself
- How conversations with students were very different to you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions or personal views

3. In a typical week, how many exercises, lab reports, problem sets and tutorial questions do you complete?

- Number of exercises, lab reports, or tutorial questions that take one hour or less to complete
- Number of exercises, lab reports, or tutorial questions that take more than one hour to complete

4. How satisfied are you with your current academic experience?

- Strongly dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Neutral
- Satisfied
- Strongly satisfied
AUSSE scales

- Engagement Scales
  - Academic Challenge
  - Active Learning
  - Student and Staff Interactions
  - Enriching Educational Experiences
  - Supportive Learning
  - Work Integrated Learning

- Outcome Measures
  - Higher Order Thinking
  - General Learning Outcomes
  - General Development Outcomes
  - Average Overall Grade
  - Departure Intention
  - Overall Satisfaction
2. Institutional review

- Which programs and units of study should we continue/ change / remove?
- What evidence do we need?
- Who should we ask?
- How do we affect change?
2.1 Review of Program of study: Academic Program Review (APR)

- review of undergraduate programs
- every major or field of study in a large, generalist degree, and every suite of postgraduate coursework programs reviewed every 5 years
  - except the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science, which are reviewed every seven years
APR required areas of investigation

- Program distinctiveness
- Curriculum development
- Teaching practices
- Assessment *
- Student load, viability & demand *
- Retention, completion & participation rates *
- Current student satisfaction *
- Graduate student satisfaction *
- External stakeholder input
- Graduate destinations *
- Graduate attributes
- Internationalisation
- Program governance (for cross-school/faculty programs)
2.2 Review of Unit of Study: Curriculum and Teaching Quality Appraisal (CTQA)

- annual process completed by the end of September each year
- conducted by the School Teaching & Learning Committee
- overseen by Associate Deans (Academic)
- informs faculty-level operational planning processes
- reported to DVC(A) through the Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee.
CTQA Data sets

- Load (by school, Faculty, UQ)
  - By funding type, Staff: student ratio, Pass rate
- Demand (by course)
  - Preferences, Entry score, Acceptance and enrolment
- Attrition after 1st year (by course)
  - No of students starting, % attrition after year 1
- Student evaluation (by question: by school, Faculty, UQ)
- Graduate satisfaction and destination (by field of study: by UQ, national)
  - Generic skills, overall satisfaction, good teaching
  - % in full time study, % in full time work
- Success / graduation rate (by program: by UQ, majors)
  - No of students in starting year, % graduations after completion
- AUSSE (by field of study: by school, Faculty, UQ, national)
  - Outcome, engagement
CTQA TEMPLATE

- Ensures the use of data for reflection and planning
- Reports on
  - strengths of teaching programs
  - identifies areas for improvement,
  - suggests proposed strategies and timeline/budget to address the latter areas
  - progress on previous year’s teaching quality initiatives
  - progress of any recently introduced programs and fields of study
- Reported to the Faculty’s Associate Dean (Academic)
  - Collated and forwarded to DVC(A)
PROFORMA FOR ANNUAL CURRICULUM AND TEACHING QUALITY APPRAISAL (CTOA)

Current student satisfaction and graduate destination and satisfaction

1. Student satisfaction for U/G and P/G courses offered by the school (CQEA). [CQEA page]
2. Graduate student satisfaction (CEQ) for most relevant fields of study and benchmarked with 66.2. [66.2] [Best page]
3. Graduate destinations (U/G) for most relevant fields of study. [Great set] [Best page]
4. AUSU results for first and final year U/G in programs co-ordinated by the school. [Data also available at the School level] (AUSSE page).

Please note that 2009 is the first year we have used the AUSSE as the internal student survey instrument and so the results are not currently available. An analysis of the AUSSE results will be requested at a later date.

Step 2 – Prepare a brief report on the basis of the review of the key T&L indicators for the school

Strengths of the School’s teaching programs/majors (as indicated by the teaching quality indicators)

- Identify areas of the School’s programs/majors that require improvement (as indicated by the teaching quality indicators). This section must cover situations where:
  • Student success is below the national average for U/G programs
  • Performance has declined recently or is below the faculty’s or UQ average for U/G programs
  • Program success is lower than other programs

- If the CQEA data sample is too small consider the CQEA data, trend analysis and if there is any other significant variation in comparison to past performance on any of the indicators

Outline strategies that aim to implement the improvements needed as identified above. For each strategy also provide:

1. The reason for implementation

---

Step 1 – Undertake a review of key T&L indicators for the school (Overview page)

Student load, demand, & staff-student ratios

1. Student load for school (i.e., total SPTE, breakdown by international, domestic, U/G vs. P/G coursework and HDR) [Overview page]
2. Student staff ratio [Overview page]
3. Student demand for U/G programs co-ordinated by, or contributed heavily to, by the school [Demand page]

Student success and retention (pass rates, completions, and grade distributions)

1. Pass rates and grade distributions [Overview page]
2. Attrition rates after first year of study for U/G programs (and/or specific majors if applicable) with comparison to other relevant U/G programs [Attrition page]
3. Success % completed by program length plus one year for key U/G programs [Success page]
2.3 Student Evaluation of Course and Teacher/s (SECaTs)

- combined student evaluation of teaching and course questionnaire, SECaT/s)
  - used every time a course is offered
  - for team-taught courses, teaching evaluations on a single form

- reports provided to the course coordinator and all course teaching staff
  - summary of all teaching and course evaluations being sent to the head of school
  - course evaluation summaries provided to chairs of school teaching and learning committees and associate deans (academic)
Student Evaluation of Course and Teacher (SECAT)

COURSE NAME: Introduction to Higher Education
CODE: J00Y1600
Evaluation Date: 2/20/2012
Teaching Period: Semester 1, 2012

1. I had a clear understanding of the aims and goals of the course.

2. The course was intellectually stimulating.

3. The course was well structured.

4. The learning materials assisted me in this course.

5. Assessment requirements were made clear to me.

6. I received helpful feedback on how I was going in the course.

7. I learned a lot in this course.

8. Overall, how would you rate this course?
   5=Outstanding  3=Satisfactory  1=Very Poor

STUDENT FEEDBACK ABOUT THE QUALITY OF TEACHER
Dr A Academic...

1. ... was well organised.

2. ... was good at explaining things.

3. ... was approachable.

4. ... stimulated my interest in the field of study.

5. ... inspired me to learn.

6. ... encouraged student input.

7. ... treated students with respect.

8. Overall, how would you rate this teacher?
   5=Outstanding  3=Satisfactory  1=Very Poor
SECaT/s Course Questions

• Likert Scale
  - I had a clear understanding of the aims and goals of the course.
  - The course was intellectually stimulating.
  - The course was well structured.
  - The learning materials assisted me in this course.
  - Assessment requirements were made clear to me.
  - I received helpful feedback on how I was going in the course.
  - I learned a lot in this course.
  - Overall, how would you rate this course?

• Open-ended Questions
  - What were the best aspects of this course?
  - What improvements to this course would you suggest?
3. Managing Quality Assurance

- How are people tracking?
  - How do staff across the university compare to each other?
- How are schools tracking in relation to the University’s strategic directions?
- What needs to be changed and how?
  - Who needs support?
  - What areas require support?
3.1 Promotion and tenure

- 5 year process
  - Annual review - collegial conversation
  - Mid term review by promotion committee
- Proforma developed as an academic profile
  - Discovery
  - Learning
  - Engagement
FOLIO 2 – Teaching

This Folio should be completed by Teaching Faculty and Research academics. Research Only academics should complete the sections that relate to postgraduate supervision (2.4 – 2.6) and where there is undergraduate teaching involvement, sections 2.1 – 2.2.

2.1 Formal Teaching Contact: Under- and Post-Graduate (excluding contact in flexible delivery/distance/intensive clinical mode)

Fill in actual hours spent in scheduled class-related teaching (last three rows). For each semester, include a “Total” line, running the total contact hours across all courses for that semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Semester</th>
<th>Course Code (Title)</th>
<th>Credits Points</th>
<th>Year total formal classroom contact hours in this course per semester. Do not include preparation time.</th>
<th>Notes – Indicate the data site. Does not include contact hours related to teaching mode (lecture, seminar, tutorial, practical, laboratory, clinical, clinical using cases, and guest presenting in seminars).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004.11</td>
<td>Contribution towards EDUC100</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>guest presenter 20 postgraduate students in face-to-face seminar session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004.11</td>
<td>Contribution to EDUC102</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>guest presenter 17 postgraduate students in face-to-face 3 hour seminar sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004.11</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005.11</td>
<td>EDUC103</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8-13 hours per semester co-coordinator 7 postgraduate students in face-to-face 3 hour seminar sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005.11</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Evaluation(s) of Teaching

Summary table of appended teaching evaluations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Course Rating</th>
<th>Teacher Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUC100</td>
<td>Learning for Contemporary Higher Education 2009.11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC102</td>
<td>Individual Action Learning Project 2005.03 2006.03</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most formal teaching activities are professional development workshops offered under the auspices of the University Staff Development Committee (USDC). The standard evaluation forms used across the USDC offerings use an item for course “Was this your overall rating of this teaching”. Course rating scales are 0-5 (with 5 being “Outstanding”). This rating is reflected in the rest of this table. The form “The presenter presented an interesting material” (item 1) and “The presenter appeared seemed to know the material well” (item 2) has been used as the Teacher rating as there is no single item rating the presenter/teacher in the USDC instrument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Course Rating</th>
<th>Teacher Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D523S</td>
<td>Developing survey to evaluate students learning</td>
<td>2009.01 2008.11</td>
<td>3/12 11/12</td>
<td>4.57 (item 1: 5.00</td>
<td>4.47 (item 1: 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M521NT</td>
<td>Running focus groups</td>
<td>2009.12</td>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>4.17 (item 1: 4.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic/Portfolio of Achievement – 3
3.1 $Q^R + Q^T$ Index

- Tracking individual performance in research
- Similar process being developed for teaching
- Role of Head of School as supervisor
3.2 Putting it all together: School Based Performance Framework

- Responsibility of the Heads of School
  - allocation of funding and of resources
- enables an assessment of where each school currently sits in its interpretation of the institutional strategy in learning, discovery and engagement at a school level
What’s coming???

- Performance indicators
  - % low SES students
  - Student experience - undergraduates
  - Student experience - graduates
  - Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)
  - Teaching quality indicator
Questions and Comments?
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