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Workshop outline

1. What is the IRU?
2. IRU academic calibration project
3. Discussion
4. Informal IRU peer review initiatives
5. Discussion
6. Fellowship initiatives
Interactive google map of IRU campuses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of university</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Share (%)</td>
<td>Acceptance rate (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>44,432</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Technology Network</td>
<td>40,797</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Research Universities</td>
<td>31,495</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Universities Network</td>
<td>20,616</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>219,290</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals include missing/unknown postcodes which cannot be assigned to a state/territory.

**Total includes acceptances for universities that are not aligned with a university group.
Social mobility (Universities Australia, 2018)

GROWTH IN DOMESTIC UNDERGRADUATE ENROLMENTS BY EQUITY GROUP

* Definition changes from 2006 SEIFA to 2011 SEIFA from 2015
** Definition changes from 2006 MCEETYA to 2011 ASGS from 2015

- 106% increase in students with a disability
- 89% increase in Indigenous students
- 55% increase in students from low SES
- 48% increase in regional and remote students

Comparison of enrolments in 2008 vs. 2016:
Social mobility *(Australian Government, 2018)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of university</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Share of applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>9,513</td>
<td>30,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Technology Network</td>
<td>12,011</td>
<td>29,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Research</td>
<td>14,864</td>
<td>34,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Universities Network</td>
<td>9,505</td>
<td>16,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*<em>Total</em></td>
<td><strong>66,909</strong></td>
<td><strong>167,960</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total includes applications for universities that are not aligned with a university group. Totals exclude data that could not be coded to an SES.
### Table 39: Applicants by region and type of university, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of university</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Share of applications (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Non-metropolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>63,146</td>
<td>9,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Technology</td>
<td>54,539</td>
<td>7,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Research</td>
<td>43,720</td>
<td>15,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Universities Network</td>
<td>14,247</td>
<td>14,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>251,172</strong></td>
<td><strong>77,522</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: This table excludes data that could not be coded to a region.*

*Total includes applications for universities that are not aligned with a university group.*

### Table 44: Share of applicants by Indigenous status and type of university, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of university</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Share of Applications (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>Non-Indigenous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>72,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Technology Network</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>60,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Research Universities</td>
<td>1,551</td>
<td>55,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Universities Network</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>26,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,867</strong></td>
<td><strong>312,457</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: This table excludes applicants whose Indigenous status is unknown.*

*Total includes applications for universities that are not aligned with a university group.*
Why peer review?

4Q approach to assessing & improving teaching (Smith, 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-reflection</th>
<th>Student learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer review</td>
<td>Student experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self Reflection
Teaching portfolio (Seldin 1991; Centra 1993; Seldin 1993; Seldin, Annis et al. 1995; Richlin and Manning 1996)
Teaching journals (Ramer 1980; Boud, Keogh et al. 1985; Handal and Lauvas 1987)
Reflective course memos (Angelo and Cross 1989; Angelo and Cross 1993)
Self-reflection and analysis (Brookfield 1995)
Responses to industry/profession feedback
Teaching philosophy statements
Development seeking behaviour
Responses to student feedback
Feedback seeking behaviours
Responses to peer feedback

Assessing and Improving Teaching

Student Learning
Student progression to honours/post-graduate qualifications
Classroom assessment techniques (Angelo and Cross 1989; Angelo and Cross 1993)
Industry/profession reviews of student preparedness
Students’ self-reported gains in knowledge, skills or attitudes (Smith, Herbert et al. 2001)
Attainment of generic skills
(Bath, Smith et al. 2004; Smith and Bath 2006)
Students’ learning journals (Morrison 1996)
Student assessment results (Knight 1995)
Criterion-referenced assessment results
Quality of portfolio work
Pass and failure rates

Peer Review
Course content
Course objectives
Course materials
Teaching pitch, pace
Assessment practices
Classroom performance
Management of teaching
Teaching and learning strategies
Classroom performance (Chism 1999)
Scholarship of teaching (Boyer 1990)
Constructive alignment (Biggs 1996)

Student Experience
Complaints data
Abitron research
Unsolicited student feedback
Student evaluations (courses)
Student evaluations (teaching)
Student logs and journals (Morrison 1996)
Course Experience Qaire
(Ramsden 1991; Wilson, Lizzie et al. 1997)
Student engagement in learning communities
(Pascarella, Terenzini et al. 1986; Tinto 1998; Tinto 2000; McInnis,
Griffin et al. 2001; Smith and Bath 2006)
Student feedback on teaching management and administration

(Smith 2008)
Why peer review?

Review and improvement activities include regular external referencing of the success of student cohorts against comparable courses of study, including... the assessment methods and grading of students’ achievement of learning outcomes for selected units of study within courses of study.

(Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015, Section 5.3, Part 4.b.) – Came into effect January 1 2017
IRU unis to trial external benchmarking

ANDREW TROUNSON
TheAustralian  12:00AM July 23, 2012

THE Innovative Research Universities grouping are about to trial a system to routinely externally benchmark student assessment, the latest sector move to reassure the quality regulator and the public.

The Group of Eight universities is already trialling its similar Quality Verification System, some results of which were presented to a Universities Australia meeting in May.

Bev Thiele, pro vice-chancellor for quality and standards at IRU member Murdoch University said the IRU’s so-called "Academic Callibration Project” builds on the work of the Go8 and is part of a wider effort by the sector to develop its own system rather than have one imposed on it such as happens in the UK.
Pilot project

20 units from across six universities
Capstone units from undergraduate courses
Written assessment task between 2000-4000 words
12 samples (3 across each grade range)

Reviewers: Level D preferred, Level C minimum
Review period: Two weeks
Academic calibration project

An inter-institutional quality process that aims to:

- demonstrate the appropriateness of the standards of learning outcomes and grades awarded in IRU universities
- maintain and improve the academic standards of IRU
- enable comparisons of learning outcomes in similar subjects across IRU
- promote discussion on good practice in learning and teaching across IRU
Unit coordinator submits:

Unit outline, assessment details & rubric

One assessment task - 12 samples across the grade spectrum

Preferably worth a high percentage of the total marks for the unit

Preferably covering many of the learning outcomes, or the most critical

De-identified as much as possible, with grades and comments
Reviewer assesses:

Learning objective clarity

Learning objective appropriateness

Assessment task suitability

Assessment task clarity

Assessment task appropriateness

Grading

Plus provides an overall judgement
Summary judgements- three options

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes were appropriate. Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the unit and its assessment.

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes were appropriate. However, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the unit and its assessment, as outlined in recommendations.

There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes. These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review.
Time

- Reviewer 2-4 week window, average 8 hours (highest was 35 hours)
- Unit coordinator - time to put together the materials
Confidentiality

- Reviewer signs declaration re any conflict of interest & confidentiality
- All documents and student samples are destroyed after the process
- Reports are returned to the unit coordinator, and are often also sent to the course coordinator and head of school
- Reports provided may be used as part of institutional re-registration requirements, and therefore may be made available to the TEQSA
- Reports may also be made available as part of the professional accreditation and course review processes
Benefits - Unit and course coordinators

• External feedback from a discipline based colleague at another institution
• Collegial and constructive evaluation that either affirms your work, or provides useful feedback on how you could improve
• Demonstrates a commitment to continuous improvement
Benefits - Schools, Faculties, Universities

• Support existing processes such as course review, and professional accreditation of courses
• Option to focus on particular units (eg capstones, ‘tricky’ units etc)
• Meets a Higher Education Standards Framework requirement
• Contextualise assessment and grading of your units in a broader national context.
• Documented endorsement of the consistency and reliability of your school/faculties assessment and grading methods, comparative to the sector.
• Contributes to proactive improvement of units
Benefits - reviewers

• Selected based on your experience in the discipline and your well-developed sense of academic standards.
• Opportunity to experience and evaluate a unit from your discipline from another institution
• Cross-pollination of ideas
Feedback - areas for improvement

• Difficulties in incorporating enough materials and context into the process
• Including more ‘social moderation’ and interaction into the model
• Technical constraints in the web based report
Interested in taking part?

If you have a unit for review, and / or if you’re interested in being a reviewer

Contact WSU Manager Quality Systems, Royson Valore

30+ WSU units nominated for 2019, and so far one person has been asked to be a reviewer.
Calibration: Discussion points

1. Have you engaged in the calibration project, or other similar initiatives? If so, what was your experience?

2. How might you use the calibration project?

3. What would encourage you to engage with the calibration project?

4. What suggestions would you make for improving the initiative?
Informal peer review in the IRU

Groups / networks: e.g. VCs, DVCs, Corporate, Librarians, Policy

Senior Leaders’ Forum each year

Professional learning community of practice - benchmarking of professional learning programs

Informal IRU peer review: Discussion points

1. Have you engaged in any of the informal IRU peer review processes, or other similar initiatives? If so, what was your experience?

2. What would encourage you to engage with these opportunities?

3. Any other feedback?
Vice Chancellors’ Fellow for Student & Graduate Success

Inspired by University Innovation Alliance Fellows

Inaugural Fellow 2016-2018, Professor Jess Vanderlelie

New Fellow 2018-2020
New Initiatives

1. Re-imagining work integrated learning

2. How does / might graduate feedback inform curriculum renewal and learning and teaching practices?
National Innovation Case Study Collection

Please consider contributing a case study for the National Innovation Case Study Collection - email me any suggested projects / names.

National Innovation Case Study Collection
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Keeping in touch

amani.bell@iru.edu.au

Twitter @AmaniBell

LinkedIn https://www.linkedin.com/in/amani-bell/