emergent skill needs for leadership learning. In addition, opportunities for students to gain practical skills through work-integrated learning and hearing practitioner present case studies of their experience, have been designed to develop students soft skills. However, as the speed of change increases, practitioners, are looking more to academics to identify new approaches to broaden student skills. In this situation the traditional boundary between academics and practitioners is becoming more porous, requiring a new framework upon which to build living learning partnerships.

The idea of a learning organisation, first mooted by Senge) has since been expanded to incorporate the possibility for change in learning approaches to be tested in a safe laboratory environment through initiatives such as ULab that use MOOCs as a hybrid learning platform. In addition the concept of a living laboratory is being developed, especially in the environmental sciences, to explore real-life testing and experimentation where users and producers co-create innovations. While less expansive, other examples of living learning laboratory partnerships, are being trialled as effective change within current curriculum offerings.

The Round Table will engage participants in an authentic learning opportunity of a Living Learning Laboratory partnership. The four element flexible framework for the Living Learning Laboratory was designed based upon the experience of an Innovative Management Practice Trial undertaken by the authors in 2013.

The outcome will be two-fold. Reflection on the flexible framework for the Living Learning Laboratory (and potential modification) based on participant feedback and secondly, dissemination of the Living Learning Laboratory to underpin curriculum design more broadly.

The Round Table contributes to the conference theme of Leading learning and the scholarship of change in several ways. First, it explores the issue of a potential new form of collaborative partnership inside and outside the academy. Second, it highlights a more authentic learning approach for students beyond placing students in a situated learning (work-integrated) environment.

---

**Session E6**

Paper

### AN ADAPTABLE TOOL FOR INSTITUTIONS AND INDIVIDUALS TO DEVELOP AND APPLY TEACHING CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

**Denise Chalmers**[1], Rick Cummings[2], Beatrice Tucker[3], Sue Stoney[4], Sofia Elliot[5], Rachel Wicking[1], Trina Jorre de St Jorre[1]

1 The University of Western Australia
2 Murdoch University
3 Curtin University
4 Edith Cowan University
5 University of Notre Dame

The Australian University Teaching Criteria and Standards (AUTCAS) framework* was developed in response to significant changes in the Australian higher education environment which include an increasingly diverse student and staff population, a new regulatory and accreditation framework and the growing imperative to demonstrate quality in teaching in the local and international higher education marketplace. The Framework has been developed through an extensive review of the literature and current practices in international and Australian universities and wide consultation across the higher education sector. The framework is underpinned by carefully researched definitions and principles of quality teaching that are expressed through seven criteria.

The organising principle is alignment with academic appointment and promotional levels. For each criterion the framework suggests standards of achievement that might be applied to each promotional level, cross-referenced to examples of indicative evidence that could be used to demonstrate achievement. The framework was developed with the intention that these criteria, standards and indicative evidence be adapted by individual universities to suit their own context and values. The framework also supports individual teachers in building evidence of their impact in an increasingly complex work environment including traditional research-teaching academics to teaching focussed academics and professional staff. The increasing diversity in academic and teaching roles requires institutions to provide greater clarity about how they determine, facilitate and reward teaching quality in their policies and practices.

The framework has been widely disseminated and trialled in Australia, contributing as a timely catalyst for discussion and interest in utilising the framework within institutions. In response to this interest, an extension project was implemented to support institutions to develop their own teaching criteria and standards, embed criteria in institutional processes such as recruitment, probation, staff review/development and promotion.

Over 24 Australian universities utilised the Framework in reviewing and developing their own teaching criteria. Successful strategies for embedding teaching criteria and standards into institutional policy and processes were identified and written as case studies. The Framework, resources, case studies and good practice recommendations for use and implementation are available on the project website (www.uniteachingcriteria.edu.au).

We will briefly describe the framework and how it has been used by institutions and individual academic staff, illustrating its flexibility by the different ways the framework has been used to support, develop, promote and embed quality teaching criteria and standards. We will conclude with an open discussion on how it can be used by teachers to demonstrate and document their diverse contributions related to teaching and learning.

---

**Session E6**

Paper

### DISCOVER, CONNECT, INSPIRE: TRANSITIONING INTO A WHOLE OF INSTITUTION, CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

Bonnie Amelia Dean[1], Kathryn Harden-Thew[1], Romy Lawson[1], Christine Brown[1], **Lisa Thomas**[1]

1 University of Wollongong

The higher education landscape is changing with growing diversity of learners, technologies, teaching spaces, and industry expectations. In this multilayered complexity of change, new strategic directions are envisaged in order to transform curriculum and support academic staff at the coalface of teaching and learning. These developments have been the impetus for change in the way professional development for teaching is offered at the University of Wollongong (UOW).

Until 2015, UOW has facilitated a University Learning and Teaching (ULT) course for new academic staff as well as a range of face-to-face and online professional development opportunities for sessional teachers. These offerings while attending to core teaching and learning principles around

diversity, inclusivity and best assessment practices, were segmented with little opportunity for engagement in professional development beyond the course.

In this context of change, the University's Learning, Teaching and Curriculum Unit is undergoing a significant process to review the professional development and support of all teaching staff across the institution. This effort aims to address the changes occurring in the broader higher education context and, more locally, as courses undergo renewal. Through engaging with faculty representatives and stakeholders across the university, a Continuing Professional Development (CPD) framework was conceptualised with seven learning criteria, benchmarked against international teaching standards (Higher Educational Academy), national standards (Australian Criteria of Teaching Standards) and internal expectations and performance framework (Academic Performance Framework, UOW). CPD has been constructed to cover five levels that increase in complexity in line with career stages. Staff can seek recognition of their teaching at a nominated level by aligning their teaching activity with the specified learning outcomes and demonstrating this through constructing a teaching portfolio of evidence. CPD also comprises open and integrated online modules and face-to-face workshops, just in time resources and special interest groups available to all UOW teaching staff.

In the first semester of implementation, several online modules have been made available and ten face-to-face workshops have been run, covering teaching and learning topics and ways to evidence professional practice for CPD portfolio support. In addition, following individual consultations, the first rounds of CPD portfolios have been peer reviewed by a panel of experienced teaching staff. In 2015, we continue to teach-out ULT while piloting CPD with full implementation planned for 2016.

Participant feedback, to date, has been positive, including teaching staff from across the university and representing several stages in career development. Though in its infancy, the feedback gained indicates that this new framework addresses two felt needs: firstly, that staff engage with CPD in order to enhance knowledge, sharpen skills and take opportunities to broaden networks across the university. Secondly, that staff are interested in the activity and language of teaching and learning for purposes of portfolio building.

This presentation will reflect on and outline the processes of transition for re-envisaging professional development at UOW. We will invite reflections on how we might evidence and evaluate new course impact, as well as the perceived, ongoing benefits and challenges of a university-wide, continuing professional development framework.

---

**Session E7**

Paper

## COORDINATION AND TEACHING IN A LARGE-SCALE FIRST-YEAR SUBJECT: A CASE FOR DISTRIBUTED LEADERSHIP

**Anthony Baker[1]**

*1 Faculty of Science, University of Technology Sydney*

The enrolment in first-year chemistry at the University of Technology Sydney is close to 1000 students. Whilst subjects are usually coordinated by a single staff member, that situation is unrealistic for such a subject. In reorganizing Chemistry 1, a distributed model of leadership was put in place. In terms of the university requirements one person had to be designated as coordinator but several tasks were delegated to other staff, such as the organization of the laboratory teaching and the

fielding of student inquiries about one-off changes of lab session.

The commitment to distributed leadership went far beyond the delegation of administrative tasks. Teaching in the laboratory was carried out by postgraduate students and there was a strong intention to make them leaders in the laboratory sessions. There was also a concern to draw the demonstrators into the academic community as junior colleagues rather than as a convenient source of casual labour. To this end a start-of-semester induction session was held at which senior staff of the School made clear the expectations that the School had of the demonstrators and taking account of a substantial literature on the induction of teaching assistants (as examples: Herrington and Nakhleh (2003), Bond-Robinson and Bernard-Rodriques (2006)). There were also break-out sessions in which experienced demonstrators shared their experiences of laboratory teaching. The demonstrators appreciated the effort to assist their professional development as academics. In subsequent semesters, feedback collected from the previous induction session was used to improve the experience.

During semester contact with the demonstrators was informal, but extensive seeing the demonstrators were research students in the School, and it was clearly communicated at every opportunity that there was strong interest in achieving quality learning and teaching in the laboratory. A major event was an end-of-semester debrief where demonstrators had full opportunity to comment on the laboratory learning and teaching. Many demonstrators mentioned that they really enjoyed the chance to suggest improvements in the laboratory teaching program and recognised that they were being acknowledged as valuable colleagues.

This focus on the demonstrators as a key element in our teaching and learning team was one element of major changes wrought in Chemistry 1, so it was not the sole reason for the passrate jumping from ca 70% to 84%. Clearly indicating student recognition for the important role the demonstrators played in their learning was that the student feedback on the experience in the laboratory, which we have specifically collected, is quite remarkable: in 2014, 28 out of 38 demonstrators achieved a rating of 4.5 or above on a 5-point Likert scale for the question "Overall, I am satisfied with the teaching of this staff member".

Bond-Robinson, J. & Bernard-Rodriques, R.A. (2006). Catalyzing Graduate Teaching Assistants Laboratory Teaching through Design Research. Journal of Chemical Education, 83(2), 313-323.

Herrington, D.G. & Nakhleh, M.B. (2003). What Defines Effective Chemistry Laboratory Instruction? Teaching Assistant and Student Perspectives. Journal of Chemical Education, 80(10), 1197-1205.

---

**Session E7**

Paper

## THE PEER ASSISTED TEACHING SCHEME: ENABLING DISTRIBUTED LEADERSHIP IN LEARNING AND TEACHING

**Angela Carbone[1]**, J Evans[1]

*1 Monash University*

Since 2005, the potential of distributed leadership for advancing teaching quality in Australian higher education has been explored through a series of projects that have primarily focused on improving leadership capacity through changes to institutional structures and leaders in formal functional roles. For the purposes of this paper, two projects (Jones et al. 2012, 2014) have been selected to explore the potential of