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TEDF Overview

• The Teaching Excellence Development Fund (TEDF) supports academic staff to develop innovative projects and capacity building initiatives that promote excellence and scholarship in teaching, learning and assessment.

• The broad aim of TEDF is to improve the quality of teaching, learning and assessment in alignment with the aspirations of the Learning for Tomorrow agenda at Curtin, as well as national priorities outlined by the National Office for Learning and Teaching (OLT).

• The scheme accommodates new Academic roles and is aligned with Curtin’s Teaching, Learning and Student Experience Plan 2013 – 2017.
TEDF Principles

• **Principle 1:** Projects/Activities funded by the TEDF will align with Curtin’s Strategic Plan and key institutional strategic teaching and learning projects.

• **Principle 2:** The TEDF will be inclusive and equitable for all Curtin teaching staff.

• **Principle 3:** The TEDF application process and reporting requirements will be manageable for claimants and those processing applications.

• **Principle 4:** The TEDF will be subject to annual evaluation and review to ensure the scheme remains fit-for-purpose.
Funding arrangements

- $360,000 available in 2016
- Maximum of $20,000 per project
- Funding will be committed in January 2016 for all successful proposals.
- Funds will be distributed to Project cost centres located in Schools and Faculties, and the responsibility lies with each Project Lead to manage all administrative and financial transactions.
- All purchases and expenses will be paid out of the individual cost centre when appropriate purchase orders and invoices have been provided. All transactions should carry the TEDF prefix on any statement.
- Project Leads will need to maintain accurate monitoring and reporting processes for final reconciliation of TEDF accounts within the 2016 Calendar year.
2016 - Strategic Priorities

• Academic integrity and good practice in assessment
• Developing cross-disciplinary curriculum content and approaches
• Developing personalised learning approaches
• Embedding employability skills for the future into the curriculum
• Improving student retention
• Improving access to and outcomes in higher education for Indigenous people
TEDF Opportunities

Examples of TEDF funding opportunities include but are not limited to:

• **Academic Integrity and good practice in assessment** – designing assessment practices that reduce the motivation and opportunity for plagiarism; fostering approaches to assessment that enhance student learning; improving peer and self-assessment practices; and developing effective assessment literacy strategies.

• **Developing cross-disciplinary curriculum content and approaches** - including employing new teaching tools, exemplars and strategies; developing innovative approaches to team teaching including staff training, peer mentoring and teaching area support.

• **Developing personalised learning approaches** – innovated projects including student personalisation, interactive teaching games, enhancing student engagement, and engaging mobile device applications.
Examples of TEDF funding opportunities include but are not limited to:

- **Embedding employability skills for the future into the curriculum** - aligning assessment for work integrated learning initiatives; cultural and inter-discipline development in the curriculum, and community of practice education; approaches to benchmarking and employability outcomes.

- **Improving student retention** - enhancing preparational strategies for students; facilitating academic advising strategies; developing early detection and intervention strategies for students at risk; enabling transition in early learning environments; developing transferable practices in educational and assessment literacy.

- **Improving access to and outcomes in higher education for Indigenous people** - including developing access and pathway programs for Indigenous people; developing innovative strategies for embedding of Indigenous education; fostering strategies for the integration of scholarship, research and professional activities with regards to Indigenous education; and fostering the development of professional learning and teaching practice within the Indigenous community.
Submission details

**Online Application** Form through Curtin **Qualtrics**:

- Project Title, Lead Applicant, Contact Details
- Project Overview and Rationale
- Project Outputs
- Project Impact and Dissemination (*refer to IMPEL model info at the end of this presentation*)
- Project Approach
- Project Team
- Project Budget – must not exceed $20,000
- Risk Management & Head of School Approval
Review Panel

The operation of the scheme is overseen by the Associate Deputy Vice Chancellor (Learning and Teaching). Selection panels for proposals will consist of a minimum of three members drawn from the following areas:

- Faculty Deans Teaching & Learning
- Associate Deputy Vice Chancellor (Learning and Teaching)
- Student Guild representative
- Curtin Teaching and Learning (CTL) Directors
- TEDF Coordinator
- 2 x Curtin Academy Fellows
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to Strategic Priorities of the TEDF</td>
<td>Relevant to learners and strategic priorities are unclear.</td>
<td>Relevant to many learners and a strategic priority.</td>
<td>Relevant to a wide range of learners and across strategic priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic merit and clarity of the project</td>
<td>The proposal lacks sufficient detail and/or clarity.</td>
<td>The rationale for the project is explained.</td>
<td>The rationale for the project is clearly and concisely explained. The conceptual framework for the proposal is clear and demonstrates a high standard of scholarship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact, transferability and sustainability</td>
<td>The project outcomes have low or unclear potential impact in the project setting; are unlikely to be transferable to new settings; and are likely to require high ongoing costs.</td>
<td>The project outcomes have moderate potential impact in the project setting; may be transferable to new settings; and are sustainable without further resourcing.</td>
<td>The project outcomes have high potential impact in the project setting; are readily transferable to new settings; and are likely to generate further income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget sustainability</td>
<td>The budget details are insufficient and/or appear inappropriate for the proposed activities.</td>
<td>The budget is sufficiently detailed and appears appropriate for the proposed activities.</td>
<td>The budget is sufficiently detailed and is clearly appropriate for the proposed activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A **Community of Practice (CoP)** is a Group of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly.

**TEDF** supports academic staff to develop innovative projects and capacity building initiatives that foster excellence and scholarship in teaching and learning.
Next TEDF CoP Event

2015 Project Presentations & Lunch
11.30am Wednesday,
11 November 2015

Hear from 4 of the 2015 Project Leads and enjoy networking with other like-minded individuals – with lunch provided!

Location: Room 105:107
RSVP to tedf-ctl@curtin.edu.au
Questions....

http://ctl.curtin.edu.au/research/tedf.cfm
Last year’s funding - 2015

- Curtin Bus School: $43,584.86
- Health Sciences: $117,704.53
- Science & Eng: $129,287.06
- Humanities: $59,056.00

TEDF – Information Session 30 October, 2015
Previous projects - issues

• Uncertainty of budget funding
• Impact on T & L quality (and excellence)
• Timeframes & completion within the year (too big)
• Overlap of projects/or work previously done
• Excessive travel/conference allocation
• Ongoing sustainability/transferability
Issues (cont’d)

• Access to suitable resources i.e. instructional designer, software developer, research assistant, video editors etc
• Internal staffing issues delayed the project
• Installation and operation of new technology & equipment (CITS, support etc)
• Ethics approval, access to student information
• 2 semesters required for completion
The Impact Management Planning and Evaluation Ladder (IMPEL)

The IMPEL model provides a framework for describing different types of change that can be achieved through educational development projects. Each stage, or ladder rung, is incrementally broader in impact than the last. These rungs are:

1. Changes for project team members
2. Changes by project team members leading to changes for students who are directly influenced
3. Contributions to knowledge in the field; growth or spread of disseminated ideas; serendipitous adoption/adaptation by people beyond the project’s intended reach
4. Changes by opportunistic adopters at participating institutions leading to changes for students who are directly influenced
5. Systemic changes at participating institutions leading to changes for all relevant students
6. Changes by opportunistic adopters beyond participating institutions leading to changes for students who are directly influenced
7. Systemic changes beyond participating institutions leading to changes for all relevant students.

The model offers both a prompt for project teams in the planning, execution and reflection stages of educational development projects, as well as a cogent frame for funding agencies to enunciate expectations, make funding decisions and evaluate the efficacy of funding schemes in facilitating strategic educational change.
Project Impact Plan

Impact is the difference that a project makes in its sphere of influence, both during and after the funding period. Maximising impact requires forecasting and planning. The questions and matrix below provide a structure to prompt active and ongoing consideration and re-evaluation of impact and how it may be maximised given the evolution of the project. Maintaining updated responses to the template is not intended to be a reporting requirement, rather a strategic steering tool for the project. The responses to the questions below, including input to the matrix, are expected to change over the life of the project as the work and results progress. The OLT will be interested in discussing evolving projections of impact at key points during the project, including at progress and final reporting points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anticipated changes at:</th>
<th>Project completion</th>
<th>Six months post-completion</th>
<th>Twelve months post-completion</th>
<th>Twenty-four months post-completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Team members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Immediate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Spreading the word</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Narrow opportunistic adoption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Narrow systemic adoption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Broad opportunistic adoption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Broad systemic adoption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. What indicators exist that there is a climate of readiness for change in relation to your intended project?
2. In brief and indicatively, what impacts (changes and benefits) do you expect your project to bring about, at the following levels and stages of the Impact Management Planning and Evaluation Ladder (IMPEL)?
3. What are your strategies for engaging with stakeholders throughout the project?
4. How will you enable transfer that is ensuring that your project remains impactful after the funding period?
5. What barriers may exist to achieving change in your project?
6. How will you keep track of the project’s impact? What analytics may be useful?
7. How will you maintain relevant project materials for others to access after the project is completed?

1 The full version of the IMPEL model, developed by Tilly Hinton while on secondment to the Office for Learning and Teaching, is online at [http://www.olt.gov.au/grants-and-projects/impact](http://www.olt.gov.au/grants-and-projects/impact). Further information on this model and resources to assist in considering project impact are available on the website.

### Examples of Impact at Different Levels of the IMPEL Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Team members</strong></td>
<td>The changes the project brings about for members of the project team.</td>
<td>• Recognition of project participants’ contributions to learning and teaching through promotion and awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Immediate students</strong></td>
<td>The changes for students that project team members make directly (in teaching/support/etc).</td>
<td>• Project team members’ students report benefits of being more networked through an online tool&lt;br&gt;• Changes to curriculum by project team members equip students to feel more work-ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Spreading the word</strong></td>
<td>The lasting contributions to knowledge that the project makes, which may lead to serendipitous adoption or adaptation beyond the project’s intended reach.</td>
<td>• Special issues of journals that further explore themes of the grant&lt;br&gt;• Publications from a grant cited fifty-eight times in other publications&lt;br&gt;• An updated online resource to support robust curriculum planning for teaching of Australian literature&lt;br&gt;• Materials used to promote teaching quality to international prospective students and partner universities&lt;br&gt;• Cascading influence through engagement with the early childhood sector and relevant government departments&lt;br&gt;• Receipt of national and international awards recognising outstanding practice along with sustained high rates of downloads, views and linking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Narrow opportunistic adoption</strong></td>
<td>Changes for students that happen because opportunistic adopters within participating institutions adopt or adapt ideas from the project.</td>
<td>• Education students supported to develop resilience, a factor in retaining staff in the teaching profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Narrow systemic adoption</strong></td>
<td>Changes for students that happen because of systemic adoption or adaptation of project ideas at one or more participating institutions.</td>
<td>• Online graduate attributes system deeply embedded across an entire school&lt;br&gt;• Almost three quarters of a million dollars of industry and philanthropic funds secured for the lead institution to further the work started by the grant&lt;br&gt;• University-wide academic leadership program with ongoing funded based on the success of the grant project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Broad opportunistic adoption</strong></td>
<td>Changes that happen because opportunistic adopters beyond participating institutions adopt or adapt ideas, leading to changes for their students.</td>
<td>• Professional development delivered to an estimated 20% of science academics in Australia&lt;br&gt;• An estimated 2,500 students benefited from active learning materials in undergraduate science programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Broad systemic adoption</strong></td>
<td>Changes for students that happen because of systemic adoption or adaptation of project ideas at a broad level, beyond the participating institutions.</td>
<td>• Report cited as key evidence for a wage increase across the profession&lt;br&gt;• Changes to professional accreditation requirements ensuring students are better equipped for study and employment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Tilley Hinton’s materials developed for OLT Website
### Examples of project impact mapped to the IMPEL Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Team members</th>
<th><strong>Recognition</strong> of project participants’ contributions to learning and teaching through promotion and awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2. Immediate students | • Project team members’ students report benefits of being **more networked** through an online tool  
• Changes to curriculum by project team members equip students to feel **more work-ready** |
| 3. Spreading the word | • Special issues of **journals** that further explore themes of the grant  
• Publications from a grant **cited fifty-eight times** in other publications  
• An updated online resource to support **robust curriculum planning** for teaching of Australian literature  
• Materials used to promote teaching quality to **international prospective students and partner universities**  
• **Cascading influence** through engagement with the early childhood sector and relevant government departments  
• Receipt of national and international **awards** recognising outstanding practice along with sustained high rates of **downloads**, views and linking |
| 4. Narrow opportunistic adoption | • Education students **supported to develop resilience**, a factor in retaining staff in the teaching profession |
| 5. Narrow systemic adoption | • Online graduate attributes system **deeply embedded** across an entire school  
• Almost **three quarters of a million dollars** of industry and philanthropic funds secured for the lead institution to further the work started by the grant  
• University-wide academic leadership program with **ongoing funded** based on the success of the grant project |
| 6. Broad opportunistic adoption | • Professional development delivered to an estimated **20% of science academics** in Australia  
• An estimated **2,500 students benefited** from active learning materials in undergraduate science programs |
| 7. Broad systemic adoption | • Report cited as key evidence for a **wage increase across the profession**  
• Changes to professional accreditation requirements ensuring **students are better equipped** for study and employment |

These examples were gathered from completed projects by Tilly Hinton while seconded to the Office for Learning and Teaching in 2012–13.
Reflections on achieving change in nationally funded grants

An enquiry underpinning each research conversation was the exploration of what participants understood about the factors that enabled or inhibited impact in educational research projects. Here’s what they had to say:

Reflections on the human dimension

- **Diverse project teams**: One of the reasons identified for the success of the project was the rich variety amongst the project team. In one project, the team was intentionally selected to have a mix of experienced and newer academics: *I’m a believer that you need fresh blood*. In another, the team included senior and junior staff in a broad range of roles at their home institutions. This allowed the team to collaborate as each person brought particular strengths to the project: *you can’t just get a grant, sit there and spend every cent of it on one’s own narrow perspective*.

- **Enthusiasm matters**: The contributions of the project team members were described as *blood out of stone in terms of how much more can we do with it without ongoing resourcing*. The reason that was possible was the *personal enthusiasm* of the team, each of whom made substantial contributions to project activities and deliverables.

- **Influence can be exponential**: The team used a generative approach to enable science academics to improve their laboratory teaching practices: *We [didn’t] set out to develop a suite of new experiments for other people to use. We set out to enable staff to do that themselves.*

- **Roles shift over time**: During the project the project team took a strong leadership role, but they realised that to continue to do so after the project would disempower others: *you’ve got a community set up for PhD students, and then some great big professor comes and galumphs all over the place and flattens discussion. Nobody wants to say anything in case they’re wrong. So I haven’t actually posted on there for ... I almost never do.*

- **Flexibility and responsiveness**: One of the intended outputs was an online community but during the project it became apparent that despite *lot of time trying to get that going and trying to seed a lot of conversations*, targeted potential adopters were time poor and resistant to participating in a new online community. Instead, the team used social media tools, existing online professional groups and Open Educational Resource repositories. By taking the time to get involved in these existing online networks, the team enabled people to test the ideas presented in the resource within a safe and familiar group of peers, after which they could recommend what they thought was relevant to their own discipline and epistemological practices.

- **Choose enthusiastic adopters**: The project team found that by bringing *enthusiastic academic colleagues into the fold* they could achieve more substantial change than struggling to engage more resistant, uninterested or cautious staff members.

- **Online resources**: This project demonstrates the wealth of information that is available when resources are shared online. The team has used Google Analytics, Gephi, Google Alerts, Survey Monkey and the analytical functionality available within YouTube and
iTunes to better understand the reach of the resources: ...all things leave footprints if you know where to look.

Reflections on the organisational dimension

- **Status quo:** A significant barrier to change is that there are limited incentives for leaders in higher education to be innovative, so the priority seems to be maintaining the status quo and avoiding significant change. Such cultural barriers militate against certain types of curriculum transformation: *[the] current status quo is guarded carefully.*

- **Embedding in an existing organisation:** The project co-leaders always intended their major deliverable – the website – to come under the auspices of the established discipline organisation. This appears to have been a very successful approach in terms of maintaining the website well beyond the projects funded life.

- **Institutional readiness:** The uptake of ideas, and the willingness to embrace change, hinges on the climate being sufficiently ready for those changes to occur: *I was able to move forward because the support structures were there. People were interested. There was some involvement. We were able to get funds. You know, everything aligned and we were able to take it forward, but other people I’ve spoken to in other institutions, it was like hitting a brick wall. Although they could influence what happened in their own subject, they couldn’t make institutional change.*

- **Structural constraints:** Change occurs within structural constraints and is difficult when *the breadth and scope of the problem is just very big, and its entrenched.* One of the strategies the team used to address this was to engage with key stakeholders. While this was *partly successful,* the project affirmed that decades-old systemic barriers would take much more than this to dismantle.

- **Making use of challenging contexts:** In times of change, project teams are well-placed to inject their perspectives into discussions: *It’s a really good place ... to keep the conversation alive ... because everyone is rethinking what they do, then there are more possibilities of things like this being embedded than perhaps there are in a program where people are, well this is my unit, this is how it’s been for 10 years, this is how it’s going to stay.*

- **Alignment:** The project approach and software functionality met both the accreditation requirements and regulatory frameworks, meaning that *everything was aligned* and the approach became more readily embedded.

- **Change requires leadership:** The project team learned that more is needed than simply creating or promoting a new teaching approach, realising that it was *naïve* to think that *if you build it, they will come.*

- **Enlist a champion:** The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) was *very aware of what’s going on,* including hosting meetings with the scholars twice annually. At the faculty level, there was also extensive support. Leadership support was identified as a critical success factor.

- **The importance of the evaluator:** Insightful formative evaluation was pivotal and *helped us guide and shape and change our direction so we could achieve what we wanted to.* The evaluator, and lessons learnt during the project regarding project management
empowered the team in balancing achieving the outcomes with what was humanly possible.

- **Institutions don’t change, people do:** Multi-institution projects spread the ability to influence change very thinly if project leaders are working in isolation. Projects need to focus on influencing people at all levels, and creating a ripple effect of change. Projects that are tokenistically multi-institution consume the limited resources available: ... management and documentation and communication and workshops and you don’t really get a lot done. You don’t get into the culture of the different organisations, you’re only really dealing with one person who’s the spokesperson and interprets what’s going on.

**Reflections on change**

- **Embracing complexity:** The project operated in a complex, changing environment that made it feel just like spaghetti. This has meant accepting that the work is inherently complicated, and that it is sometimes impossible to know whether we’ve got it right.

- **Change can sustain itself:** To make change self-sustaining, stakeholders need to be convinced of the benefits through presentations, publications and networking: if they have been convinced ... then they would work within their units, within their departments and within their schools to make that happen ... it will sustain itself.

- **Clarity:** This was identified as the strength of the project. Project activities were underpinned by a clear conceptualisation of what we were doing and why.

- **Change needs to be opportunistic:** A grant-funded project adds extra layers of work to already-crowded institutional roles: you’ve got projects and then you’ve got all the internal projects and all your daily work. So you don’t have dedicated time and energy ... So what you’ve got is energy to ... be opportunistic about it. Given competing priorities, there is a risk that project team members can rapidly wear out your welcome talking about something that actually isn’t currently part of the culture of readiness of the organisation.

- **Project relevance:** Projects may not necessarily have enduring relevance, but they are nevertheless important to the sector. In this project, once the approach had been embedded, members of the project team moved on to further, related work, and the more recent work formed a more pertinent point of reference for others wishing to adopt or adapt the project ideas.

- **Familiarity:** The close involvement that a project necessitates makes it difficult to discern influence because it becomes inherently part of your ongoing academic work: it’s a bit like having a cardigan that you wear all the time. You don’t think about it anymore because it’s just there.

- **Impact can snowball:** Exposure to the website can lead to transformative shifts in thinking that early childhood educators then embed in their practice and take back into early childhood settings, going on to influence others, in other words: the impact of that could go on and on.

- **Raising awareness:** Scholars are coached to think about how to bring others along in the journey. They build awareness in their work through think tanks or talking in groups,
having focus groups or something, or running some sort of PD event, or presenting their results, or putting up posters.

- **Projects can be sustained long term**: An ambitious national project that can have a long-term, ongoing influence on the quality of learning and teaching in the sector, during both funded and unfunded periods of operation.

These reflections were gathered from completed projects by Tilly Hinton while seconded to the Office for Learning and Teaching in 2012–13.