

Assessment and Review Summit Program: Notes

	Academic Integrity		Assessment and Calibration
	Industry engagement/Work Integrated Learning		Institution-wide quality, quality assurance
	Professional Learning		

19/09/2017

9:00 am - **Welcome, Acknowledgement for Country, housekeeping and introduction to Stream Coordinators**
 9:05 am [Jacqui Elson-Green](#), Program Director, Higher Education Quality Network, Higher Ed Services

9:05 am - Plenary session
 9:15 am **Summit Opening**
[Emeritus Professor Kwong Lee Dow](#), Patron, Higher Education Quality Network
[Dr Andrew Trnacek](#), CEO, Higher Ed Services

- The substantive learning from what we learn, the by-product is we meet and make new colleagues. The words share/sharing, collaboration
- This is a contrast of public external perception of institutions driven by competitive rankings, driven by competitive attempts to get students. The point is healthy for us to keep competition and collaboration with us. We are much more collaborative than the external perception is.
- This gathering is that we do is bring together a range of people who are exploring common areas, we come together and we focus on particular topics in more depth than it is possible to do in other conference settings. We bring together academic staff and professional staff. We leave with a better understanding of quality and formulations. This is always said to be a diverse sector. When we look across the HE it looks uniform, but I don't believe it is that. What is your context? What is your relationship with other institutions?
- Very small private provider institutions and are carving out their niche. They are part of the tapestry of what makes HE sector diverse, offering more choice and more relevance.

Andrew, CEO, HES: **HES is about Connect. Collaborate. Co-Create.**

9:15 am - Plenary session
 9:45 am **Embedding an institutional framework for employability**
[Doug Cole](#), Head of Global Employability and Enterprise, Higher Education Academy

- Overview metrics, language, frameworks and practice
- Employability drivers: Governments, metrics/league tables
- Media/metrics/league tables
- Employers/students and institutions
- We are obsessed with numbers, we share the same challenges, learn from each other

- Are we all speaking the same language? What point are we talking about employability? From colleagues and media, not the research. Research is a good starting point to know what was happening. WIL alone is not employability. Dominant discourse is employability skills. To be successful, it is more than just skills. Employability is about a career, not just skills.
- Work readiness-graduate attributes: Do students understand what that is? How does any kind of graduate attribute approach based on research? Are we looking broadly enough? The language is important because we need to know how we measure impact.
- Dawn Bennet, Ruth Bridgstock: HERDSA. You will never get one university to accept one framework, you need to bring them along as part of the process. Adapt and edit it and make it happen at the program level. What does it mean for physics staff? Many have staff who have a very narrow view of employability.
- Two main bodies in literature: but we will never agree. We describe how we 'do it'.
- HEA launched our series of seven frameworks: Really useful starting point at an institutional level and program level.
- Student Success - Curriculum design and HE provision: Assessment, employability, access, retention, progression, attainment, engagement, internationalisation, flexible learning
- Transforming assessment:
- **HEA Embedding employability in HE Framework: Get 4 stages operationalised: 1) define employability; 2) auditing and mapping, 3) prioritising actions; and 4) measuring impact:**
- *There are ten areas of focus:* attributes and capabilities, experience and networks, confidence, resilience, adaptability reflection and articulation; self, social and cultural awareness, career guidance and management, enterprise and entrepreneurship
- **Key considerations:**
- Bringing staff, industry and students together
- Authentic assessment
- Assessment for learning
- Balancing summative and formative assessment
- Impact on the student experience/retention and attainment
- Staff CPD, HR and marketing
- **Where are we now?**
- WIL: work placements, internships, career management, live projects and briefs, community projects, industry consulted on course design, guest lectures, industry panels, alumni networks
- Northumbria: DVC Learning and Teaching led is critically important, embed this, Program Framework for Northumbria Awards; operationalised at faculty and course/program level
- A bank of metrics to support Graduate outcomes: increase industry links/collaborations, number of students engaged in WIL, percentage of students accessing careers support, survey results, stakeholder feedback, reflective journals etc.
- Do we have a defined and co-ordinated approach to employability that is understood and supported by all staff and made explicit to all students at a program level? Do you involve industry and other stakeholders from the outset in planning your approach? Are you speaking the same language? Does your assessment policy and practice align with this work?

9:45 am -
10:25 am

Professions Australia Panel

Professional Accreditation as an external benchmarking tool

[Klaus Veil](#), Vice-President, Australian Council of Professions 'Professions Australia'

[Pam Pryor](#), Inaugural Registrar Australian, OHS Education Accreditation Board (2011 to 2017)

[Michael Carpenter](#), CEO, Australian Psychology Accreditation Council

- Operationalising is what this panel is about. One of the benchmarking tools, the quality control and professional aspect off this. This is done by the professional bodies. One of the benchmarking tools is the accreditation/course accreditation.
- Higher Education Accreditation Story so far: PA represents 420,000 professions. External review and accreditation of HE courses by professional organisations is a common and well established form of external benchmarking. It doesn't matter what they format is. Accreditation is a major focus of the Board. Brenda Ainsley is CEO of the Board and is passionate about accreditation, professional ethics and governance. We have been with the HE sector for the last couple of years, we have signed a Joint Statement of Principles with all universities and also working the non-university sector
- There has been scrutiny: State of accreditation review [Emeritus Prof Christine Ewan], Health professions [Wood]
- Both review found that accreditation is progressing toward improve efficiency but more action is required
- **The role of professional accreditation in External Benchmarking: Michael Carpenter**
- What is benchmarking? Evaluate something by comparison with a standard. The role of accreditation, it almost at program level, varies in focus- public protection/protect students/ ensure professional competence
- Varies in approach: quality improvement/policing/benchmarking (e.g. with overseas bodies)
- Washington Accord: With engineering to allow movement across a range of countries. There are many things that are common: document submission [can be quite painful], review by peers; benchmarking, physical visit to program, resourcing, staffing, facilities, are the right outcomes are achieved? Fairly major reports with Christine Ewan [role of professional accreditation which could be streamline] and Woods Report, both make the role of TEQSA to stream line processes and reduce the burden. Where is the point of intersect? I am not entirely sure that both reports have got it right: TEQSA looks at self-accrediting bodies at the institutional level, but also 120 private providers. Obvious overlap and more work with the regulatory work and professions. We would be interested where professional accreditation adds value, it does not just create burden? What its role along with TEQSA and ASQA?
- **Accreditation Boards doing external benchmarking-examples: Pam Pryor: Australian OHS Education Accreditation Board**
- Occupational health and safety, only been around 2011. Only 13 provide health and safety. In a fairly short time, deep impact and voluntary impact. We did not specific the benchmarking purpose [external benchmarking]. Went to the Assessment Workshops.

- 1.4.1, 5.4.3: How are universities going to that? How are you going to select your benchmark? Sensitivities, competition, maturity and status of program and staff, identifying a suitable benchmark
- Accreditation -independent, third party benchmarking. Programs are meeting the standard
- Assessment criteria, assessment process, assessment panel, assessment report and annual report
- Assessment criteria structured in line with HESF, mapping LO OHS Body of Knowledge LO and OHS capability statements
- Developed through national workshops with OHS educators and professionals
- International comparator with Global partners
- Initial assessment: application, desk top audit, preliminary meeting of assessment panel, review of LMS material, Panel meets face to face, telephone interviews
- Assessment Panels: 3 people, educators, OHS professionals, education advisor, rotate our education panels, panel members rotate so there is 'cross fertilisation', program leaders of accredited programs invited panel members
- Accreditation Report: informed by comparison with other programs, constructive review of program, includes action plan reported on annual basis
- Programs report on: achievement against action plan, annual risk themes, student consensus
- Accreditation Board reports: on collated student consensus data, annual trends observed through accreditation
- The themes we will find will become reports back to universities
- Professional accreditation awards
- Aligning course accreditation and professional accreditation

10:25 am - REFRESHMENT BREAK
10:45 am

- 10:45 am - Plenary session
11:15 am
- Group of Eight Update on the Quality Verification System**
[Professor Pascale Quester](#), Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Vice-President (Academic), The University of Adelaide and Chair of Group of Eight, DVCs
- Group of Eight: Degree of homogeneity. It has a particular logic because of the context is so important. Like-minded institutions need to get together to have a homogeneity across all institutions. This is a case study because the context is important. External discipline led academic peer review. We were looking at final year of disciplines. The purpose was to maintain and improve academic standards. We did not replicate anything like the TEQSA process, we wanted something light touch. It was not about grade moderation.
 - Covert objective was to talk about this: get community of practice and exchange practice. Benchmark to enable comparisons. How do we do it by light touch?
 - Course materials: course profiles, information of course mapping, copies of de-identified assessment tasks, marking criteria
 - 2016: well established process. We have developed a capacity to do six disciplines for 2016: Potential for 96 reviews
 - However, some Go8 universities do not deliver in some disciplines under review

- Some of the challenges: gathering review materials and engagement with reviewers; transfer of materials, timing of reviews, identification of specific discipline areas for review
- Cost element: pay academics [honarium \$600], paying our own staff to do the reviews. We struggle in the need to specify the discipline within academic disciplines when searching for reviewers
- Incredibly enriching experience, real dialogue and pedagogy
- In some disciplines more successfully than others. What are those learning outcomes we want to achieve with students?
- We have proposed 10 disciplines but have refined this 6 disciplines; we haven't developed a technology solution, we don't have a drop box, we have to transcend that and enable the simple management and exchange of systems and sharing that is very valuable.
- QVS effective tool for monitoring and brokering assessment

11:15 am -
11:45 am

Plenary session

James Cook University: Engaging in the IRU Academic Calibration Process for subject review and the Peer Review Portal to support program review

[Associate Professor Michelle Lasen](#), Head, Teaching Quality and Student Success, James Cook University

- Investment on of a team and Academic Board
- Look at IRU calibration process for subject and we are starting to use the Peer Review Portal as part of program review
- Learning, Teaching and Assessment Policy
- Reviewee/reviewer
- Academic staff rubric to evaluate quality of assessment design
- We have done considerable benchmarking across nationally and internationally
- Staff professional resources: 4- quadrant model of evaluating teaching: multiple sources of evidence
- Internal learning and teaching grants to promote peer review
- Peer review process could be enhanced
- Pee review by external academics or industry partners
- Engaging in the IRU Academic Calibration Process
- Documentation for Unit coordinator: grading nomenclature; information about the course structure, course level learning outcomes, unit learning outcomes, gradate distribution, context statement, assessment task is calibrated
- 12 samples across a grade range
- IRU Calibrate portal-seamless implementation
- Reviewer comes to a summary judgement -course coordinator, unit coordinator
- Dedicated software system. Developed calibrate. Dedicated calibration system.
- Calibration register - evidence base are uploaded up to Cloud Store
- JCU subjects calibrated in 2017: 10 units
- JCU reviewer's experience:
- Working towards utilising the Peer Review Portal to support program review
- We are hoping to use for whole of course level
- Academic Course Review procedure
- Annual course performance report
- Every 5-7 years to develop

- What reviews and what evidence?
- Academic Board: Courses under review
- Peer Review Portal and Calibrate -manual and automatic function

11:45 am -
12:15 pm

Plenary session

Peer Review Portal supporting higher education networks: A vehicle to support, connect and advance the sector in peer review

[Dr Sara Booth Principal fellow \(HEA\)](#), Strategic Advisor - Quality External, University of Tasmania

- Cottage-industry approach to quality towards an industrial production model
- What can we learn from the aviation sector?
- It is about the quality of the review experience
- Current experience in review is about duplication of effort and reporting, consistency in decision-making
- Significant costs in course review - needs to be scalable and sustainable, efficient and secure, administrative workload
- 144 HE institutions with over 450 users, external reference group, superuser group, CADAD professional development resource
- Peer endorsement of courses
- Project types-peer review of assessment [inputs/outputs], program review, benchmarking and calibration
- Applicant experience, collaborators and reviewers

12:15 pm -
1:15 pm

NETWORKING LUNCH

1:15 pm -
2:00 pm

Roundtable Discussion

Other perspectives on peer review

Summary of Notes

How does your institution monitor and report review activity?

- Peer Review: 1) Of what? -teaching, unit, program, institution; 2) for what purpose? 1) to prove or improve quality; 2) to manage risk; 3) for whom? Students/institution/TEQSA/Professional Accreditation Bodies
- Reports to Academic Board, re-accreditation cycles
- Progress reports- Academic Board and Learning and Teaching Committee, Action Plans
- Discussion about the distinction of focus at the Programme level or Individual Level
- Part of the problem is that we are in a context which is about low trust and fear
- We cannot expect people to engage in the risky business of peer review if they see no value in it. It will be perceived as important if leadership is involved and treats it as important to enhance quality not merely to gain compliance
- Peer review will be possible only if there is a cultural shift. The culture itself mitigates against engagement
- Sessional staff, upon which private and public institutions heavily rely on, cannot perceive the value

- One institution in our group (a private one), a leader encouraged the corporate leaders to invest their money into supporting sessional staff to develop their knowledge and skills regarding educational improvement and peer evaluation. There were positive effects.
- We did not agree with the QVS scheme. It implied the staff did not move between institutions. What brings us together is our disciplines and practice areas. Teaching and assessment is driven by practice and discipline standards. So benchmarking and verification is best designed with common focus of students not institutions. Purpose can also be a common starting point. We also disagreed with the calibration project using numbers. Numbers have no meaning until we give it. Nevertheless the participants need to focus on the feedback to enable change.
- Good practice: Program approach; collaborative method to preparing unit guides with lots of people involved, need more support, sell the positive message; financial incentives to participate; expert assistance; promotions policy, resources; e-portfolios and recording of skills; unit representatives (students) giving feedback
- How do we do it? Monash: quality review timetable; align with course review; template for program reviews; linked to strategy; encourage enhancement; business case separate; moderation of assessments
- Accreditation: assurance focus; overlaps with different accreditation
- **How does your institution monitor and report challenges?**
- As a group we need to involve more in peer review of programs-successful early career graduates (see published studies on the FlipCurric Website)
- Monitor-private provider: TEQSA audit, PRP, accounting standards, benchmarking partners, policy processes; courses/units, student retention, completion data, rolling out year level; internal peer to peer unit review; buddy systems, assessment providers
- Challenges: lack of resources, multiple campuses, high casualisation, how to incentivise
- Challenges: lack of insightful data; limitation of one size fits all; problem of overlap with professional accreditation and internal review; Need to ensure information flow; overwhelming as lot on the staff and feel responsible and stressed
- Challenges: layers of policy and implementation, costs associated with it
Coming up with common terms and definitions, different trimesters; people, resources and time, large sessional cohort; change management; time to engage with smaller providers/huge workload; cultural sensitivity to feedback; academic freedom; technology is an issue; student advisory groups and participation; executive support
- Conflicting study periods and schedules
- Establishing network and partner contacts
- Cost responsibility within institution
- Embedding process in existing systems
- Traction and commitment

What are the areas of good practice?

- Encourage providers to benchmark best practice with each other
- Feedback loop is very important, ability to do something with the feedback
- Involving students in the review process at the course level/mentor them
- Mentoring for first year students
- Peer assisted teaching program

- Telling students you made the changes to the unit based on their feedback, also include external reviewers in the unit outline
- Benefits: technology has been helpful, scholarship of L&T, continuous quality improvement at course level
- Course review: external providers are involved, every course is accredited, multi-campus delivery, comparison of grades distribution, assessment moderated nationally, pre-assessment moderation meetings
- SCU publishing reports on wiki; network and collaboration groups, reciprocal reviews, establish a schedule
- A group of us are considering setting up a pathways quality and peer review network

2:00 pm -
2:30 pm

Plenary session

Creating a culture of engagement: students and universities working in partnership towards enhancement

[Professor Sally Varnham](#), Professor at Law, University of Technology Sydney
Sophie Johnston, President, National Union of Students

- Enhancement of opportunity working with students
- Doug Cole: talked about employability; professional development opportunities for students
- Sparks in Scotland-partnership with HEA and QAA
- National quality code: Anthony McClaran partnership
- Ireland are closest to us: national engagement framework
- New Zealand universities working together on student partnership
- What, why and how?
- 20 universities presenting on student partnerships
- Need to train student representatives
- Mick Healey-students as partners
- Using students as part of the review process, use students and review at the national level
- Engaging students in the review process; STARS network
- Higher Ed Achievement Report [UK]
- **Students and tertiary education providers undertaking partnership for quality enhancement (Step-up for quality enhancement)**
- Principle 1: building authentic partnerships
- Principle 2: Communication -honesty and transparency
- Principle 3: Training and support as a partnership
- Principle 4: Every students' voice- diversity and inclusivity
- Principle 5: Valuing student voice-recognition of formal and informal engagement
- Principle 6: National presence- for facilitation and support

2:30 pm -
3:00 pm

Plenary session

Industry as a strategic and operational risk in WIL program

[Dr Craig Cameron](#), Senior Lecturer in Corporations Law, Griffith University and Corporate Counsel, Dental Services Network

- Different definitions of WIL
- Reference on risk is enterprise risk management
- 2 key themes: industry represents positive and negative risk; competition
- There is no WIL without industry
- Industry is represented by entities' that host students in the workplace
- Strategic risk is an issue: Demand for WIL placements by the university exceeds the supply of WIL placements; a potential or current host organisation does not offer a WIL placement

- Relationship management is everything
- Operational risks associated with the host organisations
- The host organisation imposes their own terms on the university or students without amendment or negotiation
- We have a demand for WIL placements which outstrips supply
- The host organisation does not understand the purpose of the WIL program
- Host organisation does not understand the legal obligations and consequences of provisions it proposes in the WIL agreement
- Risk acceptance

3:00 pm - REFRESHMENT BREAK
3:30 pm

3:30 pm - Stream: Institution-wide quality, quality assurance
4:00 pm ***Swimming Between the Flags: Accreditation Standards as Safeguard or Unnecessary Constraint***
[Dr Brenda Clare](#), National Director, Australian Association of Social Workers

3:30 pm - Stream: Industry engagement/Work Integrated Learning
4:30 pm ***New work, New WIL and New partnership***
[Associate Professor Judith Smith](#), Associate Director, Real World Learning, Queensland University of Technology
[Judie Kay](#), Assistant Director, Careers and Employability, RMIT University and President, ACEN

- ATN -Transforming Practice Innovative Models for WIL
- ACCI/ Industry Group
- Issue: Student found great WIL opportunity but when I looked into it; there was no office and the student was working in a café
- Traditional WIL fit into new workforce
- De we need to start to consider more flexibility in our WIL programs?
- 21st century of work forces shaping the future of work
- Up to 40% students are starting their own business
- Start-ups are the largest growing areas
- National Work Integrate Learning Strategy
- Small to Medium enterprises (SMEs) make up 95% of employing businesses in Australia
- SMES would engage with WIIL with support (Phillips KPA)
- Project aims: Identifying an showcasing innovative WIL models; Developing resources
- Scanning of Existing Innovative Models:
- Micro placements, online projects or placements; hackathons/events/competition/ incubators/start-ups; consulting and advising
- Broadening the concept of WIL, expansion of partnerships, brokering industry and community and students
- Global Online WIL: Students from one or more countries working on assessable industry project: E.g. Irish Tourism Board
- Micro-Placements: 2-5 day projects over a week
- Innovation Incubator:
- Exploring features of emerging WIL models
- Look at the snapshot and identify its key features. How might students evidence their skills and capabilities through this experience? Whole group discussion on features and assessment strategies

- Assessment practices supporting emerging WIL models: 360 assessments; profiles and action plans; use of professional online networks; videos and elevator pitches; presentations to industry; badges and micro-credentialing for WIL
- What is the evidence that industry need?
- Working across multi-disciplinary teams
- Co-design with students; integrating WIL and employability across the curriculum

3:30 pm - 5:00 pm	Stream: Assessment and Calibration Calibration workshop Professor Phil Hancock , Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning) Faculty of Arts, Business, Law and Education, University of Western Australia
4:00 pm - 4:30 pm	Stream: Institution-wide quality, quality assurance Operationalising the Peer Review Portal: How to get it happening. Elisa Cassin , Manager, Academic Operations, Faculty of Business and Law, Swinburne University of Technology
4:30 pm - 5:00 pm	Stream: Industry engagement/Work Integrated Learning WIL under TEQSA and Fair Work Australia Associate Professor William McBride , Assistant Dean Education, University of Newcastle
4:30 pm - 5:00 pm	Stream: Institution-wide quality, quality assurance Course monitoring and review as a 'Course quality assurance continuum' Noha Khalaf , Senior Coordinator, Academic Quality, La Trobe University
5:00 pm - 5:30 pm	Keynote Presentation Creating Communities of Practice: Peer review of assessment, calibration and professional development (via Skype) Emeritus Professor Chris Rust , Emeritus Professor of Higher Education, Oxford Brookes University Discussion on external examiners and professional development Why is peer review so important to raising standards? How do you compare a degree from Oxford Brookes with a degree from Oxford? Notion of external peer review Carried out a series of reviews on external examining. They have three distinct roles: 1) act as a process checker/auditor; 2) critical friends; and 3) arbiter of national standards. The first two roles are done quite well, but we argued that you cannot be an arbiter of national standards. Our funding council wants to work toward this. The big development is that more institutions are giving external examiners training which is voluntary. We have been developing PD for external examiners-assessment literacy, you are being brought in as a discipline expert. We have developed a PD day and we are in the process to developing an online version. What themes are generated in reports? Reports have to be online and they become public documents. Course teams have to provide a response to external reports. How does calibration fit in? Calibration -we are taking this from Royce Sadler- which is about the calibration of assessors. Like minded universities appoint like-minded assessors. It is about having a rounded fully qualified external

examiner, we have started in geography and we are bringing on more disciplines. We are also looking at the Mark Freeman example of calibration. It is a real opportunity to own your own standards and take back control.

EROS [post-moderation] built around communities of practice. Should peer review be blind? Pre-moderation is better than post-moderation. Achievement Matters is an example of Calibration.

What do you think about the Peer Review Portal? I can see the logic in using technology which makes sense, it has potential. Accounting model has spark plus, Chemistry has its own assessment tool. The calibration of assessors needs a synchronous dialogue. It needs Skype/face-to-face screen conversations to build trust. Portal is a bit like a dating app. The EROS project had significant challenges in match making. We are having a job to getting disciplines involved in professional development. It is about a wholistic approach to calibration. It is about setting up communities of practice. We are starting to get discipline groupings, we are trying to get the professional bodies involved, example are the vets, where you have professional bodies. How did they become professionals? You need to train educators and professionals. In terms of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) outputs, we are not standing still. The Minister is going to include a new metric-grade inflation as there is a lack of sector wide minimum standards. The sector has the responsibility to address the issue. We can link the calibration project to the what the Minister is saying.

5:30 pm - WELCOME RECEPTION & NETWORKING
7:30 pm

20/09/2017

8:30 am - ***Welcome, housekeeping and introduction to Stream Coordinators***
8:35 am [Jacqui Elson-Green](#), Program Director, Higher Education Quality Network, Higher Ed Services

8:35 am - Plenary session
9:35 am ***An Australian and New Zealand perspective: How are regulatory agencies supporting and engaging with the sector on assessment, review, course accreditation and professional accreditation?***
[Dr Michael Tomlinson FGIA, FCIS](#), Director, Assurance Group, TEQSA
[Emeritus Professor Sheelagh Matear](#), Executive Director, Academic Quality Agency, New Zealand

Michael will discuss assessments and review

Reflections on assessment

- The course lifecycle
- Pathway Colleges: Level 5
- With standards framework, LO must be at 'level' which is AQF level. We send it out to experts to find out if this course is at level. Complications with nested courses, does the assessment need to be AQF 5 level, if they go through an AQF 7, they need to assess at AQF 7. There are requirements in the standards about course approval, that process is not specified. But they must be overseen by academic GB and informed by 'overarching academic scrutiny'. The process itself has to ensure that the course meets the relevant standards and that the resources are able to let course be available. It is all about student experience and students achieve the learning outcomes.

- Learning outcomes must be specified: they need to be field specific, generic, knowledge and skills for employment and study, independent and critical thinking skills for LLL. For self-accreditation institutions TEQSA look at the course template, ensuring course level learning outcomes.
- Alignment AQF level-course LOs - unit LOs-assessment -rationale and mapping
- Must enable progressive and coherent achievement of Los
- Whatever pathway, student must achieve course LOs to graduate
- Where the course level learning outcomes assessed? Unit level, course level, 'capstone' assessment or distributed?

Different forms of review

- End of cycle review
- Major periodic review of course and assessment design required at least 7 years
- SAAs: Could include formal re-accreditation by academic GB, but not necessarily, however, must be overseen by it
- **Must include 'external referencing' is more valuable than benchmarking**
- We have a Guidance Note on External Referencing
- Must cover design and content, expected Los, assessment
- Must include external referencing of student performance statistics
- **Interim Monitoring**
- Usually at the end of each semester where a unit is taught:
- Quality of teaching
- Student progress
- Use to improve!
- **Non-SAA:**
- Internal review starting point for our assessment in Cycle 2
- Course met standards last time-has it been updated sufficiently?
- What information fed into review, including course performance

SAA

- Internal review also the focus
- We will choose 'sample courses' to test quality of internal review and explore: what was presented and evidence of 'overarching academic scrutiny'. Detect and correct! Improve and enhance!
- Test capacity for own self-assurance. Detect problems, detect gaps and improve them

Performance monitoring

- Data can tell a story, particularly benchmarking with other institutions [graphs]. Graphs can tell a story.
- Academic staff SSR benchmark over 5 years
- Drill-down: Look at provider level, organisational level for data such as attrition
- **Purpose of indicators is to focus on the finding but focus on the question**

Professional accreditation

- Mandatory if 'required' for graduates to practice (3.1.5)
- When is it 'required'?
- For professions registered by law
- Health professions registrations by AHPRAH, teaching
- Engineering in QLD and VIC
- Accounting for certain functions

- Where it is normally required by employers
- Engineering
- Planning (PIA)
- Not required in other fields, such as marketing
- **Professional bodies should synch their standards with HESF 2015**
- Difficult however to synch assessments due to different cycles, requirements, but some successful examples
- **Guidance Notes:**
 - Academic Integrity
 - Academic Integrity Good Practice Note
 - Academic Quality Assurance
 - Course Design
 - Financial Standing
 - External Referencing

Supporting and engaging on assessment, review, course accreditation

- The New Zealand context
- What is AQA?
- How does AQA engage on assessment, review, course accreditation and professional accreditation
- Lots of commonality across both agencies
- There is a lot that is changing in education, quality assurance will reflect these changes
- Fiscal, economic drivers
- In NZ, moving from one Cycle into another Cycle: UK, Scotland and Australia
- How we might change?
- NZ context, we are a composite tertiary education sector, not a HE sector. It encompasses all types of sectors, 8 universities, 500 non-universities, 3 Wananga institutions, 10 work-place training organisations, private providers
- The university sector: 8 universities and relatively homogenous. Across NZ have been governed by same Education Act, VCs are responsible for quality assurance. Set up two responses: Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAPP) and Academic Quality Agency (AQA)
- AQA role is ongoing quality assurance of universities, we are operationally independent and at arm's length. We have an academic audit and it has been developed and defined.

Principles of quality assurance for New Zealand Universities

1. Developed by the universities
 2. Evidence-based
 3. Enhancement-led
 4. Founded on self-review
 5. Assured by peer review
 6. Collective and collegial
 7. Individually binding
 8. Internationally benchmarked and endorsed
 9. Independently operated
 10. Publicly available
- NZQA: programme approval and accreditation, moderation, consistency reviews, external evaluation and review
 - Matear and Sid King (2017). What are sorts of drivers and conditions for different review contexts?

How does AQA engage?

- We use an academic audit (cycle 5)
- 40 guideline statements across 7 'academic activity themes', including
- 3.1 Programme approval
- 3.2 graduate attributes
- 3.3 Graduate Outcomes
- 3.4 Programme Review
- 3.5 Benchmarking Programmes
- 3.6 Assessment
- 3.7 Equivalence of LO
- They have made a number of recommendations on assessment: a few more recommendations which were commenting:
- assessment of grading practices across the University with an objective of removing inconsistency in grading practices both within and between Colleges and ensuring equivalence of marks and grades between different programmes [this was a very important driver for change]
- Investigate practices related to inconsistencies in assessment
- Reviews the mechanisms used by staff to moderate undergraduate assessment tasks,
- Develop a policy on moderation expectations
- Revise assessment policy

And then what??

- One-year follow up visit and report to the AQA Board
- Mid-cycle report
- Report again on response to recommendations in next audit
- Where are we going next?
- Model for Cycle 6 audits
- 10 components, including greater use of evidence that demonstrates embeddedness or systemisation of practices
- Common enhancement theme : How do we increase access for Maori and Pacifica students
- Audit universities 7-8 years after their Cycle 5 audit
- Student members of audit panels. A lot to prepare and develop students as audit members.
- Universities to report publicly on response to recommendations
- **In terms of assessment, review, course accreditation and professional accreditation**
- Assessment : Assessment and outcome standards are moderated and national and internationally appropriate
- Review
- Accreditation
- Small, relatively homogenous university sector
- It is not an industrial, quality production model
- Synthesis reports on common enhancement themes. What are the benefits in working on a theme collaboratively?

9:35 am -
9:55 am

Plenary session

Key opportunities as well as challenges to emerge from Australia's regulatory architecture since the Report on The Review of Higher Education Regulation (Dow & Braithwaite, 2013)

[Emeritus Professor Kwong Lee Dow](#), Patron, Higher Education Quality Network

- Let me take a couple of minutes to set up a longer historic context in the development of accreditation and regulation in Australia
- Hong Kong Accreditation Council
- There are three key marker points: 1) follow on from the Martin Committee which was a major review in 1965, which led into Advanced Colleges of Education that these institutions which were equal but different to universities. Canberra College of Advanced Education and Tasmania College of Advanced Education, not the teachers colleges. Accreditation was about that degree level programs will be delivered other than universities. Universities sailed on till up to Dawkins without any external accreditation but university people were involved in the College sector. They learnt a great deal and improved their own processes. It was the Dawkins period, that brought a number of colleges into a unified national system. Dawkins saw through formation of another group of institutions. After all that Denise Bradley in 2008, another 20 years on said that this is the time to bring a more regulatory concept, aligning HE institutions with regulation in so many other fields. From 2008 Bradley looking at how tertiary education would be expanded in Australia, aligning the vocational education sector and the HE sector. She initially argued for a single regulatory body. This didn't happen and we went into a new body that had a tertiary title, with a very different set of goals. The AUQA accreditations which led into from Dawkins, which were done across universities, that period became quite an embedded process on site visits, peers to do reviews of other institutions. The notion to be more broad based in the regulatory sense, to be more efficient and getting things done electronically
- At the time, I felt I could speak authoritatively about TEQSA, we did intensive consultations and spent a lot of time with TEQSA. Time moves on. I don't carry a great authority, but draw my impressions of what is going on.
- First and major thing to say: is that everything is going well. Institutions are responding positively to partnership and collaboration. The relationships have been very positive. I would say that is truer for universities, which in the main they have been light touch in terms of registration. Those institutions still having each course assessed and accredited will inevitably have more strain. One reason for that has been the development of the Higher Standards Panel and credit to go to the Chair and the Panel. Alan Robson and his people and the evolution through Peter Shergold. There are some issues, some institutions which are dual sector. Big TAFE institutes which are seeking degree accreditation [William Angliss Institute] and we have a number of private providers who have been largely VET institutions. One of the things to look to the future, TEQSA requirements focus on whole of institution, need how to work it a program level We have to be alert to an issue of fair consistency. Two further points: When we did this review, we were concerned TEQSA were being caught up with Ministers, we were worried at the time of themed assessments. Don't get drawn into politics, just do re-registrations and course accreditation. Times have changed. It is sensible, some theme issues: attrition, retention, academic integrity: it is proper for taking this up. Be careful on not taking on issues that can get so big and messy and which there won't be clear answers. Another thing about themes, we in Australia are starting to feel the consequences of not having OLT, they identified funded work on issues and built a prominence through grants. Now there is a little bit of risk, that it will be

tipped into TEQSA. The last thing, be careful in a world for innovation and fresh ways of doing things, that we don't put everything on the regulator.

- We still have a lot to be gained working through the major activities and we don't kill off other possibilities.

9:55 am -
10:25 am

Keynote presentation

Innovative cheating: Assessment and Quality Assurance Issues for Universities and Beyond

[Associate Professor Wendy Sutherland-Smith](#), Director of Teaching and Learning (Pedagogy and Quality Assurance), School of Psychology, Deakin University

- Innovative ways students cheat.
- Media has hype around cheating.
- *Bad Genius* (film): inspired by true events
- Exam cheating
- Why do students cheat?
- Some student cheat in ALL forms of assessment- assignment, practicum, exams
- Student cheat because they:
 - Fear high stakes assessment
 - Fear a specific skill set in assessment
 - Become desperate
 - Aware of the seriousness of cheating
 - Don't see their actions as unethical
 - See study as 'business deal' and 'outsourcing' assessment is a legitimate use of time/resources
- TEQSA Guidelines on contract cheating
- TEQSA: It is widely regarded that the best way to detect and deter contract cheating is to know your students.
- QAA: There is no single solution but focus on 'education, deterrence, detection'
- Assessment reform ALONE is not the answer- but it's a really important component
- Assessment needs to be personalised
- Assessment that is more difficult to cheat in involves: vivas/orals and self-reflection
- Why should we care about cheating in assessment?
- Assessment should evidence students' knowledge and skill levels
- QA lens-accountability for quality of programs and graduates
- HE is a \$21 billion export industry for Australia
- Must maintain national/international reputation in quality of educational product/graduates
- Public universities funded by tax payers - we are accountable and responsible for the quality of our programs and graduates to the employment sector and the community at large
- Integrity lens: contractual and personal obligations
- Contract cheating: is purchasing of bespoke university assignments with the intention of submitting them for assessment
- Contract cheating is a \$300m global industry with a prevalence of around 3-10%
- Get students involved and raise student awareness

- We need to get students/student union involved as they are invaluable allies in deterring cheating; raise awareness
- October 18, 2017 2nd International action against contract cheating

10:25 am - REFRESHMENT BREAK
10:55 am

10:55 am - Stream: Industry engagement/Work Integrated Learning
11:25 am ***Partnerships for Assessing and Evaluating: What Matters Most?***
[Professor Janice Orrell](#), Professor of Higher Education, Flinders University
One thing that is really important, it is always context specific. This presentation focusses on the critical role of assessment
Why is assessment and evaluation so fundamental in education?
What form should partnerships take in these endeavours?
Is it enough to be an expert in the discipline or practice or is something more needed?

Assessment (not grading or ranking) defines and informs students about what is important for them to learn. It shapes their learning and it is used to assure society of graduates' capability.

Evaluation is an essential part of the accreditation process with its primary purposes being quality improvement and assurance. Done well, evaluation will produce evidence of how well a program is meeting learning expectations and identify areas where the curriculum and its delivery can be improved and inform the allocation of resources in doing so.

Accreditation draws on diverse voices preparedly engaged partners to review the processes, infrastructure and outcomes to assure stakeholders that due care is occurring in the design and delivery of the program of study ensuring at the expectations and needs for the program itself are being met.

Assessment and evaluation practices

- Largely conducted by those who are recognised to be experts in the related field (discipline or practice) using by commonly accepted practices.
- Practice itself is frequently found to make and shape educational practice and becomes common practice that is accepted by its community of practice (Britzman 2003)
- Thus, high stakes practices of assessment, evaluation and accreditation are largely governed by 'wisdom of experience' much of it tacit and not necessarily available for critical education.
- Conditions
- Starts from and rewards what matters most
- Questioning reliability and validity of our judgements
- Higher order learning
- Feedback loop needs to be built into what we do
- New participants inducted and mentored in the processes
- What matters most! Is taking a whole of program approach, that means the learning outcomes of all the program, deliberate design of programs to foster self-regulating learners and learning
- **Medical program at UNSW does portfolio assessment really well**
- **Big thing about programmatic assessment is self-regulated learning. How do you embed this into a structured process**

A paradigm shift

- Mature partnerships between universities and industry
- A shared vision for the future
- Reciprocal benefit and intentionality
- Assessment and evaluation are an essential part of our work
- Quality partnerships between universities and community organisations are increasingly based on provision of professional placements, enabling student to meet professional registration requirements and facilitating future employment
- It takes time
- Deep engage and constructive reciprocity between universities and community facilitates
- Audits of WIL units:
- Emerging body of research between partnerships and pathways
- Different types of partners: tentative, alignment engagement and committed engagements
- Some universities do this very well, the point of leadership that there is a definite commitment.
- Changing HE landscape
- Are we at risk of trying to invent a better mouse trap?
- How do we include Indigenous students out on placement. UNSW had a co-aligned diploma in professional practice. When Indigenous students went out they saw what is important and relevant.
- Value added ethos. What is this reciprocity? We need to look at perceived inequality and lack of power; inadequate resources and infrastructure; invisibility of university/industry/community work
- Ongoing challenges
- Defensiveness and resistance within academic silos
- Professional accreditation and certification regulations that focus on knowledge testing and skills acquisition to the exclusion of disposition of discernment, judgement
- Orrell (2011)

10:55 am - Stream: Academic Integrity
 11:25 am ***Test the Waters: Auditing a Contract Cheating Website***
[Associate Professor Zofia Pawlaczek](#), Director Program Quality & Development, RMIT University

10:55 am - Workshop
 11:55 am ***CADAD Professional learning support for peer review across the institution:***
[Professor Kevin Ashford-Rowe](#), Director, Learning and Teaching Centre, Australian Catholic University
[Kylie Readman](#), Director of the Centre for Support and Advancement of Learning and Teaching, The University of The Sunshine Coast
[Dr Sara Booth Principal fellow \(HEA\)](#), Strategic Advisor - Quality External, University of Tasmania

11:25 am - Stream: Academic Integrity
 11:55 am ***Global Essay Mills Survey***
[Rebecca Awdry](#), Manager of Academic Quality and Development, Teaching and Learning, University of Canberra

11:25 am - Industry engagement/Work Integrated Learning
 12:25 pm ***Co-creating an industry-academic postgraduate professional education framework***

[Associate Professor Karen Theobald](#), Director of Academic Programs, Queensland University of Technology, School of Nursing
[Professor Amanda Henderson](#), Griffith University
[Bernadette Thomson](#), Nursing Director Education, Princess Alexandra Hospital – QEII Jubilee Hospital Network Metro South Health
[Julie Humphries](#), Nurse Educator NPDU Emergency, QE II Jubilee Hospital, Metro South Health

The first part of session and then we will invite you to be involved and help us with our outcomes.

What does a partnership really look like? QUT and Griffith and two largest hospital services worked on this project. This was part of an OLT seed grant and worked on it for 18 months. We decided to take on two large PG units- Emergency Nursing. We are sharing what we have done and what we have got to. The key aims were to co-create a framework.

The framework need to be aligned the PG education goals and curriculum development process of the health care industry and higher education and meet professional learning opportunities.

Milestones for curriculum development and evaluation:

18 hours of workshops

First workshop: Creating a shared vision

Who? Executive directors, clinical and academic course coordinated, emergency nurse clinicians and professional organisation reps

What was achieved?

Agreement of capabilities of RN specialists and Graduate Certificate emergency graduands

Recognition of sector differences

Enacting our collaboration

Recognising contributions from each party to establish environment of industry-academic learning

Identifying teaching and learning approaches and possibilities

Representative from CENA

Feedback: Student engagement to review proposed program and from four diverse sites

University challenges and opportunities

Learning relevant and contemporary and platforms

WIL is a poorly defined part of the curriculum

Reciprocity and engaging from your discipline: What can you highlight from your discipline?

The industry partners need to take on the work-integrated learning. We valued it being owned by our industry partners.

Challenge of new academics with industry experience

Agile and responsive workforce

Access, analyse and appropriately use information

Advancing professionalism

Co-creation with industry collaboration

Healthcare district which is fully digital across 5 facilities, education across 6000 nurses. This has made students look at how they deliver healthcare.

How to use technology. Major change and the ED environment is highly stressed environment. We want them to be agile and responsive to patient needs. They need to deliver patient care through patient complaints. They

work in a multi-collaborative group and lead those health care teams. Use evidence and best apply it.

Making it happen: What does it look like in the workplace?

Mentoring/rostering-bring the best pairs/groups together

Privileging opportunities what learning opportunities are availing themselves

Scaffolding-organising how circumstances coming together

Nursing Excellence Programs and Magnet: For professional development. Nurses love reward and recognition and that pathway to develop articulation agreements with universities is very rewarding. Growing this professional identify and body of knowledge.

What can industry do better to accommodate student learning and what can universities assist us?

30 years' experience in critical care: I have learnt through this program. I am the nurse educator at the QUT, we see 56,000 presentations a year. In Aug, saw 32 category ones, jump from our normal process. There is one nurse educator with 112 nurses, assist nurses at the bedside. Voicecera: electronic wireless. Each of the nurses have a mentor, they can have quite a few mentors. Clinical handover is an art, as a medical facilitator to help them through the process. Use simulation. The pressures for the ED are: ramping puts a lot of pressure on nurses, the other thing that impacts on us is triage. University-Industry Integration Framework

What students really want:

Strong links between academic courses and clinical standards

Greater clinical evidence

More dedicated facilitators on site

Consistent expectations

Flexibility around learning

Partnering nursing theory and clinical application

Rotations and on-ward learning

Appropriate and meaningful assessment

11:55 am - Stream: Professional learning
12:25 pm ***The Impact of Institutional Assessment and Feedback reforms on Academic Practice***
[Dr Simon Bedford](#), Senior Lecturer – Assessment and Feedback, Learning, Teaching & Curriculum Unit, University of Wollongong

11:55 am - Stream: Assessment and Calibration
12:25 pm ***Improving assessment quality and processes in specialty training***
[Jacob Pearce](#), Senior Research Fellow, Psychometrics and Methodology Research Program, Australian Council for Educational Research
[Daniel Urbach](#), Senior Research Fellow, Psychometrics and Methodology Research Program, Australian Council for Educational Research

12:25 pm - NETWORKING LUNCH
1:30 pm

1:30 pm - Stream: Assessment and Calibration
2:00 pm ***Design Considerations for Cases used in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning***
[Professor Ieva Stupans](#), Professor of Pharmacy, RMIT

1:30 pm -
2:00 pm

Stream: Industry engagement/Work Integrated Learning
Engagement with Professional Practice in Engineering Education Programs

[Dr Lincoln Wood](#), National Manager, Accreditation, Engineers Australia

A/Prof Bill McBride
Bernadette Foley
Doug Hargreaves

You see things; and you say Why?

But I dream things that never were; and I say 'Why not?' [George Bernard Shaw]

The challenge

Engineering accreditation requires the provision of appropriate engagement with professional practice

Industry placements of up to 12 weeks duration over summer vacations have long been the norm

These placements are no longer available in adequate numbers

A fundamental re-assessment of these placements

Expectations of the community

An engineer acts to meet an obligation in relation to a professional task

Requires a professional judgement and a consequent decision

Engineering education must offer a foundation for the development of professional judgement and decisions

Design - a transformation process- distinguishes engineering from other STEM disciplines

What do engineers actually do?

Professional Performance Innovation and Risk

Stakeholders

Task

Competence

Public

Risk

Innovation

Management

Contract PPIR Warren Centre, University of Sydney

Engineering Outputs

The creative outputs of designs are captured in information

Designs have to be managed through the lifecycle of a technical product

Student engineers need more than knowledge

Education programs should provide formative experiences

Judgement vs decision-making

Judgement: the capacity to form an opinion objectively

Decision: operationalising judgements

Experts use two types of mental processes: subconscious automatic pattern recognition and conscious analytical styles are deductive.

You only gain the subconscious through experience. Expert can move effortlessly

Used professional judgement and decision: Adapted from: Clinical decision making: how surgeons do it: Wendy Crebbin, Spencer Beasley and David AK Watters. Pp-422-428.

Expertise is built on a sequence of 'molecules of judgement'

DNA of expertise: Intertwining threads of analytical knowledge and experience, mediated by critical reflection, growing judgement and expertise
 This drumbeat will ideally begin in undergraduate degree; professional learning environment
 Professional communications that are used in the professional workplace are very different to casual social communication styles-essential for communicating with others
 Development of a professional identity: constructive role models
 Constraints of commerce-engineers typically work in teams - often large and multi-disciplinary teams
 Experiences 'in the wild'
 Professional Learning Environment: Professional workplace; role of industry
 Outcomes of a PLE: experiences
 Student engineers will experience how engineering professions: think, work, learn, judgement, make decisions and earn trust

1:30 pm -
 2:00 pm

Stream: Professional learning
Applying Andragogy to Assessment Design - How to engage your learners and make your teaching easier
[Dr Duncan Nulty](#), Academic and Educational Developer, Learning and Teaching Centre Course Coordinator, Graduate Certificate in Higher Education, Australian Catholic University

2:00 pm -
 2:30 pm

Stream: Professional learning
Quality in Learning and Teaching
[Dr Julie Fleming](#), Senior Lecturer, CQUniversity
[Associate Professor Koqi Naidoo](#), Director, Learning Academy, Charles Sturt University

2:00 pm -
 2:30 pm

Stream: Industry engagement/Work Integrated Learning
TEQSA Advisory Note on WIL
[Associate Professor Judith Smith](#), Associate Director, Real World Learning, Queensland University of Technology
[Dr Michael Tomlinson FGIA, FCIS](#), Director, Assurance Group, TEQSA

WIL and the New Standards
 This has the most substantial feedback from people. We had letters from ACEN, Engineering Deans etc.
 Institutional quality assurance [3.1, 5.3 and 6.3]
 Academic policies and procedures; overall delivery of units, incl WIL
 Delivery with Other Parties (5.4)
 WIL placements, other community-based learning and collaborative research training arrangements are quality assured, including assurance of the quality of supervision
 GN defines WIL as 'learning in a workplace outside HEP' as a part of course of study.
 These learning experiences need to be quality assured
 Standards prescribe no particular model
 Outcome: Acknowledge support provided to students on zero-credit units may be limited because unfunded
 Online placements need online support? Student outcomes and experience must be comparable and QA applied as required by 5.4.1
 Online experience has extended learning

WIL risks: major risks: no or inadequate QA framework; not enough placements available; roles and expectations of all parties not set out; inadequate workplace supervision; inadequate support from provider; conflict with supervisors; ethical and professional behaviour; partnerships with industry and community; and management of student IP
Written agreement; student preparation and support; some form of due diligence

2:00 pm - Stream: Academic Integrity
2:30 pm ***My eQuals the Journey towards credential security***
Jacqui Elson-Green, Kate Whight, Higher Ed Services

2:30 pm - REFRESHMENT BREAK
3:00 pm

3:00 pm - Closing keynote presentation
3:30 pm ***Developing and assessing graduates who are work-ready plus***
[Emeritus Professor Geoff Scott](#), Emeritus Professor of Higher Education and Sustainability, Western Sydney University