## Contact details

### Unit coordinator/lecturer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit coordinator/lecturer</td>
<td>Kristin Warr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kristin.Warr@utas.edu.au">Kristin.Warr@utas.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phone</td>
<td>0362262188 or 0448 524 632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fax</td>
<td>0362261881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact times:</strong></td>
<td>Via email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Please note Kristin only works Tuesdays,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursdays and Fridays.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

## Unit Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit administration</td>
<td>Grad Cert Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:TILT.Enquiries@utas.edu.au">TILT.Enquiries@utas.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phone</td>
<td>6226 7251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fax</td>
<td>6226 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact times:</strong></td>
<td>Business hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Unit description

Introducing innovation and supporting changes in practice in order to enhance students’ experiences are important components of leadership in learning and teaching. This unit provides you with the opportunity to demonstrate leadership through undertaking a supervised project on a strategic learning and teaching priority that is of benefit to you, your School, and/or the University*. Incorporating knowledge developed in previous units in the course, you are required to plan, implement and evaluate the outcomes of your project. (* It is important that you are actively engaged in teaching during the semester that you attempt this unit.)

Learning outcomes

On completion of this unit, you should be able to:

1. demonstrate your capacity to design, implement, evaluate and report on, a structured small-scale university learning and teaching development project;
2. justify the purpose/s and design of the project in terms of current issues and concerns within the higher education community and the particular needs of your institution, colleagues and/or students; and
3. critically reflect upon the outcomes of your project, drawing on your own evidence and with reference to current literature regarding university learning and teaching.

Generic graduate attributes

The University has defined a set of generic graduate attributes (GGAs) that can be expected of all graduates (see http://www.teaching-learning.utas.edu.au/orientation/generic). By undertaking this unit you should make progress in attaining the following attributes:

**Knowledge:** Knowledge of project planning and evaluation will be developed through reading, discussions and participation in a project within your particular professional and/or discipline concepts. Knowledge of the higher education teaching and learning context will be extended through engaging with literature relevant to projects in terms of both purpose and design.

**Communication skills:** will be developed through interactive learning contexts, including discussion and academic reading and writing tasks. There will also be opportunity for you to develop skills in reporting to stakeholders (in both oral and written format) through the lifecycle of the project.

**Problem-solving skills:** will be developed as you engage with the tasks of planning, implementing and evaluating a specific university learning and teaching project.

Prior knowledge &/or skills

You need to have completed ELT501 or CAM502. Having completed ELT 502 or 503 would be of some advantage, but is not mandatory. You need to be committed to self improvement in your teaching and/or other educational activities, and willing to engage colleagues in this process.
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Learning resources required

Requisite texts
There is no set text for this unit. It is expected that you will source appropriate references as you progress your own project.

Recommended reading

Overview papers

To link to this article: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2012.647786](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2012.647786)


The Dexter and Seden paper is a very recent one written about the benefits of small scale learning and teaching projects and places this in the broader HE context (in this case in the UK – but there are definite synergies with the Australian sector). The Westera paper is aimed at technology-based innovation.

I would then suggest that you select 2 or 3 readings that you can relate to your own individual discipline/context. I think it would be most useful to read articles that provide exemplars of projects similar to those you are planning. This should help you get a feel for how projects move through the planning, implementation, evaluation and dissemination phases. At our face to face meeting we should be able to draw out the common threads in these readings with a view to shaping your own project.

As I am not sure of your own individual directions at this early stage, I have provided some possible starting points – 4 websites and then links to specific papers describing innovations in a variety of areas. Please be mindful that some of these papers describe projects introduced by a team (and with financial support) – so are able to be somewhat more ambitious than projects implemented by individual academic staff.

Useful Web sites:

The HERDSA website has links to all refereed papers from conferences for the past 10 years. These papers often describe small scale teaching and learning innovations – and cover a range of discipline areas: [http://www.herdsa.org.au/index.php?page_id=162](http://www.herdsa.org.au/index.php?page_id=162)

These sites may also be useful:


The Educause conference web sites has a number of interesting papers describing innovations in ‘… higher education, managing knowledge technologies to advance scholarship, learning and research’. I found the papers to be very readable and useful in describing the type of innovations that are achievable by individuals and small teams in the Higher Education sector.

[http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/](http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/)
If you go to the Subject Centres tab on the top of the page, you will find links to specific discipline areas – or go to http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/disciplines.

On these individual pages there are links to journals, case studies and other initiatives. The Health Sciences site, for example, has a number of mini-projects detailed (see link under Health Science on the next page).


(Office for Learning and Teaching and [former] Australian Learning and Teaching Council projects – these would be much larger and with serious budgets)

http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo.aspx

An outline of the technology based projects funded by the UK body, JISC.

Specific links to papers describing innovations:

(Categories and the title for each of these are provided as a guide to the content area of the paper.)

- **Enhancing student experience**
  
  Jarkey, 2004: Orientation as an ongoing learning experience: Student focused and holistic (Content area – Arts)
  

- **Looking at Student Feedback**
  
  Rowe, Wood & Petocz, 2008 Engaging students: Student preferences for feedback.
  

- **Using Mentoring and authentic experiences to enhance student learning**
  
  Baird, 2004: Transforming knowledge through mentor-supported cognitive apprenticeship learning methods (Content area – Building Design)
  

- **Using technology to support student learning**
  
  Hallas, 2005: Getting started in flexible learning: Perceptions from an online professional development workshop (Implementation and evaluation of a staff Professional learning workshop)
  

  Poyatos-Matas & Allan: Providing feedback to online students: A new approach
  

  Schmid & Yeung, 2005: The influence of a pre-laboratory work module on student performance in the first year chemistry laboratory
  

  
  http://www.caudit.edu.au/educauseaustralasia07/authors_papers/Watson-112.pdf
Chrisfield & Green 2007: Development of interactive online anatomy images in the LUNA Insight Image database – building digital collections and learning applications step by step – a collaboration between Human Biosciences and the Library at La Trobe.

- Health Science


A large number of funded mini-projects in the Health Sciences are reported in the following document:
http://www.health.heacademy.ac.uk/projects/miniprojects/MPbooklet.pdf

- Information Management

Polykett and Benn: Beyond e-Reserve: Implementation of a repository-based reading list management system at the University of Western Australia
http://www.caudit.edu.au/educauseaustralasia07/authors_papers/Poleykett-109%20FINAL.pdf

- Science

Wilson and Russell, 2003: The first year physics diary project

Planning proformas/resources

Another useful portal
The Office for Learning and Teaching (OLT) website has links to some very useful Higher Education teaching and learning sites.

Learning expectations and strategies

The University is committed to high standards of professional conduct in all activities, and holds its commitment and responsibilities to its students as being of paramount importance. Likewise, it holds expectations about the responsibilities students have as they pursue their studies within the special environment the University offers. The University’s Code of Conduct for Teaching and Learning states:

*Students are expected to participate actively and positively in the teaching/learning environment. They must attend classes when and as required, strive to maintain steady progress within the subject or unit framework, comply with workload expectations, and submit required work on time.*

Thus, in ELT504 you will be expected to participate fully in all aspects of the planned teaching and learning program (see below). This will involve completing appropriate pre-reading, attending the full day compulsory F2F workshop, contributing in a meaningful way to discussions with other participants on this day, maintaining regular contact with the lecturer during the progress of your project and submitting all assessment tasks in a professional manner. You will also be encouraged to participate in two additional F2F meetings and/or online communications with other participants.
Details of teaching arrangements

During this unit, you will be involved in pre-reading and preparation tasks, one compulsory F2F workshop (full day via videolink); up to two further F2F meetings on your own campus or via videolink; individual contact with the lecturer; and formal assessment tasks related to the design, implementation and evaluation of a specific university learning and teaching project. The compulsory F2F session will be held on 17th February in Hobart commencing at 10am. Other sessions/activities will occur/be negotiated as shown in the following table.

## Unit schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session/Activity</th>
<th>Date/time and duration</th>
<th>Content/topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pre-reading and preliminary thinking about Draft Proposal | Prior to first F2F meeting: should be allocated approximately 4 hours | 1. Review Dexter & Seddon paper noted above  
2. Read 2-3 exemplar projects – see above  
3. Preliminary thinking about your own project possibilities.  
4. See project planning exemplars appended to this unit outline |
| Compulsory F2F meeting                                | (February 17th) 10am -3pm    | 1. Introduction to participants  
2. Re-iteration of unit learning intentions; discussion of Action Learning models and contexts  
3. Overview of current themes and issues in Higher Education  
4. Consideration of UTAS strategic priorities  
5. Discussion of project planning with emphasis on preparing for evaluation  
6. Participant discussions of Draft Proposal – University Learning and Teaching Project.  
7. Discussion of requirements for Assessment Tasks  
8. Value adding - Outline of UTAS Teaching Development Grants and other appropriate avenues for support and dissemination of t & l projects. |
| Submission of Draft Proposal for feedback              | (3rd March) Optional         | Submission of Draft Proposal                                                                                                                  |
| Informal Meeting (Non-compulsory)                     | By phone or in person        | Opportunity to discuss feedback on draft proposal/gain peer feedback and to share resources                                                      |
| Assessment Task 1                                     | 24th March                   | Submission of Assessment Task 1: Project Plan                                                                                                  |
Individual meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date to be negotiated with participants; up to two hours; Hobart, CC, Launceston or VC as required.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Informal discussion of ‘work in progress’ reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Participant Presentations – Assessment Task 2: Progress Report (Oral Option)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Discussion of requirements for Assessment Task 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Task 2

| 12th May |
| Submission of Assessment Task 2 Progress Report (Written Option) Oral option – On or before this date |
| 1. Informal discussion of ‘project outcomes’ reports |
| 2. Further discussion of requirements for Assessment Task 3 |

Informal Meeting (Non-compulsory)

| To be negotiated |
| 1. Informal discussion of ‘project outcomes’ reports |
| 2. Further discussion of requirements for Assessment Task 3 |

Assessment Task 3

| 16th June |
| Submission of Assessment Task 3: Evaluation of Outcomes |

Individual supervision

| As required; initiated by participants |
| 1. Clarification of assessment task requirements |
| 2. Support in the design, implementation and evaluation of projects |

Participants will also be encouraged to present a report on their projects at Teaching Matters or in a School or Faculty research seminar context.

Assessment

Assessment schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment task</th>
<th>Date due</th>
<th>Percent weighting</th>
<th>Links to Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft project proposal (formative – feedback only)</td>
<td>3rd March</td>
<td>Unweighted</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Task 1</td>
<td>24th March</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Task 2</td>
<td>12th May</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Task 3</td>
<td>16th June</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that Assessment tasks are detailed in the section below. Rubrics for each Assessment Task are included in Appendix 1.
**Assessment details**

**Formative assessment task:** Ungraded Pass

**Task description**
Outline of project including summary of justification for project, main stakeholders, aims of the project, proposed actions and methods of evaluation.

**Task length**
Approximately 5 hours (broad and selective reading)

300 words (please note that this is a brief proposal only)

**Links to unit’s learning outcomes**
Unit Learning Outcomes 1, 2 and 3

GGA - Knowledge

GGA – Communication Skills (Written)

(Ungraded pass – formative feedback will be given to draft proposals)

**Guidelines**
It would be expected that your draft proposal:

1. Includes key areas of intentions, actions and expected outcomes and encompasses an achievable timeframe.

2. Identifies one or more current themes and/or issues in higher education

3. Explains the relevance of the project to your current teaching and learning context(s)

**Date due:**
Monday 3rd March 2014

---

**Assessment task 1:**

**Task description**
Project Plan - University Learning and Teaching Project

**Task length**
1500 words

**Links to unit’s learning outcomes**
Unit Learning Outcomes 1 and 2

GGA - Knowledge

GGA – Communication Skills (Written)

GGA – Problem-solving skills
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Guidelines

The Project Plan is to comprise a revised and extended version of your Draft Proposal – University Learning and Teaching Project. It should show evidence that you have:

1. Made use of a relevant template or planning document to identify in detail the project focus, implementation plan, proposed evaluation (including a timeline) and expected outcomes

2. Explained how the project addresses specific dimensions of current themes and issues in Higher Education and your own teaching context.

3. Produced a quality written presentation to communicate your project.

You should also show that you have considered feedback given on the Draft proposal.

Details of the assessment criteria are included in the rubric in Appendix 1.

Date due

Monday 24th March 2014

* Templates are provided at the conclusion of this outline – You may like to use the University of Tasmania Project Planning Template (Teaching and Learning), the Major School/Faculty Teaching Project Proposal template, or other templates as appropriate.

Assessment task 2 (40%):

Task description

Progress Report - University Teaching and Learning Project

Task length

2000 words

OR

a 30 minute oral presentation with supporting a-v and/or printed resources

Links to unit learning outcomes and/or GGAs

Unit Learning Outcomes 1, 2 and 3

GGA- Knowledge

GGA –Communication Skills (Oral and/or Written)

GGA – Problem-solving skills

Assessment criteria / guidelines

The Progress Report is designed to allow you to demonstrate your capacity to implement your planned project and to begin the process of collecting evaluative evidence on the outcomes (planned and unexpected) of the project. It also provides you with the opportunity to communicate the progress of your project to your
colleagues. In the report you should:

1. **Map/describe implementation of the project to date**;

2. **Identify/comment on any changes and/or additions that have been made to the project design during implementation**;

3. **Identify and explain the types of evidence/data that you are collecting and/or creating in order to assist you in the critical evaluation of the outcomes of the project, together with how you will analyse these**; and

4. **discuss how the progress of the project to date confirms and/or challenges current thinking and/or literature related to the focus of the project**.

If you choose the written option in this Task, you should construct your Progress Report as a Discussion Paper or use an appropriate reporting proforma accompanied by any necessary annotations. You should use standard academic language and referencing conventions.

Full details of the assessment criteria are included in the rubric in Appendix 1.

If you choose the oral option in this Task, you should deliver your Progress Report in the format of a Conference Presentation, taking care to use an effective oral presentation style and to show evidence of concern for engagement of the audience.

**Date due**

Written Option: Monday 12th May, 2014

Oral Option: by negotiation (on or before the above date)

**Assessment Task 3 (30%):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task description</th>
<th>Evaluation of Outcomes - University Teaching and Learning Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task length</td>
<td>2500 words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Links to unit learning outcomes and/or GGAs | Unit Learning Outcomes 2 and 3  
GGA- Knowledge  
GGA –Communication Skills (Written)  |
The Evaluation of Outcomes task is designed to allow you to critically reflect on the outcomes of your project, with reference to current literature regarding university learning and teaching and in terms of the particular needs of your institution, colleagues and/or students. In your evaluation, you should:

1. Present the evidence you have used, and analysis you have conducted to identify what you consider to be the most significant outcomes of your project, be they intended or unexpected; and

2. Analyse/explain how these outcomes address, reflect and/or challenge current thinking and research in the field of university learning and teaching and the particular needs of your institution, colleagues and/or students.

You should construct your Evaluation of Outcomes as a stand-alone Discussion Paper, and use standard academic language and referencing conventions.

Alternatively, you might wish to construct your Evaluation of Outcomes as the discussion section of a proposed journal article suitable for submission to professional journals (including *Innovative Higher Education* and *Higher Education Research and Development*).

Full details of the assessment criteria are included in the rubric in Appendix 1.

**Date due**

Monday 16th June 2014

**How your final result is determined**

You must satisfactorily complete each of Assessment Tasks 1, 2 and 3 outlined above, and must attempt and submit the formative assessment task to pass this unit. Your final result is determined by summing the marks obtained for all assessment tasks on each of the criteria (summarised in the table below).

HD: An HD on 7 criteria and with at least a DN on the remaining 3
DN: An DN on 7 criteria and with at least a CR on the remaining 3
CR: An CR on 7 criteria and with at least a PP on the remaining 3
PP: At least a PP on each of the 10 criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Task</th>
<th>1 (Proposal) (30%)</th>
<th>2 (Progress report) (40%)</th>
<th>3 (Evaluation of outcomes) (30%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning outcome</td>
<td>Criterion 1</td>
<td>Criterion 1</td>
<td>Criterion 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrate your capacity to design, implement, evaluate and report on, a structured small-scale university learning and teaching development project</td>
<td>Criterion 1</td>
<td>Criterion 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. Justify this purpose/s and design of the project in terms of current issues and concerns within the higher education community and the particular needs of your institution, colleagues and/or students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Criterion 2</th>
<th>Criterion 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criterion 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Critically reflect upon the outcomes of your project, drawing on your own evidence and with reference to current literature regarding university learning and teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Criterion 3</th>
<th>Criterion 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criterion 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is the practice of the Faculty of Education that individual pieces of assessment be graded according to the University’s grading system, i.e. percentages/marks for individual pieces of assessment are not released.

**Submission of assignments**

Completed written assessment tasks should be submitted electronically through MyLO before 5pm on the due date.

The electronic submission date and time generated by MyLO will be deemed to be the date and time the assignment is received.

Generally, the date of presentation for oral assessment tasks will be subject to negotiation, within set time frames. All oral assessment tasks will need to be supported by audio-visual and/or printed resources. A copy of these resources should be submitted directly to the lecturer, via MyLO, by the close of business on the same day as the oral presentation.

**Requests for extensions**

All requests for extensions should be submitted via email to the Unit Coordinator (Kristin.Warr@utas.edu.au) at least three days before the due date of the assignment, except in the case of unexpected emergencies.

Generally, foreseeable work commitments will not be grounds for an extension. If you anticipate that work commitments, such as teaching offshore, may impact on your ability to satisfy the requirements of the course, you are advised to notify the unit coordinator and negotiate alternative arrangements.

**Penalties**

Unless an extension has been granted in writing, a penalty of 5% of the awarded mark will be deducted for each day an assignment is overdue. As written assignments are to be submitted electronically, submission on weekends is possible. Weekend days, therefore, will attract the same penalties as weekdays.
Task length and word limits have been set for every assessment task. Submissions that exceed the word limit by more than 20% will incur a penalty of 10% of the awarded mark for each 10% over the word limit.

**Review of results and appeals**

Appeals should go to the lecturer-in-charge in the first instance. If unresolved, appeals are referred to the Course Coordinator and, if necessary, to Faculty Executive (Education).

**Academic referencing***

In your oral and written work you will need to support your ideas by referring to scholarly literature and feedback received from colleagues and/or students. It is important that you understand how to correctly refer to the work and ideas of others, including unpublished and informal conversations, in order to maintain academic integrity.

Failure to appropriately acknowledge the ideas of others, including colleagues and students, constitutes academic dishonesty (plagiarism), a matter considered by the University of Tasmania as a serious offence.

The appropriate referencing style for this unit is APA.

For information on presentation of assignments, including referencing styles:

Please read the following statement on plagiarism. Should you require clarification please see your unit coordinator or lecturer.

**Academic misconduct***

**Academic misconduct** includes cheating, plagiarism, allowing another student to copy work for an assignment or an examination and any other conduct by which a student:

(a) seeks to gain, for themselves or for any other person, any academic advantage or advancement to which they or that other person are not entitled; or
(b) improperly disadvantages any other student.

Students engaging in any form of academic misconduct may be dealt with under the Ordinance of Student Discipline, and this can include imposition of penalties that range from a deduction/cancellation of marks to exclusion from a unit or the University. Details of penalties that can be imposed are available in the Ordinance of Student Discipline – Part 3 Academic Misconduct, see http://www.utas.edu.au/universitycouncil/legislation/

---

### Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a form of cheating. It is taking and using someone else’s thoughts, writings or inventions and representing them as your own; for example, using an author’s words without putting them in quotation marks and citing the source, using an author’s ideas without proper acknowledgment and citation, copying another student’s work. If you have any doubts about how to refer to the work of others in your assignments, please consult your lecturer or tutor for relevant referencing guidelines, and the academic integrity resources on the web at:
http://www.academicintegrity.utas.edu.au/

The intentional copying of someone else’s work as one’s own is a serious offence punishable by penalties that may range from a fine or deduction/cancellation of marks and, in the most serious of cases, to exclusion from a unit, a course or the University.

The University and any persons authorised by the University may submit your
assessable works to a plagiarism checking service, to obtain a report on possible instances of plagiarism. Assessable works may also be included in a reference database. It is a condition of this arrangement that the original author’s permission is required before a work within the database can be viewed.

For further information on this statement and general referencing guidelines, see http://www.utas.edu.au/plagiarism/ or follow the link under ‘Policy, Procedures and Feedback’ on the Current Students homepage.

**Work Health and Safety (WHS)**

The University is committed to providing a safe and secure teaching and learning environment. In addition to specific requirements of this unit you should refer to the University’s policy at: http://www.utas.edu.au/work-health-safety/

**Further information and assistance**

If you are experiencing difficulties with your studies or assignments, have personal or life-planning issues, disability or illness which may affect your course of study, you are advised to raise these with your lecturer in the first instance.

There is a range of University-wide support services available to you including Teaching & Learning, Student Services, International Services. Please refer to the Current Students homepage at: http://www.utas.edu.au/students/

Should you require assistance in accessing the Library visit their website for more information at http://www.utas.edu.au/library/
**Formative Assessment Task:**

**Assessment Criteria:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Includes key areas of intentions, actions and expected outcomes and</td>
<td>You have a clearly stated purpose and outcomes that will be measurable. You have outlined how you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encompasses an ‘achievable’ timeframe</td>
<td>intend to proceed with the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The project is achievable within the time frame. Explicit planning relative to a time-line is included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses a current theme and/or issue in higher education</td>
<td>A current theme or issue in Higher Education has been identified as a justification for the project,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>together with relevant references.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has relevance within your current teaching and learning context(s)</td>
<td>A clear explanation is provided as to the relevance of the project to your current teaching and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learning contexts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note:
For this assignment, only written feedback will be given. Satisfactory assignments will be given an Ungraded Pass.
## Assessment Task 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Identified the project focus, implementation plan (including a timeline) and expected outcomes, making use of a planning proforma or template to further articulate proposal</strong></td>
<td>The project has been outlined in terms of focus, plan and outcomes. However to interpret the outline, some prior knowledge is assumed. A proforma or template has been used for the proposal, with relevant headings addressed. Where appropriate, there is some evidence that the feedback has been responded to in the writing of the new proposal.</td>
<td>The project has been clearly outlined. The reader is able to make sense of the purpose of the project and get a sense of how the project will be implemented and evaluated. A proforma or template has been adopted and adapted to the particular use of the proposal. The entries relate to subheadings and are clearly worded. Where appropriate, it is clear that feedback has been responded to in the new proposal.</td>
<td>The project has been clearly and systematically outlined with attention to detail. The reader can understand how the project will be carried out and how it will be evaluated. The scope of the project is realistic and well defined. It is evident that considerable attention has been paid to the pragmatics of implementation and evaluation. An appropriate proforma or template has been adapted for use. The entries under subheadings are systematically entered and consistent. Wording is clear. Descriptions are comprehensive. Where appropriate, feedback has been integrated into the proposal in a way that has improved the project plan.</td>
<td>As for Distinction and - the entries under each subheading are concise, well structured and comprehensive. The central purpose of the project is very clear. The project is logically and comprehensively described in terms of focus, implementation and outcomes. Each of the components is linked to one another to read clearly and provide a concise description of the project. There is an underpinning framework to the project that ties together the intended outcomes, the methods of implementation and the evaluation. Where appropriate, feedback has been integrated into the proposal in a way in that has improved the project plan or it is evident that the writer has used feedback as a starting point for further thinking to extend ideas, clarify or develop the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Justified the project in terms of current themes and issues in Higher Education</strong></td>
<td>A link has been made to one or more themes or issues in Higher Education (with references).</td>
<td>A link has been made to one or more themes in Higher Education (with references) with explanation of how the current project is positioned within this.</td>
<td>As for Credit but has identified both broad and more specific issue/s (with references) that provide a background to the project. Explains how the project links in to or contrasts to other similar work/projects described in the literature.</td>
<td>As for Distinction and - the position of the project is cohesively outlined in terms of both a broad framework of Higher Education issues, and more specific issues as identified by current literature in the particular field. An appraisal of how the outcomes of the project will contribute to what is known about the issue is included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Situated the project within your context and explained how the project has relevance to your current teaching and learning context(s)</strong></td>
<td>Current context has been outlined as a background to the study with some explanation of how the project will address these.</td>
<td>Specific issues within the current context have been identified and the conception and planning of the project explained in terms of these.</td>
<td>As for Credit but has also included evidence of analysis of the current situation prior to planning.</td>
<td>As for Distinction and - a cohesive and compelling argument is provided to support the relevance of the project to your current context. The potential outcomes of the project are very closely aligned to the issues identified in the planning phase. Ideas flow smoothly and are linked to one another.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Assessment Rubric for Task 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provided a map or description of the project to date and commented upon any alterations to the project design</td>
<td>Cursory outline of the project is given with some detail lacking or the necessity to have been briefly beforehand. Some alterations to original design are mentioned, or where alterations have not been explained or acknowledged.</td>
<td>The project has been outlined so that the audience/reader can understand the justification for the project and the description of how the project has been undertaken. The audience/reader have identified some points of clarification. Some alterations to original design are mentioned and briefly commented upon. Where alterations have not been needed, this has been explained or acknowledged.</td>
<td>The project has been outlined so that the audience has a good idea of the purposes of the project and how it has progressed with only a minimal need for clarification or questions. Some aspects of the project may not be covered in the same depth as for an HD. Alterations to original design are outlined and explained. Where alterations have not been needed, this has been explained or acknowledged.</td>
<td>The project is outlined clearly and logically so that the audience can gain an understanding even if the material is new to them. The introduction to the project has taken into account any necessary prior knowledge that the audience/reader would need. Each aspect of the project is covered – including justification, methodology, analysis of evidence – together with an outlining of the stakeholders. Explains context of alterations succinctly and honestly, together with good justification. It is evident that the evaluation aspect of the project has taken into account of any alterations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Identified the type of evidence that is being collected to inform the evaluation of outcomes of the project</td>
<td>The evaluation process has been outlined, although some detail is lacking.</td>
<td>The evaluation process has been outlined in some detail, including sources of evidence. However some clarification is needed.</td>
<td>The evaluation process has been outlined in some detail, sources of evidence have been clearly identified together with methods of analysis. The evaluation process has been outlined in detail, sources of evidence are self-explanatory, supported with justifications.</td>
<td>The evaluation process has been outlined in detail, sources of evidence clearly identified together with methods of analysis. Data sources and analysis have been justified by a theoretical position.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Provided a summary of the project to date and how it is confirming or challenging current thinking and literature in this area</td>
<td>The summary of the project has incorporated some linkages with current thinking or literature.</td>
<td>The summary of the project, to date, has been reflected upon with respect to current thinking and literature. The sources for comparison are limited.</td>
<td>The project has been reflected upon with respect to current thinking and literature. A number of recent and relevant sources are referred to, in conjunction with an explanation as to why they are important or informative.</td>
<td>The position of the project, to date, is cohesively outlined in terms of both a broad framework of Higher Education issues, and more specific issues as identified by current literature in the particular field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Presented the progress report in an oral presentation to colleagues</td>
<td>Some preparation is evident but presenter would have benefitted from greater rehearsal. There may be some mild tension displayed, or a delay in recovering from minor errors or mistakes. Visual aids readable Able to hear clearly.</td>
<td>The presentation has been prepared in terms of both the oral component and any visual (or other) aids. Speech is clear and of a good volume. Any minor mistakes are corrected or recovered from quickly. There are clear attempts to make connections with the audience in terms of relating to their own context, or familiar contexts or questioning.</td>
<td>A good degree of preparation is evident. Presentation is logically sequenced. Supporting visual (or other) aids are used appropriately. Speech is clear, a good volume and generally delivered in a convincing manner. The presenter appears to have a good grasp and strong interest in the topic and is able to make connections with the audience. Questions are answered with some confidence.</td>
<td>Well prepared, any visual aids are of high quality and well coordinated with speaking. Opening and closing remarks capture attention and mood of the audience. Information is presented logically and in a way to engender interest in the audience. Presentation well paced and entertaining. Responds to audience questions with confidence. Speech is clear, a good volume, well paced and delivered with confidence. Eye contact is made with the audience and facial expressions generate a strong interest and enthusiasm about the topic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>The project has been outlined in relatively clear language, however expression could be improved. The report is written in an appropriate format for outlining progress. Some evidence of spelling/punctuation or grammatical errors that may make the report difficult to understand in places.</td>
<td>The project has been outlined in relatively clear language. There is some evidence of proof reading but errors in spelling, punctuation/grammar still evident. The report is written in an appropriate format for outlining progress and covers necessary information to allow colleagues to assess how the project is tracking. A scholarly writing style has not been completely adopted or there is inclusion of redundant or less than relevant information.</td>
<td>The project has been clearly and systematically outlined with attention to detail. Expression is clear and concise. The report is written in an appropriate format for outlining progress and covers necessary information to allow colleagues to assess how the project is tracking. Some reference to relevant literature has been made. The standard of the written work is high – sentences are well structured. Evidence of proofreading with only a few typographical errors.</td>
<td>The project is logically and comprehensively described. Each of the components is linked to one another to read clearly. The report is written in an appropriate format for outlining progress (consistent with other planning documentation) and includes sufficient information to allow colleagues to assess how the project is tracking without including unnecessary information. Literature is used to support a clear argument and integrates well into the report. Referencing is consistent. Expression is of an extremely high standard. The report is virtually free of any spelling, punctuation or grammatical errors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Presented the progress report in a written presentation |
**Assessment Rubric for Task 3:**

The Evaluation of Outcomes task is designed to allow you to critically reflect on the outcomes of your project, with reference to current literature regarding university learning and teaching and in terms of the particular needs of your institution, colleagues and/or students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Presented the evidence that you have used to evaluate and analysis you have conducted to identify what you consider to be the most significant of your project, be they intended or unexpected</strong></td>
<td>Some evidence used for evaluation has been presented. Outcomes for the project have been identified.</td>
<td>Multiple sources of evidence are presented with some justification for sources and analysis. Outcomes for the project have been clearly identified, together with an explanation of whether they were intended or unexpected.</td>
<td>Evidence is presented and there is some reference to a scholarly framework for its collection and analysis. A comprehensive presentation of the project outcomes together with identification of key outcomes and an explanation of whether they were intended or unexpected.</td>
<td>Evidence is presented within a scholarly framework. Evidence used is justified within a methodological framework. Analysis of evidence is consistent with chosen methodology/framework. Key outcomes of the project have been clearly identified, together with a justification of which ones are significant and why this is so. Unexpected outcomes are explained or critiqued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Analysed/explained how your outcomes address, reflect and/or challenge current thinking and research in the field of university learning and teaching and the particular needs of your institution, colleagues and/or students.</strong></td>
<td>Outcomes of the project have been explained and some linkages with current literature have been incorporated, together with some reference to your own context.</td>
<td>Outcomes of the project have been explained and there has been some analysis. Outcomes have been reflected upon with respect to current thinking or literature, although the sources for comparison are limited. There is a reference to your own context.</td>
<td>The project has been explained and analysed with respect to current thinking and literature. A number of recent and relevant sources are referred to, in conjunction with an explanation as to why outcomes are important or informative to your own context.</td>
<td>As for distinction however the outcomes cohesively explained and are extremely well in terms of both a broad framework of Higher Education issues, and more specific issues as identified by current literature in the particular field. Analysis of outcomes with respect to your own context is comprehensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Constructed your ‘Evaluation of Outcomes’ as a stand-alone discussion paper, and used standard academic language and referencing conventions.</strong></td>
<td>Discussion is written so that the reader can follow the arguments. The required referencing system is used.</td>
<td>Discussion is written clearly and in academic style. Referencing system is consistent with the required style. Relevant literature has been used to support discussion.</td>
<td>Discussion is clear and concise. Arguments are logically sequenced and well linked. Relevant literature has been used well to support the discussion. Referencing style consistent throughout the report. The discussion is written in academic style and has very few errors of spelling, punctuation or grammar.</td>
<td>Discussion has been very well framed, from a conceptual and theoretical basis. Current relevant literature has been well integrated to support a clear argument. Discussion is clear and concise. Arguments are logically sequenced and well linked. Expression is of an extremely high standard. The report is virtually free of any spelling, punctuation or grammatical errors. Academic writing style and referencing style correctly applied throughout the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Assignment follows, in general, the format of a discussion paper in a relevant journal. Discussion is written clearly and in academic style. Referencing system is consistent with the required style. The required referencing system is used.</td>
<td>Assignment follows format of a discussion paper in a relevant journal. Discussion is written clearly and in academic style. Referencing system is consistent with the required style.</td>
<td>Assignment follows format of a discussion paper in a relevant journal with each section given appropriate attention. Discussion is clear and concise. Arguments are logically sequenced and well linked. Relevant literature has been used well to support the discussion. Referencing style required by the journal has been used consistently throughout the report. The discussion is written in academic style and has very few errors of spelling, punctuation or grammar.</td>
<td>Assignment follows format of a discussion paper in a relevant journal with each section given appropriate attention. Discussion has been very well framed, from a conceptual and theoretical basis. Current relevant literature has been well integrated to support a clear argument. Expression is of an extremely high standard. The report is virtually free of any spelling, punctuation or grammatical errors. Academic writing style and referencing style consistent with that required by the journal has been used correctly throughout the report. Discussion is ready for submission for publication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3. Constructed your ‘Evaluation of Outcomes’ as the discussion section of a proposed journal article suitable for submission to professional journals (including Innovative Higher Education and Higher Education Research and Development). | Assignment follows format of a discussion paper in a relevant journal. Discussion is written clearly and in academic style. Referencing system is consistent with the required style. | Assignment follows format of a discussion paper in a relevant journal with each section given appropriate attention. Discussion is clear and concise. Arguments are logically sequenced and well linked. Relevant literature has been used well to support the discussion. Referencing style required by the journal has been used consistently throughout the report. The discussion is written in academic style and has very few errors of spelling, punctuation or grammar. | Assignment follows format of a discussion paper in a relevant journal with each section given appropriate attention. Discussion has been very well framed, from a conceptual and theoretical basis. Current relevant literature has been well integrated to support a clear argument. Expression is of an extremely high standard. The report is virtually free of any spelling, punctuation or grammatical errors. Academic writing style and referencing style consistent with that required by the journal has been used correctly throughout the report. Discussion is ready for submission for publication. |