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Executive summary

This sub-group of the ALTC funded Preparing Academics for Teaching in Higher Education (PATHE) project (Gannaway, D., Goody, A., Hicks, M., O'Brien, M., Smiegl, H., & Wilson, G., 2007) investigated the question of

*How can the impact of Foundations of University Teaching (FUT) programs be evaluated?*

Seeking to understand the impact of Foundations of University Teaching (FUT) programs on the experience of beginning university teachers (who attend as participants) is complex. Extending the sphere of investigation to examining the impact on the experience and learning of these teachers and their students, school and faculty requires some clever and strategic thinking and designing, to enable potentially valuable collection and interpretation of evidence.

Impact is a multi-dimensional concept, defined by sets of dimensions and criteria that are context-specific for each program. ‘Impact’ will be ‘measured’ by the set of values that inform this judgment. As various sets of stakeholders have different value sets, ‘impact’ will be contingent on the stakeholder identity and value set. That is, ‘impact’ for the same program ‘looks and is experienced differently’ for each of the stakeholders such as FUT teachers, FUT participants and their students, and their school, faculty or university.

Our approach to this project then, was to identify a range of useful approaches to evaluation and to address a wide range of stakeholders’ needs for both formative and summative evaluation purposes. We developed the *FUT Evaluation Framework* and a set of principles to inform the evaluation program design process. To do this, we:

- examined the literature in the field;
- interviewed coordinators of FUT programs in Australia to survey contemporary practice;
- explored and refined an evaluation framework previously developed by Dr Carol Bowie informed by the interviews and literature;
- trialed the initial version of the framework in one institution with FUT participants, teachers and their students; and
- collected, selected and mapped samples of approaches, tools and instruments from practice and literature against the refined framework.

This approach was intended to identify and characterise present and reported practices and to test and validate the framework to examine its
efficacy for system-wide use. We found that there were diverse evaluation practices in Australia and in published literature.

The *FUT Evaluation Framework* enables FUT staff to begin to *name and frame* their conception of evaluation for *their particular* FUT program, in *their particular* context, to:

1. more clearly reveal and articulate their evaluation purpose and focus;
2. identify and situate their present practice across the three contexts; and
3. revise or augment their evaluation practices, congruent with their intentions, priorities and values associated with their particular FUT program, stakeholders and context

Therefore the *FUT Evaluation Framework* can serve as an *audit tool* to situate current practice or to guide thinking and planning for new evaluation programs.

The framework presents a number of purposes and foci within each of three teaching and learning contexts for evaluation:

- **Primary Context**: where FUT Teachers and the participant engage;
- **Secondary Context**: where participant and their students engage; and
- **Tertiary Context**: the higher education, professional or discipline field or context where the participant is based, at levels from local to global;

Where:

- **Student** refers to university students who enroll in courses offered or convened by the FUT program participant;
- **Participant** refers to the teacher of university students and who is enrolled in an FUT program; and
- **FUT Teachers** refers to the teachers or presenters who are offering the FUT program.

We identified four principles of good practice in approaching evaluation of FUT programs:

1. Design evaluation with deliberate and specific intent.
2. Gather credible relevant and valuable evidence.
3. Embed evaluation in learning experiences.

We recommend taking an *evaluation portfolio approach* where successive evaluation programs may tackle the same or different evaluation purposes or foci. We suggest, designing your present evaluation, with future cycles of evaluation, in mind, triangulating evidence, *within and longitudinally between* your successive evaluation programs, congruent with your purposes and foci and your FUT program philosophy.
The final stage (subsequent to the submission of this report), will be the development of a **set of electronic resources for web access**, including:

1. The FUT Evaluation Framework
2. Set of principles for good practice in evaluation of FUT programs
3. Set of electronic resources consistent with and illustrating (1 & 2), suitable for web access that includes
   - Tools
   - Strategies and approaches
   - Case studies (drawn from literature and contemporary practice with annotations)
   - Examples and proformas to guide evaluators through a step by step evaluation planning or auditing process

**Recommendations**

**Section 2.2**
We recommend that users ‘name and frame’ their conception of evaluation for their FUT program using the **FUT Evaluation Framework**, as a **practice audit**, or an **initial planning tool**. This investigation will then enable FUT evaluators to:

- more clearly reveal and articulate their evaluation purpose and focus;
- identify and situate their present practice across the three contexts; and
- revise or augment their evaluation practices, congruent with their intentions, priorities and values associated with their particular FUT program, stakeholders and context

**Section 2.3**
We recommend that good practice in evaluating FUT programs, across the three contexts of the FUT Evaluation Framework, **primary, secondary, and tertiary**, incorporates the following approaches to evaluation:

1. Design evaluation with deliberate and specific intent.
2. Gather credible relevant and valuable evidence.
3. Embed evaluation in learning experiences.
4. Close the loop: Feedback, feed-forward and feed-into learning from evaluation

**Section 2.3**
We recommend taking a **portfolio of evaluation studies approach**, where successive evaluations may tackle the same or different evaluation purposes or foci. We recommend designing evaluation programs, with future cycles of evaluation, in mind, triangulating evidence, **within and longitudinally between** your successive evaluation cycles, congruent with your purposes and foci and your FUT program philosophy.
Section 2.4
We recommend considering the conceptual taxonomy of evidence reported by Schwandt (2009:206) (Figure 4 Section 2.4) as the first port of call at the macro-level, for considering your approach to evaluating your FUT program.

Section 2.4
We recommend consideration of the 4Q model (Smith 2008) (Figure 5, Tables 2-4 Section 2.4) in making more specific decisions about selection of evidence, sources and tools, to build a collection of valuable evidence for different purposes and foci of evaluation across the three contexts: primary, secondary and tertiary.
Section 1 Introduction

1.1 This sub-project
The project brief identified cluster groups to form around the focus areas identified:

- benchmarking and peer feedback;
- theoretical frameworks of established practices and investigation of emergent practices to inform Foundations programs;
- evaluating the impact of Foundation programs on teaching quality;
- curricula that can distinguish what might be expected in induction, foundation and graduate certificate programs;
- professional development for those who teach and manage foundations programs; and
- a repository of resources that can be used in Foundation programs

The brief of this sub-group, as bolded above, indicated the concepts of evaluating, impact, and teaching quality. However when the group was constituted it was thought that impact was too broad and did not adequately provide the answers for those who coordinate Foundations Programs. The types of evaluation questions Foundations coordinators ask are:

- How do I evaluate my FUT program?
- What influence does my program have on the participants, their students, peers and others and practices?
- How can I justify my program to others (that is, senior management, faculty deans, and heads of schools)?

From these broad questions the sub-group, in consultation with the steering group, refined this sub-project to primarily address the following question and related, intended outcomes:

- How can the impact of these programs be evaluated?

The sub-group’s intention was to define impact within a framework of evaluation in multiple contexts and approaches to FUTs rather than undertaking a survey of practice to determine ‘impact’. More specifically, this sub-group’s intention was to develop a set of principles to inform the design process and an evaluation framework with associated resources and annotated case studies (from practice and literature) to enable FUT staff to develop and employ knowingly, strategies to investigate and characterise the impact of their particular FUT programs, in their particular context, for their particular purposes.
1.2 Evaluation

Evaluation, as a profession, arose out of social transformation and economic reform in the United States and pre-dates to World War 1. Iverson (2003) notes how the concept of evaluation occurred:

The rise of professional evaluation came out of a series of deteriorating social and economic experiences of the 1930s Depression where the United States Federal Government was committed to reducing social problems such as poverty, hunger and unemployment. (p. 9)

In those early days, there was little effort to assess effectiveness and efficiency of program outcomes designed to alleviate such social problems. During the 1960s in the Kennedy era, these types of programs became more public and open to public scrutiny. Government and concerned agencies were required to account for public monies and it was during this period that evaluation practices flourished (Chelminsky & Shadish, 1997; Patton, 1997). Evaluation was concerned with ensuring that the government’s social and economic programs were improving its citizens’ lives and it was focused solely on this purpose.

During the 1960s and 1970s, evaluation steadily developed into a professional field. This movement allowed the discipline to become more informed and advanced the profession theoretically and practically (Iverson, 2003). In the last twenty-five years, the trends in evaluation have moved from a scientific approach to a more socially oriented practice, shifting from precision to usefulness, distance to participation and being academic in approach to client-focused (Fetterman, 2001). This direction of evaluation draws in and involves its stakeholders to own the process and its outcomes. Therefore, the practice of evaluation has become more open, inclusive and diverse in purpose. Evaluation practice has been accompanied by a transformation in its meaning and an expansion of its purpose. Now, evaluation has expanded into not only government social reforms and economic programs but is also being used in the disciplines of business, psychology, engineering, health, education and many others (Russ-Eft & Preskill, 2001). The definitions of evaluation will now be explored.

1.3 Evaluation Defined

The term evaluation is used in different ways and across different disciplines and is often defined quite narrowly for the purposes of reducing scrutiny of its multiple purposes. Evaluation shares an intellectual space with notions of quality, monitoring, auditing and continuous improvement.
To define the broad concept of evaluation, its purposes and processes must be examined. Scriven (1991) defines evaluation as “the process of determining the merit, worth, or value of something, or the product of that process [...] to define this worth or value against a set of standards by which judgment can be made” (p. 139). Evaluation is a process that is observable, quantifiable and provides objective indicators of that which is being evaluated and the difference it appears to be making in the lives of participants (Patton 1997). Greene (2002) further defines evaluation as social inquiry where “(I)t is at least partly constitutive of the context in which it takes place, particularly of the organisational and interpersonal relationships of power, authority, and voice in that context” (p. 2).

Mark, Henry and Julnes (2000) offered a broader definition of evaluation whereby it:

[...] assists sense making about policies and programs through the conduct of systematic inquiry that describes and explains the policies’ and programs’ operations, effects, justifications, and social implications [...] (T)he ultimate goal of evaluation is social betterment (p. 3).

According to Nagarajan and Vanheukelen (1997) evaluations should be analytical, systematic, reliable, issue-oriented and user-driven. Other definitions view evaluation as examining a purposeful activity where lessons can be learnt from such an examination and subsequent judgement occurs (Nagarajan & Vanheukelen, 1997). Within these definitions, there is a move away from the scientific logic to a more people-oriented social view of evaluation. This movement reflects environments which are dynamic, changing and volatile where involved people want to engage in collaborative, participatory and learning-oriented processes (Preskill, 2004).

In the HE literature much has been written about the university teachers, inducting university teachers, educational development of teachers, and foundation programs for new university teachers. Yet little has been written about the evaluation or impact of such programs. Formal induction and development of university teachers usually occurs within the first three (3) years of full-time higher education teaching experience. These inductions to university teaching programs are generally seen as playing a significant role in fostering and supporting the quality of teaching and learning at both the individual and institutional levels (Dearn, Fraser and Ryan, 2002).

Knight, Tait and Yorke’s (2006), work on the value of postgraduate certificates in higher education from a participant’s and coordinator’s
perspective juxta[poses well with this sub-project’s aims and outcomes. Other work in the sector intersects with this project is the Learning Technology Dissemination Initiative called “The Evaluation Cookbook”; a practical guide to evaluation methods. However this guide offers evaluation samples but does not position it in the context of a framework with guiding principles.

The Australian Committee for University teaching and Staff development (CUTSD) funded Australian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education (ASCILTE) (1999), national evaluation project outcomes included a learning centered evaluation framework of innovation using ICTs in higher education, (Bain 1999, Alexander and Hedberg, 1994) with an evaluation handbook, including guidance and principles for evaluation as well as tools and resources. Other resources used in that project included those of the Flashlight Group with Dr Steve Erhmann as a consultant to the project. One of the members of this sub-project (Dr Carol Bowie) was a mentor and participant in three sub-projects in the ASCILITE CUTSD project. The initial version of the **FUT Evaluation Framework** developed (by Dr Carol Bowie) in this sub-project is an application, extension and adaption of the Learning centered evaluation framework of Bain, Alexander and Hedberg, across the three contexts of engagement, explained in Section 2. 

(ASCILITE project: [http://www.tlc.murdoch.edu.au/project/cutsd01.html](http://www.tlc.murdoch.edu.au/project/cutsd01.html),
Flashlight Group:  [http://www.tltgroup.org/about.htm](http://www.tltgroup.org/about.htm),
Section 2 Evaluating the impact of Foundations of University Teaching Programs: A Framework and Design Principles

2.1 Evaluating the Impact of Foundations of University Teaching Programs

What is Impact Evaluation?
Impact evaluation is one form of evaluation where its focus is on desired change that includes interventions and strategies. In the literature the lack of impact evaluation is a recurrent theme. Yet its importance cannot be underplayed. Although most educational development professionals value the importance of monitoring their program’s impact, systematic evaluation is not common, and often relies only on inference measures such as extent of participation and satisfaction.

Impact is a multi-dimensional concept. When ‘evaluating the impact of a program’ then there will be:

1) A particular evaluation question (or set of questions) that you are wanting to explore;
2) A context within which the program is running that has a number of stakeholders and environment(s); and
3) A set of values that may or may not be common to all stakeholders, by which the ‘impact’ will be judged.

Impact, then, needs to be defined by sets of dimensions and criteria that are context-specific for each program.

Kirkpatrick (1994) described four levels of impact of training: participants’ reaction to the training; participants’ learning (change in attitudes, knowledge or skills); participants’ behavioural change; and results at student or organisational level. Guskey (2000) reported five levels of professional development evaluation: participants’ reactions; participants’ learning; organisation support and change; participants’ use of new knowledge and skills; and student learning outcomes. Researchers Kreber and Brook (2001) indicated that there are six points of focus when undertaking systematic impact evaluation of programs (like Foundations Programs):

(1) Participants’ perceptions/satisfaction;
(2) Participants’ beliefs about teaching and learning;
(3) Participants’ teaching performance;
(4) Students’ perceptions of staff’s teaching performance;
(5) Students’ learning; and
(6) Effects on the culture of the institution.
Figure 1 below identifies how an evaluation strategy is aligned to the level at which impact is to be assessed and the intervention strategies required.


As Mark (2009:236) observes, “many evaluation reports describe the key evaluation questions, but offer no explanation about where they came from.” The relationship between the evaluation designers, those who conduct the evaluation, and the stakeholders, needs to be declared. For example, has the design of the evaluation been determined by the teacher of the FUT program or have various stakeholders been involved in the development of the evaluation purposes, foci and questions? Who is actually conducting the evaluation? The teachers, other stakeholders or independent persons? Evaluators need to consider biases and their own assumptions, as well as conflicts of interest.

Bamber (2008:109) reviewed a range of reported studies of early career “lecturer development programs” and identified within each, a theory of change. She cautions that, “just as the development programs have a theory of change – so do the evaluations. This means that each evaluation will take a particular philosophical and theoretical position”. Bamber (2008) goes further to state:

A caution is, then, that while evaluation should be informed by literature, it needs to be understood that the evaluators convictions and philosophies create a lens through which data are viewed, collected and interpreted.’ (p. 109)

‘Impact’ will be ‘measured’ by the set of values that inform judgement. As various sets of stakeholders may well have different value sets, ‘impact’ will be contingent on the stakeholder identity and value set. That is,
'impact’ for the same program ‘looks and is experienced differently’ for each of the stakeholders such as FUT teachers, FUT participants and their students, and their school, faculty or university.

To measure ‘impact’ then, either,

(a) Multi-dimensional and context-specific evidence will need to be investigated and analysed from a range of stakeholder perspectives and value-sets; or

(b) The design of the evaluation strategy will be contingent upon initial agreement between stakeholders on the primary evaluation purpose(s) and foci, and contexts of that particular investigation; or

(c) A particular lens may be applied by a set of stakeholders to design an evaluation of impact according to their particular value set.

The FUT Evaluation Framework can serve as an audit tool to situate current practice or to guide thinking and planning for new evaluation programs. It can support evaluation design in any of the three approaches (a) to (c) above.

Seeking to understand the impact of Foundations of University Teaching (FUT) programs on the experience of beginning university teachers (who attend as participants) is complex. A number of projects have scrutinised practice in Australia and New Zealand (Clarke 2006, Dearn, Fraser & Ryan 2002, Fraser 2005, Prebble, Hargraves, Leach, Naidoo, Suddaby and Zepke 2004) and the United Kingdom (Gibbs, 2006, Prosser, M., Rickinson, M., Bence, V., Hanbury, A., and Kulej, M. 2006, Knight 2006), including accredited and non-accredited courses based on a range of models of participation of beginning university teachers. Extending the sphere of investigation to examining the impact on the experience and learning of these teachers and their students, school and faculty requires some clever and strategic thinking and designing, to enable potentially valuable collection and interpretation of evidence.

This sub-group of the ALTC funded Preparing Academics for Teaching in Higher Education (PATHE) project (Gannaway, D., Goody, A., Hicks, M., O’Brien, M., Smiegl, H., & Wilson, G., 2007) has developed a set of principles to inform the design process and an evaluation framework with associated resources and annotated case studies to enable FUT staff to develop and employ knowingly, strategies to investigate and characterise the impact of their FUT programs.
2.2 An Evaluation Framework for Foundations of University Teaching Programs

One primary purpose of FUT programs is to improve early career university teaching with intended subsequent benefits in improving student learning. There are at least three intersecting contexts of operation (see Figure 1) here:

1. **FUT teachers** and participants in the FUT program;
2. FUT program **participants** and their **students**, in their practice, in their particular context; and
3. Impact upon T&L across the **institution** and **sector**.

This sub-project team took the approach of constructing an evaluation framework for Foundations of University Teaching programs that spans across these three contexts with relevant purposes and foci for each.

**Why an evaluation framework?**

Like metaphors, frameworks present a ‘cognitive map of organization dynamics’ (White, 2002 p.113; Fostaty Young, 2008, p.44) that have the ability to focus our attention according to a particular frame of reference. They provide parameters within which to name and frame and it is through the act of naming and framing that we may come to understand and articulate better the beliefs and conceptions that influence our teaching (Fostaty Young, 2008 p.44).

Through investigation of this framework, as a practice audit, or an initial planning tool, we intend that users may begin to ‘name and frame’ their conception of evaluation for their FUT program. We intend that this will enable FUT evaluators to

- more clearly reveal and articulate their evaluation purpose and focus;
- identify and situate their present practice across the three contexts; and
- Revise or augment their evaluation practices, congruent with their intentions, priorities and values associated with their particular FUT program, stakeholders and context.

This framework (see Framework 1) extends the evaluation approaches and frameworks of Bain (1999) and Alexander and Hedberg (1994) employed in the ASCILITE and the Australian Committee for University Teaching and Staff Development (CUTSD) funded project (reported in the special issue of HERD see Bain 1999) that explicitly focused on learner-centered evaluation approaches.
The FUT Evaluation Framework

The framework focuses on three contexts (see Framework 1) for evaluation:

- **Primary Context**: the teaching and learning context where the FUT Teachers and the Participant engage.
- **Secondary Context**: the teaching and learning context where the participant and their students engage.
- **Tertiary Context**: the higher education, professional or discipline field or context where the participant is based, at levels from local to global.

Where

- **Student** refers to university students who enroll in courses offered or convened by the FUT program participant.
- **Participant** refers to the teacher of university students and who is enrolled in an FUT program.
- **FUT Teachers** refers to the teachers or presenters who are offering the FUT program.

**Figure 2: The FUT Evaluation Framework Contexts**

- a) **Primary Context**: Two blue intersecting circles
- b) **Secondary Context**: Blue and purple intersecting circles
- c) **Tertiary Context**: Box of light turquoise underpinning all three circles

Taking the approach of a portfolio of evaluation studies over time may be a useful approach for FUT program evaluation in the higher education context, where one study would have particular purposes, foci and contexts, then the next study, may repeat or change, the whole or elements of the study, enabling incorporation of other stakeholder perspectives and value sets.
Framework 1: The Foundations of University Teaching Programs Framework for Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Who &amp; Elements</th>
<th>As an FUT Teacher, my focus and purpose of evaluation is .......... <em>Focus and Purpose</em></th>
<th>As an FUT Teacher, I will knowingly employ ..........</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Primary context  | • FUT Teaching Team  
• Participant Cohort  
• FUT Teaching team and Participant’s teaching and learning environment  
• T&L process and content | 1. Curriculum Analysis  
   • Content analysis  
     Does the current course have a participant learning focus?  
     • Teaching for learning analysis (alignment)  
     Are the aims, the teaching and learning processes and the learning outcomes of the program aligned? Do they meet the needs of the participants and their particular context?  
     Does the teaching in the program reflect best practice in Higher Education? | • Survey, interviews, focus groups, reflective processes  
• Learning outcomes and products analysis  
• Achievement of intended aims and objectives  
• participants’ picture of achievements, progress and achievement of learning outcomes  
• intended and unintended learning: scope, nature, quality  
• quality of writing  
• quality of peer-feedback  
• teaching team debriefings, observations and reflections,  
• teaching team impressions of whether achieved intended aims and objectives and course alignment  
• graduation, progression, retention, success and satisfaction, extension or elaboration  
• networking and mentoring locally  
• involvement of alumni / graduates of courses |
|                  | This refers to the T&L context where the FUT teaching team and the Participant engage. | 2. Formative monitoring of learning and teaching environment within the foundations subject  
   • In what ways is the FUT effective?  
   • Is it accessible / attractive to the participants?  
   • Are participants supported and recognised for their participation? By peers, School, Faculty, Discipline? Policy?  
   • Are there sufficient physical and financial resources available for the offering of the program? | |
|                  | 3. Formative monitoring of learning process  
• How visible is the participants’ learning progress across the program? To the participant? To the program facilitator/s? To others? | |
### Secondary context
This refers to the T&L context where the participant and their students engage.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants and their Teaching Team</td>
<td>Pre-, post- mapping changes in participants’ approach to teaching, personal professional development, confidence and self-agency as a teacher,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Cohort</td>
<td>Pre-, post- mapping and auditing of curriculum, assessment, evaluation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant and their students teaching and learning environment</td>
<td>Pre-, post- mapping changes in participants’ students approaches to learning and learning outcomes, development of skills / capabilities / attributes, confidence and self-agency as a learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T&amp;L process and content</td>
<td>Improved collegial and scholarly engagement between teaching staff and with students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Impact evaluation (local)
- Can the learning from the program be displayed and transferred beyond FUT context?
- How is the participant’s communication, recognition of quality or excellence of their work, and engagement with others work, recognised or evidenced?
- As a result of the FUT, has the participant’s work been adapted and adopted by others?
- Have collaborations occurred as a result of the FUT?
- What benefits to the collaborator or adopter have occurred?

2. Formative monitoring of the teaching environment
- Are participants supported and recognised for their participation? By peers, School, Faculty, Discipline? Policy?
- Are physical, financial and mentoring resources available to encourage, support and enable the participant to develop

### Tertiary context
This refers to the HE, professional context.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant’s School, Faculty, Discipline, Professional Body, Institution HE Sector</td>
<td>No. of trained staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flow on to GCHE from FUT, graduations, progressions, retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of teaching awards and recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T&amp;L grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T&amp;L publications and research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conference attendance, presentations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Maintenance
- Has the participant’s learning from the FUT program influenced learning and teaching in the school, discipline, faculty, institution, and sector?
- Is there evidence of longer term benefits of the FUT at the school, discipline, faculty, institution, and sector?

### 4. Summative evaluation of learning outcomes
- Are the learning outcomes as expected? Intended?
or discipline field or context where the participant is based, at levels from local to global.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Has there been a return on investment of the time and learning by the participant attending the FUT? How has this been demonstrated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify the value to various stakeholders and to sectoral “early career” or cross-institutional development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Impact evaluation (local to global: i.e. institutional, national, global, discipline or sector based etc)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Is there any evidence that attendance at FUT has been communicated and recognised as quality or excellence in the participant’s work and engagement with others work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has any adaption and adoption by others of the participant’s learning from the FUT that is reflected in their work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the participant’s learning from the FUT improved collaborations in their school, discipline, faculty, institution, and sector?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What identifiable benefits can be evidenced by the collaborator or adopter?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>and publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• School and Faculty and Institution presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Committee, working party work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policy development input and leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mentoring and networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaborations on ALTC opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policy recognition of FUT and GC in confirmation and promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establishment and sustainable communities of practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunity / costs / benefits /risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public communication to peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engagement with others (local to global) leading to recognition or collaborations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adoption, adaption and collaborations and benefits of this engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognition for participation – reduced hours or hours allocated for participation in workload models etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• International / national data about participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student:** refers to university students who enrol in courses offered or convened by the Participant.

**Participant** refers: to the teacher of university students, who is enrolled in a Foundations of University Teaching (FUT) program.

**FUT Teachers:** The teaching staff who are offering the FUT program.

*(Bowie 2006, adapted from Bain 1999, adapted from Alexander & Hedberg, 1994)*
2.3 Designing Evaluation of Foundations of University Teaching Programs: Principles for Good Practice

This section offers a set of principles that, in conjunction with the FUT Evaluation Framework, will enable FUT staff to develop and employ knowingly, strategies to investigate and characterise the impact of their particular programs, in their particular contexts, for their particular purpose.

Strategies for designing evaluation for improving teaching and participant learning in Foundations of University Teaching Programs

Good practice in evaluating FUT programs incorporates the following approaches to evaluation:

1. Design evaluation with deliberate and specific intent.
2. Gather credible relevant and valuable evidence.
3. Embed evaluation in learning experiences.

The next section elaborates upon these principles across the three contexts of the FUT Evaluation Framework: Primary, secondary and tertiary. (See also Figure 2 and Section 2 for further definition of the three contexts.)

Principle 1: Design evaluation with deliberate and specific intent.

In evaluating FUT programs, we may intend to do all or any of the following:

- Understand the nature of the FUT program
- How to assign value to the FUT program and its performance
- How to construct knowledge or use knowledge generated by evaluation of FUT programs.

(Adapted from Donaldson, 2009 p. 241)

Biggs and Tang (2007) present a model of curriculum design, Constructive Alignment, based on ‘constructivism in learning’ and ‘alignment in teaching’ where aims and objectives, assessment and teaching and learning activities ‘align constructively’. When you are designing your curricula for your FUT program, think about evaluation also. A simple approach to designing impact evaluation programs for Foundations of University Teaching (FUT) programs, then, is to work through three steps:

1. Develop an appropriate evaluative approach.
2. Articulate and prioritise the evaluation questions - the purpose and focus
3. Select methods to gather credible evidence to answer these questions.

Clearly, there will not be a consensus view or approach to evaluation of the impact of FUT programs, rather there will be responses to particular evaluation questions, in particular contexts, for particular purposes that will be interpreted through particular lenses.

The FUT Evaluation Framework (Framework 1) sets out a range of purposes and foci and associated strategies and tools for evaluating FUT programs across the three contexts mentioned above. Select your evaluation purpose and focus, to be in concert with, your FUT program philosophy. Align your choice of methods and evidence to be congruent with this rationale.

As Mark (2009) observes, “many evaluation reports describe the key evaluation questions, but offer no explanation about where they came from.” He then advises, “… be concerned about the credibility of judgements about what the key research questions are. … Can you provide a reasoned justification for the choice of one research question (or set of questions) over others?” (p. 236).

Also be concerned about the point made earlier by Bamber (2008) that whilst FUT programs will have particular “convictions and philosophies”, so too, do evaluation programs; and that these “create a lens through which data are viewed, collected and interpreted” (p. 109).

You can use the FUT Evaluation Framework to audit or situate your current practice or to extend your thinking further across the three contexts: primary, secondary and tertiary; for future evaluation designs.

Consider taking a portfolio of evaluation studies approach. Successive evaluations may tackle the same or different evaluation purposes or foci. Design the present evaluation, with future cycles of evaluation, in mind.

**Principle 2: Gather credible, relevant and valuable evidence**

It would be a difficult task to reach a consensus about what counts as credible evidence for evaluation of impact of FUT programs. Consideration of the evaluation purpose and focus in the particular FUT context and practical, time and other resource constraints will enable you to select and design an approach consistent with your stakeholders’ values and
priorities. Schwandt (2009) suggests that three properties of evidence should be assessed:

- **Relevance**: Does the information bear directly on the hypothesis or claim in question?
- **Credibility**: Can we believe the information?
- **Probative (inferential) force**: How strongly does the information point toward the claim or hypothesis being considered?

Useful knowledge can be experimental and observational, quantitative or qualitative, or generated from a mixture of methods. Statistics and experience can produce information that may be evidence about the value and impact of an FUT program. Whether or not this evidence is credible to stakeholders will also depend upon:

- Evaluation questions and how they are posed
- Sources of information
- Conditions of data collection
- Reliability of measurement
- Validity of interpretations
- Quality control procedures

(Donaldson, 2009 p. 244)

Use the FUT Evaluation Framework to select tools and evidence with reference to your intended evaluation purpose and foci. The Framework incorporates the 4Q model of evidence for evaluations reported by Smith (2008). The evaluation planning grid (EPG) (Bowie 2008) in Figure 3 below is an example of how you might record your responses to these questions. This style of EPG creates a compact summary and record of your evaluation plans and process. It can be used in your evaluation report or summary and can help in documenting your teaching and learning practice.

**Use multiple viewing lenses or triangulation.**
Collecting and considering data of different types and from different sources helps to construct a richer, more informed picture of the real processes and outcomes. Consider triangulation not only within the primary context but also across the secondary and tertiary contexts, as in some of the examples in Principles (2) and (3) below. Consider taking an evaluation portfolio approach. Successive evaluation programs may tackle the same or different evaluation purposes or foci: Triangulate evidence, within and longitudinally between your successive evaluation programs, congruent with your purposes and foci and your FUT program philosophy.

**Credible evidence and credible evaluations**
Although developing a credible set of evidence for an evaluation is necessary, it is not sufficient to establish the credibility of the evaluation
program. Schwandt (2009:209) points out that what constitutes a credible evaluation will not just depend upon the credibility of the evidence set and evaluation approach, but on how the ‘different claims are explained and defended’ and how the evidence is marshaled in support of the argument. Schwandt (2009) comments:

“What constitutes credible, trustworthy, believable, or convincing evidence cannot be decided by method of choice alone. This so for several reasons, such as the following:

1. Evidence is always put together in defense of some particular claim. Thus we cannot discuss the matter of evidence in the abstract – that is absent of a thorough understanding of ‘evidence for what?’

2. Appraising the credibility of evidence is never simply a matter of asking about the method used to generate it.

3. The circumstances and particular practice in which evidence is being argued influences appraisals of the probative (inferential) force of that evidence. Thus, for example, the same evidence generated by the same method is judged differently in a criminal court from how it is judged in a civil court.”

(p. 209-10).

Principle 3: Embed evaluation in learning experiences
When you are designing your curricula for your FUT program, think about evaluation also. The best evaluation programs are embedded in the learning processes for the FUT participant and teacher. Think about ways to make participants’ learning explicitly visible to both the participant and the FUT teachers. For example, include a reflective loop where participants complete an activity, stop to review it and then redo it to improve their first attempt. Within the primary context, this can serve as a learning experience, and with appropriate documentation, can be a valuable source of evaluative information for both the participant and the FUT teachers.

When you are designing your FUT program, look also to apply this principle across the other two contexts: secondary and tertiary. For example, include, as part of the learning experiences of the participants:

- a presentation to colleagues in their school or teaching team about something new they have learnt of relevance to their local context – attend and document your observations, or ask participant’s for a summary; or

- invite graduates back to the next offering of the course to talk about what they learnt and have applied in their teaching and its impact – document your observations during the dialogue; or
• enable working collaboratively with local colleagues to develop and frame up a local project to deal with a specific issue in their teaching – dependent upon the timeframe, examine the problem frame up, the solutions offered and / or follow up on the success of the implementation; or articulate your FUT program with another vehicle to follow up, like a community of practice or school committee working party etc.
• support a peer review of teaching process – examine the quality of the comment if the participant is reviewing, as an indication of their understanding and development as a teacher; examine the actions the participant determines to take, if they are reviewed.
• Invite graduates of the FUT program to present at teaching and learning week activities or other fora in your institution – attend and document and / or request a copy of the presentation and permission to include in a longitudinal archive (public or private, with appropriate permissions) – consider opportunities for publicising the program and recognizing participants’ work.

Principle 4: Close the loop: Feedback, feed-forward and feed-into learning from evaluation into the FUT Program

After you have decided what you are going to take action on, think about who would benefit from hearing about the summary and outcomes: for example, closing the loop and feeding the information back to participants of surveys; or feeding forward the information to the next group of students in your program; or create a dynamic within your current program where responses by teaching staff and participants, to evaluation are explicitly visible and valued. Respect and value your participants and teaching team, by making evaluation a visible, explicit, key part of the learning and reflection experience of the program. Create and model, a habit of closing the loop on evaluation, early!

Is there a way that you can build feedback or feed-forward into the local context of your participants and track their activity and progress? An expression of this principle to the secondary and tertiary context is through scholarship and publication. Another expression is through leadership and engagement with professions. For example, exploration of local issues for participants, within the FUT program, such as dialogue about:
• What do we want to change following what we have just learnt? How? When?
• Who would benefit from knowing what we have just learnt? How? When?
• How can we adopt and adapt this for our course or faculty? Who can help? How? When?
• What research would we need to complete, to frame up a response to this issue?

These could generate impetus to collaborate with local colleagues to do local research and pursue solutions. Engagement with professional bodies may also be part of this activity. These projects supply leadership opportunities and involve scholarly articulation, communication, and publication. Tracking these activities, experiences and outcomes may well occur through different fora than the FUT program directly, but making explicit links or articulation between the FUT program and these activities for participants may foster their success and yours!
### Figure 3: Designing your evaluation: An evaluation planning grid

CASE STUDY: Example Evaluation Plan for an FUT (Developed by Dr Carol Bowie GIHE, Griffith University, 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Purpose and Questions</th>
<th>Who will 'know' about this? (Stakeholders)</th>
<th>Types of evidence, tool most appropriate, mode of collection and other Comments</th>
<th>Comment on timing and resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Framework contexts and dimensions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Primary 1(b) 2(a)&(b) 3(b) | Participants | Self-assessment and reflection by participants on  
changes in understanding and application  
confidence in T&L in HE  
value of aims of intensive (at end of intensive and 6-12 months later)  
Tools and strategies in evaluation design  
reflective activities in the intensive (individual, initial seeds for discussion,  
review and grounding into practice activities and writing)  
end of day feedback collection  
end of intensive survey  
informal email requests for feedback (fortnight following intensive)  
email survey between 6 to 12 months after intensive | |
| Secondary 1(a) | | | |
| Tertiary 1(a)&(b) | | | |
| **Major Question:** | Participants & teacher | | |
| How well have the participants achieved the intended aims of the FUT? | Admin Team | | |
| Are these aims appropriate and valuable to participants as beginning teachers in HE? | Participants & students teaching | | |
| | | | |
| **What were the participants' experiences of the FUT Intensive?** | Participants & teacher | The participants' experiences and perceptions will be investigated by  
Participant survey for the whole group at end of days (paper), end of intensive (paper), and 6-12 months later (email), and anecdotal or ad hoc informal feedback (mainly email) from participants about activities and evaluation of T&L 'new adventures' with their students and teaching team and colleagues.  
Informal participant responses to emails from coordinator in month following intensive  
Reflection on observations of outcomes of activities during intensive by Coordinator – (longitudinal reflective personal teaching diary and notes)  
Observations and reflections from the teaching team – debriefing notes and focus questions for discussion, annual evaluation report feed into strategic planning process of ADU and university teaching & learning excellence committee  
Feedback from the Administrative Staff about workshops run and follow up requests | |
| Did the intensive help the participants to learn?  
To learn what we intended?  
Are they able to apply it to their teaching context and student cohort?  
Did they enjoy it?  
Any other 'unintended' learning of value? | Admin Team | | |
| | | | |
| **What was the experience of the teaching team? (Coordinator and presenters, Admin Staff)** | Participants & teacher | The teaching team experiences and observations will be investigated by  
A survey that will be completed individually by each of the teaching team (email). This will form the documentation of their individual observations etc.  
A de-briefing discussion will be run (by Coordinator) for ADU with the data collation as the trigger for reflection. | Debriefing discussion will be run mid-semester |
2.4 Evidence sources and tools

Sources of Evidence
The principles and values associated with good practice in evaluating FUT programs are outlined in detail in Section 2.3. The need to collect various types of evidence from multiple sources in the evaluation process is particularly stressed in the Second Principle: “Gather credible, relevant and valuable evidence”.

A conceptual taxonomy of evidence such as reported in Schwandt (2009:206) (Figure 4) offers one way of making choices about the nature and type of evidence required to answer the intended evaluation questions.

![Figure 4: Conceptual taxonomy of evidence](Source: Schwandt, 2009 p. 206)

In this taxonomy, in Figure 4, the horizontal axis represents the context of evidence. (Particular - individual perspectives to General - population estimates); and the vertical axis represents the range of methods used to generate evidence. (Measurement = quantitative methods; Meaning = qualitative).

Types of evidence that fall into each of the four quadrants are:
• Quadrant (1) narrative form – case profiles, interviews and focus groups, individual stakeholders and participants perceptions, beliefs, experiences and so on.
• Quadrant (2) social views and preferences as documented in policy studies, case studies and Delphi group analyses.
• Quadrant (3) primarily numerical and personal, focused on the measurement of attitudes, beliefs and preferences using psychometric and sociometric instruments.
• Quadrant (4) numerical and focused on average effect or efficacy of an intervention, randomised and controlled trials and quasi-experiments.

Schwandt’s model (2009) has a useful synergy with our framework and provides a valuable first port of call at the macro-level, for considering your approach to evaluating your FUT program. We selected another way of conceptualising evidence, according to the 4Q model reported by Smith (2008). This alternative approach enables us to build a picture of valuable evidence for different purposes and foci of evaluation across the three contexts: primary, secondary and tertiary.

Smith (2008) presents the 4Q model of evaluation in which the sources of evidence are represented by four quadrants as shown diagrammatically in Figure 5.

![Figure 5: 4Q model of evaluation (adapted from Smith, 2008) defining sources of evidence to be collected as part of an evaluation process.](image)

He refers to the collection of evidence from each quarter as ‘quadrangulation’ and argues that,
By drawing on different sources of data about a teaching design or student learning issue, a clearer, more comprehensive, more valid, picture of the situation will be formed. A clear and comprehensive picture ... is both more believable and more empowering. It is believable because quadrangulation, like triangulation, has increased our faith in the validity of our view of the issues; it is more empowering because in developing the comprehensive picture of the issue, a great many insights inform us in varying ways about our teaching practices. (Smith, 2008 p.528).

Following Smith, the four sources of evidence are Self, Peer, Student Experience and Student Learning. These sources of evidence are relevant for the collection of evaluation data within the three contexts of the Framework for Evaluation. However, the identities of “Self”, “Peer”, and “Student” will vary depending on the context in which the evaluation is being conducted. Table 1 indicates who occupies each generic role in the primary, secondary and tertiary contexts.

It will be noted that in the broader tertiary context, the identities of ‘Peer’ and ‘Student’ may be equivalent to those of the primary or secondary context. The absorption, in the tertiary context, of the primary and secondary peer and student identities is consistent with the mapping of the contexts as expressed Figure 2 (Section 2.2). It is clear in this figure that the primary and secondary contexts are situated within the tertiary context. Consequently, it follows that any evidence that may be collected as part of evaluation with the primary and secondary contexts would also contribute to an evaluation within the tertiary context.

Additionally, ‘Peer’ and ‘Student’ may include peers and students from across the institution (other than the stakeholders directly involved in the FUT program), or from institutions across the HE sector. In this broader context, some evidence may also be sourced from the institution itself (that is, institutional statistics such as student numbers, retention/attrition rates, and teaching awards). For the purposes of aligning with the 4Q Model of Evaluation, the Institution as a source of evidence may be regarded as a ‘Peer’.

Table 1 Identity of sources of evidence within primary, secondary and tertiary contexts of evaluations of FUT. ...see over page
Table 1 Identity of sources of evidence within primary, secondary and tertiary contexts of evaluations of FUT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary context</th>
<th>Secondary context</th>
<th>Tertiary context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Self”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT Teacher or</td>
<td>Participants in</td>
<td>FUT Teacher or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching team</td>
<td>the FUT course</td>
<td>teaching team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsible for</td>
<td></td>
<td>responsible for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the delivery of</td>
<td></td>
<td>the delivery of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the FUT course</td>
<td></td>
<td>the FUT course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Peer”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues of</td>
<td>Colleagues of the</td>
<td>Colleagues of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Teacher or</td>
<td>participant; Faculty</td>
<td>FUT teacher or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching team</td>
<td>members</td>
<td>Colleagues of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsible for</td>
<td></td>
<td>participant or the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the delivery of</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution; Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the FUT course</td>
<td></td>
<td>members from within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the institution or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>across institutions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the discipline, faculty, institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or sector within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>which the FUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>teacher operates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Student”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants in</td>
<td>Students of the</td>
<td>Participants or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the FUT course</td>
<td>participants of the</td>
<td>Students of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FUT course</td>
<td>university or of other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>universities (for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>purposes of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>benchmarking and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comparison between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>programs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The collection of “credible, relevant and valuable” evidence then is facilitated by gathering data from the range of sources suggested in the 4Q Model of Evaluation. At the same time, to better insure quality evidence, a consideration of Schwandt’s Taxonomy of Evidence, should be factored into the evaluation planning of FUT programs.

Types of Evidence: Tools and strategies

Having established the need to collect evidence from a range of sources, consideration should be given to the type of evidence to gather, and the tools and strategies used to collect the data. Tables 2 and 3 (Appendix 1) indicate, within the primary and secondary contexts, the type of evidence that might be collected. Table 4 (Appendix 2) addresses the evidence in support of evaluation within the tertiary context. Tools that could be used or an artefact that might be collected, and further references or case study exemplars are also listed.

(Note: The context examples listed in the far right hand column are listed and described in Table 7 in the Case Studies of Practice section 3.2)
Section 3 Case Studies

3.1 Case studies from literature

Previously published evaluation studies of the impact of teaching and learning development programs for early career academics have been mined for illustration of a range of evaluation designs that map across the FUT Evaluation Framework. (Framework 1)

The selected case studies have been reported in higher education literature over the past decade and include evaluation studies in local contexts, as well as comparisons across multiple institutions and countries. This is not intended to be an exhaustive literature search; rather the aim was to select studies or elements of studies that map across the evaluation framework contexts, purposes and foci.

Also, this literature survey was not constrained to only Foundations of University Teaching (FUT) programs as the strategies and approaches taken in these selected examples of evaluations of the impact or effectiveness of 'lecturer development’ programs (which include FUTs to accredited units or courses such as graduate certificates in higher education as well as local induction programs with broader scope than teaching and learning) have clear capacity for adoption and adaption, or may seed elaboration of our thinking, at the early career FUT level targeted by the PATHE project.

We have tabled the studies (Table 5, Appendix 1 and 2) with annotations about
• How the study maps onto our FUT evaluation framework with identification of the framework context, purpose and focus
• Strategies and tools employed and evidence gathered in the study
• Different evaluation designs and how they are consonant with their FUT program’s philosophy or theoretical basis.
• Outcomes of the evaluative study

Evaluation design and FUT program philosophy consonance

Bamber (2008:109) reviewed a range of reported studies of early career ‘lecturer development programs’ and identified within each, ‘a theory of change’. She cautions that, ‘just as the development programs have a theory of change – so do the evaluations. This means that each evaluation will take a particular philosophical and theoretical position.’

‘A caution is, then, that while evaluation should be informed by literature, it needs to be understood that the evaluators convictions and philosophies create a lens through which data are viewed, collected and interpreted.’ (Bamber, 2008, p109)
Mark (2009:236) also advises, “... be concerned about the credibility of judgements about what the key research questions are. ... Can you provide a reasoned justification for the choice of one research question (or set of questions) over others?”

Bamber (2008:109) discusses the value of large-scale evaluations and more locally based examinations of practice. As you might expect, she summarises by commenting that the ‘large scale evaluations have value in that they provide a useful backdrop for the local evaluations’; and that the multi-institutional studies provide ‘tentative benchmark data’ and make ‘important links between lecturer development program participants’ experiences and theoretical constructs’.

Finally, Bamber (2008) recommends, as do we, that evaluation program designers need to be cognisant of their need to view their evaluation through the ‘filter of their local profile’. (See further discussion in section 2.1)

**Navigating Table and Annotated Cases Studies from Literature**

At the beginning of this section is a navigating table (Table 1) that maps the selected published studies against the three contexts, evaluation purposes and foci of the FUT evaluation framework.

In Appendix 1, the (annotated) case studies drawn from literature are separated into large scale evaluation studies in Table 1 and other (local) studies in Table 2. This work will be extended in the next stage of the study with literature already identified and listed in Appendix 2.
Table 5 Map of the selected published studies against the three contexts, evaluation purposes and foci of the FUT Evaluation Framework
(See Appendix 1 for case study information and annotations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Purpose and focus</th>
<th>Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Primary** | 1 Curriculum Analysis | Pickering (2006)  
Postareff et al. (2007)  
Stefani & Elton (2002)  
Sword (2008) |
| 2 Formative monitoring of learning and teaching environment within the foundations subject | Pickering (2006)  
Postareff et al. (2007)  
Stefani & Elton (2002)  
Sword (2008) |
Pickering (2006)  
Postareff et al. (2007)  
Stefani & Elton (2002)  
Sword (2008) |
| 4 Summative evaluation of learning outcomes | Ginns, Kitay & Prosser (2008)  
Pickering (2006)  
Postareff et al. (2007)  
Stefani & Elton (2002)  
Sword (2008) |
| **Secondary** | 1 Impact evaluation (local) | Ho, Watkins & Kelly (2001)  
Ginns, Kitay & Prosser (2008)  
Pickering (2006)  
Postareff et al. (2007)  
Stefani & Elton (2002)  
Stes et al. (2007)  
Sword (2008) |
| 2 Formative monitoring of the teaching environment | Pickering (2006)  
Stes et al. (2007)  
Sword (2008) |
| **Tertiary** | 1 Maintenance | Prebble et al. (2005)  
**Sword (2008)** |
| 2 Sustainability | Prebble et al. (2005)  
**Sword (2008)** |
| 3 Impact evaluation (local to global) | Dearn, Fraser & Ryan (2002)  
Fraser, Dearn & Ryan (2002)  
Knight (2006)  
Prebble et al. (2005)  
Stefani & Elton (2002)  
Sword (2008) |
3.2 Case studies of Practice across Australian Universities

In order to present the range of current practice across Australian Universities we conducted telephone interviews (and one e-interview) with 24 University representatives regarding their current evaluation practice of FUT programs.

### Table 6 - Interview participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Representatives</th>
<th>FUT program in development</th>
<th>Integration/ articulation of FUT with Grad. Cert. HE</th>
<th>Program source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qld 8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 Central Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 Central Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 Central Unit 1 with Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 Central Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 Central Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Central Unit 1 attached to College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tas 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Central Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total = 24</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questions that formed the interviews are given at Appendix 3. These interviews provided a cross-section of current practice and generated a range of evaluative examples. The details gathered from the interviews are presented as case study entries in the Table 7 below, without identifying the institutions. Representatives were also asked to provide complementary documentation, and some of these were forthcoming with copies of survey instruments, focus group questionnaires and background details.

The context for each University is quite specific and indicates the spectrum of current practice - for many (20 cases identified from the
interviews) there is integration between FUT programs and the offering of Graduate Certificates of HE (or equivalent) and it is often difficult to delineate between the two programs. Format of programs varies from intensive two or more days to components spread across a semester, with online adjunct activities and related assessment tasks. This range of format and assessment is often dependent on the articulation of FUT programs with the award Graduate Certificate courses. There was also a range of institutional structure represented, where the Foundations program was offered from a separate central organizational Unit or Faculty-based. In some (3 cases from interviews) institutions contacted a Foundations of University teaching type program is still in development.

Limitations of the interview/case study process

All interviews were undertaken by the same interviewer to gain consistency and the preferred target representative from each institution was the person responsible for the delivery and presentation of the FUT. This was achieved in most cases, and for 3 institutions more than one representative was interviewed.

The interview process does have some limitations; representatives that were available were sometimes relatively new to their institutions (4 cases identified in interviews) and commented they were only able to report on recent practice, representatives were undertaking various roles at their institution – facilitator/presenter/convenor; the interview time was scaled to a telephone conversation and although many were willing, only a few were forthcoming with the actual examples of their documentation.

All questions were asked of each representative to gather similar case study details. There were some differences in how particular questions were interpreted. (For instance Question 7 – Do you document your reflection? - Some interviewees interpreted this as asking about the reflective practice of the program presenters and facilitators, others responded with details about use of reflections as an activity with participants in the FUT programs).

The interviewer may have been able to elaborate on some questions and qualify the responses, but this would have extended the interview questions and perhaps reduced the ability to compare across institutions. Further details were followed up with a number of institutions depending on availability of the people involved.

Emerging trends from the case studies –

The range of practice that is evident from the case studies exhibits some definite trends in evaluation practice and presentation of FUT programs. These are:

- Evaluation instruments – there is general practice of using a similar survey of FUT participants as that used by students evaluating
award units (SET style evaluation of award units/subjects). This is emphasized by the integration of FUT programs with the award Grad. Cert. courses.

- Range of evaluative evidence is gathered – each institution gathers a range of evaluative data, during and after the offer of the FUT programs. This demonstrates the emphasis that is given to gathering multiple sources of evidence, rather than relying on one perspective. These are gathered from the various stakeholders – FUT participants, teachers (facilitators/ convenors/ presenters) and institutional personnel and range from structured survey questionnaires, focus groups interviews and reflections, incidental comments and activities.

- Trend towards community of practice – based model by highlighting the potential for collegial support of each cohort participating in each offer of FUT. This is evident in the focus given to peer support and review, and group reflective practice.

- Inclusion of action learning based project activity – many FUT programs include an action learning project, either as an integral component of the FUT program or as an optional element. These recommend the plan/ act/ observe/ reflect cycle that is indicated in action learning literature (reference: Bourner, Cooper & France, 2000)

- Modelling of active teaching behavior – FUT facilitators and convenors generally recommend that the desired 'reflective practitioner' behavior be evident from all presenters as well as the approach recommended for participants. (reference: Kahn et.al. 2006)

To add to the picture of evaluation this table below (Table 7) outlines the examples of evaluation practice at each context level - Primary, secondary and tertiary. The 23 interviews provided details that have been categorized according to the context level and intention. These are given in the Example column.
Table 7 Current practice examples at each context
(Note: The context examples listed in the far right hand column are listed and described in Table 2, 3 & 4 in the evidence and data tables in section 2.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Nature/ type of instrument</th>
<th>Comment- purpose</th>
<th>Example – comment about intent -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY - T &amp; L context where FUT teachers/ participants engage</td>
<td>1. Satisfaction survey</td>
<td>On completion – summative</td>
<td>Provided – included as <strong>Example 1 and 2</strong> is the structure of a survey for participants This is similar to the standard student SET for awards units/ subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Post its / one-minute paper / concept map</td>
<td>During – formative</td>
<td>Conducted at end of particular sessions, or at end of Day with intention of gathering participants response / feedback or questions Asked – <em>What aspect of the workshop/ day was most useful? What aspect was least useful? And Which workshop/ topic would you like to know more about?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Stop/ start/ continue</td>
<td>During – formative</td>
<td>Ask participants at end of day or at intervals in program – what would you like to see us stop doing? / start doing? / or continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>doing? Purpose for formative feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Variety – speech bubble / questions</td>
<td>Different type of evaluation each day/week – speech bubble / etc - Formative monitoring</td>
<td>Participants asked to add caption to cartoon indicating what they might tell a colleague/ or how this might relate to their teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Debrief of teaching approaches</td>
<td>Gathers details on degree to which participants will(plan to) use strategies</td>
<td>Discussion at end of program about teaching approaches and their applicability for participants – asking participants how might you use these strategies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Discussion of assessment – reflection on task with participants</td>
<td>Formative – more applicable to award course</td>
<td>Intention to gauge participants reaction to required/ assessment tasks – by consensus then agreed to modify task based on this feedback ( needs all to agree when credit unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Critique of evaluative techniques with participants</td>
<td>Discussion of range of evaluative techniques used in program – enables modeling of practice</td>
<td>Participants undertake SET – type evaluation and critique of evaluations – ‘leads to thought provoking discussion’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Daily/ regular debrief</strong></td>
<td>This can be across presenters/ teachers in the program at end of day – or by participants at end of day/ regular intervals in program</td>
<td>Comment – ‘participants asked to reflect about day before and share key ideas that they picked up. This aids in assessing things that worked and those that didn’t and to share this with all facilitators’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **9. Longitudinal survey** | Collecting range of data after program and then at intervals beyond | Aim is to gather data on change in teaching philosophy, practice and behavior from before program and after, and intervals beyond. **Example 3** *(Related to Example 4 as well)*  
How completing the program has impacted on the way they teach? With examples from their teaching to support comments  
*(Related to Example 4 as well)* |
| **10. Community of practice / Learning circles – contact with participants ongoing after program** | Intent to maintain contact with participants after program and gauge impact over time | Aim is to ‘plan to continue with the participant group in learning circles or learning community over time.’ Sometimes there is |
| 11. | Follow career progress of participants / Alumni after program | Intent to follow career pathways of participants - gather data as to their roles/ responsibilities and scholarship after FUT | Aim is to gather data on ‘people who’ve completed Foundations that are recognized within Faculty and then moving into leadership positions like Faculty learning and teaching coordinators roles, etc.’, or publications and presentations coming from teaching practice. |

Website for FUT Community of practice space helps form groups and ongoing support. Example – ‘using Blackboard where teaching questions are posted every fortnight and the aim has been to have the group interact with those questions and discuss.’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECONDARY - Participants / their students engage</th>
<th>1. Survey about impact on participants practice</th>
<th>Transferring beyond FUT context - follow up 6 to 12 months after</th>
<th>Example of survey – Example 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Foundations portfolio</td>
<td>Ongoing journal reflective process – by participants and separate form by teachers</td>
<td>Purpose is to articulate/analyse change/intentions over time – This exercise is undertaken by participants to indicate impact/change in their practice and separately by teachers (all roles involved) to reflect on the success/implementation of program and participant response from sessions, etc – what they would do differently next time/incident analysis – noted as ‘reflective essay’, ‘documented folder’ by case studies. Desired entries from all roles involved – presenters, FUT teachers, convenors, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Reflective process of teacher/presenter modeled for participants / online blog</td>
<td>Ongoing reflective process – for participants and / or teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Peer review processes - - Either of participants teaching after program or of teaching of program directly</td>
<td>Have peer/colleague observe session or look at materials – with particular focus in mind, or generally to comment on teaching process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERTIARY – Context where participant based – e.g. School/ Faculty / University</td>
<td>1. Reporting process</td>
<td>Regular reporting after program iterations</td>
<td>Reports prepared with participant demographics, data from feedback, teacher reflections, and recommendations for future planning – reported to University Committees and Faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. External evaluator</td>
<td>Bring external ‘expert’ in to evaluate FUT program</td>
<td>Case involved ‘external evaluator’ to conduct focus groups with participants and presented report on findings which informed changes and plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Action research project – ongoing review and development</td>
<td>Continuous cycle of review and development for unit improvement</td>
<td><em>We meet monthly, discuss possible change, and make notes of decisions and actions needed. Like an action research project because we are constantly looking at (the unit) in context of university development and the needs of participants and development ideas.’</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nominations to program followed up in Schools</td>
<td>Heads of School/ Ass Deans Teaching &amp; Learning nominate academic staff to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FUT – then follow up regarding their response/change/ideas to practice - this may indicate probationary process or new staff mentoring in Faculties

| 5. School based presentation of action cycle process | Following FUT participants asked to present in their Faculty/School what it is they are implementing and the ongoing action process - encouraging scholarship of teaching Comparing content/materials/references, etc between institutions |

| 6. Benchmarking with other programs/Universities | Comparing content/materials/resources, etc between institutions | The focus questions for the benchmarking exercise with another University may include the following:  
- Is the FUT content scope and level appropriate for our audience?  
- Are we achieving our intended aims?  
- Are our teaching philosophy and key concepts appropriate? |
| 7. Follow up participants for future changes/ impact/ grants/ awards | Like 11 in Primary context – this also reflects the institutional context – follow career pathway of participants | • Are we reaching our audience? Comment on: What other pathways for access are achievable and sustainable?  
• What articulation might be appropriate with the casual academic staff introduction to teaching and learning workshops and the Graduate Certificate in Higher Education?  
• What feedback can you give on the conduct of the workshop program?  
• How can we work together in the future to share resources and materials and learn from and with each other? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accreditation cycle – review and planning</th>
<th>Undertake formal review in regular cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Anticipation document – long term study / 5 year cycle</td>
<td>Like 9 in Primary context – this follows up on participants and their teaching practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Wider dissemination – conferences / articles</td>
<td>- Like 11 in Primary context – follow career pathway and scholarship output of participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 1 Student feedback on teaching

Ten standard items

1. The lecturer/tutor makes clear what I need to do to be successful in this course.

2. The lecturer/tutor is skilled at developing a class atmosphere conducive to learning.

3. The lecturer/tutor has a good manner (e.g. friendly, helpful, and enthusiastic).

4. The lecturer/tutor shows appropriate concern for student progress and needs.

5. The lecturer/tutor provides feedback that is constructive and helpful.

6. The lecturer/tutor helps me to improve my understanding of concepts and principles.

7. The lecturer/tutor structures and presents the course content in ways that help me to understand.

8. The lecturer/tutor has acted on, or will act on, student feedback to improve their teaching.

9. The lecturer/tutor sets tasks that are useful as learning experiences.

10. Overall, how would you rate the teaching of the lecturer/tutor in this course?
Example 2 Evaluation of FUT intensive workshop

1. What is the most significant thing that you have learnt in this workshop about teaching and learning?
2. What aspects from the workshop are still unclear?
3. What have you learnt from this workshop that you will apply in your teaching this semester?
4. What suggestions for future developments in this workshop do you have?
5. Overall, how effective was this teacher in helping you to learn?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How would you rate each session of the workshop?
Please indicate your level of satisfaction with each of the sessions that you attended. The response scale key is the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Understanding for Teaching and Learning
- Designing: Aligning intentions, strategies and outcomes
- Teaching for learning skills for the future
- Assessing: Aligning purposes, methods and intended learning outcomes
- Improving the quality of feedback to students
- Evaluation 1: Documenting the quality of your teaching
- Tricky Issues

7. Please indicate your overall satisfaction with the workshop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How did we go in achieving our intended workshop aims?

**Overall Program Aims**

Through active participation in the workshop, participants begin to
- develop an informed (not just intuitive) conceptual framework for understanding teaching for learning that they can contextualise to their own teaching and learning environment and experiences
- develop (modeled through workshop) collaborative, collegial, reflective approaches to their practice as teachers
- reflect on teaching for learning and their practice as a new university teacher
• address how to align their beliefs and intentions in teaching for learning, with their choice of strategies for teaching, assessing and evaluating

**Participants will**

• take away some practical teaching tips or new ideas
• take away resources and contacts to various elements that support teaching for learning at GU

Please add your Comments on: *How did we go in achieving our intended workshop aims?*
Example 3 Mapping teaching and learning outcomes

Please provide brief details on any teaching and learning activities that you have been involved in during completion of, or since graduating from the Grad Cert / Foundations of University Teaching program.

1. **Seminars/ workshop/ staff meetings / mentoring** - Note an such activities you have conducted alone or as part of a group or have been involved in developing, or assisting other staff in a T & L mentoring role, or presenting materials related to T & L

2. **Resources** - Any resource you have developed fully/ independently, or have been involved in partially – even in advisory role

3. **Further study** – have you completed any further degrees/ units of study/ professional development opportunities related to T & L?

4. **Grants** - Have you applied for or received any grants related to T & L?

5. **Publications** – Have you had any publications related to T & L?

6. **Attendance at T & L conferences/ seminars**/ other T & L related professional development activities?

7. **Any T & L related positions** you have held/ hold in your School / Faculty/ Division?
Example 4 Email survey to participants 6 to 12 months later

The email was sent to all participants with instructions on how to return via
1) Reply email to Administration (third party collection and anonymity preserved) or
2) Print out and fill in and return via internal mail to administration (third party collection and anonymity preserved).

Dear Colleagues,

I would like to find out how useful you thought the Casual Academic Staff Workshops and the Foundations of University Teaching Two-day Intensives were for you, now that you have been teaching for 6 to 12 months.

Attached is a questionnaire that I would appreciate your responses to, as we review and modify the CAS and FUT resources and workshops for next year.

Please save the attachment to your desktop and complete it and resave it.

Then ‘reply’ this message (or send to email address), re-attach the document and one of the project officers will collate it anonymously. If you prefer and are not concerned about staying anonymous, then you can send it directly back to me at email address.
Section 4 Initial trial of the Evaluation Framework

Case study using the first version of the framework

Using the evaluation framework proposed by the sub-group of the ALTC funded Preparing Academics for Teaching in Higher Education (PATHE) project (Gannaway, D., Goody, A., Hicks, M., O’Brien, M., Smieg, H., & Wilson, G. (2007) to explore how that may help us to investigate and characterise the impact of one university’s version of an FUT program.

During 2008-2009 the FUT at this Regional University has been under review. The program commenced in 2005 as a complementary program to an Early Career Researcher Program. From 2005 to 2009 it has had one administrative coordinator and been staffed by temporarily appointed staff drawn from Schools, and remunerated with an honorarium payment. The program has always been conducted as a suite of between 4 and 8 discrete sessions during the pre-student orientation period of the year.

The FUT has been presented as a blend of generic induction activity and specific seminars on aspects of teaching practice. The sessions are typically run as half day seminars with two or three facilitators who share resources and practices with the participants and according to a particular theme, for example, Assessment, Student Engagement, On-line learning, Group work strategies, Lecture strategies, Reflective practice for staff and for students. Generic induction would typically include an overview of governance structures and committees, specific reference to relevant policy and procedure in relation to, for example, assessment, plagiarism, the institutional Learning & Teaching Plan.

In any one year the participant group profile was diverse incorporating postgraduate tutors, staff commencing academic work in Australia for the first time, staff whose first language was not English, specific discipline groups teaching in diverse settings such as outdoor/fieldwork, laboratory, large lecture groups, studios and workshops. Some participants could not be described as in their ‘early career’ as academic teachers but were seeking acculturation, refresher opportunities, and networking in a new workplace.

Previous evaluations of the program typically included end-of-session reactive feedback with Likert scales, reflective writing by facilitators and participants (one-minute papers), follow-up phone calls and personal mentoring appointments arranged by participants with the facilitators as required and as a follow up to sessions. Post program mentoring has always been a feature of the program.

Attention to evaluating the impact on practice of facilitators, participants and on student learning outcomes was limited to semi-structured interviews conducted by the program coordinator typically conducted 6 months after the program. Attention to any impact on student learning
was gathered through the university instrument for gathering student feedback.

Using the evaluation framework\(^1\) as proposed by the sub-group focussing on impact in the *Preparation of Academics for Teaching in Higher Education* (PATHE) project, has provided a useful lens by which we have been able to explore, investigate and characterise the impact of this institution’s version of an FUT program. The following snapshots (and associated quotes in Table 8) are offered as further exploration of the framework.

**Primary context:**

1. Feedback from participants gained in post-program follow-up interviews showed that the consistently strongest value to them from the program was the social networking opportunity with other new staff and the post program mentoring provided by the coordinator and the program facilitators.
2. Using Blackboard on a trial basis to establish ‘learning conversations’ between facilitators and participants was evaluated as modestly successful. Participants indicated that they generally prefer a face-to-face mentoring discussion than an asynchronous online discussion on learning and teaching issues.
3. Using one-minute papers as a basis for participants’ reflecting on their learning has always been positively received.

**Secondary context:**

Participants who had not previously used reflective diaries/journals for their own practice have trialed the one-minute paper approach [and variations thereof] as a teaching approach with students subsequent to the FUT program, and noted the usefulness of the insights gained from students in this way. In some cases participants were able to track the positive development of student learning and engagement as a result of this style of feedback to adjust their practices. These insights were contrasted with the standard feedback required from the university student evaluation instrument. It seems apparent that the impact of the approach can be especially attributed to the ongoing commitment of one of the staff facilitators who is a published scholar on reflective teaching practice.

**Tertiary context:**

Where mentoring relationships have been established in a face-to-face program our evaluation shows that this has enabled/fostered critical scholarly conversations about aspects of teaching and learning over time. Both past facilitators and participants indicated that these conversations have included sharing resources on teaching practice, scholarly

---

\(^1\) Primary Context: the teaching and learning context where the FUT Teachers and the Participant engage.  
Secondary Context: the teaching and learning context where the participant and their students engage.  
Tertiary Context: the higher education, professional or discipline field or context where the participant is based, at levels from local to global
collaborations on publications, assistance with portfolio development for academic promotion, introducing ALTC resources and opportunities, providing peer feedback in classroom settings as well as in assessment strategies.

The principal value of utilising the three contexts for evaluation in this particular institution has been to:

1. Assist facilitators to clarify the intention of the evaluation
2. Further customise the types of evaluation that are relevant to purpose
3. Identify the various stakeholders in the evaluation process
4. Establish a more even-handed approach to the formative and summative requirements of program evaluation
5. Shift the emphasis on evaluation occurring mainly within the primary context to a greater consideration of evaluation in the secondary and tertiary contexts, and thereby ensure a more comprehensive evaluation of the impact of the program.

The next phase of impact evaluation for the program at this institution will be to look more closely at the 4Q model of evaluation (Smith 2008) and the Schwandt (2009) taxonomy of evidence as an overlay for the initial framework used. This is a deliberate developmental step to build on the small scale audit of the current program and the initial simple base of evaluative intentions and tools. More specifically it is intended to focus attention on the tertiary context of the framework. It is anticipated that this will contribute to building a scholarly focus among our group of facilitators when considering the intention and practice of evaluation, and use of evaluative data, for examining impact on professional practice and on learning outcomes for students.

Table 8 Impact on practice in each context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary context</th>
<th>Using Reflective practices and ‘free write’ feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>captured their reflections after involvement in a session introducing them to ways of using reflective processes and using ‘free write feedback’. Follow-up with participants was undertaken to gather examples of how they applied this approach before during and after teaching events:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection to action [ before teaching]</td>
<td>“I feel better about my self-doubts now and will use this as a means to identify changes to be made...it’s quite an efficient tool.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Perhaps I can re-conceptualise myself as a co-learner or perhaps identify my current practices which already position me as a co-learner...?”
“The reflective exercise forced me to dwell on my assumptions about learners and I am going to need to study my own practice in the classroom now.”

**Reflection in action [when teaching]**
“Today I focussed upon the notions of ‘voice’ [whose?] And silence and how that is expressed differently with mature age learners and exit Year 12 students in my classroom.”

“I asked a lot more questions with this group and the students asked me when was I ‘going to actually tell them something?’”

**Reflection on action [after teaching]**
“I don’t know whether the students are learning or not and I need to find some ways of checking that without resorting to a test on knowledge alone.”

**Reflection for action [before next teaching to guide actions]**
“Having tried some of the suggested reflective practices with the students I got the feedback of ‘I don’t like to be forced to reflect...I don’t like it.’ I’ve been preoccupied with this student feedback and I’m going to raise it for discussion and a way to explore ways of learning with them.”

“I was preoccupied with my ‘assumptions’ and how that dictates my teaching approaches after THAT exercise and I’m now considering asking a colleague to attend a tutorial as a peer/participant to give me feedback.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Primary context</strong></th>
<th><strong>Using on-line mentoring [via Blackboard] with pre-prepared focus questions generated by facilitators on L&amp;T issues:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Facilitators:** ‘I think we hoped that the questions designed for this would stimulate discussion – but clearly the discussions petered out quite quickly and the reasons were clearly about having no time available and that the discussion had ‘run its course’ and that’s fair enough.”
“‘This type of interaction is actually more like a Q&A than a conversational/reflective activity. It might be better to time this kind of mentoring for further into the year when ‘practice’ has settled down a bit more.’
“I’m glad we tried this approach because it made me stop and think about what I expect my students to do...so it has changed my practice in that regard...as for the FUT participants I can see in their comments that they at least know who to go to for help in the future – in that sense I’m...” |
confident that a mentoring connection has been made.”
“Downloading the induction type of information from Blackboard was okay but judging from the comments of the participants you probably can’t really replace the face-to-face contact for the actual teaching – so I think we need to look at the tension between induction ‘stuff’ [that the institution wants to have covered] and introduction to teaching which the novice teachers are asking for – the practical strategies and us sharing our practice with them.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary context</th>
<th>Trialling reading circles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants were interviewed to follow-up on how they used the ideas and activities in their classrooms after introducing them to reading circle strategies:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I got some really practical ideas for getting activities started and I’d say that has helped me to establish a friendly atmosphere in the tutorials, I used the speed-dating activity to get them to mix and get to know each other – I was a little anxious as it didn’t seem very scholarly if you know what I mean, but that group have some really tight reading circles established now – they’re actually working! And I think when I look back now I have been learning about learning so I can help my first year students...the content seems less of a focus with this group.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“My assumption was that ‘students don’t read’ and I think I was partly right...the reading circle approach seems to have broken down the activity into do-able tasks for them but I worry that they are reading in a disconnected way...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I’ve never considered trying different reading strategies with undergraduates before, I thought it was something they would just do [or not] so this has been quite an eye-opener.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tertiary context</th>
<th>Improved student feedback scores/comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I found this quite nerve-wracking actually...but I was unhappy with the lecture format for my part of a program in the first semester and the student feedback was pretty chilly...so in the second semester I made changes to the format, changed rooms, split the student group into three smaller tutorial groups and my feedback this time has increased from a 2.5[out of 5] to a much higher rating of 4.0. My course co-ordinator came to observe my classes and he thought they worked a lot better too so I felt really relieved.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tertiary context</th>
<th>Development of teaching philosophy for portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “...have used the material from the workshop to start writing a statement about my teaching values and it has been immediately useful to incorporate in a small grant
application."

“I thought that reflecting on my teaching approaches and ‘philosophy’ was a bit airy fairy when we did this in the program! That was two years ago and now here I am undertaking a collaborative study with a colleague about academic under-preparedness...and our study is all about interrogating our teaching assumptions...so the focus is more on us than on the student deficit.”
Section 5 Recommendations and a Final Stage

Recommendations

Section 2.2
We recommend that users ‘name and frame’ their conception of evaluation for their FUT program using the FUT Evaluation Framework, as a practice audit, or an initial planning tool. This investigation will then enable FUT evaluators to:
• more clearly reveal and articulate their evaluation purpose and focus;
• identify and situate their present practice across the three contexts; and
• Revise or augment their evaluation practices, congruent with their intentions, priorities and values associated with their particular FUT program, stakeholders and context.

Section 2.3
We recommend that good practice in evaluating FUT programs, across the three contexts of the FUT Evaluation Framework, primary, secondary, and tertiary, incorporates the following approaches to evaluation:
1. Design evaluation with deliberate and specific intent.
2. Gather credible relevant and valuable evidence.
3. Embed evaluation in learning experiences.
4. Close the loop: Feedback, feed-forward and feed-into learning from evaluation

Section 2.3
We recommend taking a portfolio of evaluation studies approach, where successive evaluations may tackle the same or different evaluation purposes or foci. We recommend designing evaluation programs, with future cycles of evaluation, in mind, triangulating evidence, within and longitudinally between your successive evaluation cycles, congruent with your purposes and foci and your FUT program philosophy.

Section 2.4
We recommend considering the conceptual taxonomy of evidence reported by Schwandt (2009:206) (Figure 3 in Section 2.4) as the first port of call at the macro-level, for considering your approach to evaluating your FUT program.

Section 2.4
We recommend consideration of the 4Q model (Smith 2008) in making more specific decisions about selection of evidence, sources and tools, to
build a collection of valuable evidence for different purposes and foci of evaluation across the three contexts: primary, secondary and tertiary.

Final Stage of this Sub-Project

The original outcomes identified for this sub-project were
- An evaluation framework for Foundations of University Teaching (FUT) programs
- A set of principles for good practice in evaluation of our target programs
- A set of case studies of good practice in evaluation
- A set of electronic resources consistent with and illustrating (1), suitable for web access that includes, tools, strategies and approaches and case studies.

In the final stages of this sub-project we have created:
1. An Evaluation Framework for FUT programs with illustrations drawn from the case studies of practice and from literature;
2. A taxonomy of evidence to enable evaluators to marshal credible, relevant and valuable evidence into credible evaluations;
3. A set of principles for good practice in evaluation of FUT programs, informed by and situated in literature;
4. The resources to support this evidence-based approach, for the different foci and purposes described by the Evaluation Framework for FUT programs, including a selection of:
   - Case studies of practice (drawn from literature and practice)
   - Examples of tools, strategies and approaches for evaluation.

The next stage of this project will be to extend the annotations of the literature case studies (Section 3.1). Then, we intend to extend the navigation table mapping the literature and practice case studies to the variety of tools and strategies employed, and update the 4Q tools and evidence tables (Section 2.4).

The final stage (subsequent to the submission of this report), will be development of a set of electronic resources for web access, including:
1. The FUT Evaluation Framework
2. Set of principles for good practice in evaluation of FUT programs
3. Set of electronic resources consistent with and illustrating (1 & 2), suitable for web access that includes
   - Tools
   - Strategies and approaches
   - Case studies (drawn from literature and contemporary practice with annotations)
   - Examples and proformas to guide evaluators through a step by step evaluation planning or auditing process.
Appendices

Appendix 1 Types of Evidence: Tools and strategies

Tables 2 and 3 indicate, within the primary and secondary contexts, the type of evidence that might be collected.

(Note: The context examples listed in the far right hand column are listed and described in Table 7 in the Case Studies of Practice section 3.2)

Table 2 Primary context: The T&L context where the teacher of the FUT course and the participant engage
(Note: The context examples listed in the far right hand column are listed and described in Table 7 in the Case Studies of Practice in section 3.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type of Evidence</th>
<th>Tool or artifact example</th>
<th>Case study exemplar or further reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Self”: FUT Teacher</td>
<td>Foundations T&amp;L Documentation</td>
<td>outline, readings, assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self reflections</td>
<td>Journal, course memos, teaching portfolio, teaching philosophy</td>
<td>Secondary: 2 and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback seeking behaviour</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response to participant feedback</td>
<td>Journal, revised teaching plans</td>
<td>Primary: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response to faculty feedback</td>
<td>Journal, course revisions</td>
<td>Primary: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video of T&amp;L activities</td>
<td>i. lecture/lectopia recording</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio of T&amp;L activities</td>
<td>ii. lecture/lectopia recording</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publications on teaching/scholarship</td>
<td>abstract</td>
<td>Primary: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scholarly presentations</td>
<td>abstract</td>
<td>Primary: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Peer” (Colleague of FUT teacher)</td>
<td>Peer Review of Foundations documentation</td>
<td>Statement or report from peer</td>
<td>Secondary: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publications on teaching/scholarship</td>
<td>Peer review statement</td>
<td>Primary 11 and Tertiary: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Type of Evidence</td>
<td>Type of Evidence</td>
<td>Case study exemplar or further reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Student Experience” (Participant Experience)</td>
<td>Participant evaluation of teaching</td>
<td>Primary: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant reflective statements</td>
<td>Secondary: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant retention/attrition</td>
<td>Data collected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant learning journals</td>
<td>Secondary: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsolicited feedback from participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subjective personal narrative</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Prosser, Rickson, Bence, Hanbury &amp; Kulej (2006); Knight (2006); Rust (1998, 2000); Stefani &amp; Elton (2002); Postaref et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>Ginns, Kitay &amp; Prosser (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>Modified Professional into Teaching Questionnaire (PiT)</td>
<td>Knight (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement in learning communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Student Learning” (Participant Learning)</td>
<td>Participant written assessments</td>
<td>External examiner reports</td>
<td>Stefani &amp; Elton (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant peer feedback</td>
<td>Secondary: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant reflective statements</td>
<td>Secondary: 3</td>
<td>Pickering (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant evaluation of teaching</td>
<td>Primary: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant self reported gain of knowledge, skills, attitudes</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Pickering (2006); Rust (1998, 2000); Stefani &amp; Elton (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in attitude, practice of the teacher</td>
<td>-Teaching Perspective Inventory (TPI) -Approaches to Teaching Inventory (ATI),</td>
<td><a href="http://www.teachingperspectives.com">http://www.teachingperspectives.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trigwell &amp; Prosser, (1999); Coffey &amp; Gibbs, (2002);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 Secondary context: The T&L context where the participant and their students engage
(Note: The context examples listed in the far right hand column are listed and described in Table 7 in the Case Studies of Practice in section 3.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type of Evidence</th>
<th>Type of Evidence</th>
<th>Case study exemplar or further reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Self&quot; (Participant)</td>
<td>Unit/course T+L Documentation</td>
<td>outline, readings, assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self reflections</td>
<td>Journal, course memos, teaching portfolio, teaching philosophy; Reflective statements</td>
<td>Secondary: 2 and 3 Pickering (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback seeking behaviour</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response to student feedback</td>
<td>Journal, revised teaching plans</td>
<td>Secondary: 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response to faculty feedback</td>
<td>Journal, course revisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video of T+L activities</td>
<td>iii. lecture/lectopia recording</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio of T+L activities</td>
<td>iv. lecture/lectopia recording</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publications on teaching/scholarship</td>
<td>abstract</td>
<td>Tertiary: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scholarly presentations</td>
<td>abstract</td>
<td>Tertiary: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approaches to Teaching Inventory (ATI), Teaching Methods Inventory (TMI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews (pre-, post-program), focus groups,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Peer” (Colleague of Participant)</strong></td>
<td><strong>External reviews</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reviews or audits for school or faculty</strong></td>
<td>Stefani &amp; Elton (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer Review of Unit/Course documentation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Statement or report from peer</strong></td>
<td>Secondary: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer observation of teaching</strong></td>
<td><strong>Statement or report from peer</strong></td>
<td>Secondary: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Stimulated recall interviews</strong></td>
<td>Pickering (2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publications on teaching/scholarship</strong></td>
<td><strong>Peer review statement</strong></td>
<td>Tertiary: 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>“Student Experience” (Students of Participant)</strong> | <strong>Student evaluation of teaching</strong> | <strong>Students’ evaluation of teaching SET or equivalence at each institution</strong> |
| <strong>Student reflective statements</strong> | <strong>Student learning journals</strong> |  |
| <strong>Student retention/attrition</strong> |  |  |
| <strong>Unsolicited feedback</strong> |  |  |
| <strong>Subjective personal narrative</strong> | <strong>Interviews</strong> | Ginns, Kitay &amp; Prosser (2008) |
| <strong>Student satisfaction/Course Experience</strong> | -Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) (Ramsden, 1991) | Ho (2000); Ho, Watkins &amp; Kelly (2001); <a href="http://www.acer.edu.au/ausse">www.acer.edu.au/ausse</a> |
| | -Student Educational Experience Questionnaire (SEEQ) | Gibbs &amp; Coffey, (2004) |
| | - Module Experience Questionnaire (MEQ) |  |
| <strong>Engagement in learning communities</strong> | <strong>The Australasian Survey of Student Engagement (AUSSE)</strong> | <a href="http://www.acer.edu.au/ausse">www.acer.edu.au/ausse</a> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Student Learning” (Students of Participant)</th>
<th>Achievement of learning outcomes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student written assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative assessment</td>
<td>Classroom Assessment Techniques</td>
<td>Angelo &amp; Cross, (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student peer feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student reflective statements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluation of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student self reported gain of knowledge, skills, attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches to study (pre and post)</td>
<td>Approaches to Studying Inventory (Entwistle, Hanley &amp; Hounsell, 1979)</td>
<td>Ho (2000); Ho, Watkins &amp; Kelly (2001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any evidence collected in the primary or secondary context is also valid within the tertiary context (See Tables 2 and 3. for details). In addition, this broader context allows for additional evidence drawn from a wider base (discipline, faculty, institution or sector level). This table illustrates examples of those types of evidence.
Appendix 2 Evidence in Support of Valuation

Table 4 addresses the evidence in support of evaluation within the tertiary context. Tools that could be used or an artifact that might be collected, and further references or case study exemplars are also listed.

(Note: The context examples listed in the far right hand column are listed and described in Table 7 in the Case Studies of Practice section 3.2)

Table 4 Tertiary context: The HE, professional or discipline field where the participant is based.

(Note: The context examples listed in the far right hand column are listed and described in Table 7 in the Case Studies of Practice in section 3.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type of Evidence</th>
<th>Tool or artifact example</th>
<th>Case study exemplar or further reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(FUT Teacher)</td>
<td>Survey of current practices in universities</td>
<td>Reports and publications</td>
<td>Dearn, Fraser &amp; Ryan (2002); Coffey &amp; Gibbs (2000); Gibbs &amp; Coffey (2004); Prosser et al. (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus Groups or interviews</td>
<td>Analysis of information across disciplines, universities, countries and sector</td>
<td>Dearn, Fraser &amp; Ryan (2002); Coffey &amp; Gibbs (2000); Gibbs &amp; Coffey (2004); Prosser et al. (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documentation of on-going evaluations</td>
<td>Longitudinal archiving</td>
<td>Sword (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey of literature</td>
<td>Analysis and application to a local context</td>
<td>Prebble et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Peer” (Colleagues of the FUT Teacher or Colleagues of the participant or the Institution)</td>
<td>External reviews</td>
<td>Reviews of department or unit SEDA reaccreditation of Grad Cert program</td>
<td>Stefani &amp; Elton (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of staff having completed FUT course</td>
<td>Institutional statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of staff progressing From FUT to GCHE</td>
<td>Institutional statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T &amp; L Research Publications</td>
<td>Institutional statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T &amp; L Conference attendance</td>
<td>Institutional statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T &amp; L Grants</td>
<td>Institutional statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration on ALTC projects</td>
<td>Institutional statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy recognition of HR policies</td>
<td>HR policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT in recruitment and promotion</td>
<td>Promotion statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition for participation in workload models</td>
<td>University policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment and sustained existence of T &amp; L Communities of Practice</td>
<td>Documentation recording activities of CoP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring and Networking</td>
<td>Evidence of systematic and systemic peer review practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**“Student Experience” (Participants or Students)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student evaluation of teaching</th>
<th>Unit and Course level evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student retention/attrition</td>
<td>Institutional statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni activities</td>
<td>Participation in activities, donations etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjective personal narrative</th>
<th>Interviews/Focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement in learning communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**“Student Learning” (Participants or Students)**

| Achievement of learning outcomes | |
|----------------------------------| |
| Achievement of graduate attributes | |
| Level of Student employment following completion of course | |
| Number of students progressing to postgraduate studies | |
| Number of students receiving national and international scholarships | |

(Note: The context examples listed on the far right hand column are listed and described in Table 7 in the Case Study section).
Table 1 Large Scale Evaluation Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Framework Mapping and Comments</th>
<th>Case Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Tertiary (3) Impact evaluation (local to global)**  
In the *Secondary Context* of the framework, this study looked for correlations between ‘lecturer development’ and student learning to yield information about **impact within the local context of the participants**.  
The study used pre- and post- mapping of participants’ approaches to teaching and teaching methods, in conjunction with their students’ experiences of their teaching.  
Comparisons across the institutions and countries would venture into **impact assessment** in the *Tertiary Context* of the framework.  
In this design approach empirical data and a theoretical underpinning of the research design have been coalesced. | 22 universities, 8 countries  
The evaluation design was predicated upon a research informed methodology underpinned by a theory of change that  
• Good teaching can positively affect student outcomes  
• Higher education teachers can be helped to improve the quality of their teaching  
• Student focused teachers contribute to better student learning  
Tools and strategies  
• Two groups of lecturers – one who did not participate and the other, the participants.  
• Entry to and Exit from lecturer development program: Approaches to Teaching Inventory (Trigwell and Prosser, 1999)  
• Entry to and Exit from lecturer development program: Teaching Methods Inventory (Coffey and Gibbs, 2002)  
• Lecturer’s students: Student Educational Experience Questionnaire (SEEQ) (Marsh, 1982)  
• Lecturer’s students: Module Experience Questionnaire (MEQ) (Gibbs and Coffey, 2004) |
**2**

|----------------------------------------------------------|

**Tertiary Impact (local to global)**

This study encompassed much more than is relevant to this PATHE project. However, as these researchers were working across the *tertiary context of the FUT evaluation framework*, this study makes a valuable contribution as an *historical benchmark of stakeholders’ perceptions* of the provision of professional development for preparation for university teaching and learning in the Australian Higher Education sector.

---

Australian Higher Education Sector: 32 Universities, key stakeholders, agencies, staff and students

This study reports on an investigation into the central provision of activities related to professional development for the teaching role of academics in Australian universities and the attitude of key stakeholders towards the professionalization of the teaching role of academics.

**Tools**
- Survey of current practices in universities
- Stakeholder focus groups

The attitudes of stakeholders in the sector to a more systematic approach to the professionalization of teaching at the university level were explored through interviews with a representative of peak higher education bodies (including Australian Vice Chancellors’ Committee, Nation Tertiary Education Union, National Union of Students) and with groups of sessional, inexperienced and experienced academic staff in six universities.

Academic staff participating in the interviews were being asked their views on the effectiveness of current forms of preparing staff for their teaching role, whether some form of teacher education for academic staff should be compulsory and if so, whether this should take the form of a nationally recognized form of validation.
| Knight (2006) | This project pursued evidence across the **primary**, **secondary** and **tertiary contexts** of the framework. **Primary** 3 Formative monitoring of the learning process 4 Summative evaluation of the learning outcomes **Secondary** 1 Impact evaluation (local) **Tertiary** 1 Maintenance 2 Sustainability 3 Impact (local-global) |

The report presents findings that the researcher’s state is broadly in line with two other studies of professional formation by Yorke, Tait & Knight (2006). One key finding, in the secondary and tertiary context, being: Professional formation as a teacher in higher education is substantially affected by doing the job, one’s own experience of being a student, non-formal workplace interactions with others, and staff development provision.

Bamber (2009) cautions that, “while evaluation should be informed by literature, it needs to be understood that the evaluators convictions and philosophies create a lens through which data are viewed, collected and interpreted.” She notes that “...the starting point for Knight’s study was critical discussion of lecture development programs in the press, and testing to see if lecture development program graduates shared these views.” She then questions: “Could this critical starting point indicate the researchers’ philosophical opposition to lecture development programs? Equally, does the position of Coffey and Gibbs, and of Prosser and colleagues, lead them to an inevitable set of findings, conditioned by their own starting points?” (Bamber, 2009)

171 respondents, questionnaire and interviews

**Tools**
- Questionnaire data (mark sense forms)
- Modified Professional into Teaching Questionnaire (PIT, Knight 2006)
- Phone and e- interviews
- Professional colleagues – reviews and comment
- Program descriptions
- Program review team comments
- National UK Formative Evaluation Study (Prosser et al. 2006)

The evaluation design stems from a philosophical approach based on the nature of professional learning. Knight cites Blackler (1995), suggesting that if professional knowledge is largely implicit, and implicit knowledge tends to be acquired unintentionally while doing a job, then learning to teach in higher education is best done in the workplace, not in formal courses.

Knight’s study set out to determine if lecturer development program graduates held similar views.

The core of the enquiry was a study of the perceptions of current and past participants from eight universities’ post graduate certificate courses in teaching and learning in higher education. Qualitative and quantitative data were collected via surveys done on mark sense sheets and by phone and e-interviews over less than 12 months.
Other two studies:  
Enhancing part-time teaching in higher education: A challenge for institutional policy and practice. Available at  

The PiT questionnaire explores participants perceptions and prioritization of eight common ways of learning to teach in higher education currently and ideally; explores fifteen ways that participants have reached their present capability as a teacher and their assessment of the value of these ways; and, participants responses to five statements about post-graduate certificates in higher education.  


**Tertiary context**  
Extraction from literature of implications for academic development, including short courses and extended training programs, applied to the New Zealand context but relevant elsewhere.  

The study was restricted to published research on the impact of academic development on teacher knowledge, values and practice.  

The researchers found much of the research on the impact of academic development on teaching was flawed. “Most of the published literature is case study accounts of studies undertaken by academic developers concerning their own professional practice. There is little standardisation of the independent variables in the literature; there is such a wide variation in the academic development programs being studied that it can be dangerous to generalise about other programs on the basis of their outcomes. The dependent, or outcome, variables measured in many studies also tend to fall short of any rigorous standard of proof: most studies determine the impact of academic development programs on students’ academic success and program completion. Very few published studies were able to draw a strong evidential link between such programs and students’ study outcomes. Instead, the relationship appears to be an indirect one: academic development programs contribute to teachers’ beliefs about teaching and their teaching practices; ‘good teaching’ contributes to successful study outcomes for students. The review concentrated on the evidence about the impact of academic development programs on teaching behaviour and beliefs; the evidence linking teaching and learning has been thoroughly reviewed by others and was simply summarised in this study. The evidence is presented for each of the five principal forms of academic development in use: short courses; professional development within the work group; peer assessment and guidance; use of student evaluation of teaching; and intensive study
of an academic program by the self-reported opinions of the course participants; very few actually observe an impact on teaching practice.” (p 90)

... further research is urgently needed on student outcomes in the New Zealand context. In the case of the academic development theme, there is a need to provide more robust evidence for the efficacy of the various forms of academic development in place in tertiary institutions, both in terms of their impact on teaching practice and their ultimate impact on student outcomes.” (p xi)

programs.” (p vii)

“The study comprised an overview of the lessons drawn by academic developers from the research on the impact of teaching on student learning, but restricted its propositions to the impact of academic development on teachers’ knowledge, values and practice.” (p 90)

The “study of the research literature suggests two principal propositions concerning the relationship between academic development and student learning outcomes: good teaching has positive impacts on student outcomes; and teachers can be assisted to improve the quality of their teaching through a variety of academic interventions. The second principal proposition leads to a further five sub-propositions:

- Short training courses tend to have limited impact on changing teaching behaviour. They tend to be most effective when used to disseminate information about institutional policy and practice, or to train staff in discrete skills and techniques.
- The academic work group is generally the most effective setting for developing the complex knowledge attitudes and skills involved in teaching.
- Teachers can be assisted to improve the quality of their teaching through obtaining feedback, advice and support for their teaching from a colleague or academic development consultant.
- Student assessments are among the most reliable and accessible indicators of the effectiveness of teaching. When used appropriately they are likely to lead to significant improvements in the quality of the teaching.
- Teachers’ conceptions about the nature of teaching and learning are the most important influences on how they teach. Intensive and comprehensive staff development programs can be effective in transforming teachers’ beliefs about teaching and learning and their teaching practice.” (p 91)
| 5 | Prosser, Rickinson, Bence, Hanbury & Kulej (2006) | **Secondary (1) Impact evaluation (local)**  
**Tertiary (3) Impact evaluation (local to global)** | UK HEA study of 32 institutions  
The evaluation design combined qualitative and quantitative approaches, with the same theory of change as the study by Coffey and Gibbs (2000):  
- Good teaching can positively affect student outcomes  
- Higher education teachers can be helped to improve the quality of their teaching  
- Student focused teachers contribute to better student learning  
**Tools**  
- Quantitative data from: Online questionnaires and Approaches to Teaching Inventory (ATI) (Trigwell and Prosser, 1999) (Program participants asked to respond as they would currently and as they would have (up to 2yrs ago) before completing the development program.)  
- Qualitative data from: focus groups with course participants and senior staff. |

This study enables comparative data across institutions and local profiles to be explored.

In the **Secondary Context** of the framework, this study looked for correlations between ‘lecturer development’ and student learning to yield information about **impact within the local context of the participants**. The study used pre- and post-mapping of participants’ approaches to teaching by asking them to respond about their current situation and to recall their situation at the entry to the development program.

Comparisons across the institutions and countries would venture into **impact assessment** in the **Tertiary Context** of the framework.
### Table 2 Other Evaluation Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Framework Mapping and Comments</th>
<th>Case Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rust (1998)</td>
<td><strong>ILLUSTRATIVE CASE – Primary and Secondary Context</strong></td>
<td>Oxford Brooks University, Post graduate certificate course, 3 cohorts (two past and one current cohorts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rust (2000)</td>
<td>This project pursued evidence across the <strong>primary and secondary contexts</strong> of the framework, including extension into the teaching and learning environment of the participants’ school or faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Primary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 <strong>Formative monitoring of the learning and teaching environment within the foundations subject</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 <strong>Formative monitoring of the learning process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 <strong>Summative evaluation of the learning outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Secondary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 <strong>Impact evaluation (local)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 <strong>Formative monitoring of the teaching environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This study illustrates the value of having an external facilitator with triangulation of evidence about impact in the secondary context of the FUT evaluation framework. The attitude statements included in the questionnaire collected information about the participants’ local school / faculty environment,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Externally led focus groups with follow up phone interviews to explore further detail about some issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Questionnaire including attitude statements and questions about course processes and whether the course had made a difference (likert and open ended responses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The course:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post graduate certificate course (1yr part time) is compulsory for those new to teaching in universities with less than 5 years experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The theoretical basis of the course:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The development program at Oxford Brookes University was predicated on a reflective practitioner model, with some elements of all of the six theoretical model frameworks of Gilbert and Gibbs (1998), including conceptual and behavioural change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rust (1998, p. 256) describes two small-scale evaluation studies, using an in-house end-of-course questionnaire, and externally-led interviews and focus groups. It elicited lecturers’ responses to the program, using questions and attitude statements designed to test participants’ perceptions and observations of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
opening a formative monitoring lens into this teaching and learning environment. The findings would also benefit from considering evidence from other sources within this environment and inclusion of student data.

Outcomes:
The conclusions Rust draws include:
- The course’s stated aim to develop reflective practitioners would seem to be largely successful.
- The impact of the course goes well beyond classroom practice to affect and influence and inform many of the other functions of a teacher in higher education.
- The impact of the course also goes beyond its primary development aims regarding teaching and learning through also providing things such as support, induction and networking.
- The changes may be more obvious to the course participant later, looking back, and this raises questions about when may be the best time to evaluate such courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILLUSTRATIVE CASE – Secondary context</strong></td>
<td>Secondary Impact Evaluation (local) Tertiary (local) and (publication – international.)</td>
<td>Hong Kong Polytechnic University 1 course of 4x 3hr weekly (consecutive) sessions, 12 participants, 2 year timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the Secondary Context of the framework, this study looked for correlations between ‘lecturer development’ and student learning to yield information about impact within the local context of the participants.</td>
<td>The FUT program evaluated in this study is a non-accredited short course for new academic staff taken on a voluntary basis. The theoretical basis for this program is reported in Ho (2000) and includes: Conceptions of teaching (Trigwell and Prosser); theories of action (Argyris &amp; Schöen); conceptual change (Posner); social change (Lewin) and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ho created a multi-stage evaluation, in order to map participants’ development over a two year period. The evaluation investigated the FUT program at three levels: The impact on the conceptions of teaching of the participants;</td>
<td>Outcomes for this study include: Conceptual change in two thirds of the participants on the program for new academic staff. All these participants changed their teaching practices in the following academic year. For one half of the teachers who changed conceptions, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sword (2008)</td>
<td>ILLUSTRATIVE CASE – Tertiary context Framework Contexts This longitudinal archive approach to the collection, management, interpretation and application of an array of materials to document the impact of an early career development program in learning and teaching, has the potential to assemble evidence across all of the three contexts: primary, secondary and tertiary; of the FUT evaluation framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sword uses an archaeological metaphor, with a request “to consider archives not as repositories of precious artefacts and historical truths but as messy excavation sites where meaning resides in the very process of getting our hands dirty.” (Sword 2008:94)

“How can we evaluate the long-term effects of such a complex teaching situation except through dialogical narrative, attention to verbal nuance, and, significantly, the gathering of longitudinal data? ... only by assembling a “messy” archive – one that deliberately captures dissenting voices and apparently contradictory data – can we later tell stories that will capture the frustrating yet fertile messiness of higher education research and teaching.” (Sword, 2008:94)

Extension of this approach from the post-graduate program to the FUT program context will enable to collection over time of evidence to capture the impact of the FUT program on participants in their context, immediately and over the subsequent early years of the teaching careers.

Teaching, research and professional service.

Tools:
- Longitudinal archiving approach

One of the key evaluation questions that Sword (2008) intends to begin answering with this approach is: How do we measure the long-term effects of academic development initiatives on the quality of our colleagues’ teaching and their students’ learning?

A longitudinal archive, houses a body of materials (in this case, electronic as well as physical) that have been collected with the express purpose of documenting institutional change over a relatively long period of time. It functions as a kind of meta-portfolio, allowing its creators and curators to assess the progress and achievement of multiple teachers and students, and indeed of entire academic program

Sword reports that the teaching team have begun systematically collecting and preserving an array of materials related to the Certificate in Academic Practice, including:
- Curriculum development notes, administrative records, syllabi, evaluation feedback, transcripts of on-line discussions and copies of student assignments and final projects, with names, grades and comments removed.
- They intend inviting Alumni of the program:
  - to contribute new artefacts to the archive: updated copies of their teaching portfolios, materials relating to innovative course developments, reflective accounts of academic citizenship initiatives in which they have taken part, and so forth;
  - to fill out a questionnaire and/or take part in
| 4 | Ginns, Kitay and Prosser (2008) | **Secondary context**  
**Impact evaluation (local)**  
**Primary context**  
**Formative evaluation of learning process**  
**Summative evaluation of learning outcomes**  
This study illustrates how two phenomenographic frameworks for understanding the variation in teachers’ conceptions (of teaching, and the scholarship of teaching) can support investigation of the | University of Sydney  
FUT program (3 days) articulates into first unit of the post graduate certificate course (1yr part-time)  
**Tools**  
- Graduate interviews (14)  
- Phenomenographic study of participants’ experiences of teaching and scholarship of teaching  
The goal of the study was to investigate the changes in teachers’ experiences as a result of the Graduate Certificate in Educational Studies (Higher Education) | a structured interview in which they will reflect on how (or if) the program has influenced their subsequent academic careers (at completion of the course and then subsequently, every two or three years)  
Sword raises and discusses a number of issues for consideration such as, the administrative workload required for general management and annual stocktake. She also raises ethical considerations including sustaining the anonymity of submissions; differential power relationships connected to requests for submissions, as well as the question of the so-called “Hawthorne effect”, whereby the subjects of a study alter their behaviours because they know they are under observation; and/or the “Pygmalion effect”, whereby students unconsciously live up to their teachers’ expectations. For each of these issues she also presents useful ‘a silver lining’ teaching application for participants and teachers of current and future programs that enable dialogue and learning about each issue. |
The impact of their GCES professional training program for teachers in higher education. The graduate interviews provided evidence from the primary and secondary contexts of the FUT evaluation framework.

Two limitations of the study are identified by the researchers. Firstly, that the use of a longitudinal design incorporating pre- and post-GCES interviews, would have been a more effective method than using recall by participants, to improve confidence in ascribing differences pre- and post-GCES to what had been learnt in the program. (See Ho et al (2001) above, for relevant example of an effective longitudinal research design.)

Second, the evidence is drawn entirely from self-reports of alumni. Complementary sources of evidence would enrich future investigation.

The key questions for the experience of teaching were:

1) Thinking back prior to doing the GCES, how would you describe your teaching? (Prior conception)

2) How has the GCES affected how you understand teaching? (Post conception)

To interpret interviewee’s descriptions of changes in their experiences of teaching and the scholarship of teaching, the researchers used phenomenographic frameworks Prosser, Martin, Trigwell, Ramsden, & Lueckenhausen (2005) and Trigwell, Martin, Benjamin and Prosser (2000).

The stated theoretical basis of the course: Emphasis is on improving student learning rather than on instructional methods. The course aims to provide opportunities to reflect on educational theory and student learning research from the perspective of their own teaching experiences through the scholarship of teaching and learning. The GCES is intended not only to enhance the teaching of individual academics but also as a strategic means of improving teaching at the institutional level.

Outcomes
The researchers were looking for the development of more complex understandings of teaching and the scholarship of teaching. Prior to the GCES none of the interviewees experienced teaching in a student focused way, whereas following the GCES, nine (of 14) reported being student focused in their teaching, with four still employing teacher focused student activity. Likewise, prior to the GCES only four interviewees had any notion of the scholarship of teaching, primarily viewing it as simply collecting and reading pertinent research literature, whereas following the program, nine
respondents reported at least some scholarship of teaching activities. The researchers suggest that these results indicate that the GCES is meeting its broad learning objectives, which are ultimately aimed at improving student learning.

Two major implications:

1) There is likely to be substantial variation in the conceptions of teaching and scholarship held by staff entering these types of post graduate programs – these phenomenographic frameworks applied in this study may prove a useful tool to academic developers in seeking to understand these variations.

2) The importance of collegial networks in supporting and reinforcing the lessons learnt in the GCES. Successful transfer of learning is a function of both individual and organizational factors, and they underscore the need for participation in university teaching programs to be supported by senior managers and peers, both during the program (e.g. through teaching release) and afterwards (e.g. through opportunities to experiment with non-traditional, student-focused teaching and assessment methods.)

| 5 | Pickering (2006) | This evaluation design has the capacity to collect evidence across all elements of the Primary context and Secondary context of the FUT evaluation framework. Documenting further information about the novice teachers’ experiences and activities in their school and faculty would seem possible from the description of the methods given in this study. Future interview protocols then, might be modified explicitly to collect evidence in the University of Brighton: Case studies of four novice teachers for one academic year (1st or 2nd yr of teaching), participating in an in-house development program requiring fortnightly seminars and action learning sets.

Theoretical basis of study (Pickering 2006:321) Research suggests that pedagogic beliefs and conceptions of teaching are strongly held (Ho, 1998, 2000; Leuddeke, 2003) and resistant to influences |
**secondary context** of the FUT evaluation framework and triangulated using other stakeholders in that context such as, teaching team members, colleagues, supervisors and students.

**Aside:** A valuable comment from the researcher worth a minute of consideration in evaluation design. This is a clear example of one way of building evaluation, by design, into the learning experiences of the participant and the FUT teacher. Pickering (2006:332) comments:

> “When considering the effect of my research study the informants commented on the usefulness of the process of watching a video of themselves teaching their own classes, and of reflecting on the video with a colleague (in this case myself). They found such collaborative reflection to be more authentic (and collegial) than the experience of writing a reflective diary, and that they could be more critical of themselves than others (for example, peer observers). The informants felt that they could learn more from watching themselves on video than being peer observed, and were forced (through collaborative reflection) to notice (Mason, 2002).”


for change within a development program (Bowden, 1989; Martin & Ramsden, 1992; Trigwell, 1995; Hannon, 2001), and also that the workplace is a complex and multidimensional context for professional learning. In the light of these issues, I aimed to examine lecturers’ learning about teaching (in this case novice lecturers) and sought to explore the change process, specifically internal influences for change (including beliefs and conceptions of teaching) and external influences for change (workplace dimensions, including participation on a development program).

**Tools**

Data was gathered in three phases at the beginning, middle and end of the academic year:
- interviews (semi-structured and loosely-structured)
- observation of teaching
- stimulated recall interviews based on videoed teaching events
- Reflective commentaries written by the lecturers at end of the year

**Outcomes**

Findings from the study (Pickering 2006:323)

The lecturers’ front-stage activities (Goffman, 1969) as I was able to observe them, did not appear to change to any significant extent throughout the course of the academic year. I refer here to practices which come under the umbrella of university teaching, such as the management of students in lectures and seminars, decisions about the content of teaching, handling questions, the use of resources and handouts, assessment of learning. I found that the informants had a number of core beliefs and that these did not appear to shift substantially during the study. However, aspects of
day-to-day experience appeared to disturb these beliefs, producing uncertainties (‘tensions’) between beliefs, and as a result the lecturers’ pedagogic perspectives, that is their sense of what was possible, plausible and desirable, were adjusted. The term pedagogic perspective (Becker et al., 1961) was used to capture this dialogue between an individual practitioner’s beliefs and their experiences.

Two final end words by Pickering, from her experiences:
- It is clear that teaching development programs had the potential to influence pedagogic practices and student learning; and
- There is a need to systematize alternative sites for change (outside of the formal development program) and to embrace the notion that change in pedagogic practices should not be seen as the defining factor of pedagogic progress.

Postareff et al. (2007) This study could easily generate evidence from across two contexts of the FUT evaluation framework. It explicitly yields evidence from:

**Primary context**

1. **Curriculum analysis**
2. **Formative monitoring of the learning and teaching environment within the foundations subject**
3. **Formative monitoring of the learning process**
4. **Summative evaluation of learning outcomes**

University of Helsinki, 200 University teachers

Course context:

“2004–2006, University of Helsinki, 2003) highlights, that every new teacher should have the possibility to participate in an introductory seminar on university teaching in order to improve teachers’ pedagogical thinking and skills. However, the training is voluntary. An essential aim of the teacher training at the University of Helsinki is to enhance a shift from a teacher-centred approach towards a more student-
Secondary context
1 Impact evaluation (local)

Evaluation study aims:
“The present study aims at exploring whether teacher training at the University of Helsinki is effective in its aims; scales measuring approaches to teaching and, in addition to these, teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs are examined by comparing four groups of teachers who differ from each other in terms of pedagogical training they have completed. Furthermore, the effect of teaching experience is examined in order to find out the unique effect of pedagogical training on each scale.” (p558)

Caveat
“In this study, results do not imply a change within a group of teachers, but differences between different groups.” (p568)

Comparison of this work with other published studies would venture into impact assessment in the Tertiary Context of the framework.


centred approach to teaching.” (p558)

“The short courses on learning and instruction in higher education (10–12 ECTS) organised by three development units, may be considered as the basic teacher-training courses, which aim to give teachers the basic skills to plan, instruct and assess teaching and learning in their courses. These basic courses focus on general theoretical principles of learning and instruction. The aim is to help university teachers become aware of and capable of using student-centred ways of teaching. These courses last approximately from 4 to 6 months.” (p562)

Tools and strategies

• Four groups
  “To analyse the effect of teaching experience on approaches to teaching and on self-efficacy beliefs, the teachers were divided into four groups depending on the amount of teaching experience they had: Forty-one teachers had no more than 2 years of teaching experience (Group A), 65 teachers had teaching experience from 3 to 7 years (Group B), 35 teachers had from 8 to 12 years of teaching experience (Group C) and the rest, 52 teachers, had teaching experience 13 years or more (Group D).” (p563)

• Questionnaire sent to four groups of teachers
  “The Inventory used in this study consists of two parts: The Approaches to Teaching Inventory (ATI), designed by Keith Trigwell and Michael Prosser (see, for example, Prosser & Trigwell, 1999; Trigwell & Prosser, 2004, 1996a), composed of 16 items, of which eight items measure the Conceptual Change / Student Focused approach to teaching (CCSF) and the other eight items are designed to measure Information Transmission /
Teacher Focused (ITTF) approach to teaching. (p562)
The second new part of the inventory is designed by Keith Trigwell, Paul Ashwin, and Sari Lindblom-Yla‘nne. The aim is to explore teachers’ motivational aspects to teaching and regulation strategies they use. From the second part, a four-item scale measuring self-efficacy was analysed in this study. Self-efficacy scale is adapted for teaching from Pintrich and colleagues’ (Pintrich, Smith, & McKeachie, 1989) motivation model for learning (see e.g., Trigwell et al., 2004). (p563)

- 75 subsequent volunteer interviews with 23 included in the study
‘A central focus of the semi-structured interviews was on teachers’ experiences of the effect of pedagogical training on their teaching. The teachers were asked how they felt about the pedagogical training and what effect it had on their teaching”. (p563)

Outcomes:
“The results of this study imply that approaches to teaching and self-efficacy beliefs change slowly. It takes at least a 1 year long training process until positive effects emerge. In fact, shorter training seems to make teachers more uncertain about themselves as teachers.” (p569)

“On the basis of the results of this study teachers should be encouraged to continue their studies after the first 10–12 ECTS course in order to increase their student-centeredness and finally to improve students’ learning.” (p570)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Stefani and Elton (2002)</td>
<td>This an example of an evaluation approach aligned with their course philosophies. (see also Bamber 2008:110) The course was distance based and aimed to convince teachers that university teaching was a problematic and researchable activity, and that a reflective, problem-based learning approach could aid development (Stefani &amp; Elton, 2002, p. 118). The evaluation approach, in concert with course philosophies, used a case study approach to reflect on the course experience, triangulated with evidence from three external evaluations of case study information on the course. This study could easily generate evidence from across the <strong>three contexts of the FUT evaluation framework</strong>. It explicitly yields evidence from: <strong>Primary context</strong> 1 Curriculum analysis 2 Formative monitoring of the learning and teaching environment within the foundations subject 3 Formative monitoring of the learning process 4 Summative evaluation of learning outcomes <strong>Secondary context</strong> 1 Impact evaluation (local) But with further documentation of the Directors comment that the program had been adopted elsewhere, the <strong>impact within the tertiary context</strong> could be evidenced more strongly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Stes et al.</td>
<td>This project pursued evidence across the <strong>Course context:</strong> The course: A Diploma in Higher Education Research and Development (Dip HERD) at the University College of London that was offered in distance mode. The theoretical basis of the course: The following principles, which formed the basis of the course design, had been formulated as appropriate for a course in the CPD of academic teachers. They were: Experiential, i.e. it must be based on self-assessment of on-going practice (Boud <em>et al.</em>, 1993) Problem-based, i.e. grow out of self-formulated problems in on-going practice (Boud &amp; Feletti, 1991) Research-based, i.e. the problems should be tackled in the main through action research (Elliott, 1993) Open, since self-initiated learning must be autonomous and hence not prescribed by others (Cowan, 1988, particularly p. 84) At a distance, since learning must occur at the learner’s place (Elton, 1991). <strong>Tools:</strong> Case study from one course participant Questionnaire sent to all course participants (4 participants, 10 questions) Three external evaluations: Summary of the Report of the College Internal Quality Audit (IQA) Summary of the External Examiner Report on the performance by the first three course participants Comment from the Report of the SEDA Re-accreditation Team Comments from the course director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Secondary context of the framework, including extension into the teaching and learning environment of the participants’ school or faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td><strong>Secondary</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>1 Impact evaluation (local)</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>2 Formative monitoring of the teaching environment</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;This study set out to investigate whether the short-term effect of a training program still continued 2 years later. The researchers developed a written questionnaire with open questions. Qualitative analysis of the participants’ self-reported data did reveal a long-term impact dependent upon contextual aspects, where colleagues and students were crucial.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;The researchers suggest future research on the impact of staff development that includes interviews and observations of faculty members in their particular contexts involving their students: triangulation of evidence collection such as this would enrich secondary context evidence and certainly counter the primary limitations (that they acknowledge) of this study (47% response rate of self-reported data only). They suggest extensive case studies might be used to analyse faculty members’ teaching practice and their teaching context before they enter the program and 2 years after completion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice faculty training course, University of Antwerp Belgium. 1 year program (half day per week), two cohorts (30 participants total, 14 responses.)&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Theoretical basis of the course&lt;br&gt;The aim of the program was to make teaching practice more professional and better geared to student-centred education and&lt;br&gt;- promoted reflection on teaching and learning&lt;br&gt;- development of both competencies and conceptions&lt;br&gt;- targeted participants’ learning and participants’ behavioural change&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;This study’s intent:&lt;br&gt;Both the individual and institutional impact of training was investigated in this study. The researchers hypothesis (p103):&lt;br&gt;- if there is a (strong) positive impact in terms of individual changes, participants will also be able and prepared to contribute to creating a new organisational teaching culture&lt;br&gt;- They also investigated which aspects of the environment participants indicated as hindering or promoting (long-term) change.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;The research questions in this study were (p103):&lt;br&gt;- Does the 1-year training program for beginning faculty members have a long-term impact?&lt;br&gt;- What is the relationship between the individual impact (in terms of changes in teaching behaviour and instructional conceptions) and the institutional impact (in terms of involvement in teaching at the organisational level)?&lt;br&gt;- Which factors—according to the participants— influence the long-term impact of the training program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Related previous study immediately after completion of the Training program:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- written questionnaire with open questions
- Given to participants 2 to 2.5 years after course completion

**Outcomes (p106)**
- Two years after finishing the training there is still an impact. All respondents indicate at least a limited behavioural change.
- The relationship between institutional impact and the strength of the individual impact is not unequivocally affirmed by the data. Participants reporting a strong individual change do report institutional change, but five of the nine participants who were not so deeply influenced by the training at an individual level also report institutional impact.
- No clear connection can be observed between the nature and extent of the impact and the nature of the factors perceived as influencing this impact.
Appendix 4 Literature case studies for annotation in the next stage of project

**Table 1: Map of other selected published studies against the three contexts of the FUT Evaluation Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Literature / relevant publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Primary** | Bell, M. (2001)  
Diezmann, C.M., & Watters, J.J. (2006)  
Quinn, L. (2003)  
| **Secondary** | Bell, M. (2001)  
Diezmann, C.M., & Watters, J.J. (2006)  
Quinn, L. (2003)  
Diezmann, C.M., & Watters, J.J. (2006)  
Quinn, L. (2003)  
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New lecturer development programs: a case study of Scottish higher education institutions
Veronica Bamber a*, Lorraine Walsh b, Charles Juwah c and David Ross d
aHeriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK; bUniversity of Dundee, UK; cThe Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen, UK; dUniversity of Paisley, Paisley, UK
Teacher Development. 2006, 10(2), 207–231.

This article examines key issues in lecturer development programs (LDPs) in Scottish higher education institutions, within the context of the national standards established recently for those who teach in United Kingdom higher education (HE). Many of the LDPs were developed in response to the Dearing Committee recommendations that university lecturers should receive training in teaching and
learning and that this should be delivered through accredited programs. The article presents four different program models that emerged within the sector in terms of program structure and delivery, participant support and institutional factors, and explains the wide variety of provision in terms of cultural factors and the nature of the national framework for HE teacher development. The article will be of interest to those who are involved in the policy and practice of lecturer development, in the challenges posed in the implementation of LDPs and the future of such initiatives. Although the research was carried out in Scotland, consultation with educational developers in England revealed similar trends there. Given similar lecturer development initiatives in other countries (e.g. Sweden, Norway and Australia), the application of the research goes beyond the geographical area described.

**Supported reflective practice: a program of peer observation and feedback for academic teaching development**

Maureen Bell, University of Wollongong, Australia

The outcomes of the evaluation of a structured, peer-supported teaching development program for academic staff are reported. Supported reflective practice forms the conceptual framework for the program, which includes feedback on observed teaching and feedback. Key themes identified are the effectiveness of the supported reflective practice process, improvements to teaching practice, developing confidence and congruent espoused theory and theory-in-use, ongoing professional development and developing collegiality. Factors that facilitate the program are explored, including the support triangle, the role of the educational developer in providing feedback and monitoring, and the role of the support colleague. Suggestions for implementation of similar programs are offered.

**Academic development for knowledge capabilities: Learning, reflecting and developing**

Shirley Booth and Elsie Anderberg, Lund University Sweden.

In this paper we look backwards to educational development principles and practices as implemented in the 1990s at Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden, and forward to ideal principles and practices for the design of courses for teachers in higher education. The bridge between the two lies partly in an evaluation study, which we will describe, and partly in the theoretical work of John Bowden on knowledge capabilities for learning for an unknown future. The underlying framework depends on phenomenography, with its theoretical emphasis on learning as becoming able to discern the whole from its background, and how the constituents of the whole relate to one another and to the whole, and its empirical emphasis on qualitative variation in the ways in which students understand, conceptualize or experience phenomena they meet in their studies. A PET model and a PET process are described, relating Practice, Experience and Theory through reflective problematization.

**Planning an Evaluation and Estimating Its Cost**

Josefina J. Card, Catherine Greeno and James L. Peterson
Evaluation & the Health Professions, Vol. 15, No. 1, 75-89 (1992)
Scientific evaluations can provide funders and program administrators with useful input concerning where to allocate scarce service dollars. But evaluation itself is legitimately the subject of cost concerns. What will it cost to get the various potential benefits of a scientific evaluation? What are the evaluation options of a given program, given its budget and the size and expertise of its staff? Where can a program administrator go for consulting help? This article provides a helpful framework for answering these important questions. First, it describes two types of evaluations which vary in both the questions they can answer and in their consequent cost. Second, it delineates and briefly describes the technical elements or steps required by each evaluation type. Third, it describes the nature and potential variability of costs associated with each technical step. Finally, it steers the reader to available sources of expert information and help.

**Structuring Reflection as a Tool in Qualitative Evaluation**

*Carmel M Diezmann* and *James J Watters*, Queensland University of Technology


Full papers from this conference at:


Reflective practice is an approach widely adopted by professionals in evaluating their practices. It has been used at all levels of education in particular to judge the quality of teaching. Reflective practice involves teachers’ examination of the efficacy of their practices. Various broad processes have been advocated by researchers including reflection-in-action, reflection-on-action and reflection-about action which focus attention on the present, past and future of activities respectively. However, concern has been expressed that practitioners have difficulty stepping out of their pre-existing mind sets to challenge pre-conceived beliefs and to seek evidence that affirms or refutes the assumptions underpinning their practice. In this paper, we undertake “market research” on reflection as a cognitive tool. We identify four features of reflection as a tool: components of reflection, scope of reflection, types of reflection, and reflection through writing. We “test drive” and demonstrate the efficacy of this model by applying it to a Graduate Certificate (Higher Education) course. The features of the tool variously contributed to a better understanding of the course. A focus on features of reflection provides a necessary structure and specificity to guide reflective practice in higher education.

**Exploring lecturers’ self-perception of change in teaching practice**

*Roisin Donnelly*† Dublin Institute of Technology, Ireland

*Teaching in Higher Education* Vol. 11, No. 2, April 2006, pp. 203–217

The principal aim of this study is to explore the self-perception of change in teaching practice by lecturers who have graduated from the Postgraduate Certificate in Third Level Learning and Teaching Course over a period extending from 2000–2003. A qualitative questionnaire was distributed to the 45 successful graduates of the course to establish the difference that the course has made on these lecturers’ professional practice as a result of the course they completed. For this study, 25 lecturers returned completed questionnaires; all indicated that change had taken made in their teaching practice, and a number of alterations
had taken place. Some of these claims lacked evidence and others provided evidence to support it. The most significant changes identified were increased reflection on current teaching practice, the introduction of new teaching strategies, increased focus on the design and delivery of classes, more work taking place on course teams, an increase in confidence about learning and teaching and a more student-centred approach taken to teaching.

The impact of a teaching in higher education scheme on new lecturer’s personal epistemologies and approaches to teaching.


14th Improving Student Learning (Through Teaching) Symposium, University of Bath, 4-6 September 2006

Gibbs et al (2004) have conducted research showing that students with teachers who have undergone a systematic scheme of training into effective teaching and learning report better learning experiences and outcomes than those who are taught by non-trained teachers. Williams & Burden (1997) said “Teachers’ beliefs about what learning is will affect everything they do in the classroom, whether these beliefs are implicit or explicit” (p56). Kember (1997) and Trigwell et al (1999) have found that the way teachers approach their teaching influences the learning outcomes of the students, with the approach adopted by the teacher being dependent on their beliefs and presumptions (Bain, 2000; Quinlan, 1999). These epistemological beliefs also exert a strong influence on teachers’ chosen method of teaching (Breen, 1999), and the values and emphasis placed on curriculum and assessment issues (Braxton, 1995; Smart & Ethington, 1995). Therefore in order to change how people teach we have to change the way they conceive teaching and learning (Trigwell, 1995; Trigwell & Prosser, 1996).

University of Wales, Bangor (UWB) runs a scheme that aims to introduce participants to theories and models of learning and effective teaching methods, whilst examining how this knowledge is transferred to a teaching context. It is delivered using discussions of personal beliefs in conjunction with current understanding of teaching and learning in HE. This research questions what is changing in both the attitudes and practices of the teachers who attend the UWB scheme and the impact it has on the students.

This study used the Discipline Focus Epistemological Beliefs Questionnaire (adapted for teachers in HE) (Hoffer) and the Approaches to Teaching Inventory (Trigwell & Prosser) to gain a baseline view of initial beliefs and attitudes at the commencement of the scheme. These questionnaires were then re-administered at the end of the induction course. The data was analysed to look for relationships between beliefs and approaches to teaching as well as changes over time. Students were also traced in a series of modules, testing them at the beginning and end for their beliefs about the module – Discipline Focus Epistemological Beliefs Questionnaire, and their Approach to Study – RASI (Entwistle & Ramsden). This data was analysed to examine the relationship and effect of the teachers’ beliefs and approach to teaching on the students’ approaches to study. Initial findings show changes in teachers’ beliefs as a consequence of attending the scheme. There were also relationships between beliefs and practices (approach to teaching). These different practices have been shown to have a significant effect on the students’ approaches to learning. Further results for this study are in the process of being analysed for discussion in the full paper.
A Theoretical Framework for Professional Development in a South African University
Lynn Quinn* Rhodes University, South Africa
International Journal for Academic Development Vol. 8, No. 1/2, May/November 2003, pp. 61–75

The changing context of higher education both internationally and in South Africa has presented challenges to lecturers that have led in some institutions to the introduction of accredited professional development courses for academics. Such courses for university lecturers are relatively new in South Africa. This paper reports on research in progress on a Post Graduate Certificate in Higher Education and Training course offered at Rhodes University in South Africa. It highlights some important questions that have arisen on the ways in which the theoretical framework of the course has or has not met the needs of diverse groups of lecturers within the specific South African context. A central theme of the course is that of the critically reflective practitioner. Lecturers are encouraged to explore the ontological and epistemological underpinnings of their disciplines and to examine the philosophical assumptions of their espoused theories about teaching and learning as well as their teaching practice. The theoretical framework has been found to be most successful for more experienced academics. However, the author raises some important questions regarding the suitability of this framework in relation to the specific post-apartheid context in which the course operates, specifically whether the course prepares lecturers to open up both “actual” and “epistemological” access to all the students at the university.

Reflection on Practice: collaborative action research for new academics
David Staniforth, University of Sheffield, United Kingdom and Tony Harland, University of Otago, New Zealand
Educational Action Research, Volume 11, Number 1, 2003, 79-91

This article examines the experiences of recently appointed academics at two universities, one in the United Kingdom and the other in New Zealand. The groups at each university used collaborative action research methods during an academic year to support their transition. Our study looks at the outcomes of the project and reports on the experiences of establishing an academic career. These experiences are characterised by continually having to rise to new challenges such as getting research programs under way, dealing with lecture preparation and high teaching loads. New starters reported problems associated with academic identity, lack of support and exploitation. We review our attempts to use collaborative action research to support professional development. In providing a safe community away from departments, we hoped that individuals would systematically enquire into their own practice. The group also served to provide an audience for the publication of this form of research, and as a critical community for contesting ideas and action.

Compulsory Higher Education Teacher Training: Joined-up policies, institutional architectures and enhancement cultures
Paul Trowler A* and Roni Bamber b a Lancaster University, UK; b Heriot Watt University, UK
A number of countries, including Sweden and the UK, are considering the introduction of compulsory teacher training for higher education (HE) lecturers. This paper assesses whether such a policy is likely to achieve its aims, and the issues that may arise as the policy is implemented. The paper draws on experience with this policy in Norway, empirical research from relevant studies, and on social practice theory to illuminate the processes involved and identify prospects and pitfalls. The paper concludes that while compulsory higher education teacher training may achieve some of its goals, as a standalone policy it is unlikely to achieve them all. Higher education institutions and their staff are involved in multiple games, with competing goals and different rules. Meanwhile higher education policy-making often lacks coherence, with contradictory outcomes in different areas of policy. If policy-makers at all levels are serious about the enhancements to teaching and learning that compulsory training is designed to achieve the policy must be prioritized, properly resourced, and measures taken to develop a hospitable environment for it both structurally and culturally. The paper concludes with some specific proposals to aid educational developers in implementing such policies.
Appendix 5 Interview Questions for the Current Evaluation Practice Survey

Opening paragraphs read before interview:

“Hi I’m ............... and I am a research assistant to the group examining evaluation in the ALTC project preparing academics for teaching in higher education. We are currently interviewing those involved in Foundations Programs about how they evaluate these programs. We got your name from the Foundations Colloquium in Townsville last year. Are you the person I should be speaking to? Could I have a moment of your time, whether now or later, to discuss this with you?

Additional info if they ask about the project:

The project is about academic Learning and Teaching programs (Foundations Programs) at universities across Australia. Our group is examining the evaluation and impact of such programs of staff, the curriculum, the institution and the impact of all this nationally and internationally. We are seeking feedback on how people who run these programs evaluate them, and we are looking for strategies, tools and information to share with others. We are also looking for exemplars of good practice on such things.”

1. What is the context of your foundations program?

2. Do you evaluate your foundations program? Y/N

3. How do you evaluate your program? What type of instruments do you use?
   • survey
   • interviews
   • focus groups
   • reflective processes/journals
   • anecdotal
   • open-ended response papers e.g. 1 minute paper

4. When do you evaluate your program?

5. What does your evaluation actually evaluate?
   • program content
   • environment/food
   • learning process/delivery
   • outcomes

6. Do you reflect yourself on how the program went?

7. Do you document your reflection?
8. Do you change anything as a result of your reflections and/or evaluations?

9. Do you follow up after the program? When?

10. How do you follow up? What does the staff member have to do?

11. Does the school/faculty follow up?

12. Is there a cost benefit analysis done for the FUT program?

13. Do you benchmark your program with others inside the university or outside?

14. Do you collaborate with others or adopt aspects from other programs?

15. What do you understand by impact evaluation?

16. Do you evaluate for impact on the individual, school/faculty, university, sector?

**The following paragraphs were to be read as the interview closed:**

“We are trying to find evidence of best practice, to share with others, as part of this we are asking if anyone has any evaluation or impact evaluation instruments that we could share and have a copy of. If you do, could you acknowledge yourself on the instrument to demonstrate I.P. Could you also acknowledge whether adaptation of this instrument is ok?

We are also looking for some case studies to put into the publication on evaluation and impact evaluation of FUT programs. Do you have any additional information or stories that could help or add to our study? Is it convenient to discuss this now or would another time be better?

Thank you for your time. Would you like feedback on this interview and report? Would you prefer to wait for the publication or I can email you some information?”
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