

# Team-based curriculum design in creating continuing professional development for university teaching staff

**Lisa Thomas**

University of Wollongong, Wollongong, Australia  
lkosta@uow.edu.au

**Kathryn Harden-Thew**

University of Wollongong, Wollongong, Australia  
kathrynp@uow.edu.au

**Janine Delahunty**

University of Wollongong, Wollongong, Australia  
janined@uow.edu.au

**Bonnie Dean**

University of Wollongong, Wollongong, Australia  
bcord@uow.edu.au

Academic teaching staff are often required to complete a compulsory learning and teaching program for probation. Until recently, the University of Wollongong has offered such a course to their probationary staff which aimed to enhance teaching practice within the institution. However, there was no expectation of further development of learning and teaching practice following probation. During 2014 a new program was developed. The Continuing Professional Development for Learning and Teaching program – CPD (L&T) - is underpinned by a framework of teaching criteria emanating from an extensive review of institutional, national and international benchmarks. For CPD (L&T) certification, staff may submit a portfolio of evidence to demonstrate achievement of criteria within the framework. Within this framework staff can submit portfolios at various stages of their career. These portfolios are peer reviewed by experts in learning and teaching from within the institution. A support program for the development of teaching practice includes online modules, face-to-face workshops, open online resources and special interest groups.

A team-based curriculum design (TBCD) approach was adopted in the development of CPD (L&T). By engaging staff, academic and professional, from across the institution, teams worked toward a collective outcome, encompassing the expertise within the university. Data was collected during the design and deployment of program resources as team members reflected on the experience of a TBCD approach. This paper explores the TBCD approach to designing a professional development curriculum through team members' reflections. This study also contributes to extending understandings of various models of TBCD in higher education.

**Keywords:** team-based curriculum design, professional development, collaboration.

## Introduction

In higher education institutions, most teaching staff are required to undertake some form of professional development (PD) in the area of learning and teaching. Across Australia and overseas, there is a widespread array of approaches to teaching preparation in higher education (Chalmers, Stoney, Goody, Goerke & Gardiner, 2012). In some institutions, this PD is undertaken through a formal course, administered by a central learning and teaching unit. Such courses typically aim to orient new staff to learning and teaching within the university, with focus student-focussed teaching, assessment and curriculum design, scholarly teaching and reflective practices (Hicks, Smigiel, Wilson & Luzeckyj, 2010). For some institutions where there is a mandate for new academic staff to complete such courses, ongoing PD in learning and teaching beyond the initial program can be scarce, limiting continuing engagement for professional learning in university teaching. Where this is the case, opportunities for sharing, learning and collaborating across faculty or discipline boundaries are reduced.

To promote interdisciplinary exchanges and engagement across the university, consideration of the design of the PD program is crucial. In a model where a small team of academic developers within a central unit is designing and facilitating professional development programs, it is essential to demonstrate consideration and understanding across disciplinary, departmental and institutional boundaries in which people teach (Clarke & Reid, 2013). If not properly addressed, programs designed and custom-built by a central team for specific purposes and audiences can miss opportunities for drawing in expertise from the wider university community. In team-based design (Burrell, Cavanagh, Young & Carter, 2015), those with learning and teaching expertise are invited to contribute to shaping content and resources through sharing practice-based examples, recording stories on film and workshopping ideas for the PD curriculum.

This paper describes the process one university undertook to transform a formal learning and teaching PD program through trialling a team-based approach to curriculum design. Prior to implementing the new PD program the University of Wollongong (UOW) had in place the University Learning and Teaching (ULT) course which was operationalised for more than a decade. ULT was designed and facilitated by the central learning and teaching unit specifically for new probationary academics. This course was implemented twice each year on a semester basis and targeted newly employed academics, who completed the course to meet probationary requirements. Casual teachers could not access the opportunities offered in this course and post-ULT staff were not offered further professional development in the area of learning and teaching. The problems arising from this style of learning and teaching professional development included the program's narrow, entry level scope for staff development and the challenge of a 'tick-box' approach to formal PD. To address these concerns UOW's academic developers, the Teaching Development (TD) team, were tasked to replace the ULT course with a Continuing Professional Development, Learning and Teaching program – CPD (L&T): open, ongoing and engaging in nature.

Exploring the opportunities to embrace expertise across the institution the TD team deployed a team-based approach in the creation of CPD (L&T) support activities. This paper presents a small-scale study outlining the CPD (L&T) framework, and then explores the perceptions of the TD team and collaborators involved in a team-based approach to curriculum design. This study also contributes to understanding various models of team-based curriculum design in higher education.

## **Continuing Professional Development for learning and teaching – CPD (L&T)**

In 2014, a task and finish group was drawn together from across the institution to develop a professional development framework for learning and teaching to replace ULT. The task and finish group included academic and professional staff from the central Learning, Teaching and Curriculum unit, faculties and the Professional and Organisational Development Services unit. An analysis of current practice of CPD (L&T) across the sector was conducted. A framework was conceptualised and benchmarked against international teaching standards (Higher Education Academy, UK), national standards (Australian Criteria of Teaching Standards, Higher Education Research Development Society of Australasia) and standards for reward, recognition and promotion within UOW itself. From this, the following professional development principles for learning and teaching were derived.

- Continuing – to support all teaching staff to actively engage in professional development for learning and teaching throughout their career
- External reference – to institutional, national and international awarding bodies and teaching criteria
- Open learning – allowing for individual choice, adopting an anytime/any place delivery for teaching staff making it easily accessible at all locations and for sessional staff.

The CPD (L&T) Framework (Appendix 1) was designed to encourage ongoing engagement with professional development throughout one's teaching career. It consists of four professional development levels available to all UOW staff interested and involved in learning and teaching, academic and professional, as well as an 'entry' level for casual teachers and research students. A set of learning outcomes support each level to indicate the criteria required to be demonstrated to reach a particular level. To seek recognition of achievement of a level, staff must submit a portfolio of evidence demonstrating their case. Portfolios are reviewed by a panel of experts drawn from within the institution, who determine the outcome. For probationary purposes, teaching staff must achieve a minimum of Level 1 CPD (L&T).

To support development relative to the CPD (L&T) framework, the TD team have developed a suite of support activities including face-to-face workshops, online modules, just in time resources and special interest groups to aid staff to meet the requirements of each CPD (L&T) level. In line with the CPD (L&T) principle of open learning, staff are invited to engage with the institution's support activities and are also free to seek professional development opportunities external to the institution.

In this paper the process of development of the face-to-face workshops and online modules is described. To create these CPD (L&T) support activities, the TD team have employed a team-based curriculum design approach, drawing on the expertise of staff from across the university.

### **Team-based curriculum design (TBCD)**

Teaching in higher education can be a lonely endeavour. Despite the known benefits of collaboration in teacher learning (Voogt, Westbrook, Handelzalts, et.al., 2011), curriculum design and teaching, these are often solitary tasks in higher education (Norton, Sonnemann & Cherastidtham, 2013). Research reports that subject/unit design is commonly an individual task within a wider, collaboratively created course structure (Bennett, Thomas, Agostinho, et

al., 2011). The situation for casual teaching staff can be even more isolating, with suggestions that they are marginalised and excluded within the university teaching system (Ryan, Burgess, Connell & Groen, 2013). However, it is not only faculty teaching staff who may experience isolation in designing for learning and teaching.

In many Australian universities academic developers (ADs) are often housed in central units, working alone or within a small team designing and delivering professional development. The AD space has been described as ‘unhomely’ (Manathunga, 2007, in Quinn & Vorster, 2014) and can be isolated from faculty activity.

The notion of collaborative team approaches in curriculum development in higher education seeks to move beyond this isolated reality. By drawing upon expertise from the coalface valuable resources can be developed. Participating staff may gain professional development from the experience of practice sharing and become recognised as leaders in learning and teaching within the institution. Burrell, Cavanagh, Young and Carter (2015) define team-based curriculum design (TBCD) as “more than two people with different expertise working together to produce a collective outcome” (p. 754). TBCD occurs when a team of experts draw together to design or redevelop curriculum within a university (Burrell et al., 2015). Hixon (2008) presents a case study of collaboration models in online course development in higher education. Through a review of the literature, she investigated a range of approaches and reported on variations to collaborative approaches. From these approaches Hixon developed five categories that team members in TBCD fit. These categories were: “(1) project management, (2) subject matter expert/author, (3) instructional design, (4) technical support/production, and (5) other” (Hixon, 2008, p.2). It is interesting to note that while a certain level of team structure is important, Hixon recognised that ultimately a level of flexibility is required to ensure a successful collaboration.

Crucial to the success of TBCD is the nomination of an individual to design and lead the process (Friend & Cook, 2013). When well facilitated, TBCD teams are capable of creating high quality programmes that are coherent, clear in structure and content, transparent, and consistent (Zundans-Fraser & Bain, 2015). Additionally, TBCD can lead to professional development for individual teachers within the team and enhancement of their perspectives of ‘good teaching’ (Voogt et al., 2011). It is therefore important to consider the configuration of the team model and the procedure for collaboration.

This paper presents the methodology, the preliminary findings and an evolving model of TBCD. Together, these represent a study in an Australian university investigating a team-based approach to the design of online and face-to-face support resources for a continuing professional development program for university teachers.

## **Methods**

Participants in this study were staff at the institution who were involved in the collaborative process of developing content for CPD (L&T) support activities. These staff, identified as key stakeholders or experts in topic areas related to the CPD (L&T) framework, were invited by email to collaborate. Staff invited to join in this collaborative process included both academic and professional.

This study focusses on the development of resources for one topic area in the CPD (L&T) framework. Following a high response to the invitation email the TD team arranged an initial

four-hour working party. The TD team followed a schedule whereby collaborators were introduced to the CPD (L&T) framework, provided with exemplars of existing CPD (L&T) support resources and the contributions of others to these. Following indepth discussion related to the topic, collaborators were invited to consider how they could contribute their expertise to support resource development.

During the initial working party it was agreed that due to the already heavy workload of collaborators, regular contact between the TD team and collaborators would be established via email or one-to-one meetings in preference to further meetings of the whole group.

## **Data collection and analysis**

This paper reports the initial phase of an ongoing initiative at the university for collaborative development of CPD (L&T) support resources – by staff, for staff. As a qualitative study it explores the perspectives of collaborators as they reflect on their engagement in development of CPD (L&T) support resources within their area of expertise (Creswell, 2012; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). It was decided that an anonymous, online questionnaire would be preferable to face-to-face data collection in view of the heavy workloads of most staff. A link to the questionnaire was emailed to each collaborator. The questions were designed to elicit collaborators' reflections on individual experiences of the support material development process. In accordance with the ethics approval for this study, participation was emphasised as voluntary and that non-participation would be without penalty. Potential participants were also assured that regardless of participation in the research their contribution to the support resources would be duly acknowledged.

In addition the members of the TD team, served dual roles as participant researchers and completed a written reflection on their experience of the process. The TD team members were encouraged to use the survey questions as the base of their reflections but also to include their own experiences across the planning and execution of the collaboration and the activity development outcomes.

The survey was sent to the 19 staff members involved. A qualitative analysis was undertaken on the first four collaborator responses and the reflections of the three TD team members using Glaser and Strauss' (1967) constant comparative method of data analysis. Collection and thematic analysis of the rich data contributed to the development of an evidence-based model of practice for engaging staff members from across the institution in the process of developing a cohesive and pedagogically-informed set of CPD (L&T) resources. This paper reports preliminary findings of the study.

## **Findings**

The qualitative responses collected have enabled the following themes to be identified.

### Collaborator themes

- *Me ... an expert?*
- *Collaborative experiences*
- *Willingness for future collaboration*

### Themes from TD team reflections

- *Leadership*
- *Return for effort?*
- *One-to-one success*

## **Collaborator themes**

### *Me ... an expert?*

Collaborators in this project had different stated understandings of their expertise in the area of learning and teaching. P1 stated, 'I have expertise and many years of research and practice and involvement in PD', while P2 reflected, 'I don't necessarily regard myself as an expert, but a good case study perhaps'. However the data collected showed that while understandings of personal expertise varied, collaborator expectations were similar. These included a desire to contribute to the development of CPD support activities and provide feedback; share practice; and engage with others to build resources.

Following the first meeting of collaborators, members stated that they felt confident that they had something to contribute and offered their contributions. A schedule of participation was drawn up at the end of the meeting where collaborators indicated their intended contributions and a timeframe for completion was established. Due to the collaborative nature of the team-based approach, members identified that they felt able to 'opt into what [they could] contribute' (P3).

### *Collaborative experiences*

The second theme grew out of the survey questions that probed team members' experience of the collaboration. At this point it became clear that collaboration is a multi-faceted concept. Responses varied from 'I'm not sure it was collaboration' (P1) to 'excellent' and '[I enjoyed] the casual and relatively informal process' (P2). P1 qualified her statement in an email where she identified her online response and added, 'I really don't feel the whole process has been collaborative at all and said so [in the survey]' (pers. comm. 14 December 2015). However, she also commented in an earlier email, 'Many thanks for your support. Collaboration is good!!' (pers. comm. 9 December 2015). Why the seeming discrepancy? In discussion with P1, she highlighted her expectation that the team would meet more regularly, rather than the one-to-one meetings she had with one AD from the TD team. For P1, individual 'support' was not perceived as the team collaboration she had expected.

When asked how the process could be improved, respondents noted that more meetings would be useful. Interestingly each respondent called for more involvement, in terms of more scheduled meetings, more discussion and preparation and more opportunities to work together between team meetings. Though, in discussion during the initial team meeting, many of the team members had spoken of being time-poor.

### *Willingness for future collaboration*

Participants felt that future involvement would be helpful for their own professional development, especially for staff members with less experience; and that it had the potential to provide 'an outlet to begin to develop [themselves] as T&L professionals in and beyond [their] faculty' (P3). P2 added, 'any opportunity for professionals to come together to collaborate and share stories, methods and experiences is valuable'.

## **Themes from TD team reflections**

### *Leadership and flexibility*

Leadership and clear goals are at the heart of collaborative team building (Burrell et al, 2015). AD1 wrote, 'I was initially hesitant... through collaboration with colleagues in the TD team, we were able to develop a plan'. The plan, though well designed was less well executed in the first meeting with all three journals reflecting the difficulty experienced in directing 'these [ideas] into something that would be usable for the modules' (AD2). Despite having a

solid core group of academic developers and clear goals, the collaborative team was large and somewhat unwieldy, notwithstanding everyone's claimed interest in participation. Due to discussion arising in the meeting, it was agreed that further collaboration would take place between smaller groups or individuals with TD team members. At this point the TD team moved away from the initial understanding of a team-based approach to collaboration to one whereby the TD team-led facilitated the collaborations with individual members or small groups.

#### *Return for effort?*

Various contributions were received that were easily adjusted to fit with either the module or workshop structures they were designed for. One such contribution from P4 was a case study which gave an overview of assessment practices, complete with vignettes which illustrated each point. This case study was also recognised in faculty and used in internal induction seminars for incoming casual staff beginning their teaching in higher education.

However, each TD team member noted in their reflective journal that although each collaborator left the meeting with clear ideas about how and what they would contribute not as many resources were received. AD3 noted, 'as we left the initial meeting there was a buzz [but] contributions did not flow, some people appeared to have over-committed, others simply didn't send in any information, we met with some to encourage their continued interest'. This was further confirmed by AD1 who found that 'buy-in was much better when we, the academic developers, worked in one-on-one collaborations'. Thus, the time commitment for the TD team became 'enormous' (AD3).

#### *One-to-one success*

As the group approach proved less effective than anticipated, a one-to-one approach developed. The difficulties of the working party approach were articulated by AD2 as 'the momentum from the [initial] meeting [becoming] somewhat lost as people became unsure about what and/or how to contribute in a meaningful way'.

This approach was not unusual for the TD team as individual meetings were already occurring in the development of other support resources with success. It was described as 'intensive' by AD3 but worth the effort as 'the outcome was support resources from a number of contributors from across the institution'. Not only did these contributions 'fit well' but collaborators 'were acknowledged' (AD3) for their input. Summing up the success, AD1 wrote, 'I have found that when we approach or are approached individually, and liaise with individually, we get more buy-in and often contributions that are better suited to our needs'.

## **Discussion**

Research suggests that university teachers view themselves as discipline scholars rather than teachers (Kember, 1997). Therefore, staff in higher education can be unaware of the value of their expertise relative to aspects of learning and teaching. This may be attributed to the well-accepted idea that an academic's understanding of teaching often comes primarily from their own experience as a learner and can be void of any understanding of underpinning educational theory (Boice, 1992; Weimer, 1990). However, when a teacher is motivated to become *more effective*, expertise can develop through acts of reflecting, monitoring and evaluating their own teaching practice (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1993) and seeking opportunities to expand understanding of learning and teaching (Kreber, 2002). Due it its

often informal development, teaching expertise frequently goes unrecognized, with few opportunities for formal reward and recognition (Kreber, 2002).

In this study, the TD team sought experts from across the university to collaborate on the development of resources for professional development in learning and teaching. Open, institution-wide calls for ‘experts’ may not be effective as many may not realise the value of their knowledge and practice or how it could relate to the development of support resources for professional development in learning and teaching. The personalised invitation to participate in this collaborative process was successful and in itself seemed to be a motivating factor for participation as it gave a sense of recognition of individual staff member’s potential to contribute to the university community. The findings illustrated a range of responses related to the description of ‘expert’ with one collaborator being quite confident in their expertise, but with another openly not considering this label as being applicable to them. However, by the end of the initial TBCD working party meeting, all invited collaborators felt they were fully able to contribute and accepted the opportunity to develop resources.

Collaborator motivation to engage beyond their workload expectations existed even with the offer of only minimal extrinsic reward. That is, those who contributed to support resource development would be recognised in a list of acknowledgements within the resources themselves. Collaborators viewed this recognition as an indicator of their development as learning and teaching experts beyond their existing field, hence affirming them as *experts* within the institution. Collaborators also regarded the TBCD approach as an opportunity to further their own professional development in learning and teaching through working with other experts. While, at present, there is limited research exploring TBCD as a form of professional development for teachers, Voogt, et al., (2015) suggest that “teacher professional development needs to be concerned with social aspects of learning, distributed across individuals and events, and directly meaningful to teachers’ practice” (pp. 260). Thus, the assumption that collaborative curriculum design processes offer opportunities for professional development may well be one that warrants further investigation.

A challenge in creating an environment for successful collaboration lies within the multiple interpretations of what collaboration ‘looks like’. Zundans-Fraser and Bain (2015) address this issue when they highlight the lack of formal institutional frameworks or terms of reference for collaborative, curriculum design. In this current study, both collaborators and the TD team were equally challenged by the notion of collaboration and were often required to alter personal views and expectations.

At the beginning of the process of building a TBCD approach, the TD team considered how to draw together experts from across the institution, using Hixon’s (2008) models to inform the process. When Burrell et al’s (2015) paper was published the TD team drew on their definition to further focus and reflect on activity, their definition stated

a team-based approach is defined as more than two people with different expertise working together to produce a collective outcome... TBCD happens when a group of staff work together as a team to develop or redevelop curriculum. (Burrell et al., 2015, p 754)

This definition outlined the activity of the TD team’s entry to the process that they had been engaged to complete. However, over time, the larger team seemed to ‘fail’ the definition. Resources were produced but the methods appeared to fall short of both Hixon’s models and

the TBCD definition. The TD team met together to understand how this could be remedied and why it had ‘failed’.

So what had gone wrong? All staff participating, both in the TD team and from across the institution were time-poor and this addition to the workloads of staff outside the TD team was not recognised by the institution. With little time for meetings, the larger, team-based approach became difficult to continue. The TD team moved, somewhat unwillingly, to meeting with contributors individually. However, despite the feelings of failure, it was acknowledged that: discussion had occurred; practice-sharing had occurred; deeper engagement with each topic had occurred; and resources were produced that fit the support structure they were designed for. Furthermore, feedback highlights that those who collaboratively produced resources had experienced some change to their understanding of themselves as experts or becoming experts in the field of learning and teaching in higher education and would be willing to participate in other collaborative projects for CPD (L&T). So rather than ‘failure’, what emerged was a different model of collaboration. The new model presented more as a ‘hub-and-spoke’ with members of the TD team central to leadership, acting as the hub; and the spokes being the collaboration, one-on-one, with individuals and small groups from within the larger group of contributors. This ‘hub-and-spoke’ model of collaboration allowed knowledge sharing and deeper engagement with the learning and teaching topics (Zundans-Fraser & Bain, 2015). It had occurred both at the initial large group meeting and during the many meetings TD team members had with individual and pairs of collaborators.

A second realised benefit of the ‘hub-and-spoke’ model was the increase in the quality of the resources produced, reflecting Zundans-Fraser and Bain’s findings (2015). While the number of resources agreed to in the initial meeting was not realised, the quality of many of the resources that were produced was high. Some of these were able to be further utilised in-faculty or, with alteration, to more than one point in the CPD (L&T) program.

As with all research, it is important to acknowledge this small study was derived from the activity of one team of academic developers in collaboration with staff drawn from across one institution. The authors, the TD team members, also acknowledge that our dual roles as participant researchers had implications for the presentation of this research. As heavily invested participants it is possible that our objectivity was compromised at times. However, the collaborative process outlined involved critical examination of activity, data collected and personal reflections as well as robust discussion within the TD team. The findings of this study strongly support that collaboration, though hard won, does produce high quality outcomes and improved understandings of professional expertise in those who participate, in this case, in the area of learning and teaching in higher education.

Areas suitable for future research include further investigation of TBCD model design and impacts on participants and institutions. Particularly studies of participating staff members’ professional development; understandings of their expertise in the area of learning and teaching; and the wider ramifications for other staff and students, would hold great value.

## **Conclusion**

The study presented here offers a ‘hub-and-spoke’ model of team-based curriculum design in the development of professional development resources for learning and teaching in higher education. Through the collection and analysis of team members reflections on the process, it

was evident that many of the selected staff did not see themselves as experts in learning and teaching despite their years of experience and local recognition. However, the invitation to participate in this project acted as a catalyst, assisting them to grow in their understanding of their knowledge and expertise in the area of learning and teaching. Invited participants were willing to contribute to the institution-wide program and revealed that this would enable them to gain recognition for their expertise beyond their current context.

## References

- Bennett, S., Thomas, L., Agostinho, S., Lockyer, L., Jones, J. & Harper, B. (2011). Understanding the design context for Australian university teachers: implications for the future of learning design. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 36 (2), 151-167.
- Boice, R. (1992). *The new faculty member*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burrell, A.R., Cavanagh, M., Young, S. & Carter, H. (2015). Team-based curriculum design as an agent of change. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 20(8), 753-766. DOI: 10.1080/13562517.2015.1085856
- Chalmers, D., Stoney, S., Goody, A., Goerke, V. & Gardiner, D. (2012). Identification and implementation of indicator and measures of effectiveness of teaching preparation programs for academics in higher education (Ref: SP10-1840) Final Report 2012. The University of Western Australia, Curtin University and Edith Cowan University. Accessed 15<sup>th</sup> April 2016 from [http://www.worldclasseducation.uwa.edu.au/\\_data/assets/file/0004/2273692/Final-Report-Teaching-Preparation-Programs-Project.pdf](http://www.worldclasseducation.uwa.edu.au/_data/assets/file/0004/2273692/Final-Report-Teaching-Preparation-Programs-Project.pdf)
- Clark, C. & Reid, J. (2013). Foundational academic development: Building collegiality across divides? *International Journal for Academic Development*, 18 (4), 318-330.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. 3rd edn. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications
- Friend, M. & Cook, L. (2013). *Interaction: Collaboration Skills for School Professionals*. 7<sup>th</sup> edition. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative research*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Hicks, M., Smigiel, H., Wilson, G. & Luzecky, A. (2010). Preparing academics to teach in higher education: Final report. Sydney, NSW: Australian Learning and Teaching Council.
- Hixon, E. (2008). Team-based online course development: A case study of collaboration models. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 11(4). Retrieved January 22, 2015 from <http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdl/winter114/hixon114.html>
- Kang, S. (2001). Toward a collaborative model for the design of web-based course. *Educational Technology*, 41(2), 22-30.
- Lincoln, Y. S. and Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. United States: Sage Publications.
- Kember, D. (1997). A reconceptualisation of the research into university academics' conceptions of teaching. *Learning and instruction*, 7(3), 255-275.
- Norton, A., Sonnemann, J. & Cherastidham (2013). *Taking University Teaching Seriously*. Melbourne, Victoria: Grattan Institute.
- Quinn, L. and Vorster, J.-A. (2014). "Isn't it time to start thinking about 'developing' academic developers in a more systematic way?" *International Journal for Academic Development*. 19(3). pp 255-258. DOI: 10.1080/1360144x.2013.879719.
- Ryan, S., Burgess, J., Connell, J. & Groen, E. (2013). Casual academic staff in an Australian university: Marginalised and excluded. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 19(2), 161-175.
- Voogt, J., Laferriere, T., Breuleux, A., Itow, R.C., Hickey, D.T. & McKenney, S. (2015). Collaborative design as a form of professional development. *Instructional Science*, 43, 259-282.
- Voogt, J., Westbrook, H., Handelzalts, A., Walraven, A., McKenney, S., Pieters, J., & de Vries, B. (2011). Teacher learning in collaborative curriculum design. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 1235-1244.
- Weimer, M. (1990). *Improving university teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Zundans-Fraser, L. & Bain, A. (2015). The role of collaboration in a comprehensive programme design process in inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, DOI: 10.1080/13603116.2015.1075610.

Copyright © 2016 Lisa Thomas, Kathryn Harden-Thew, Janine Delahunty and Bonnie Dean. The authors assign to HERDSA and educational non-profit institutions a non-exclusive license to use this document for personal use and in courses of instruction provided that the article is used in full and this copyright statement is reproduced. The authors also grant a non-exclusive license to HERDSA to publish this document in full on the World Wide Web (prime site and mirrors) and within the portable electronic format HERDSA 2016 conference proceedings. Any other usage is prohibited without the express permission of the authors.

## Appendix 1 CPD (L&T) Framework

Higher Education Teaching Criteria	Design & plan effective learning experiences	Facilitate activities that influence and motivate student learning	Support student individual development & diversity	Facilitate assessment & feedback that fosters independent learning	Integrate scholarship, research and professional activities with teaching in support of learning	Evaluate teaching practice and engage in continuing professional development	Demonstrate personal & professional effectiveness
Pre-level (Sessional teachers)	<i>Design sound inclusive learning experiences for students.</i>	<i>Facilitate a variety of inclusive learning experiences for students.</i>		<i>Support assessment tasks that foster learning. Provide constructive feedback to students.</i>		<i>Reflect upon feedback/data from students and colleagues, as well as personal experiences, in order to improve teaching practice.</i>	
Level 1 CPD (ULT) learning outcomes  *Minimum requirement for probation	<i>Design sound inclusive learning experiences incorporating TEL, for students.</i>	<i>Facilitate a variety of inclusive learning experiences for students.</i>	<i>Facilitate learning environments that assist student transitions.</i>	<i>Develop a variety of effective assessment tasks that foster learning. Provide constructive feedback to students in a range of settings.</i>	<i>Apply sound, discipline relevant, L&amp;T theoretical principles to explain their teaching practice.</i>	<i>Evaluate effectiveness of teaching practice and student learning outcomes. Reflect upon feedback/data from students and colleagues, as well as personal experiences, in order to improve teaching practice.</i>	<i>Develop effective, resilient professional practices that enhance teamwork.</i>
Level 2 CPD learning outcomes	<i>Effectively design curriculum demonstrating integration across the degree.</i>	<i>Facilitate a wide variety of inclusive learning experiences for students.</i>	<i>Support students in their choice and navigation of formal and informal learning pathways.</i>	<i>Design scaffolded assessments that foster progressive learning.</i>	<i>Demonstrate scholarship of teaching and learning through authorship of evaluations, reports and/or scholarly articles that showcase their teaching practice.</i>	<i>Using evaluation data support and mentor teaching teams. Reflect upon feedback from students and colleagues, as well as personal experiences, in order to improve teaching practice and engage in CPD.</i>	<i>Develop effective, resilient professional practices that enhance course management.</i>
Level 3 CPD learning outcomes	<i>Demonstrating appraisal of current factors impacting on the HE context in Australia lead in the delivery of effective teaching practices, demonstrating integration of curriculum with national, disciplinary and professional standards through engagement with professional bodies.</i>			<i>Design rigorous assessment practices that include sound moderation practice.</i>	<i>Demonstrate scholarship of teaching and learning through a portfolio of scholarly publications.</i>	<i>Reflect on evaluation data to improve institutional curriculum delivery. Support teaching teams through mentoring and/ or peer review.</i>	<i>Develop effective, resilient professional practices that enhance learning &amp; teaching leadership. Demonstrate impact of your leadership in the UOW learning and teaching context and beyond.</i>
Level 4 CPD learning outcomes	<i>Demonstrating appraisal of current factors impacting on the international HE context lead in policy and guideline development relevant to teaching, learning and assessment.</i>				<i>Champion research/ scholarship of learning and teaching. Showcase a sustained scholarship of teaching and learning through a portfolio of publications and formal outputs.</i>	<i>Reflect upon feedback from peers, as well as personal experiences, in order to improve learning and teaching practices institutionally, nationally or internationally.</i>	<i>Demonstrate strategic leadership in the learning and teaching context. Demonstrate impact of learning and teaching expertise to a wide spread audience (e.g. national grants; awards; fellowships; key note invitations; decision making roles).</i>