

Quality of Teaching Policy

Policy Number: 1.6.2.24
Responsibility: DVC (LTSS)
Approving Authority: The Senate 2/15
Date approved: 22 July 2015
Review date: 22 July 2016

1.0 Overview

It is inherently difficult to attain a reliable and valid measure for a complex phenomenon such as teaching. Internationally, the approach is to employ a mix of direct and indirect quantitative and qualitative measures, and that is what is employed at USP. We already are collecting the requisite data, what we seek to do is consolidate and analyse these data in a timely and robust fashion. We also seek to use these data in a cycle of continuous iterative improvement.

At the institutional level the University employs an holistic approach to evaluate the quality of teaching. This mirrors international best practice like the Australian Tertiary Education Quality Standards Agency's quality teaching indicators, and New Zealand's Tertiary Education Commission Educational Performance Indicators (EPIs). Key teaching quality indicators include surveys of teaching and courses, surveys of the student experience such as the Australasian Survey of Student Engagement (AUSSE) and National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), graduate destination surveys, and surveys of employer satisfaction. Evaluation of staff is a crucial part of this bigger picture.

It is our goal to mirror the quality indicators used for the measurement of research quality, and provide a variety of high level, institutionally-required measures to evaluate the quality of teaching for an individual. The use of multiple indicators acknowledges that, as in research, a staff member may perform better in some criteria than others, allowing judgement by supervisory staff as to overall performance

The measures that are used here are not intended to supplant or compete with the criteria detailed in the USP Academic Development & Assessment Criteria (ADAC). This latter document details pathways to staff professional development, and this is more formative in nature. If staff follow the pathways in the ADAC, then they will attain the quality of teaching measures sought by the University. There is not an expectation that staff performance as measured by QoT will follow a linear path as is expected for QoR, although we would expect to see senior more experienced staff contributing to leadership in the scholarship of teaching.

2.0 Quality of Teaching (QoT) Measures

- 2.1 Course learning outcomes need to be well aligned with the graduate attributes for the degree or programme. The first QoT measure is then to ensure *alignment between learning outcomes and assessment activities*, in order to be sure that graduates attain our graduate attributes. Other indicators such as evaluation and pass rates, are meaningless unless graduate skills are assessed appropriately. This is consistent with the assurance of learning process (an important component of many accreditation requirements). A template is provided (see 3.0).
- 2.2 Second are *educational performance indicators* (EPIs), such as course pass rates, and programme completion rate for each course and programme the staff member teaches. For individual staff we shall use course pass rates for each course taught, what we will be looking to see is some major deviation in pass rates between years as one of our quality of teaching measures. These data shall be provided for HoS in advance of the staff preparing his or her portfolio.
- 2.3 Student *evaluation of teaching and courses* forms a crucial component of quality of teaching, and this is the third measure. Evaluation data used here shall be numerical and summative, but staff may draw upon qualitative data when presenting evidence of the quality of their teaching (e.g., written comments on evaluation forms). The staff shall also be required to describe how they have utilized feedback to improve practice, and this shall be used in subsequent iterations of evaluation. For the first iteration, that is, the current review of the previous year we shall only use student evaluation of courses. These data shall be provided for HoS in advance of the staff preparing his or her portfolio.
- 2.4 Unobtrusive *observation of lessons* constitutes the fourth measure of quality of teaching. This shall be by academic peers at the same or higher level of appointment, from outside the School in which the staff works. A template for observation is provided as an attachment. The measure shall not be counted for staff who teach solely or mostly online. For the current review of previous year classes, this shall be the data collected as per the protocol in 2014 (see 4.0).
- 2.5 The University is committed to providing students with exposure to technology-rich, innovative, pedagogies. Hence, the fifth quality of teaching measure is *effective use of ICT-supported pedagogies*. The University uses Moodle for all course and programmes, and this measure shall be evaluated by examination of Moodle analytics. A template is (see 5.0).
- 2.6 The final measure of quality of teaching is evidence of *staff professional development*; activities and contributions (for senior staff). This may consist of attendance at workshops, contributions to the scholarship of teaching, or completion of relevant qualifications (e.g., the GCTT or equivalent). Staff to provide evidence when submitting their portfolio to HoS.
- 2.7 Staff may provide supplementary evidence if their teaching duties are such that they are different from the norm, but must include the 6 measures above.
- 2.8 Staff also may complete the attached form, which allows them to explain articulate reasons for lack of achievement in one or more of the QoT measures.

3.0 Alignment Between Learning Outcomes And Assessment Activities

Staff shall provide learning outcomes to their HoS for each course they taught in the year under review.

HoS shall then check the following two things:

1. Overall, are the learning outcomes SMART:
 - a. S = Specific (i.e., not vague, unclear, or too broad)
 - b. M = Measurable (as objective as possible)
 - c. A = Attainable (must be realistic for the level of study)
 - d. R = Relevant (must make sense in relation to programme as a whole)
 - e. T = Time-bound (must be manageable in the timeframe)
2. For each learning outcome is there a clearly identified assessment activity or event that actually measures student achievement of the outcome?

Score for this QoT measure:-

1. Item 1, matching with SMART:
 - a. None match = Does not meet expectations;
 - b. 1 match = Development Required;
 - c. 3 match = Satisfactory;
 - d. 4 match = Exceeds Expectations;
 - e. All 5 match = Excellent.
2. Item 2, evidence is presented of:
 - a. None match = Does not meet expectations;
 - b. 1 match = Development Required;
 - c. 3 match = Satisfactory;
 - d. 4 match = Exceeds Expectations;
 - e. All 5 match = Excellent.

Overall rating HoS can look at staff performance across the two items and give an overall rating as per the table below.

More detail about SMART leaning outcomes/objectives are available at a variety of web sites:

<http://blog.convergencetraining.com/how-to-write-smart-learning-objectives;>
<http://explearning.ucf.edu/registered-students/tips-for-success/writing-smart-learning-objectives/195;>
<http://uncw.edu/career/documents/WritingSMARTLearningObjectives.pdf>

Note that the categories vary slightly in the literature (e.g., *Relevant* is sometimes replaced by *Realistic*, or *Results-focussed*, and *Time-bound* by *Timely*), but are broadly similar.

The most important elements of the SMART learning outcomes are the first 3.

4.0 Classroom Observation Checklist for 2015

4.1 Starting the class

Did the lecturer:

- Set up a welcoming classroom environment
- Engage the attention of the students
- Establish the learning objectives for the day
- Link the session objectives with course outcomes, assessment and key course questions/themes
- Check on student learning progress and prior knowledge

4.2 Lecturer attributes

Did the lecturer:

- Communicate the subject area
- Set out the structure and logic of the session
- Demonstrate ways of engaging with the subject matter set out in the learning outcomes (for example, problem-solving)
- Link the learning to assessment
- Highlight key questions or ideas
- Break up the learning into manageable sections
- Explain the purpose of each section
- Intersperse teacher input with student learning activities
- Invite student participation and input
- Use formative feedback strategies to gauge student learning progress
- Use examples from practice or everyday analogies to illustrate key ideas and connect with students
- Use accessible language and check on understanding of key terminology
- Use a range of strategies and tools to communicate the learning

4.3 Delivery

Did the lecturer:

- Show enthusiasm
- Show approachability
- Vary the style of delivery
- Connect with the learners
- Avoid extended reading from notes
- Acknowledge and accommodate student diversity
- Speak clearly and at a reasonable pace
- Deal with challenging student behaviours

4.4 Student participation

Did the lecturer:

- Set up group or individual learning opportunities within the class
- Set up on-line or in-class activities to give students the opportunity to apply or practise course learning
- Use in-class strategies to diagnose current student learning
- Use in-class strategies to get feedback on student progress on course learning
- Encourage peer learning opportunities
- Invite individual reflection on class learning
- Use a range of questioning techniques to invite student participation
- Use multiple strategies for active involvement by students
- Respond to student answers and connect responses to class learning

4.5 Closing

Did the lecturer:

- Consolidate key ideas
- Indicate links with the next session and assessment
- End in a memorable way
- Leave the students with a challenging idea or question

4.6 Score for this QoT measure:

1. Observations confirm that:
 - a. 0-8 activities are observed = Does not meet expectations;
 - b. 9-16 activities are observed = Development Required;
 - c. 17-24 activities are observed = Satisfactory;
 - d. 25-32 activities are observed = Exceeds Expectations;
 - e. 33+ activities are observed = Excellent.

5.0 Effective Use of ICT-supported Pedagogies

In the context of USP, we shall evaluate the use of ICT in pedagogy by two measures; the use of ICT to inform assessment, and the provision of some ICT-based resource that enhances the learning experience.

Table 1. Examples of ICT Tools and Their Use

ICT Tools	Application	Evidence
Available tools	How tools are used	How tools show evidence of enhancing learning
Moodle quiz/workshops etc	Provision of a pre-lesson activity to prepare students before class Self-testing learning activities	Activity is attempted by students Student complete a post-lesson quiz
Multimedia video or other resource	Provision of a video clip explaining a difficult topic	Good or improved performance in difficult topic
Other learning tools	OERs, activities developed locally, m-Learning activities	Assessment aligned with any of the activities

6.0 Staff Professional Development

Staff shall provide evidence of staff professional development; activities and contributions to others professional development (for senior staff). This may consist of attendance at workshops, contributions to the scholarship of teaching, or completion of relevant qualifications (e.g., the GCTT or equivalent). Staff shall provide evidence by means of a portfolio to HoS.

7.0 Quality of Teaching Comments to HoS (Optional)

If a staff member fails to meet expectations for one or more of the QoT measures they have the option of providing an explanation for their HoS to take into account when considering their overall performance against the 6 QoT measures adopted by the University.

Staff may wish to comment on the following:

1. Other work commitments (list the main ones)
2. Was not able to engage in activities related to the QoT measure (e.g., teach only by online mode, therefore no class observations were done)
3. Did not receive any mentoring or support from others
4. Other (please explain)

Table 2. Metrics for Measurement of Quality of Teaching

	Does Not Meet Performance Expectations	Development Required	Satisfactory	Exceeds Expectations	Excellent
Alignment of Learning Outcomes & Assessment (from sheet, see above)	0	1	2	3	4
Course Pass Rates (variation cf. University average from last 3 years for this course)	>4 % 0	±4% 1	±3% 2	±2% 3	±1% 4
ICT-Pedagogies (from sheet, see above)	0	1	2	3	4
Evaluation of Teaching (from report)	0	1	2	3	4
Observations of Lessons (from report)	0	1	2	3	4
Staff Professional Development (evidence of)	None 0	Provides intentions only 1	One of: -Workshop attendance -Conference attendance 2	One of: -Workshop presentation 3	One of: -Workshop organiser/leader -Invited keynote/public address -Published article on teaching -Other 4
Overall	0-4	5-7	8-11	12-15	16+

Overall Scoring – Total of All Measures (4 out of 6 at the same level):

- Does Not Meet Performance Expectations 0-3
- Development Required 4-7
- Satisfactory 8-11
- Exceeds Expectations 12-15
- Excellent 16+

HoS should use judgement especially when providing the overall rating, taking into account any explanations provided.

QoT Criteria Record Sheet

1.0 Alignment of Learning Outcomes and Assessment Activities

Course learning outcomes need to be well aligned with the graduate attributes for the degree or programme, in order to be sure that graduates attain the graduate attributes for their programme.

Staff: Staff shall provide learning outcomes to their HoS for each course they taught in the year under review.

HOS: HOS shall then check the following two things:

1. Overall, are the learning outcomes SMART:
 - a. S = Specific (i.e., not vague, unclear, or too broad)
 - b. M = Measurable (as objective as possible)
 - c. A = Attainable (realistic for the level of study)
 - d. R = Relevant (make sense in relation to programme as a whole)
 - e. T = Time-bound (manageable in the timeframe)
2. For each learning outcome is there a clearly identified assessment activity or event that actually measures student achievement of the outcome.

Score for this QoT measure:

1. Item 1, matching with SMART:
 - a. None match = Does not meet performance expectations;
 - b. 1 match = Development Required;
 - c. 3 match = Satisfactory;
 - d. 4 match = Exceeds Expectations;
 - e. All 5 match = Excellent.
2. Item 2, evidence is presented of:
 - a. None match = Does not meet performance expectations;
 - b. 1 match = Development Required;
 - c. 3 match = Satisfactory;
 - d. 4 match = Exceeds Expectations;
 - e. All 5 match = Excellent.

When making their overall rating for these criteria, the HoS should look at staff performance across the two items, and give an overall rating with the items treated equally, and enter this into the spreadsheet.

Overall Rating – Transfer to Score Sheet:

1. Does not meet performance expectations 0 points
2. Development Required 1 point
3. Satisfactory 2 points
4. Exceeds Expectations 3 points
5. Excellent 4 points.

2.0 Course Pass Rates

For individual staff we shall use course pass rates for each course taught, what we will be looking to see is some major deviation in pass rates between years as one of our quality of teaching measures.

P&Q Office: These data shall be provided to the HoS by the P&Q Office in advance of the staff preparing his or her portfolio. These data shall be pass rates for each course taught by the staff member in the year under review, along with pass rates for the same course taught by the same mode for the last 3 offerings (not necessarily last 3 years).

HOS: HOS shall then check for variation with historical pass rates and enter data into the spreadsheet based on the following:

Score for this QoT measure:

Variation of University average from last 3 offerings for this course by the same mode, with the overall rating:

- a. $>4\%$ Does not meet performance expectations
- b. $\pm 4\%$ Development Required
- c. $\pm 3\%$ Satisfactory
- d. $\pm 2\%$ Exceeds Expectations
- e. $\pm 1\%$ Excellent.

Overall Rating – Transfer to Score Sheet:

1. Does not meet performance expectations 0 points
2. Development Required 1 point
3. Satisfactory 2 points
4. Exceeds Expectations 3 points
5. Excellent 4 points.

3.0 Evaluation of Teaching

Evaluation of teaching data used here shall be based on student evaluation of courses, and staff responses to previous evaluations of teaching.

P&Q: P&Q shall provide student evaluations of courses for each course taught by the staff member to the staff member for the year under review. For the purposes of these QoT criteria, only Questions 9, 10, 11, & 13 shall be used.

Staff: Staff also may draw upon qualitative data when presenting evidence of the quality of their teaching such as written comments on evaluation forms, but if they do so they must reference the raw data from the course evaluations. The staff also shall be required to describe how they have utilized feedback to improve practice, and this shall be used in subsequent iterations of evaluation.

HOS: HOS shall consider the quantitative data from student evaluation of teaching by reference to teaching-related questions from the evaluation forms. Specifically, they are asked to consider student Responses to *Student Evaluation of Courses* Questions 9, 10, 11, & 13.

Score for this QoT measure:

1. Most students score Agree or Strongly Agree for *Student Evaluation of Courses* Questions 9, 10, 11, & 13:
 - a. None = Does not meet performance expectations;
 - b. 1 = Development Required;
 - c. 2 = Satisfactory;
 - d. 3 = Exceeds Expectations;
 - e. 4 = Excellent.

A judgement then shall be made by the HOS looking at quantitative and qualitative data and an overall rating made.

Overall Rating – Transfer to Score Sheet:

1. Does not meet performance expectations 0 points
2. Development Required 1 point
3. Satisfactory 2 points
4. Exceeds Expectations 3 points
5. Excellent 4 points.

4.0 Observation of Lessons

Observation of lessons shall be by academic peers at the same or higher level of appointment, from outside the School in which the staff works, and who have completed the QoT training workshops held in mid-2015.

The measure shall not be counted for staff who teach solely, or mostly, online.

Staff: Staff shall arrange for at least one of their lessons to be observed by an approved observer (one who has undergone the QoT observation training workshop) from their Faculty but not their School (checklist provided as an appendix). The observer shall employ the template for observation provided (as an attachment).

HOS: The HOS shall consider the completed observations checklist provided by the observer.

Score for this QoT measure:

1. 0-8 activities are observed = Does not meet performance expectations
2. 9-16 activities are observed = Development Required
3. 17-24 activities are observed = Satisfactory
4. 25-32 activities are observed = Exceeds Expectations
5. 33+ activities are observed = Excellent.

Overall Rating – Transfer to Score Sheet:

1. Does not meet performance expectations 0 points
2. Development Required 1 point
3. Satisfactory 2 points
4. Exceeds Expectations 3 points
5. Excellent 4 points.

5.0 Effective Use of ICT-supported Pedagogies

The University is committed to providing students with exposure to technology-rich, innovative, pedagogies. Hence, the fifth quality of teaching measure is effective use of ICT-supported pedagogies. The University uses Moodle for all course and programmes, and this measure shall be evaluated by examination of Moodle analytics.

In the context of USP, we shall evaluate the use of ICT in pedagogy by two measures; the use of ICT to inform assessment, and the provision of some ICT-based resource that enhances the learning experience.

Staff: Staff shall produce a portfolio of evidence of effective use of ICT to enhance learning, guided by the Table below.

HOS: Evaluation of staff use of ICT to enhance learning shall be judged by the evidence produced by staff to support their claims, guided by the Table below.

Table 1. Examples of ICT Tools and Their Use

ICT Tools	Application	Evidence
Available tools	How tools are used	How tools show evidence of enhancing learning
Moodle quiz/workshops etc.	Provision of a pre-lesson activity to prepare students before class Self-testing learning activities	Activity is attempted by students Student complete a post-lesson quiz
Multimedia video or other resource	Provision of a video clip explaining a difficult topic	Good or improved performance in difficult topic
Other learning tools	OERs, activities developed locally, m-Learning activities	Assessment aligned with any of the activities

Score for this QoT measure:

1. Evidence provided (see table):
 - a. None = Does not meet performance expectations;
 - b. 1 item = Development Required;
 - c. 2 items = Satisfactory;
 - d. 3 items = Exceeds Expectations;
 - e. 4 items = Excellent.

Overall Rating – Transfer to Score Sheet:

1. Does not meet performance expectations 0 points
2. Development Required 1 point
3. Satisfactory 2 points
4. Exceeds Expectations 3 points
5. Excellent 4 points.

6.0 Staff Professional Development

Evidence of staff professional development; activities and contributions (for senior staff). This may consist of attendance at workshops, contributions to the scholarship of teaching, or completion of relevant qualifications (e.g., the GCTT or equivalent).

Staff: to provide evidence when submitting their portfolio to HoS

HOS: Evaluation of the professional development of their staff shall be judged by the evidence produced by staff to support their claims, guided by the below.

Score for this QoT measure:

1. Evidence provided:
 - a. None = Does not meet performance expectations;
 - b. Provides intentions only = Development Required;
 - c. One of, workshop, conference attended = Satisfactory;
 - d. Workshop presentation = Exceeds Expectations;
 - e. One of, workshop organiser, invited address, publication on teacher = Excellent.

Overall Rating – Transfer to Score Sheet:

1. Does not meet performance expectations 0 points
2. Development Required 1 point
3. Satisfactory 2 points
4. Exceeds Expectations 3 points
5. Excellent 4 points.

7.0 Supplementary Evidence

If a staff member fails to meet expectations for one or more of the QoT measures they have the option of providing an explanation for their HoS to take into account when considering their overall performance against the QoT measures adopted by the University.

Staff may wish to comment on the following:

1. Other work commitments (list the main ones);
2. Was not able to engage in activities related to the QoT measure (e.g., teach only by online mode, therefore no class observations were done);
3. Did not receive any mentoring or support from others;
4. Other (please explain).

QoT Overall Score Sheet

Appendix 2

Staff:
 School:.....HOS:.....

Circle Each QoT Criteria & Sum Scores to Give Overall Rating

		Does Not Meet Performance Expectations	Development Required	Satisfactory	Exceeds Expectations	Excellent
1	Alignment of Learning Outcomes & Assessment Activities	0	1	2	3	4
2	Course Pass Rates	0	1	2	3	4
3	Evaluation of Teaching	0	1	2	3	4
4	Observations of Lessons	0	1	2	3	4
5	Effective Use of ICT-supported Pedagogies	0	1	2	3	4
6	Staff Professional Development	0	1	2	3	4
	Overall	0-4	5-7	8-11	12-15	16+

Signed

Staff:.....Date:.....
 HOS:.....