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Preface

The University’s reputation with students, their parents and families, and our communities rests significantly on the quality of our teaching. The University reflects this in its aspiration to provide students with “an outstanding university experience so that they become successful and influential graduates and loyal alumni.” (University of Auckland Strategic Plan, 2013-2020, p. 5) and in its objective to create “a high-quality learning environment that maximises the opportunity for all our students to succeed and provides them with an inclusive, intellectually challenging and transformative educational experience.”

The TeachWell@UoA Framework has been developed to support the realization of these ambitions and to describe what is considered reasonable for all university teachers to be able to achieve. It also incorporates a component that defines extended capability to capture the excellence that is a feature of teaching among many of our staff. The prime focus, however, is to provide baseline expectations for teaching.

Teaching well not only supports a high-quality student experience. Describing the process of teaching well also helps define the scope for our development as university teachers and the professional learning opportunities that are necessary to support this development.

In developing the framework careful attention has been paid to reflecting the wide variety of teaching and learning activities at the University – lecture, tutorial, workshop, laboratory, studio, clinics, online, bedside, experiential, work-based, field-based – and the range of disciplinary conventions (often referred to as “signature pedagogies”) associated with learning in particular fields. TeachWell@UoA thus sets out principles and practices that are inclusive of multiple contexts and concepts of teaching and learning.

I extend my thanks to all of those who have been involved in the development of the TeachWell@UoA Framework – in particular to the working group comprising Associate Deans Teaching and Learning (or equivalent) in each faculty, University of Auckland national tertiary teaching excellence award winners, and representatives from the Centre for Learning and Research in Higher Education (CLeaR). Thanks are also due to Professor Graeme Aitken for conceiving this project and for chairing the working group.

Professor John Morrow
Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic
January 2020
Overview

The Framework comprises five dimensions – a set of Framework Design Principles that contextualise teaching well within a New Zealand and University of Auckland context, Criteria that outline the Core Capability for teaching well at the University along with a parallel description of Extended Capability, a classification of the Uses of the Criteria for Reflection and Goalsetting, and for Evidence and Documentation, and an outline of Support available to staff. These dimensions are illustrated in Figure 1.

**Figure 1. Dimensions of TeachWell@UoA Framework**
Teaching is a process aimed at optimising both the experience of learning for students (often referred to as engagement) and their achievement. As such, it is as much a function of what students experience and achieve as it is of what the teacher does. Conventionally conceived, teaching comprises four inter-related elements:

- establishing purpose
- planning or designing content and strategy to deliver on that purpose;
- implementing strategy; and
- assessing impact

Because of the complex interaction among these elements, and between teacher, student and context, teaching well is an imperfect, experimental process. As such the framework developed here gives prominence to the following principles:

### Figure 2. Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Te Tiriti o Waitangi</td>
<td>Teaching well needs to incorporate the use of contexts and content that affirm the knowledge, language, identity, and culture of Māori.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ako</td>
<td>Teaching well cannot be defined only by what teachers know and do. It must also consider what students contribute and experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prominence of Underlying Concepts</td>
<td>Teaching well needs to be defined through underlying concepts of teaching (ako or pedagogy) that need to be enacted according to context (subject, level, students, space, venue, time).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Recognition of Context</td>
<td>Any model of Teaching well must be broad enough to capture the different nature of learning across the full range of University teaching settings and to accommodate different disciplinary conventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Management of Constraints</td>
<td>Teaching well cannot be defined by constraints and nor, because of the constraints, can it be defined by solely by outcomes. Rather it needs to focus on actions aimed at optimising learning and engagement within inevitable constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Teaching well needs to recognise the collaborative nature of teaching and that most often we are stronger collectively than any one of us can be individually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Teaching well needs to acknowledge that we won’t always get it right, and that there may be some times when the teaching and learning experience is less than ideal. Responsiveness and improvement are more important than single point achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Core Capability: TeachWell@UoA Criteria

The TeachWell@UoA criteria (Figure 3) describe what is considered reasonable for all university teachers to be able to achieve.

The criteria are arranged against five areas of activity:
- design for learning,
- teach for learning,
- assess for learning,
- reflect on learning and
- contribute to learning.

Figure 3. TeachWell@UoA: Core Capability

| Design | • selecting appropriate outcomes.  
|        | • deliberately attending to diversity of student background, prior knowledge and experience.  
|        | • planning opportunities for active student learning.  
|        | • aligning intended learning outcomes, teaching approach and assessment.  
| Teach  | • facilitating student understanding.  
|        | • encouraging the engagement and learning of all students.  
|        | • establishing a safe, inclusive and supportive learning environment (physical and/or digital).  
| Assess | • providing feedback to students that is helpful, timely and constructive.  
|        | • designing assessment opportunities that enable students to develop and demonstrate their capabilities.  
| Reflect| • engaging with evidence and professional learning opportunities to improve teaching.  
| Contribute | • making constructive contributions to the teaching culture of the school/department/teaching team.  

## Extended Capability: TeachWell@UoA

**Extended Criteria**

Although the main purpose of the TeachWell@UoA Framework is to describe a level of general capability a set of criteria have also been developed to describe the University’s aspiration for teaching excellence. These extended capability criteria (Figure 4) are organised against the same Areas of Activity as the Core Capability model. Note in particular the more extended expectations in relation to reflection on teaching.

**Figure 4. TeachWell@UoA: Extended Capability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Teach</th>
<th>Assess</th>
<th>Reflect</th>
<th>Contribute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • integrating and referencing evidence-based approaches and current thinking about learning and teaching as a source of experimentation and innovation. | • using assessment evidence (e.g. short response items, discussion) during teaching to improve understanding.  
 • adjusting teaching when lack of engagement is evident.  
 • building and maintaining a vibrant learning culture characterised by intellectual rigour, cultural responsiveness, and active student involvement. | • designing and refining assessments to optimise content validity, reliability, fairness and consequential relevance (i.e. meaningfully inform adjustments in teaching). | • systematically analysing direct (formative and summative assessment responses) and indirect (e.g. SET, peer observations) evidence of learning to identify priorities for innovating to better support student learning.  
 • proactively seeking and listening to student voice, and responding appropriately.  
 • engaging with the scholarly literature about practices most likely to improve learning.  
 • proactively pursuing own learning about teaching and learning.  
 • articulating a clear sense of purpose for teaching and learning as transformative experiences for teacher and student. | • engaging in formal or informal leadership that has had a beneficial influence on others’ teaching and that advances student learning in the course, department/school and faculty. |
The prime purpose of the TeachWell@UoA framework is to define expectations for teaching at the University that will then inform both support for, and recognition of, teaching. Figure 5 identifies the ways it is anticipated the TeachWell@UoA criteria will be used.

**Figure 5. Using the TeachWell@UoA Criteria**

| Academic Staff | to understand the full scope of teaching and inform their developing teaching philosophy  
|                | to identify professional learning priorities and opportunities to develop their practice  
|                | to support implementation of related university teaching policies (e.g. Assessment, Retention)  
|                | to develop a cumulative record of teaching achievement and progress  
|                | to inform a course review and reflection  
|                | to support continuation applications  
|                | to support promotion applications |
| Teaching Teams | to identify strengths and allocate responsibilities  
|                | to identify gaps and professional learning priorities |
| Departments or Schools | to build and strengthen a teaching culture  
|                        | to identify professional learning priorities  
|                        | to mentor new staff  
|                        | to inform ADPR conversations |
| Faculties | to build and strengthen a teaching culture  
|            | to identify opportunities to develop teaching practice  
|            | to mentor new staff  
|            | to inform the content of Practice Notes  
|            | to inform recognition of teaching (e.g. teaching awards) and decisions about continuation and promotion  
|            | to prioritise funding aimed at supporting teaching |
| University Administration | to inform recognition of teaching (e.g. teaching awards) and decisions about promotion  
|                          | to prioritise funding aimed at supporting teaching  
|                          | to identify infrastructure and support needs  
|                          | to inform policy development related to teaching |
Assisting Reflection and Goalsetting

One application of the TeachWell@UoA Criteria is to use them as the basis for designing questions that facilitate reflection and goalsetting about teaching among teaching teams, within departments and Schools, and as part of the ADPR process. The questions in Figure 6 are examples of the prompts that might be used in these discussions. The prompts are not comprehensive and nor is it intended that discussions work through all of them. It may be quite appropriate just to focus on one and to explore it in some depth.

Figure 6. Application of the TeachWell@UoA Criteria for Reflection and Goalsetting by teaching teams, departments/Schools, and for ADPR
Support

The University's academic professional development programmes offered through People and Organisational Development (POD), the learning design support available through the University Learning Design Service (LDS), and qualifications offered through the Faculty of Education and Social Work are designed to support the development of Core Capability and to enable progress to Extended Capability. These supports are illustrated in Figure 7 below.

Figure 7. Support for TeachWell@UoA Core and Extended Capability

- POD Courses and Workshops
- University Learning Design Service (LDS)
- Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education
  PGCertHigherEd
- Master of Higher Education
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Teaching and Learning Committees

Teaching Symposium
Evidence & Documentation

Using the TeachWell@UoA Criteria in any of the ways listed in Figure 5 requires the collection of evidence about teaching. There is a common confusion between teaching criteria and teaching-related evidence. Criteria describe the broad parameters of expectation. Evidence demonstrates achievement of the criteria.

There are eight broad forms of evidence that can be used to illustrate teaching achievement. These are listed in Figure 8 along with the connection to the relevant criteria from the TeachWell@UoA Areas of Activity. The list is illustrative, not exhaustive.

Figure 8. Examples of Evidence

| Student experience of learning | Analysis of Qualtrics. • Analysis of SET data (qualitative and quantitative). • Student voice by way of informal feedback, focus groups and/or consultation with class representatives. |
| Outcomes for students | Analysis of: Student grade and grade distributions; Student performance by gender, ethnicity, etc. • Analysis of and responses to: Student misunderstandings, confusions, successes, and insights as revealed in their work/performance. • Pre and post-test. |
| Attestation by others | Reflections on and responses to systematic observations by colleagues. • Comments from community, industry, professional partners. • Comments from graduate employers. |
| Artefacts | Annotated examples of planning and/or assessment to highlight key elements of planning and assessment for learning. • Examples of resources (written, visual, digital) to support teaching evaluated for their impact. • Annotated examples of student work to highlight key elements of learning (or non-learning). • Exemplars of feedback to students. |
| Self-assessment | Reflective comment on own practice. • Articulated approach to teaching. |
| Professional Learning | Examples of learning from professional reading, collegial interaction, seminar or workshop participation. • Teaching-related qualifications. |
| Influence | Examples of contribution to teaching culture. • Examples of working collegially with learning designers and other teaching-related professional staff. • Presentations as an invited speaker. • Pedagogical publications. |
| Esteem | Recognition through teaching awards. • Invitations to share teaching ideas. |
In the same way that academic staff maintain a record of research, it is possible to maintain a systematic record of teaching. This parallel suggests an approach to maintaining a teaching record that aligns with the research Evidence Portfolio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Record/Portfolio Category</th>
<th>Equivalent Research Record Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statement</strong></td>
<td>Platform of Research - Contextual Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of approach to teaching (philosophy of teaching).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-What are you trying to achieve in teaching?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-What are you working on in teaching?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Record</strong></td>
<td>Research Outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching record by year recording subject, level, type (lecture, tutorial etc), proportion of contribution to courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence</strong></td>
<td>Quality and impact measures, and explanation of FOUR Nominated Research Outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of quality using examples of teaching-based evidence from Figure 3 and accompanied by a description of FOUR most significant contributions to student learning. An EXAMPLE is provided in Appendix 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contribution</strong></td>
<td>Contribution to the research environment (best 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to teaching and/or leadership of teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Consistent with the University of Auckland 5-D Leadership Framework.
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Three external sources have informed the ongoing development of the TeachWell@UoA Framework:

a) the Universitas 21 network of universities *Teaching Indicators Framework* developed from an analysis of existing policy documents and teaching portfolios provided by other U21 universities, each with a similar profile to the University of Auckland.²

b) the Royal Academy of Engineering (United Kingdom) *Career Framework for University Teaching* that has established criteria for defining and evaluating teaching achievement at all stages of the academic career.³

c) the Higher Education Academy (United Kingdom) *Professional Standards Framework* for teaching and supporting learning in higher education,⁴ and an accompanying four categories of Fellowship, from Associate to Principal, to recognise individual’s practice, impact and leadership of teaching and learning. We have also been informed by the development of the *Ako Aronui Framework⁵* developed at AUT in consultation with the HEA to contextualise the HEA Professional Standards Framework within Māori philosophies, worldviews and values.

---
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⁴ See UK Professional Standards Framework (UKPSF) Resources at https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/individuals/fellowship/fellowship-resources
⁵ https://cflat.aut.ac.nz/ako-aronui/ako-aronui-framework/