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Background:
This sub-project, considering ‘Models’ of Foundations programs, is one of five inter-related sub-projects scoping different approaches to preparation of academics for teaching in the Higher Education sector in Australia. This specific project aimed to identify different models of Foundations programs, and to describe features of these models, particularly in terms of what made them both effective and efficient in terms of meeting their goals.

Once constituent elements of a framework to describe models of Foundations programs were identified, this sub-project sought to describe a range of typical models of Foundations programs and establish, with the assistance of a stakeholder group, which model/s is/are likely to be most effective and efficient. In the first phase, a research assistant was employed to summarise the existing data with a view to finding characteristics that assisted in developing and describing different models (Brown, Martens & Calma, 2009). From this work, the project team developed an overarching visual representation to identify key elements of different models. This is reproduced below:

![Diagram showing elements of a model for Foundations programs]

Figure 1: Elements of a model for Foundations programs.
The second phase of the ‘Models’ project collected case studies of good practice from across the Australian Higher Education sector, in order to illustrate the range of models that are currently utilised. A case study approach was chosen to enable the constituent elements identified in the framework to be explored in context. The collected case studies then formed the focus of a roundtable discussion, held with a representative stakeholder group from across the sector with respect to elements of Foundations programs that would contribute to effectiveness and efficiency.

**Introduction:**

In the past decade, increasing emphasis has been placed on the quality of teaching and learning in the Higher Education (HE) sector (Ramsden, 2003). This is reflected in a number of ways: there is a growing body of literature concerning pedagogy in HE, an increasing emphasis on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning; targeted funding to reward good teaching in universities (eg the Learning and Teaching Performance Fund); specific funding of teaching related research (through the Australian Learning and Teaching council [ALTC]) as well as institutional initiatives such as the appointments of Pro Vice-Chancellors and Deputy Vice-Chancellors with responsibility for Teaching and Learning, Teaching and Learning committees and the growth of Graduate Certificates in University Learning and Teaching.

An important link for academic staff is the provision of a strong Foundations program that introduces them not only to the area learning and teaching in HE but the support that is available to them as they progress through their academic teaching career. The Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development (CADAD) recognised that there would be benefits in a sector-wide consideration of Foundations programs, with the resultant opportunities for sharing of practice, enhancement of existing programs and benchmarking between institutions. This formed the basis of a successful ALTC grant to examine the preparation for academics teaching in higher education (the PATHE project). The methodology employed in the overarching project was to workshop smaller sub-projects that would be undertaken by small teams with cross-institutional membership. This report relates to one of those sub-projects, led by UTAS, with representatives from the University of Canberra and Flinders University. This project is looking at models of Foundations programs.

A review of the literature, and major survey of Foundations programs within the Australian Higher Education sector has been undertaken as part of the overarching PATHE project (Gannaway, Goody, Hicks, O’Brien, Smigiel & Wilson, 2007). From this literature review (Luzeckyj & Badger, 2008) and through an analysis of survey data (Goody, 2007), a framework to describe the elements of Foundations programs has been devised by the ‘Models’ sub-project group (Brown, Martens & Calma, 2009). This is reproduced in figure 1. With the identification of a framework in which to situate models of foundations programs, this sub-
project determined that gathering specific case studies of practice was the best way to illustrate each element.

Five case studies have been written to represent the variation found in foundations programs currently offered in Australian Universities. The case studies were chosen to represent good practice models within a range of contexts. These were then used as data for a group of stakeholders, who identified the characteristics that encompass good practice to feed back into the overarching PATHE project.

The ultimate aim of the PATHE project of which this project is part, is to provide an insight into good practice in Foundations programs, and to provide a resource, through a PATHE website and written report. This resource is designed to assist academic development units when planning, implementing and evaluating Foundations programs.

**Methodology:**
This phase of the sub-project employed a multi-stage methodology:

- Identification of successful Foundations programs that represented elements of the framework produced in phase 1;
- Writing case studies of good practice from these programs to provide exemplars;
- Utilising case studies to inform a roundtable of stakeholders, who considered responses to three research questions.

A key to the methodology was the use of case studies. This approach was chosen as the models of Foundations programs adopted by institutions across Australia are diverse and contextualised. The case study approach allows for the investigation of the phenomenon of preparing academics to teach in higher education “within its real-life context: when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (Yin, 1984, p23) and therefore “has the potential to give an insight into the context of a problem as well as illustrating the main point” (Fry, Ketteridge and Marshall, 1999, p.46).

**Identification of programs for case studies**
It was desirable that Foundations programs selected for case studies should be representative of different features of the elements of the model (figure 1). Specifically, the following features were identified as being important to include, recognising that individual cases may meet more than one of these:
- A program offered in a multi-campus university
- Representatives of both fully on-line and face to face delivery
- Representatives of programs that articulate into, and stand alone from, a Graduate Certificate
- Representatives of programs that are mandated and voluntary
- Representatives of programs that are formally assessed and assessed by attendance
As the PATHE project was initiated through the CADAD network, this network was used to identify institutions that were offering Foundations programs that would illustrate these features. It was a conscious decision not to use cases from the three universities represented by the project team, and where possible, avoid universities that had previously provided cases to other PATHE sub-projects. Eight universities were subsequently contacted, with five agreeing to participate in the case study stage. Each of the participating institutions nominated a contact or contacts and these colleagues were invited by a member of the sub-project team to take part in an interview.

Writing case studies of good practice
Nominated staff were contacted and interviewed by members of the sub-project team (Brown, Donnan and Maddox) and interviewed according to the interview schedule (Appendix 1). From the interview data, de-identified case studies were constructed using the pre-determined pro-forma. The pro-forma included a synopsis of the case, and then outlined the context prior to addressing each of the elements in the framework – delivery, policy curriculum and philosophical approach. The pro-forma also included a short summary of how the program was evaluated for effectiveness, and the best features and challenges of the program according to the interviewee. The case studies were subsequently returned to the interviewees for any corrections/clarifications and final approval.

Stakeholder roundtable
A group of ten stakeholders from the Higher Education sector were invited to give a commentary on the case studies in a roundtable held in Hobart in June. The attendees at the roundtable were purposefully selected to enable a range of stakeholder views to be represented in the consideration of the case studies, and more broadly in what contributes to the effectiveness and efficiency of foundation programs.

The make-up of the stakeholder group was:

- Senior Teaching and Learning Leader (Pro-Vice Chancellor)
- Senior Academic Developer (Drawn from CADAD group)
- Head of School (and ALTC Teaching Excellence Award winner)
- Academic staff member who recently completed a Foundations program
- Discipline-based academic staff member who contributes to a foundations program
- Foundations coordinator
- Contract staff member who has recently completed a Foundations program
- Sessional staff/PhD student who has recently completed a Foundations program
- Student representative (immediate past Student Union president)
- Prime Minister’s Award winner for Teaching and Learning

The four members of the sub-project team also attended the roundtable.
Prior to attending the roundtable, stakeholders and the sub-project team received a summary of the project, the model with explanation and a copy of the five de-identified case studies. Upon arrival, they were briefed on the purpose of the PATHE project by A/Prof Heather Smigiel (PATHE project leader) and the sub-project by Dr Natalie Brown. They also had the opportunity to introduce themselves to the group, and their particular background/expertise that led them to be part of the group was disclosed.

The stakeholders’ roundtable was constructed so that participants engaged in three successive activities aimed at drawing out specific features of the programs that make them efficient and effective. The data collected from this activity was treated in its entirety (i.e. the views of individual stakeholders have not been considered separately) consistent with a shared values methodology (SVM) (Brown, unpublished).

The first activity aimed to develop a shared understanding of underpinning purposes of Foundations programs. The stakeholders and sub-project team were assigned to four groups of 3-4 participants. The groups were asked to discuss the possible range of purposes for Foundations programs, and in doing so were asked to draw on their own context and experiences and bring these to the table for consideration of the group. At the conclusion of the discussion, groups were asked to decide upon four underpinning purposes that could be reported to the whole group. A key to SVM is that any submission being put forward needs to be agreed upon by the whole group. Groups were also asked to note any areas of dissension.

Once the agreed purposes from each group were shared, groups were then reformed and asked to consider the next two questions using a similar methodology: What elements are critical to ensure that the program achieves the identified purposes?, and How can this be done in an efficient manner?

The second activity required roundtable participants to discuss each of the five case studies in order to prepare for a plenary session in the afternoon. Case studies were examined in order to identify what features contributed to their success, were there any areas of concern, and were there any questions that remained to be answered about the program.

The final activity drew on the agreed purposes, critical elements and requirements for efficiency identified in the first activity. Case studies were reviewed in light of these, in order to address the research questions:

1. What are the characteristics of effective Foundations programs?
2. What makes them effective?
3. What makes them efficient?

This project received ethics approval from the Social Sciences Human Research Ethics committee (UTAS).
Results and Discussion:

**Identification and writing of case studies**

Five case studies were constructed from the interview process outlined in the previous section. These are included as Appendix 2. As intended, these case studies incorporated a diversity of models reflective of the range uncovered in the mapping project completed in 2007 by Alan Goody. The case studies included programs that illustrated fully on-line, fully face to face, and blended delivery; short block-taught and extensive 18 month programs; programs with formal assessment and those with attendance requirements only. The only consistent feature of the programs was their mandatory nature, at least for commencing academic staff of level C and below. A summary of the range of programs chosen, with reference to the framework is now presented.

**Policy**

All Foundations programs chosen as case studies were mandatory for commencing academic staff at level C and below (see Table 1). Indeed, the sub-project team was unable to find an example of an institution where the program was voluntary to include in the cases. This appears to indicate a strong move within the sector to mandate foundations programs as identified by Goody’s mapping report (2007), and suggests an increasing focus on the importance of learning and teaching across the sector as previously reported by Ramsden (2003).

With respect to the involvement of sessional staff, three programs allowed participation providing places were available. In one case, sessional staff were not able to participate, but a different type of program tailored more specifically to their needs was offered. Two other institutions also noted that although sessionals could attend the Foundations program, there were other programs specifically targeted for this group. One case exemplified a policy of mandating Foundations for sessional staff in their second consecutive appointment (although they were unable to attend in their first appointment). It should be noted that, in this case, this policy was supported by the payment of sessional staff to attend the program.

In light of the findings of the recent RED report (Percy et al., 2008), specifically that support for sessional teachers is “still largely ad hoc” and “professional development rare” (p11), the institutions in these case studies appeared to be demonstrating good practice. Even in the case where sessional staff were unable to participate in the formal Foundations program, there was an alternative program available for induction into teaching specifically targeted at sessional staff.

The allocation of time relief for those completing Foundations varied between institutions. It was not provided in the two institutions that delivered short (2.5 or 5 day) intensive programs during semester break. However, when the program was ongoing over 1 or 2 semesters, this was factored into workload. Allocation of time for staff completing the online program, designed to be flexible and fit better with other commitments, varied from school to school. The difficulty for staff, particularly newly appointed academic staff to balance workloads with commitment to a
Foundations program or other professional learning has been well documented (Dearn et al., 2002; Fleming et al., 2004). The cases included in this report have clearly considered this factor, either through the timing and/or delivery pattern of the Foundations program or reduction in workload of the academics. Indeed, a strong motivation for the development of the online delivery program was being able to provide a Foundations program to staff geographically dispersed and whose teaching and other commitments require flexibility.

Table 1: Summary of policy element for case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
<th>Case 4</th>
<th>Case 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probationary requirement for new staff, not available for sessionals staff, time allocation school specific</td>
<td>Mandatory, time relief provided, sessional staff can complete if places available</td>
<td>Mandatory, no time relief, sessional staff may enrol</td>
<td>Mandatory for all new staff up to Level C, no time relief, open to PhD students and sessional staff</td>
<td>Mandatory for full time and sessional staff on their second consecutive contract, time relief provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of reporting, there were no instances where there were formal processes in place for the notification of completions. However, in all cases records were kept and reporting of completions in annual reports against strategic plans or to DVC divisions was routine. One institution notified schools of successful completion. Although, formal assessment did occur in the some cases, others required only completion of tasks or full attendance. All institutions recognised completion via a letter or certificate and these were used as evidence to meet probationary requirements, or in seeking promotion.

**Delivery**
The case studies demonstrated a range of delivery patterns. Four of the five involved primarily face to face delivery, with the fifth fully online (Table 2). Three of the cases (including the online delivery program) incorporated tasks that were completed over the course of a full semester, with in-built flexibility for staff with teaching commitments. Case study four illustrated an intensive program that was delivered in five consecutive days, involving disciplinary based academics as panel members and opportunities to engage in micro-teaching tasks.

Table 2: Summary of policy element for case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery</th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
<th>Case 4</th>
<th>Case 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fully online, one semester duration</td>
<td>Face to face supplemented with independent work over 2-3 semesters</td>
<td>Face to face for 2½ days (and opportunities to make up) over one semester</td>
<td>Face to face for 5 days on main campus, out of semester time</td>
<td>Face to face for 2 days with out of session tasks, one semester duration (online option available)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case study 2 was a much more extensive program than the other cases. This program incorporated three modules completed over two or three semesters. The first module was delivered face to face, while the second and third are able to be tailored to specific contexts (the second involved engaging in peer review with experienced, discipline-based colleagues, the third a negotiated project). The range of delivery patterns exemplified by these cases are representative of similar programs across the international HE sector (Asmar, 2002G; Gibbs & Coffey, 2004; Stes, Clement, & Van Petegem, 2007) and the HE sector in Australia (Dearn et al., 2002; Goody, 2007). It should be noted, however, that there is a trend towards the Foundations program being delivered as a formal unit in a Graduate Certificate program in some Australian universities (Goody, 2007). This model is not represented in the selected cases, however each of the selected programs did articulate in some ways into the Graduate Certificate, through credit points or recognition of prior learning.

With the exception of the online program, all were delivered by an academic development unit. The online program was delivered through a newly formed organisational capabilities unit that incorporated professional learning in teaching and learning, research and areas formerly undertaken by Human Resources.

The importance of academic developers in delivering Foundations courses was exemplified in each of the chosen cases. However, as recognised in the literature, buy-in from faculties and disciplinary colleagues has also been considered in the design of some programs and included either formally or informally. In one case this has been through formation of a panel of colleagues contributing to the delivery of the program, in another the final half day of the program is situated in faculties. Two programs included disciplinary colleagues through a peer observation/review component. The need for new academics to be supported in what they have learnt through Foundations in their departmental setting has been recognised as imperative (Donnelly, 2006; Gibbs & Coffey, 2004), so clearly links made with like-minded disciplinary colleagues are most valuable. Assignment of a departmental mentor has been previously suggested as one way of achieving this (Clark et al., 2002; Mathias, 2005), and the peer review models reflected in two of these cases can be seen as mirroring this practice.

Although the cases were purposefully selected, the features used to inform the selection predominantly took into account context, and the framework elements of delivery and policy. It was more difficult, at the outset of the project to distinguish exemplar cases on the basis of curriculum and philosophical approach, as these elements are not explicitly in the public domain (for example on university web sites).

Curriculum
Despite the differences in delivery and structure, there were many similarities in curriculum content (Table 3). A focus on student-centred learning came through in all the case studies and this included emphasis on engagement and on interactive teaching and learning. All programs, provided opportunities for participants to not only have interactive
teaching modelled to them, but for them to engage in this, through micro-teaching or through sharing and discussing teaching activities. In this way, the selected cases all demonstrated a focus on the learning experience rather than solely on the performance of the teacher. This has been recognised as critically important (Gibbs & Coffey, 2004; Stes, Clement, & Van Petegem, 2007) and reflects a move away from providing ‘tips and tricks’ of teaching (Dearn et al., 2002; Rust, 2000). Curriculum design, in particular Constructive Alignment (Biggs, 2003) was commonly included, as was a focus on assessment for learning.

Table 3: Summary of the curriculum element in the case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students and learning, Curriculum, Assessment for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive teaching, learning and assessment; Peer Review,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiated project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student engagement, student learning, course design,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university policies, recognition and reward, peer review of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning &amp; engagement; planning for learning and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment, developing learning and teaching activities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment, reflective practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive alignment; Scholarship of Teaching and Learning;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research supervision as teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The importance of reflective practice was clearly embedded in the majority of cases, together with encouragement to collect of evaluative evidence of teaching and learning practice. In several cases this was also modelled through the assessment requirements, either requiring a teaching portfolio, or the completion of reflective tasks. The two cases incorporating peer observation had developed this notion further. The work of Schön (1983, 1987) has been heavily drawn upon, and has been previously recognised in Australian and UK approaches to teacher education (Luzeckyj & Badger, 2008).

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, was present to some extent in all cases, but explicitly developed in case study two, where the final module encourages participants to present their work at a teaching and learning conference, or in a journal.

The case studies also included, either explicitly or implicitly a networking component with other colleagues – from within the program, from faculties and central units. Indeed, in case studies 3, 4 and 5 networking with colleagues was identified as one of the best features of the Foundations program.

Inclusion of university policies and procedures, particularly with respect to teaching and learning was embedded in each case study. Interviewees made reference to the importance of modelling university policy in the design and delivery of the program. Attention to embedding of graduate attributes, constructive alignment and integration with recognition and
reward policies (through early development of peer review and teaching portfolios) exemplify this practice.

Philosophical approach
As expected, philosophical approaches of each institution were reflected in the delivery, curriculum and policy elements of the Foundations programs (Table 4). Perhaps the most obvious example of this is case study 1, where the institution has a focus on student centredness and flexibility in delivery of courses. The Foundations program has similarly adopted a flexible delivery approach utilising fully online delivery. This has a dual purpose, firstly to model the philosophical approach of the institution and to send a clear and consistent message to academic staff. Secondly, staff cannot help but to engage with the online environment, hence giving them experience, and allowing them to develop skills in, and understanding of, online learning. The importance of upskilling staff in this area has been noted by several authors (Fraser, Dearn & Ryan, 2003; McLoughlin and Samuels, 2002) and is certainly pertinent in an institution where online delivery is prevalent.

Table 4: Summary of the philosophical approach in the case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophical approach</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case 1</td>
<td>Alignment with university’s goals - Student learning paradigm (rather than instructional), constructive alignment, flexible learning; Reflective practice - Modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2</td>
<td>Experience-based learning and Reflective practice; Collegiality and Scholarship - Work integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 3</td>
<td>Introduction to teaching and learning in HE, focus on student learning, modelling of practice and reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 4</td>
<td>Student centred; scholarly practice &amp; enquiry; commitment to diversity; authentic contexts, cross-disciplinary communities of practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 5</td>
<td>Addressing university policy in teaching and learning (including graduate qualities, flexibility and commitment to diversity); establishing university culture; constructive alignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In case study 1, by positioning participants as online learners, the Foundations course further models the underpinning philosophy of adopting a learning paradigm, rather than an instructive one. Similarly the inclusion of online discussions and reflections on experience and a portfolio for reflection, models a commitment to ongoing reflective practice.

In case study two, the design of the program – extending to two or three semesters, and incorporating peer observation and a negotiated project, can be seen to model the underpinning principles of experience-based learning, reflective practice, collegiality and scholarship. The integration of the program into the work practices of participants (ie being work integrated) is also seen as important, and adding to the relevance of the program.
In case study three, providing a basic introduction to teaching in HE, with an emphasis on student learning is the stated underpinning philosophy. This is reflected by delivering a short, intensive program that is mandatory for staff. Inclusion of a half-day in faculties that incorporates micro-teaching, and begins to develop a discipline based community of practice provides an opportunity for extension of the introductory program through disciplinary networks.

In case study four, a number of underpinning principles have been articulated including: student centred learning, development of scholarly practice, recognition of diversity and prior experience, and collaborative learning. The five day intensive program has been designed taking into account these principles, with opportunities for exploration of a range of teaching contexts, and the inclusion of discipline-based colleagues in the delivery of the program.

Case study five describes a commitment to constructive alignment between graduate qualities, learning outcomes, teaching, learning and assessment and takes this into account in the design of the program. Attention to university policy, the teaching and learning framework and the institutional commitment to diversity and flexible pathways can also be seen to be reflected in the program. This is through sharing and discussion of teaching experiences in a variety of contexts, group work activities, the inclusion of an online option for staff who are not able to attend face to face session and a choice of out-of-session tasks.

In summary the underpinning philosophical approaches are once again representative of the range of Foundations programs offered in the HE sector. In terms of the categories of models according to theoretical frameworks discussed by Gilbert and Gibbs (cited in Rust, 2000), these programs, although having elements of behavioural change are more closely aligned with student learning and reflective practice philosophies.

**Stakeholder Roundtable**

The roundtable proceeded according to the outlined format (Appendix 3). The morning session was dedicated to consideration to three key questions (see methodology), each of which will be discussed in turn.

The first question, *What are the purposes of Foundations programs*, was considered by the groups with each putting forward four key points (see Table 3). These points were then considered by the whole group, and later synthesised to produce four overarching purposes that reflected the individual group contributions.
Table 5: Group responses to purposes of Foundations programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Group Summaries</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting staff to their specific institutional context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing reflective practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedding a student-centred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To open the door to bigger concepts, language and literature on teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop cross-disciplinary networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give time to focus on teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop skills and knowledge and to be exposed to new and innovative and best practice in teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop collegiality, networking, and a ‘gateway’ to the teaching and learning centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare academics <em>emotionally, practically and theoretically</em> for teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce participants to education as a discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet external and internal criteria- for example probation, promotion and eligibility for grants and funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is the processes we put in place to enable formal, informal and continuing collaboration, both online and face to face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give people the tools to use in their teaching practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To model good practice with explicit references to literature and research based teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning tasks must be embedded in own practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although each group identified different purposes, there were a number of synergies from which four main themes emerging from discussion could be distilled. These were:

- **Embedding a student-centred approach to teaching**  
  Achieved through modelling, introduction of best practice methodologies, and enabling connections to be made with academic’s own context.

- **Encouraging a scholarly approach to teaching**  
  Achieved through introducing academics to the body of literature around teaching in higher education and the practices of scholarly teaching, including the importance of reflective practice.

- **Networking and relationship building**  
  Achieved through developing a sense of collegiality across disciplines and the institution and building relationships with colleagues in schools and central units.

- **Orienting staff to their institutional context**
Achieved through introducing staff to philosophical approaches of the institution and introducing relevant policies and procedures (including promotion, awards and grants).

In the discussion that surrounded these emerging shared values, there was also strong support for the inclusion of sessional staff in Foundations programs. The perspective of stakeholders who were or had been in this category of employment, was well accepted, recognising that many new or aspiring academics have backgrounds in research, and may have only their own experiences of having been taught to draw upon. Lack of opportunity for networking with colleagues from different schools, introduction to University policies, procedures and reward structures were also cited in support of catering for sessional staff.

Consideration of the second question, *What elements are critical to ensure that the program achieves the identified purposes*, followed agreement on the underpinning purposes.

At the outset, it was unanimously agreed that the foundations course should include a face to face component and be supplemented by online support, or include modelling of online learning where this was utilised. This was argued through the premise that a key focus of a Foundations program was to orient staff to their institutional context, to encourage and foster cross-disciplinary interaction through activities and assessment. These objectives were thought to be difficult, although it was acknowledged, not impossible, to achieve in a fully online course.

A practical component where staff have the opportunity to test out teaching styles and techniques in a low-risk/low-stakes, formative (and supportive) environment was also thought to be important. Similarly there needs to be good role modelling, and opportunities for observation and peer critique. To that end, it was contended that the program should showcase innovative good practice and different teaching styles.

Recognition of the diverse backgrounds of participating academics; experienced/inexperienced, sessional/permanent and the provision of discipline specific examples were also thought to be critical. Where there is a requirement to be involved in cross-campus teaching, teaching online as well as face to face, in lectures, tutorials or practical classes, these should be a specific focus in the program. In summary, it was thought the program should provide a variety of diverse tasks, methods and approaches to teaching to cater for all types of staff and modes of teaching at that institution. The delivery and assessment in the program should also be designed to promote engagement. Being aware of context, and giving academics opportunity to relate the content to their own context was a key suggestion.

In order to achieve its aims, the stakeholder group believed that a Foundations program must be adequately resourced and staff should be funded to attend, including sessional staff. Any face to face events should include provision of quality refreshments to reflect a valuing of participants’ time. In addition, there was a need to provide staff who
complete the program with some reward and or recognition for their efforts.

In considering the third question, *How can we promote efficiency in a Foundations program*, the stakeholder group believed that efficiency and effectiveness were intertwined, and many of the points raised in answer to the second question could be extended to promotion of efficiency. In essence, there was consensus around the most efficient mode of delivery for such programs being short face to face, intensive sessions. However, offering the program as more than one of these intensive sessions, over an extended period of time, to allow reflection and build a learning community was also seen as desirable. Indeed, provision of ongoing opportunities, even after the completion of Foundations, for social networking and professional development was seen as being highly valuable.

A second key to efficiency was seen as programs having multiple purposes and synergies. Therefore, whilst an understanding of student learning and skill development in teaching was important, there should also be links to probation and academic promotion requirements. The group also believed that it was important to recognise different experiences and contexts of participants, so provision of context specific pathways, or negotiated elements were also seen as important. This can avoid the criticism sometimes levelled at professional learning programs of being too broad, and ineffective through a ‘one size fits all’ approach (Fleming et al., 2004).

In considering the case studies, the stakeholder group clearly saw the institutional context as shaping the design and delivery of the programs. This affirmed the sub-project group’s decision to represent models with context clearly articulated. The group also noted that, taking into account context, each of the case studies had addressed the underpinning principles, decided upon by the group in the earlier session.

In terms of effectiveness and efficiency there were a number of features in the case studies that drew the attention of the stakeholder group. Delivery of a fully online program was seen as being a very efficient mode of delivery. Although this ran counter to their previously stated assertion that face to face interaction was necessary, the group did see that the online discussions could build networks and well structured tasks could enhance collaboration. It was also seen as a viable option for institutions with offshore or geographically separated campuses.

The flexibility in provision of programs was acknowledged as a key advantage to the fully online program, but was also seen to be demonstrated by the provision of several offerings during a year (case study three), and an online option (case study five, and being developed in case study two). The ability for participants to negotiate content through selection of tasks or completing a negotiated project was also seen as catering for differing needs of the cohort.

Whilst short intensive sessions were seen to be effective in terms of resourcing, and identified in the early discussions as being an effective mode of delivery, on consideration of the actual case studies there were
some questions put forward by the stakeholder group. These included how this may encourage ongoing reflective practice in staff, consolidation of learning and understanding, and how communities of practice were encouraged in a sustainable way. These elements may well be embedded in the practice of these institutions, but were not clear from the case studies as written.

Provision of opportunities to engage in practical teaching in a supportive environment was seen as a positive element of the programs, however the importance of considering underlying theoretical frameworks, and drawing from evidence-based practice to support this was duly noted. In case study one, giving staff from that institution the opportunity to engage with the technology that they themselves would be using to teach, was also seen as highly valuable.

The emphasis on networking and collegiality that came through all the case studies was highly regarded. It was noted by the stakeholder group that teaching in a university can be an isolating experience, and it was not uncommon for little discussion about teaching and learning to take place within a school or department. Inclusion of explicit networking opportunities was seen as positive, as was the involvement of faculties and discipline-based staff. It should be said that the latter did have some caveats, particularly around ensuring that there were sufficient academic staff within the faculties to allow contribution, and that these people were committed to the teaching and learning agenda, and had a shared understanding of the purposes of the Foundations course. Recognition (in terms of reward, or time release) for discipline-based colleagues who contributed to the program, particularly those who worked in peer review or mentoring relationships was also mentioned as important. Finally, the question of networking beyond the institution was raised as one that has some sensitivities, yet is worth exploring – particularly in the light of the positive experience of the stakeholder group involved in this project.

Conclusion:
The framework developed to describe Foundations proved a very useful tool for selecting and illustrating a range of models of Foundations programs. By selecting case studies that illustrated varying elements of the framework a set of models that represented good practice was able to be collected, and described to give concrete examples of Foundations programs. These exemplars are now available as an important reference source of Foundations programs in the Australian HE sector. By describing these models in context, it is argued they are more useful for institutions who wish to use models for benchmarking purposes, or who are looking for good practice models when designing or enhancing their own programs.

The models themselves have given a clear insight into the range of structure and delivery patterns, curriculum and, underpinning policy of Foundations programs across Australia. Importantly, the models also demonstrate how philosophical approach of institutions, and their context influence Foundations programs.
Whilst the chosen case studies illustrated a range of models, there were significant similarities amongst elements of the programs. The mandatory nature of programs for beginning staff reflects a growing emphasis on the importance of quality teaching and learning across the sector. Similarly, provision of programs for sessional staff in the featured institutions represents an increasing recognition of their role in teaching and learning. The four underpinning purposes of Foundations programs identified by the stakeholder group: Embedding a student-centred approach to teaching; Encouraging a scholarly approach to teaching; Networking and relationship building and, Orienting staff to their institutional context, were all present to some extent in each of the case studies, although emphasis varied according to context. The multiple purposes of Foundations programs, and the need to cater for staff with a range of prior experiences, identified by the stakeholder group as contributing to effectiveness and efficiency were also seen in the selected case studies. The stakeholder group also identified a need for connecting completion of the Foundations program to recognition and reward. This connection was clearly seen in the featured case studies through probation and promotion requirements. However, most importantly in each of the selected institutions, a strong connection between completion of the Foundations programs and personal or institutional success in teaching and learning had been identified.
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Appendix 1

Interview Schedule for Case Studies

Introduction
We are interested in your Foundation program as part of an ALTC project on Preparing Academics to teach in Higher Education. For the purposes of this project, foundations programs are considered to be:

formal programs that induct and develop university teachers with the aim of fostering and supporting the quality of teaching and learning in the university.

Participants generally complete the programs in the first three years of service and most often very early, i.e. in the first semester of teaching. The programs go beyond "induction" programs that introduce academic staff (all staff) to their new institution and generally have a broader focus than preparation for teaching and learning.

We intend to construct five or six Case Studies to illustrate good practice in the Australian Higher Education Sector. We thank you very much for agreeing to participate in this.

Questions

1. Name:

2. Organisation:

3. How large is your institution and do you have multiple campuses?

3. Where does the Foundations program sit within the University and who teaches it?
   Possible sub questions;
   - Who contributes?
   - How does this tie in with the rest of their role?
   - Do you bring guest teachers in?

4. If your Foundations unit is taught by your Academic Development Unit, can you describe your ADU?
   Possible sub questions;
   - How long has it been operating?
   - What is the size and structure?
   - What functions does it have within the University?
5. What is the policy around the Foundations program at your institution?
   Possible sub questions;
   - Is it mandatory for all staff, or new staff?
   - Is there time relief allocated?
   - Is it counted as part of workload?
   - Do you have any formal reporting obligations?
   - Are there other incentives for staff to do this?
   - Is this part of a certified course or can it lead to one?

6. Typically what groups of staff undertake this course?
   Possible sub questions;
   - Do sessional staff participate?
   - Are there any restrictions around participation of sessional staff?

7. Do you have an underpinning philosophy to your Foundation program?
   OR Do you have a stated rationale (and if so, where is this stated)?

8. What are the key concepts you try to cover?
   AND Do you have stated learning outcomes?

9. How is your program delivered?
   Possible sub questions;
   - Online, face to face, blended? If online or blended what eLearning strategies do you use?
   - Total time spent on program?
   - Intensive or stretched?
   - Portfolio-based?
   - How often is it offered each year?
   - Are there links to other programs offered by your unit?

10. Can you describe the types of learning activities that the participants engage in to meet the learning outcomes/requirements of the program?

11. Are there any particular resources that you always use in the program?
   (we don’t need to know specific readings– more general)

12. What tasks do participants have to undertake to fulfil the requirements of the program?
   - Are any of these assessed formally?
   - Are there different ways that different groups of participants can meet the learning outcomes/requirements of the program?

13. How often is your program formally evaluated?
   (by participants, by the ADU, by the institution?)

14. How do you know that your program is effective?

15. What are the best features of your program?

16. What are the challenges of your program?
Case Studies
Case Study 1

Synopsis
This case study describes a foundations program that is delivered fully online from a central unit within the University. The program is a probation requirement for new staff, needing to be completed within the first three years of appointment. Although not a formal HECS-based unit, it is assessed and can be recognised for credit into the first unit of the Graduate Diploma in Adult and Tertiary Education taught through the Faculty of Education. Assessment is through contribution to online discussions, reflective writing and submission of a teaching portfolio.

The program is underpinned by the principles of constructive alignment and incorporates a substantial reflective component. It also seeks to develop a community of practice through online interactions, and to give participating teaching staff a hands-on opportunity to explore the learning management system from a student’s perspective. Importantly, it aims to be flexible enough to allow staff to participate regardless of their location and particular teaching timetables.

Snapshot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Model</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Summary comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>How is the program delivered?</td>
<td>Fully on-line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the program include independent learning?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the length of the program?</td>
<td>1 Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the program articulate with other programs?</td>
<td>Can be used as a one unit credit into the Graduate Diploma of Adult and Tertiary teaching taught through the Faculty of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Is the program mandatory?</td>
<td>Yes – probation requirement for new staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there recognition in workload or time relief</td>
<td>Varies from school to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the program open to PhD students/ sessional staff</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>What are the assessment requirements</td>
<td>Contribution to on-line discussions, reflective writing piece and teaching portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a peer observation element?</td>
<td>Not formally included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the resources used?</td>
<td>On-line tutorials, course readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a role for disciplinary participants?</td>
<td>Not formally included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the program incorporate networking?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Context

This Case Study is drawn from a university of approximately 17 000 students, including 2000 overseas students from 90 countries. The university is sited on three campuses, with significant geographical separation and employs 1400 staff. Although there are no offshore campuses, the university has partnerships with overseas institutions, and onshore staff travel to carry out teaching in these centres.

The teaching of the foundations program sits within a central unit. Prior to 2009, this was an academic development unit, however recent restructuring has seen the formation of an Organisational Capabilities Unit that has broader responsibility across the university. The unit’s role encompasses provision of professional development in teaching and learning, research and areas formerly undertaken by Human Resources. This change has been made to reflect and respond to changes in the Higher Education sector where boundaries between these areas of work are no longer clear, or desirable.

The foundations program is one of three staged programs that are tailored to beginning tertiary teachers. The first is an online induction program that can be revisited at any time. The second is a one day face to face skills development program, backed up by an online module for those people who cannot attend. This day is targeted at tutors and casual staff and covers a basic introduction to tutoring. Importantly, it is centrally funded so that casual staff are paid to attend, and printed resources are available for them. There are two further components of this skills development program for casual staff. The first is for the introduction of technology (such as the LMS, Lectopia), the second optional component focuses on laboratory teaching for demonstrators. This is currently outsourced to external providers and is proving to be quite popular.

Structure and delivery of the program

The semester-long program is delivered fully on-line through the university’s learning management system (LMS), two or three times each year in response to demand. The change to on-line was made three years ago to respond to a need for greater flexibility for staff completing the unit as well as to reflect the broader university focus on student-centred learning and flexibility in delivery of courses. The unit is moderated by an academic staff developer, and includes online modules that require participants to engage with provided material or reflect on practice and contribute to a series of online discussions that function like tutorials. An added advantage of using the LMS is that it gives staff the opportunity to interact with the system, from the perspective of a student, therefore informing their own use of the system as teachers. It also requires staff to engage with this supporting technology, hence increasing their skills and confidence for using this in their own teaching.

1 It should be noted that the term ‘Foundations’ is not used at this institution to avoid confusion with foundations units studied by undergraduate students. The program discussed in this case is known as the Tertiary Teaching program.

2 If demand warrants, a more intensive program over 6 weeks is sometimes offered over the winter.
The unit has three assessment tasks: contribution to online discussions, a piece of reflective writing, and a teaching portfolio. Although the program is assessed, it is not an accredited, HECS-based unit. Therefore, the program is not bound by semesterisation and it is possible to be somewhat flexible in terms of giving extensions to assessment tasks. However, as the online dialogue is very important in terms of developing the learning outcomes, discussion fora are only open for a restricted time to promote engagement with the material. In terms of articulation into accredited programs, successful completion of this course, can be used as a one-unit credit into the Graduate Diploma of Adult and Tertiary Teaching taught through the Faculty of Education. There is an agreement in place with the Faculty, and there is liaison in terms of assessment tasks required in the foundation program.

**Policy**

It is a probationary requirement for new academic staff to undertake the foundation program, and they can do so at any stage in the first three years of their appointment. The Head of School is required to sign off on enrolment to acknowledge the program as a component of the academic’s workload, although it varies from school to school as to whether the academic may get time release in order to participate. The flexibility of the online course has overcome many of the issues around competing priorities that existed when the program was delivered in face to face mode.

There are no formal reporting requirements to the university, although records are kept. Successful participants are issued with a certificate of completion and they use this in their portfolio, or for performance management purposes.

The foundations course is only available to tenurable, full-time and part-time staff with contracts of at least 6 months duration. Casual academic staff are not able to participate. This is due to the course being tailored to the needs of those staff who are responsible for curriculum development and designing assessment tasks. The skills development program (see above) has been developed to meet the needs of casual staff.

**Curriculum**

The concepts covered fall into three key areas; Students and the learning environment; Curriculum; and Assessment for learning. These areas have been developed through a process of review, which has seen an overall reduction in topics in favour of a more holistic consideration of these three areas. In designing the curriculum, the principles of constructive alignment have been used as well as attention to integrating with other areas of university policy, such as the systematic alignment of Graduate Attributes. These curriculum design principles are modelled for staff participating in the course.

In delivering the curriculum much emphasis is given to modelling the use of technology, in particular through the LMS. Participants in the program cannot avoid engaging with technology, and can hopefully see not only that it is easy – but also that it has a great many possibilities for use in teaching. Since the inception of the on-line course, there have been a
number of ideas emerging from participants in this regard, validating this approach. A further example of modelling practice is the placement of course readings onto e-Reserve linked from the LMS, with explicit consideration of copyright issues.

The program is developmental, allowing participating staff not only to consider their current practice but to look to what they may change in the future in light of what they are learning. In addition, there is a strong reflective component, and encouragement to collect and consider evidence of practice beyond a reliance on teaching evaluations. As such the assessment tasks require participation in on-line discussions around readings and practice, a piece of reflective writing and a scaffolded teaching portfolio.

Feedback from the students is that the teaching portfolio is the most useful component of the course. Although it is evaluated at the end of the program, support is given through the development phase through targeted readings/online tutorials and individual feedback. There is a focus on giving developmental advice that can be built upon in probation interviews, promotion applications and/or teaching awards and grants.

**Philosophical approach**
There are two facets to the philosophical approach to the development of this program that stand out. The first is very much one of systematic alignment with the university’s goals and priorities. The second is a commitment to the development of reflective teachers. The stated aims of the program are;

- encourage participants to adopt a learning paradigm, rather than an instructive paradigm,
- enhance participants' understanding of student-centred/focused learning,
- introduce alignment as an effective approach to curriculum development,
- encourage on-going reflective practice.

**Evaluation and effectiveness:**
Each year, participants are invited to give feedback (which is made publically available), and this together with review and reflection by the teaching staff provides for continual revision and improvement. The program is evaluated against constructive alignment principles and recent and relevant professional learning of the academic developers delivering the course. It was as a result of this ongoing review process that the course was changed from face to face to fully online in 2007.

In terms of effectiveness, ongoing feedback suggests the course is successful in meeting the needs of participants, particularly in the on-line format. A further indication of this is a consistent number of staff, employed prior to the program being mandatory, who enrol out of choice, based on word of mouth. The program is also very positively viewed in applications for promotion.
Best features:

“Flexibility is definitely the best, it really did fill a need and address one of the biggest issues for people associated with this whole thing - especially with an expectation to complete. It is very hypocritical to expect face to face when we are not in keeping with the philosophy of the university to be flexible for the students. This definitely was the biggest plus for us - to provide this flexibility for people.”

“The on-line discussions and completing the portfolio have also been very well received by people in the program”

“The format has proven highly successful, and we plan to use it to deliver a similar unit on postgraduate supervision out of the Organisational Capabilities Unit.”

Challenges:

Most of the challenges really relate to the on-line teaching environment, and can be overcome with attention to online pedagogy. The first is to ensure that the most is being made of the technology. This has meant that those delivering the course have needed to come to terms with the LMS and what it offers, as well as the pedagogical practices that are necessary to make it effective, including remaining vigilant to postings and continually encouraging engagement. Other identified issues are; getting the initial buy-in to the unit (that may require prompting by out-of-the-system email), getting participants to keep their postings short enough for people to read, but long enough to demonstrate understanding, and making pedagogical decisions on how much to guide discussions, without “doing it for them”.

Case Study 2

Synopsis
This case study describes a foundations program that is delivered through three sequential units offered by the academic development unit of the University. New staff have been required to complete this program, under University policy, since 1994. Although not a formal HECS-based course, it is assessed and can be recognised for partial credit into the Graduate Certificate Higher Education offered through the Faculty of Education. The program is underpinned by three principles: reflection, collegiality and scholarship. It is predominantly a face to face program, however a flexible is currently being developed to better cater for staff at the satellite and overseas campuses.

Snapshot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Model</th>
<th>Summary comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the program delivered?</td>
<td>Face to face supplemented with online and independent work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the program include independent learning?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the length of the program?</td>
<td>3 modules constituting 150 hours of study over 2-3 semesters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the program articulate with other programs?</td>
<td>8 credit points towards post-graduate awards in Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the program mandatory?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there recognition in workload or time relief</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the program open to PhD students/ sessional staff</td>
<td>Yes, if places are available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the assessment requirements</td>
<td>Assessment tasks are set in each module, with assessment criteria. Ungraded pass awarded on successful completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a peer observation element?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the resources used?</td>
<td>Biggs &amp; Tang, 2007; Private Universe (DVD); HERDSA green guide for Peer Observation Partnerships in Higher Education (Bell, 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a role for disciplinary participants?</td>
<td>Yes, in the peer review module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the program incorporate networking?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context
This Case Study is drawn from a university of approximately 22 000 students. There is one main campus, with five smaller satellite campuses or Centres catering for approximately 5% of the student intake. There is also an offshore campus of approximately 5 000 students.

The teaching of the foundation program sits within a central unit with a broad brief that includes educational development and support for development of interactive resources. The academic development focus areas are: teacher development, career development, leadership
development, curriculum development and policy development. The foundation program is predominantly taught by academic development staff within this unit and essentially fits with the teaching development strand. There is some contribution from guest lecturers/speakers in the introductory unit, and colleagues from Schools work with foundations participants in the second unit that is centred on peer observation.

Structure and delivery of the program
The foundation program comprises three units:
Unit 1: Teaching Skills Workshops;
Unit 2: Learning Through Teaching Project; and
Unit 3: Negotiated Project.

The first unit is delivered face to face and runs over a week shortly before the beginning of each semester (twice each year). In addition to the face to face component there is some on-line content that needs to be completed. It is essentially a series of workshops on teaching and learning topics (such as active learning and student diversity). The remaining two units are completed over the semester or beyond. The second unit is a peer observation program where participants are paired up with experienced colleagues in their own schools, and the third unit is an independent project. A flexible mode of the program is currently being developed to better cater for staff on the satellite campuses. The first unit has been split into 9 modules with some completely on-line and others are supplemented with a videoconference.

There are assessment requirements in each of the units with clearly outlined assessment criteria. Opportunities are given for feedback on work, and participants are encouraged to seek peer feedback. Ultimately participants receive an Ungraded Pass or Fail award for the completed units. Overall, the program accounts for about 150 hours of study. Successful completion of this course can be used as eight credit points of advanced standing towards further postgraduate studies in Education.

Policy
The foundation program has been mandatory since 1994 with current University policy requiring completion of the three unit program for all teaching staff with a contract of more than 12 months, and at least 0.4 FTE. The policy requires Heads of School to take account of participation in the program as a component of the academic’s workload, although interpretation of this varies from school to school. There is an expectation that the program will be completed within a year, but in many cases staff will extend this for 18 months or two years.

There is no formal requirement to report results of the foundation program, however a written report is prepared for the Academic Staff Development Committee (a sub-committee of the University education

---

3 There are exemptions to this requirement for staff who have formal qualifications in higher or adult education, have completed an equivalent program in another institution, or can provide evidence of excellent teaching from at least three different sources of evidence. In addition it is possible to receive an exemption for the final unit if staff have published in the area of teaching and learning.
Committee) twice each year. In so far as ensuring individual staff members comply with the policy, this tends to be through the Probations and Promotions committees. These committees can ask for a [foundations] completion report. Essentially, it is in these committees that the policy really bites.

Sessional staff are not required to complete the foundation program, however a number do apply for entry. If there are available spaces in the course, then they are accepted, however this is not always the case. With the advent of the flexible course for satellite campuses, a number of sessional staff at these locations have been picking up the course.

Curriculum
In unit one, there are series of workshops on topics pertinent to teaching and learning underpinned by what is known from the Higher Education literature. Workshops include discussion, experiential and interactive learning leading to a short teaching practice session presented to colleagues. This session is videoed and then there is opportunity for peer feedback and self reflection.

Each of the workshop sessions has a set of learning outcomes ascribed as well as underpinning ideas that are thought to be important for staff to consider. For example, in the three hour session on assessment, the ideas that; assessment supports learning, is for multiple purposes and, should be aligned with learning outcomes are supplemented with discussions of plagiarism and exploration of assessment policies. Examples of assessment tasks used by staff that minimise plagiarism are also examined. The text is Biggs and Tang (2007) and a series of DVDs, that have been developed by the centre, are used for this unit. At present the DVD Private Universe is being used to stimulate thinking around the concept of constructivism.

The second unit is based on the peer observation process, and the Green Guide for Peer Observation Partnerships in Higher Education (Bell, 2005) is the supporting text. Although at present the peer observation within ULT is not part of the University’s formalised peer review program for purposes of supporting probation and promotion, it may be modified in future to allow this.

The third unit is a negotiated, independent project around teaching and learning. Projects can include evaluation of units, review of curriculum, development of resources, literature reviews or reflective essays. Participants are encouraged to present their work at a conference or submit an article for publication.

Philosophical approach
The course outline states that the [foundation] course is designed around fundamental educational principles including:

- experience-based learning; and
- reflective practice.

Participating staff are introduced to Kolb’s Experience-based Learning model (1984) and Schon’s theory of reflective practice (1983; 1987).
Taking this further, academic staff teaching the unit see the program underpinned by three principles: reflection, collegiality and scholarship. The idea of reflection is an invitation to look at current practice, in light of teaching context and what is known about student learning. It is important that participants are teaching concurrently with undertaking the program as practice is strongly drawn upon. The collegiality is developed on several levels through embedded activities. Firstly discussions with colleagues about teaching and learning are encouraged as is the need to work productively with colleagues and to reflect in a collaborative way. Finally, the course seeks to develop an awareness of the literature on teaching, learning and assessment and requires the use this of this literature to articulate participants’ practice. This element culminates in unit 3 whether participants are encouraged to contribute to the literature or at least make their work public to colleagues, to contribute to colleagues to thinking around teaching and learning issues.

*Evaluation and effectiveness:*
A formal evaluation of the entire program has not occurred in the last 3 years, however student evaluations of the second unit are conducted after each offering. Formative evaluation through unsolicited comments and emails are collated.

In terms of effectiveness, the “feel good” factor at the end of the introductory unit is usually high, with many participants indicating they found it useful. There are also a number in each offering who admit to not wanting to participate at the beginning, but realise the worth once the first unit has been completed. Interestingly, there have been a number of staff completing the program who were not required to under the mandatory requirement. It therefore appears to be seen as a worthwhile activity to undertake by staff.

The best indication of success may well be the consistent recognition of the University for teaching performance in external awards and funding. There are also a high number of staff, who have completed the foundation program and subsequently have received citations for teaching. Indeed, staff who are successful in getting awards and citations for teaching have almost invariably done the foundation program.

*Best features:*
“It has a sound design and a strong history of continuous coordination [by the academic development team].”

“I think the program is strongly supported by the whole University and by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor [Academic] and I have regular contact with him about the program and he comes and opens every Unit 1 and he’s really interested in it.”

“I think the whole thing is work integrated; we are constantly looking at what people are doing and how they are relating what is happening in
[Foundations] to their real context. Unit 2 is totally work integrated – peer observation process and people at work. It’s totally integrated: Unit 3 is a project around people’s work, typically work that they would be doing if they were not doing [foundation]. By doing it in the [foundation] context they get additional support and stimulation.”

Challenges:

“It’s something where you have to be really on your game, doing your best, at the peak of your game really: it’s a very critical audience.”

“I don’t see any of it as routine; I think each time we are doing this sort of work, it’s always a challenge. We have to have a program that is really spot-on, really helpful to our colleagues, because they are under so much pressure to do so many things. They have to spend time on things that we are developing and we need to make it really worthwhile.”

“I think there are constant challenges in helping people integrate views [presented in foundations] about learning and teaching into their own views and context of teaching.”

“It’s a major challenge with sessional staff and many professional staff. … the logistics of it, and the structuring of that and so on, making the program integrated in people’s career paths is something we are trying to work on at the moment.”

“A big challenge is to improve completion rates – getting most if not all participants finishing all 3 units. I’m working on this now.”
Case Study 3

Synopsis
The foundations program at the centre of this case study is closely related to the confirmation processes for the appointment of new staff and is mandatory for some academic staff as a condition of their employment. Although separate from the graduate certificate in higher education offered within the university, the foundations program is a prerequisite for formal enrolment in that course and a natural sequence for staff to become more extensively involved in the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Delivered four times a year in two-and-a-half-day time slots, the program focuses on student learning, introduces current research on student learning and university teaching, and explores practical models and methods that can be used by participants to enhance student learning in their classes. A new feature of the program has been a revamped approach to the third day as an opportunity for situated, individualized professional development. Most faculties have implemented ‘in-house’ third-day activities which reinforce program principles in participants’ ‘home’ context, such as themed faculty teaching and learning forums and peer observation of teaching programs. The long-term goal is for all faculties to offer such third-day activities, so that program participants are given the opportunity to complete the program in their own faculty context, thereby putting teaching and learning principles into practice.

Snapshot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Model</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Summary comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>How is the program delivered?</td>
<td>Face to Face, from the main campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the program include independent learning?</td>
<td>Yes, a pre-program activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the length of the program?</td>
<td>2.5 days block teaching, opportunity to make up missed sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the program articulate with other programs?</td>
<td>A pre-requisite for enrolment in the Graduate Certificate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Is the program mandatory?</td>
<td>Yes – closely related to confirmation process for new staff appointments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there recognition in workload or time relief</td>
<td>No formal time relief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the program open to PhD students/ sessional staff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>What are the assessment requirements</td>
<td>Mandatory 100% attendance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a peer observation element?</td>
<td>Yes, facilitated in faculties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the resources used?</td>
<td>Biggs &amp; Tang (2007); Ramsden (2003); Prosser &amp; Trigwell (1999) and readings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a role for disciplinary participants?</td>
<td>Final half day facilitated by faculties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the program incorporate networking?</td>
<td>Yes in disciplinary groupings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Context**
The case study is drawn from a Group of Eight university which has a total enrolment of approximately 46,000 students, including 10,000 international students. There are approximately 3100 academic staff (full time equivalent) teaching on ten campuses although most of them are located on the main metropolitan campus.

The central academic development unit has been established for more than twenty-five years and includes both academic and professional staff. Professional staff undertake roles such as program support, website maintenance and development and research assistance. Project areas of involvement by academic staff include teaching in the graduate certificate offered by the unit, presenting research supervision programs, working on faculty projects, consulting with staff across the university, administering and analysing student evaluation surveys, and conducting their own research.

**Structure and delivery**
Team teaching of the foundations program is carried out by seven academic staff in the central unit and there is involvement with faculties in its delivery. The program is taught in a face to face mode on the main campus and there is a pre-program activity associated with a student learning scenario. The program consists of two and a half day intensive block. It is offered four times a year, generally in February, April, June and November. The first block is always offered at the beginning of the year before the formal teaching semester commences. Participants from other campuses travel to the central location to attend the program.

Generally participants complete the program in the two and a half day blocks but in some cases there is a flexible option to make up missed sessions (e.g., timetable clashes) in equivalent sessions offered at other times during the year. The mandatory element of 100% attendance over the two and a half days means that the onus is on participants to ensure attendance at all sessions.

All academic staff in the central unit teach at least one specialist topic and team teaching is a feature of the program.

An average number of participants in a course might be 40 staff but this varies according to the time and semester of offering. In response to increasing demand for the program in 2008, the number of staff accepted for each intake of the program was increased from 40 to 70 participants to avoid waiting lists.

**Policy**
Completion of the foundations program is a mandatory requirement for confirmation of appointment for all new academic staff on fixed and continuing appointments. Exemptions may be given however for particular higher education/education qualifications. Attendance at the first morning of the program is an essential foundation for the other sessions. Staff who are absent from sessions are required to complete these in later blocks offered during the year.
Sessional staff may enrol but there are separate faculty programs for them and generally the numbers of sessionals are low. There is no formal time relief for program attendance because it is a requirement of appointment. Participants receive a certificate upon completion of the program.

Reporting about the program by the central unit occurs in the normal context of reporting against the strategic plan and this incorporates numbers attending the four blocks across the year and data drawn from evaluations conducted on each course.

Curriculum
The central curriculum design focuses on research on student learning and conceptions of teaching; and then the application of this to participants’ own teaching contexts. The formally stated learning outcomes cover engagement with current research on student learning and implications for participants own teaching, models and methods that have developed from the research, participant understandings of student learning and applications of those conceptions to their own curriculums and development of abilities to further improve students’ learning in the future. Participants are also introduced to the university’s policies on teaching and learning. The program is outlined below:

Pre-program activity: Response to student learning scenario

Day 1 of the program includes: Welcome; Introduction; Good teaching for student learning; students’ perceptions of and approaches to learning; course design, learning outcomes, constructive alignment, learning activities and assessment.

Day 2: Teaching for student engagement; Groups: Lectures, tutorials; laboratory teaching and task tutorials; three or four staff facilitate break-out sessions; Assessment for learning; Evaluating the student experience; Recognising and rewarding good teaching; Reconsidering teaching and Evaluation

Final half day: micro teaching conducted in small groups. The micro teaching sessions are based on three minute presentations that are peer reviewed by facilitators and fellow participants and these often occur in disciplinary groupings. In some cases there may be supplementary faculty-based activities instead of the micro teaching e.g., presentation in a faculty teaching and learning forum and these may be organised by faculty associate deans of education

Curriculum resources include a comprehensive folder of presentations including access to readings via e-reserve, references to specific articles and use of texts by Biggs & Tang (2007), Ramsden (2003), and Prosser and Trigwell (1999) etc.
**Philosophical approach**

The program is designed as a basic introduction to higher education teaching and learning principles and provides opportunities for participants to develop their knowledge and skills. The focus is on student learning and the research around student learning. A central element is the opportunity for participants to reflect on their experience of teaching and learning. Practical models and methods to enhance student learning and the integration of these into participants’ curriculum practice are also core values.

**Evaluation and effectiveness**

All participants complete formal program evaluations and these are carefully reviewed by facilitators. Broader program evaluation occurs every few years and is informed by feedback from faculties. It is difficult to determine effectiveness but the fact that participants regularly contact facilitators for advice and that many go on to enrol in the Graduate Certificate are positive indicators. Generally the evidence of the impact of the program on teaching is difficult to determine.

**Best features:**

The best features of the program were identified in terms of:

- its central focus on student learning rather than on teaching tips;
- responsiveness to participant feedback;
- modelling of good teaching practice; and
- the establishment of a community of practice where participants meet staff from their own disciplines/faculties, as well as others across the university and that they establish networks and relationships which are highly regarded.

**Challenges:**

A significant challenge is the difficulty of determining how much content to cover in a short amount of time, refining coverage without overloading. Another consideration was that staff enrol from all disciplines but some participants are unable to see the relevance of concepts unless they are contextualised in their disciplinary settings. A small number of staff attend the course because it is compulsory and do not wish to be there but this is discussed up front in the first session.
Case Study 4

Synopsis
The intensive five day foundations program and the follow-up activities underpinning this foundations program in this case study introduce new and existing staff to the principles and practices of learning and teaching at the university. The program is closely associated with the creation of collegial networks and communities of academics and support staff working to improve the student learning experience.

This program has been nationally recognised in earlier years for the way it enhances the quality of teaching and learning in an institution. What emerges in this case study however is the way the teaching/development team continue to explore new initiatives around delivery modes, evaluation of program impact, faculty partnerships and opportunities for more flexible pathways. It illustrates the case that even with a successful foundations program, there is an ongoing agenda to be constantly innovative so that the model never remains static.

Snapshot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Model</th>
<th>Summary comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the program delivered?</td>
<td>Face to face on main campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the program include independent learning?</td>
<td>Yes – reflective tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the length of the program?</td>
<td>5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the program articulate with other programs?</td>
<td>Program and 2 related assessment tasks give credit for the first unit of the Graduate Certificate (University Learning &amp; Teaching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the program mandatory?</td>
<td>Yes, up to the level of Senior Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there recognition in workload or time relief</td>
<td>No – held in semester breaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the program open to PhD students/sessional staff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the assessment requirements</td>
<td>No formal assessment – follow up reflective task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a peer observation element?</td>
<td>No – peer feedback on microteaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the resources used?</td>
<td>Online readings, folder of resources, Biggs, Brookfield, Race, Video of student panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a role for disciplinary participants?</td>
<td>Contribute as guest speakers, facilitators, panel members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the program incorporate networking?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context
The case study is drawn from a Group of Eight university which has a total enrolment of approximately 42,000 students, including 9,000 international students. There are approximately 6,500 staff of which about 3000 are academic staff. Based on the figures from the 2004 RED Report sessional
staff do up to 60% of teaching at the University. Staff are distributed across three campuses, although the majority of them are located on the central metropolitan campus.

The four broad roles of the central learning and teaching unit which conducts the program are teaching development, curriculum development, technology-enabled learning and teaching and organisational capacity development which incorporates high level policy.

*Structure and delivery*

The program consists of an intensive five-day workshop and follow-up activities embedded in participants’ teaching practice. The workshops assist staff in developing a scholarly view of teaching by drawing on their own experience as learners and teachers, from the experiences and feedback of students and colleagues, and from relevant research, both educational and disciplinary. The follow-up activities enable the participants to apply learning and teaching ideas in practice, as well as to reflect on this process and where relevant evaluate the impact.

The five day program is taught face to face on the main campus and is offered four times a year, generally in mid-February, in the inter-semester break in June/July and at the end of October and November. An average class cohort is 25 and classes are always at full capacity based on classroom constraints. There is generally a waiting list, with often 130 expressions of interest and spaces only for 100. However, due to changes in applicant circumstances and cancellations generally all the applicants have an opportunity to attend the program within one year of expressing their interest.

Team teaching is carried out by the whole unit and up to ten staff facilitate sessions in their areas of expertise such as curriculum development, technology-enabled teaching etc. There is a co-ordinator for the program and this role constitutes 40% of the coordinator’s total workload. Faculty staff contribute as guests, facilitators and panel members and they are often foundation participants from previous cohorts and senior colleagues, such as associate deans of education, award winners etc.

Data over the last four years contributes to the profile of staff completing foundations: the majority are full time with ongoing teaching positions; there is a fraction [less than 10%] of casual and sessional staff and these are not excluded if they have responsibility for a course; the majority of participants are quite new to the university, often having commenced employment within the last year but with previous experience in other universities, one to three years on average; and there is a fair number of staff who have taught for five years, up to the level of Associate Professor. It should be noted that sessional staff programs are presented in the faculties with support from the central unit; attendance by participants is paid for by the faculties but generally the sessions are one-off workshops focused on key aspects of faculty teaching.

The program has been supported by an online document repository, evaluation forms and some online discussions but has not included activities equivalent to those offered in the face to face mode. The central unit is in the early stages of looking more deeply at the delivery model that underpins the
program and two different modes are being considered: intensive workshops along the lines of the present five-day model; and workshops extended over a longer period. An impetus for this review and an argument for increased flexibility is the inconvenience of program attendance for staff involved in examinations, teaching and marking.

**Policy**

A central learning and teaching unit is responsible for teaching the foundations program and its overall development. The program is mandatory for all new staff up to the level of Senior Lecturer with ongoing teaching positions but exemptions may be granted to staff who have completed a Graduate Certificate, Diploma or Masters in higher education, a similar program in another university or demonstrated experience of at least three years in high quality university teaching e.g. learning and teaching awards, citations etc. The recruitment letter of appointment from HR indicates completion of the program is a condition of employment and that staff have three years in which to finalise this. There is no time relief for participation in the program because sessions are held outside of teaching time but travel costs for staff from remote campuses are met by the university.

Completion of the foundations program and two related assessment tasks provide credit for the first and prerequisite course in the Graduate Certificate in University Learning and Teaching offered at the university.

Formal reporting about the program is not mandatory but regular reports are provided to the DVC (Academic) on completion rates, evaluations, latest developments etc. Certificates of completion used to be awarded to participants in an annual ceremony, but from 2009 they will be awarded in the one-day University Learning and Teaching Forum. To be eligible to receive the foundations certificate participants are required to have attended all sessions. Participants who miss a session are invited to complete that session in a later program.

**Curriculum**

The program seeks to develop increased participant understanding, skills and confidence in their learning and teaching practice. Examples of stated learning outcomes include demonstrating an understanding of student learning, developing a learning and teaching strategy and methodology incorporating current theories and practice and developing a reflective conception of teaching, including continuing evaluation feedback and review cycles.

The program includes sessions on:
- student learning;
- engaging students;
- developing learning aims and outcomes;
- developing learning activities to support learning outcomes;
- small and large group teaching;
- assessment;
- reflective practice

A range of different teaching contexts or environments are explored in the program: large class teaching (lectures); small class teaching (tutorials);
groupwork; and online learning. Constructive alignment, student-centred teaching and reflective practice are major lenses for the program. Learning activities include group discussions, reflective tasks and presentations by facilitators and guest speakers. For example, large class teaching panel discussion includes faculty representatives from across the university, representing different disciplines, experience and approaches.

There is no formal assessment conducted in the program but the follow-up activity requires a 2-3 page reflection based on personal experience, advice from peers/colleagues, feedback from students and ideas from the literature. This new initiative receives a Pass/Fail grade and feedback is provided. The development team is working on ways to involve the faculties more closely in recognising the efforts of their new members to improve their teaching practice. Establishing faculty communities of practice, breakfast/lunch meetings and having peers sit in on classes are being considered as part of this approach.

Changes in the promotion process now require an application of only ten pages, which includes a brief case for teaching (as well as for research and service), which is supported by evidence rather than a larger teaching portfolio. The program aligns with this by focussing participants on developing a rationale for teaching and collecting evidence for teaching, rather than building a portfolio.

Participants are provided with a folder of extensive resources in print form and online links. While there is not a single resource, there are three to four additional readings for every session and these include Biggs, Brookfield, Race. There is also a video of a student panel on assessment developed in-house that is highly regarded by participants. Feedback from participants indicates that, while participants do not immediately use all resources, they commonly refer to them later when they encounter teaching problems or when introducing group work as examples.

**Philosophical approach**

This foundations program is designed to support teaching staff to develop increased understanding, skills and confidence in their learning and teaching practice. Core principles of the program are presented to participants in the Resources folder and consist of the following:

- Student-centred perspectives and approaches underpin the content and the processes modelled throughout the program
- There is no “one way to teach” effectively, but rather the diversity of staff/students, and the range of disciplines and contexts will result in a diversity of approaches, strategies and methods
- Developing scholarly practice as the basis for ongoing professional and career development is encouraged
- A spirit of enquiry is fostered through actively exploring and discovering ideas
- There is a commitment to incorporate and promote learning and teaching practices that are inclusive of the diverse student body
- Participants’ prior learning and experiences are valued and actively incorporated
• Collaborative peer learning in cross-disciplinary context is supported and encouraged
• Learning is facilitated by drawing on real world contexts and relevant examples
• Development of cross-disciplinary collegial networks is encouraged

_Evaluation and effectiveness_

To date the teaching team has focussed on evaluating participant satisfaction and immediate feedback during and after the program. Evaluations are completed online by participants at the end of each day of the program and addressed by the teaching team the following day. With the transition to online evaluation there was a drop in the response rate but the perception of the team was that comments were deeper and consisted of more critical feedback.

The team is exploring a broader more evaluative framework. One approach being considered is capturing participants’ conceptions of learning and teaching _before_ the program, immediately _post_ program and then eighteen months later, with the focus on detecting shifts in thinking about learning and teaching. Another tool to detect any changes in participant teaching practice is through the reflective piece of writing that constitutes the follow-up activity leading to the completion of the program. Other evaluation foci might include formal leadership, career progress, publishing in learning and teaching.

_Best features:_

The best features of the program identified by participants have been the development of collegial networks, a feeling of community and connectedness; furthermore, the opportunity to reflect on aspects of academic life, without being immersed in the daily routine of teaching, meetings and writing papers, has been highly valued.

_Challenges:_

Major challenges include engaging more with the faculties and where academics really are. Foundations participants come to the central unit but the actual work occurs in the faculty so the ongoing concern is to seek more engagement and buy-in at that level. One initiative is greater involvement by the faculties in assessing the reflective pieces so they are more aware about the developments in their own faculties and have more ownership in the program. While still working with Associate Deans Education and Learning and Teaching Fellows, there is a need for the impact of the program to be more deeply embedded in the nine faculties and the 56 schools by involving Heads of Schools and other stakeholders. A final observation was on ways to promote greater flexibility and pathways arising from the re-conceptualisation of the Graduate Certificate which is presently being re-accredited through a different faculty, with modularisation offering opportunities for multiple pathways.
Case Study 5

Synopsis
This case study describes a foundations program that is delivered face to face, combined with an additional blended learning component, from a central unit within the University. The program is mandatory for all continuing academic staff and for all sessional staff on their second consecutive appointment. The program is linked to a course that is part of the Graduate Certificate in Education (University Teaching) offered through the School of Education and taught by the academic development team of the Learning and Teaching Unit (LTU). It is important to note that the Graduate Certificate is also mandatory. Assessment is through attendance at the two day face to face component and the two hour follow-up session, as well through a written or oral reflection over three out-of-session tasks.

The program is underpinned by Biggs’ model of constructive alignment. The first day focuses on learning outcomes (Graduate Qualities), assessment and teaching and learning approaches. The second day is underpinned by a scholarship of teaching and learning approach, which focuses on collecting data/feedback about teaching, reflection on the data collected and making teaching public. The program also seeks to build a network for cross disciplinary interaction and connect people who are interested in exploring learning and teaching issues in higher education.

Snapshot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Model</th>
<th>Summary comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>How is the program delivered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the program include independent learning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the length of the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the program articulate with other programs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Is the program mandatory?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there recognition in workload or time relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the program open to PhD students/ sessional staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>What are the assessment requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a peer observation element?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the resources used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a role for disciplinary participants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the program incorporate networking?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Context**

This Case Study is drawn from a university of approximately 33,000 students. The university is sited on 5 campuses (one remote), and employs 800 academic staff and 1000 sessional staff.

The teaching of the foundations program sits within a central unit, known as the Learning and Teaching Unit. This unit consists of two primary areas, support for students and support for staff (academic development, online education support, leadership in the scholarship of teaching and supervisor development). The foundations program has been operating since 2003 and is delivered by academic development staff. All of the academic developers are involved in the delivery of the program with a focus on their area of interest/expertise. Other staff from the Learning and Teaching Unit maybe invited to participate depending on the needs of the cohort.

The foundations program is one component of a course that is part of the Graduate Certificate in Education (University Teaching). The program is mandatory for continuing academic staff and sessional staff in their second consecutive appointment. The sessional staff are paid to attend by the School that employs them.

**Structure and delivery of the program**

The program is delivered in three main components. The first is a two day face to face intensive mode which aims to be interactive using group work, discussion, role plays, and case studies and includes a SWAP session. The second is a two hour face to face follow up where participants meet with an academic developer and negotiate the pathway they will take to fulfil the program requirements. The third is participation in three out-of-session tasks which result in either a written or oral reflection with an academic developer. The program is run four times per year during non-teaching time.

There is an online option (flexibly delivered) for staff that cannot make it to the two full day face to face session. This involves participation in a blended learning environment where participants commit to two one hour sessions per week for three weeks using Centra which gives a live e-learning experience. These participants then complete the program by continuing with the second and third components as described above.

The program’s assessment tasks are a choice of three out-of-session activities selected from ten possible options. The out-of-session tasks can be completed in written form as a report or a portfolio. Academic development staff provide participants with feedback on the tasks. Participants are deemed to have completed the foundations program when they have: attended the two day face to face program (or online version), attended the two hour follow-up session and completed the three out-of-session tasks. In terms of articulation into the accredited Graduate Certificate program, attendance/participation in the two day face to face foundations program (or online version) is a requirement of the first course of the Graduate Certificate (Introduction to University Teaching). The Graduate Certificate is a

---

4 The term ‘Foundations’ is not used at this institution. The program discussed in this case is known as Teaching at Uni.
mandatory program offered through the School of Education and taught by the academic development team of the Learning and Teaching Unit (LTU).

**Policy**

It is mandatory for new continuing academic staff and sessional staff in their second consecutive appointment to undertake the foundation program. The School in which sessional staff are employed are required to pay their staff to participate in the foundations program (two full days, two hour follow-up and three three-hour out-of-session tasks). For continuing staff the School is responsible for acknowledging the program as a component of the academic's workload.

The School is notified when participants have successfully completed the requirements of the foundation program. Successful participants are issued with a certificate of completion.

As the foundations course is only available to continuing staff, fixed term contract staff and sessional staff in their second consecutive appointment, a tutoring program is run to support all sessional staff. However as this program is not mandated the Schools are not required to pay the sessional staff to attend. However, participants in the foundations program who participate in the ‘Tutoring at Uni’ workshop can claim payment for attendance as one of their three out-of-session tasks.

In one of the divisions of the University it is possible for PhD students to apply for a scholarship which allows them entry into the Graduate Certificate in Education (University Teaching). The successful candidates also complete the foundations program as it is part of one of the courses in the graduate certificate.

**Curriculum**

The concepts that are focused on are:

1) Alignment in relation to outcomes, assessment and teaching and learning activities;
2) Scholarship of Teaching and Learning; and
3) Research Supervision as Teaching.

In designing the curriculum, the principles of constructive alignment have been used as well as attention to integrating with the teaching and learning framework and embedding of Graduate Qualities. These principles and a commitment to diversity and flexible pathways are modelled for staff participating in the program.

Participants in the program are provided with a folder containing the units that will be covered including recommended readings available through e-Reader and a program-specific website. The program ‘assessment approach’ is flexible, allowing participants to consider both their current practice and potential future practice through discussion with academic developers and independent investigation through the three out-of-session tasks or via written reflection.

There is positive feedback from the participants regarding the networking opportunities, discussion and sharing opportunities and the SWAP session.
that occurs in the face to face (and the online version) teaching session. The SWAP session is where participants share an example of their teaching practice with time allowed for question so others can explore and experiment with new teaching strategies.

**Philosophical approach**

There are three components to the philosophical approach:

1) Addressing university policy in the form of the teaching and learning framework;
2) Establishing the university community and culture with a particular commitment to diversity and flexible pathways;
3) Commitment to constructive alignment between graduate qualities, learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities and assessment.

The foundations program is designed to improve the teaching skills of academic staff through an exploration of a range of teaching and learning issues.

**Evaluation and effectiveness:**

The foundations program is run four times a year and after each delivery participants are invited to give feedback, and this together with review and reflection by the teaching staff provides for continual revision and improvement. In addition the program has undergone one external review in the past six years.

An indication of the effectiveness is in the number of consultations that continue after the program has finished. Another indication is that it has been anecdotally observed that those who have completed the foundations program before participating in the Graduate Certificate appear to progress quicker than those who did not complete the foundation program first.

**Best features:**

1) Networking and the opportunity for sharing and talking time.
2) Diversity of the cohort and the experiences they bring (including teaching experience and discipline diversity).
3) Flexibility of delivery and the opportunity to introduce the importance of graduate qualities.
4) Academic developers get the opportunity to connect with new academic staff in a positive way and build strong relationships with faculty members.

**Challenges:**

1) Timing of sessions to ensure people can participate. The program is run four times a year during non-teaching time.
2) Encouraging the “experienced/expert” teacher to reflect upon teaching practice.
3) Dealing with the diversity of experience in the cohort who may include full professors and first time teachers.
4) Continually trying to be innovative while still maintaining the integrity of what is trying to be achieved within the program.
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**Murdoch University**
Dr Jennifer Weir

**University of South Australia**
Ms Dale Wache
Dr David Birbeck

**University of New South Wales**
Ms Giedre Kligyte

**University of Sydney**
Dr Amani Bell

**University of Wollongong**
Dr Gordon Joughin

Roundtable Stakeholder Group

**Flinders University:** Professor Mark Israel

**University of New South Wales:** Dr Husna Razee

**University of Wollongong:** Dr Gordon Joughin

**University of Tasmania:**
Dr Andrea Adam
Ms Jillian Downing
Professor Sue Jones
Ms Rikki Mawad
Professor Gary O’Donovan
Mr Kevin Redd
Ms Sharon Thomas
Appendix 4

Roundtable Program

10.20 am  Welcome and introductions (Dr Natalie Brown)
10.30 am  Introduction to project (Associate Professor Heather Smigiel)
10.45 am  Brief outline of the Models sub-project and format for the day
10.55 am  Workshop 1: Shared values methodology (Dr Natalie Brown)
          What is the purpose of foundation programs?
          What makes them effective?
          What makes them efficient?

11.30 am  Feedback to whole group
11.45 am  Consideration of Case Studies
          Lunch (University Staff Club)
2.00 pm   Group joined by Professor Mark Israel, Flinders University (by video)
2.05 pm   Group summary of consideration of Case Studies
2.45 pm   Revisit purposes and principles from Workshop 1 to make
          recommendations
3.30 pm   Thank you and close
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Flinders University
La Trobe University
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University of New South Wales
University of Sydney
University of South Australia
University of Tasmania
University of Wollongong