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1. PROJECT SUMMARY (Conditions of Grant, clause 2.2(a)-(e) of Part A)

Objectives

*Indicate the extent to which the Project Objectives specified in clause 3 of Part A of the Conditions of Grant were met. Where obligations established in the Conditions of Grant were not met, please identify these and provide an explanation of circumstances and consequences.*

**Table 1: Project objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFIED OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>EXTENT TO WHICH THE OBJECTIVE WAS MET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examine whether, compared to other first-year students, differences in expectations about learning at university or in access to technology affect the learning experience, retention levels, and academic success of low socio-economic status (LSES) students and/or students who are first in their family to attend university (FIF).</td>
<td>The objective was met. All commencing FBUSL first year students were invited to complete an expectations and readiness survey. The survey covered student expectations and access to technology. Of a population of 699 domestic commencing first year students, 261 responded to the survey (a response rate of 37.3%). Responses showed no significant differences in expectations and readiness between student demographic groups, including LSES and first-in-family students. Student feedback on individual courses (or units) for all relevant Semester 1, 2016 was analysed, to ascertain if differences in students’ learning experiences across demographic groups exist. No significant differences were found. Student responses to the University-wide Survey on University Experience Survey, conducted in Semesters 1, were analysed to ascertain the impact of access to technology across student demographic groups. No significant differences were found. Course (unit) pass rates were analysed to ascertain if there were differences between LSES and all other students, and First-in-Family students and all other students. No significant differences were found. Grade Point Averages (GPAs) were analysed to ascertain if there were differences between LSES and all other students, and first-in-family students and all other students. No significant differences were found. Withdrawal rates before census, and withdrawal rates after census, were analysed to ascertain if there were differences between LSES and all other students, and first-in-family students and all other students. No significant differences were found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Develop an evidence base that will improve the blended learning (flipped classroom) model at the University of Newcastle for students in these target groups and inform recommendations for policy implementation elsewhere in the sector. | The objective was met. The evidence base was developed from:  
• A literature review  
• Interviews with blended learning course coordinators  
• Interviews and focus groups with LSES and first-in-family students  
• The data collection outlined in the above identified objective. |
The evidence suggests that:
- blended learning does not adversely impact LSES or first-in-family students;
- blended learning may assist LSES and first-in-family students by allowing them to draw on their own social and cultural capital during the learning process, rather than ‘filling them up’ with the social and cultural capital of traditional students;
- students in equity cohorts may benefit from a teaching and learning experience that is flexible;
- blended learning may be more motivating for all students, requiring them to engage in more metacognition.

The evidence underpins the operational definition of blended learning adopted by the Faculty of Business and Law at the University of Newcastle, which consists of the following four dimensions:
1. courses [subjects] are constructively aligned;
2. there is a mix of online learning and face-to-face learning, supported by technology;
3. most or all lower-order learning occurs outside the classroom; leaving most time in the classroom for active, social, higher-order learning; and
4. there is an emphasis on linking concepts/theory to real-world examples.

The Faculty’s Blended Learning Plan 2017-2018 was developed using this definition, and informed by the evidence base. The Blended Learning Plan will inform the Faculty’s continued transition to blended learning for undergraduate teaching, supporting an effective and engaging student learning experience that demonstrates and further improves the University’s commitment to equity. The plan has been distributed to all University of Newcastle Faculty of Business and Law academic staff, and is also housed on the Faculty’s blended learning webpage, which is available to all Faculty staff.

The findings were further shared with colleagues at the University of Newcastle and other higher education providers at:
- The Faculty of Business and Law’s Teaching and Learning Day, attended by 65 academic and relevant professional staff.
- Faculty of Business and Law Board meetings.
- Faculty of Business and Law Executive meetings.
- Faculty of Business and Law’s Research Showcase, where a poster explaining the research project and disseminating initial findings was presented to university and general public audience.
- the Tertiary Education Management Conference, held from 11-14 September 2016, Auckland, New Zealand.
- the Blended Learning Summit, held from 19-21 October 2016, Sydney.

---

**Identified Objective**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent to Which the Objective Was Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- the 2016 Conference of the Law &amp; Society Association of Australia and New Zealand, held from 30 November – 3 December 2016, Brisbane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appendix 1: TEMC Conference PowerPoint presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appendix 2: Blended Learning Summit PowerPoint presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appendix 4: Blended Learning Plan 2017-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Activities, Milestones and Key Performance Indicators**

**Below, please specify whether:**

- all project Activities specified in Schedule 1 of the Conditions of Grant were completed
- all Project Milestones specified in Schedule 1 of the Conditions of Grant were completed
- all Key Performance Indicators specified in Schedule 1 of the Conditions of Grant were met.

*Where obligations established in the Conditions of Grant were not met, identify these and provide an explanation of circumstances and consequences.*

### Table 2: Project activities, milestones and KPIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>PLANNED ACTIVITIES &amp; MILESTONES</th>
<th>PROJECT ACTIVITIES &amp; MILESTONES COMPLETED</th>
<th>IDENTIFIED KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS</th>
<th>KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2016</td>
<td>Recruitment of Project Officer (HEW Level 6 - full-time for 11 month period)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Project officer contracted</td>
<td>Two HEW Level 6 Project Officers were recruited to the project in February 2016. The role was job-shared between them, and equated to one full-time HEW Level 6 for an eleven month period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2016</td>
<td>Project team convened</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Project team convened and team roles agreed between members</td>
<td>A research team meeting was convened in December 2015. Roles were discussed and recorded at this meeting. A full project team meeting, with the two Project Officers, was convened in February 2016, and the role of the Project Officers was discussed at this meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2016</td>
<td>Ethics application submitted with view to approval being granted by end February 2016</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ethics application developed and approved</td>
<td>The ethics application was submitted on the 27 January 2017. Approval was granted on the 4 February 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2016</td>
<td>Collect and collate baseline data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Baseline data collected and collated</td>
<td>All first year commencing students enrolled in the Faculty of Business and Law were invited to complete an expectations and readiness survey. The survey closed on 22 February 2016, just prior to the commencement of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME FRAME</td>
<td>PLANNED ACTIVITIES &amp; MILESTONES</td>
<td>PROJECT ACTIVITIES &amp; MILESTONES COMPLETED</td>
<td>IDENTIFIED KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS</td>
<td>KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS OUTCOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul – Sept 2016</td>
<td>Collate and analyse qualitative and quantitative (SFC/SFT) survey data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Collation and analysis of qualitative and quantitative (SFC/SFT) survey data completed</td>
<td>All students are invited to complete a Student Feedback on Course (SFC) survey for each course they are enrolled in. The SFC survey opens at the end of Semester, and is administered by the University of Newcastle’s Strategic Planning and Performance (SPP) unit as part of its regular function. Thirteen first year courses were offered by the Faculty of Business and Law in Semester 1, 2016. Eight of the courses were delivered via blended learning. The SFC surveys students across fifteen categories. These are: Support; Learning Activities; Teaching; Expectations; Assessment; Criteria; Feedback; Structure; Relevance; Organisation; Resources; Challenge; Self Evaluation; Outcomes; and Satisfaction. The average response rate across all courses was 27.2%. There was no significant difference in mean across all courses, categories, and demographic groups. However, those who were first in family often found it harder to adjust to the University environment when considering such areas as group work and essay writing; and found it more important to regularly attendance in classes. Student Feedback on Teaching (SFT) data did not inform this project. It was decided that student perceptions of individual teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
styles were not directly relevant to the research questions.

The research team did decide to analyse responses to the Student Feedback on University (SFUN) survey. All students are invited to complete a SFUN survey, which opens at the end of Semester, and is administered by the University of Newcastle’s Strategic Planning and Performance (SPP) unit as part of its regular function.

Questions concerning students’ access to technology, and students’ emotional and physical wellness, were deliberately included in the SFUN survey distributed to Faculty of Business and Law students. All first year commencing students’ responses were analysed for this project. No significant differences between LSES and non-LSES students were found; and no significant differences between first-in-family and non-first-in-family students were found. Whilst not a statistically significant difference, first-in-family students did report a lower level of emotional and physical wellness while at University.

Sept 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>PLANNED ACTIVITIES &amp; MILESTONES</th>
<th>PROJECT ACTIVITIES &amp; MILESTONES COMPLETED</th>
<th>IDENTIFIED KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS</th>
<th>KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept 2016</td>
<td>Arrange and conduct focus groups</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimum of 6 focus groups conducted</td>
<td>The focus group protocol was finalised in March 2016, and approved by ethics at the beginning of April 2016. Six different times to conduct six focus groups across both the Callaghan and Ourimbah campuses during the last week of April and the first week of May were established. All eligible students were contacted by letter and email and invited to register for a focus group, or nominate an alternate time that would be accommodated by the research team. Students were further informed by posters, flyers, and short before-class spiels. A total of 21 registrations were received. Of these, six students turned up at their nominated time. Two of the students were interviewed together, the remaining four were interviewed individually. Interviews were transcribed in June 2016. Analysis of all interview data was completed by September 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transcribe, collate and analyse focus group data</td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of all focus group data completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oct 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>PLANNED ACTIVITIES &amp; MILESTONES</th>
<th>PROJECT ACTIVITIES &amp; MILESTONES COMPLETED</th>
<th>IDENTIFIED KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS</th>
<th>KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Oct 2016  | Present initial findings to academic and professional staff audience, including at a meeting of the University’s Student | Yes                                      | Findings presented to academic and professional staff at the University of Newcastle, and to colleagues from other universities | Findings were presented to academic and professional staff members at the University of Newcastle by way of:
1. Newsletter updates
2. A presentation, and report submissions, to Faculty of Business and Law Executive Committee meetings and Faculty of Business and Law Board meetings |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>PLANNED ACTIVITIES &amp; MILESTONES</th>
<th>PROJECT ACTIVITIES &amp; MILESTONES COMPLETED</th>
<th>IDENTIFIED KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS</th>
<th>KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. A research poster that was displayed in the University of Newcastle Art Gallery during research week 4. A presentation at the Faculty of Business and Law’s Teaching and Learning Day</td>
<td>Findings were presented to colleagues from other universities at three conferences: • Tertiary Education Management Conference, 11-14 September 2016, Auckland. • Blended Learning Summit, 19-21 October 2016, Sydney. • 2016 Conference of the Law &amp; Society Association of Australia and New Zealand, Disruption, Temporality, Law: The Future of Law &amp; Society Scholarship, ‘Not All Learning is Created Equal: Exploring the equity potential for blended learning in law,’ 30 November – 3 December 2016, Brisbane. Findings were also shared during a presentation to, and meeting with, academic and professional staff members of the Innovative Learning and Teaching Unit at The University of Auckland Business School in September 2016. Findings will be presented to the University of Newcastle’s Student Experience Committee during the Committee’s first meeting for 2017 (date to be confirmed). Unfortunately, the research team were unable to present at the Student Experience Committee held in early October, or the final committee for 2016, held in early November. - Appendix 1: TEMC Conference PowerPoint presentation. - Appendix 2: Blended Learning Summit PowerPoint presentation. - Appendix 3: 2016 Conference of the Law &amp; Society Association of Australia and New Zealand PowerPoint presentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Highlights and Issues

*Provide a summary of highlights and achievements arising from your project (maximum half page)*

- Confirmation that our students are responding well to our move from a traditional course delivery to a blended learning course delivery
- Pleasing findings re: performance and satisfaction of equity students at UON (despite the findings of the literature review)
- Presentation of findings at conferences to interested and engaged audiences
- Development of blended learning tools for teaching staff use.

Did the project lead to implementable outcomes? What changes will result at your institution/nationally? How is research being translated into practice? Are there activities resulting from this project that will be continued?

Research on blended learning and equity groups will continue. The Faculty of Business and Law will continue to closely monitor equity groups’ experiences of blended learning through student feedback, course retention and performance data, and other appropriate student voice forums, in addition to staying current with relevant peer-reviewed literature and reports, to inform initiatives to support these groups. The University has identified mature-aged special entry students, and students with a disability, as equity groups with significant difference in academic performance between the equity group and comparison group; and additional attention will be paid to these groups.

Did you undertake an evaluation of your project?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Not yet. Project findings have not yet been fully disseminated.
Please summarise the findings and attach the evaluation report.

Where applicable, indicate number of the following resulting from this project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quantity/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student contacts</td>
<td>261, from survey responses and focus group participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal (or other publication) submissions</td>
<td>0 (to date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Presentations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites developed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational or marketing campaigns</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organisations engaged</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools engaged</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental/family contacts</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optional - If you included transformational/behavioural change KPIs in your EOI please summarise outcomes here:

Describe any issues that occurred during the year and any mitigation strategies you implemented.

It was challenging to recruit students to participate in focus groups. Mitigation strategies to increase focus group participation included presentations in lectures to attract student participation, incentivising participation and reviewing the methodology to determine if one on one interviews would have more success in attracting student participation.
2. OTHER PROJECT MATERIAL (Conditions of Grant, clause 2.2 (b)-(e) of Part A)

List the titles of any published reports, pamphlets or other documentation produced in the course of the Project and attach them to this Final Report.

Table 3: Additional materials produced over the course of the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>DATE OF PUBLICATION</th>
<th>PUBLICATION DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference paper</td>
<td>Ms Kate Ramzan-Levy, Dr Johanna Macneil, Ms Sarah Tooth</td>
<td>12 September 2016</td>
<td>2016 TEMC Conference: From Rhetoric to Reality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation title: Real World Learning Experiences: Blended Learning and Work Ready Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference paper</td>
<td>Dr Johanna Macneil, Ms Kate Ramzan-Levy, Ms Sarah Tooth</td>
<td>21 October 2016</td>
<td>2016 Blended Learning Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation title: Designing blended learning for improved student learning outcomes and greater equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference paper</td>
<td>Dr Amy Maguire, Dr Johanna Macneil, Dr Renzo-Bravo, Ms Kate Ramzan-Levy, Ms Sarah Tooth</td>
<td>30 November 2016</td>
<td>2016 Conference of the Law &amp; Society Association of Australia and New Zealand, Disruption, Temporality, Law: The Future of Law &amp; Society Scholarship,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation title: 'Not All Learning is Created Equal: Exploring the equity potential for blended learning in law,'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended Learning Plan</td>
<td>Dr Johanna Macneil</td>
<td>7 October 2016</td>
<td>Internal publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Title: Faculty of Business and Law Blended Learning Plan 2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research poster Appendix 5</td>
<td>Dr Johanna Macneil, Ms Kate Ramzan-Levy, Ms Sarah Tooth</td>
<td>12 September – 16 September</td>
<td>Faculty of Business and Law Research Showcase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poster title: Not all learning is created equal: Exploring the equity potential for blended learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning Day presentation</td>
<td>Dr Johanna Macneil</td>
<td>November 2016</td>
<td>Presentation to staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. ACQUITTAL REPORT (Conditions of Grant, clause 6.4(e), clause 6.7-8 of Part A)

*IMPORTANT NOTICE - Unspent 2015 National Priorities Pool Grant Funds*

- Grant recipients must fully expend these 2015 National Priorities Pool funds in the project period for which the grant is made and report on this expenditure to the Commonwealth, including the amount of any unspent funds.
- If a provider fails to spend the full amount granted it in respect of a year, the unspent funds may be recovered by the Commonwealth.

Have you fully expended the Grant Funds provided under the Conditions of Grant?

Yes [X]  No [ ]

If the answer is No, please specify:

- the amount of funds remaining: $
- the reason for this underspend:

Ensure that the completed Acquittal Report template is signed by an appropriate university officer and attached to this Final Report.
DECLARATION

I declare that:

- I am authorised by the university to sign this Declaration on its behalf, and
- to the best of my knowledge, the information that I have provided in the Final Report and Acquittal Report for the HEPPP 2015 National Priorities Pool project Enhancing University Retention and Success for First-in-Family, Low SES Students Through a Flipped Classroom Learning Model is true, correct and accurate in all particulars.

I understand that:

- The provision of false or misleading information or the making of false or misleading statements to the Commonwealth is a serious offence under the Criminal Code Act 1995 (Cth).
- If any actual or potential conflict of interest arises, I must notify the Commonwealth immediately in writing of the facts giving rise to the actual or potential conflict of interest and to take such steps as the Commonwealth may require so as to resolve or otherwise deal with any conflict of interest that may arise.

I agree to publication of the Final Report on the Department of Education and Training website, once accepted by the department.

Title                  Professor
Name                   Liz Burd
Position                Acting Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Signature              

Johanna Macneil
APPENDIX 1: TEMC Conference PowerPoint

University of Newcastle Student Demographics

- Highest number of Indigenous students at any Australian university
- Second highest number of low-SES background students at any Australian university

University of Newcastle Student Age

- The majority of students are between the ages of 20-24.
- There are also a significant number of students aged 30-34.

Faculty of Business and Law Student Demographics

- Majority of students are from families in the middle tertile.
- Fewer students are from families in the lower tertile.

Faculty of Business and Law Student Age

- The majority of students are between the ages of 20-24.
- There are also a significant number of students aged 30-34.

Johanna Macneil
APPENDIX 2: Blended Learning Summit PowerPoint

Overview
1. Working definition of blended learning
2. Student equity and the Faculty of Business & Law at UoN
3. Blended learning in the Faculty
4. Research project: description and initial findings
5. Opportunities for equity in blended learning
6. Comments or questions?

Definition of Blended learning
Consistent with discussions so far...
- defined as “a combination of on-line learning and face-to-face class activities designed in an intentional, pedagogically valuable manner” (Papola et al 1996)
- blending occurs by “integrating the most appropriate learning and teaching strategies, technology and/or media to provide meaningful, flexible learning experiences to achieve learning outcomes.” (McMullan et al. 2018)
- Faculty of Business and Law operationalises blended learning as:
  - constructivist aligned
  - on-line learning and F2F learning, supported by technology
  - use of low- or high-order learning outside the classroom, most in the classroom
- active, social, higher-order learning
- emphasis on linking concepts/theory to real-world examples

Research project objectives
Through a collaboration of academic staff and professional staff...
1. To explore whether/how incoming first-year and low-BSES background students are differentially affected in the transition to blended learning...
   - Do expectations affect blended learning experience?
   - Does access to technology affect blended learning experience?

2. To develop an evidence base to facilitate a more student-centred approach to teaching and learning, and improve outcomes for first-year, low-BSES background students

Research Project Methodology
Mixed-methods approach, through University MREC
- review of relevant national and international literature
- Expectations and Feelings Survey, quantitative items and open-ended (qualitative) as well targeting domestic first-year F1L students, administered before commencement
- population of 699; 361 responses; response rate of 53.1%
- interview with course coordinators, and low-BSES first-year students
- feedback on University Experience Survey, with relevant items, around Week 8
- 366 commencing first-year F1L students responded
- Analysis of Semester 1, 2019 Student Feedback on Courses (SFC) data; response rates from 20% – 40%, around weeks 11–13
- Retention and attitudinal data, and student marks (unique identifiers)

Student Feedback Survey
Survey Respondents: First In Family status
- 52%
- 57%
- 55%
- No Information
- Low BSES
- Medium BSES
- High BSES
Expectations and Readiness Survey

What is most exciting for you about the prospect of learning at university?

All other students

Expectations and Readiness Survey

What do you think will be the biggest challenge for you about learning at university?

All other students

Student feedback survey

First in Family (FIF) respondents

- found it harder to adjust to the University environment in areas such as group work and essay writing
- reported a lower level of emotional and physical well-being while at University
- found it more important to have regular attendance in classes, but reported less satisfaction with the quality of teaching at the University
- no other differential impact found (eg. expectations, marks, technology, etc)

NB: BEB background did not differentially impact any response outcomes

Opportunities for building equity in blended learning

For students...

- with significant outside-of-university commitments
- learning at their own pace in blocks of time that suit their learning style, but also at a convenient time
- from seeing the University once per course, instead of twice
- whose experience is not traditionally reflected in curriculum
- incorporating content relating to indigeneous experience
- including “real-world” issues or problems that acknowledge/venerate issues faced by students
- with fewer resources of cultural, capital, lower self-effacy
- solid confidence/capability through regular explicit comment of learning
- drawn in through inclusive facilitation of elder, social learning

Developing an evidence base

Teaching in higher education – there isn’t enough evidence to tell us what works and why

- Teachers need to know what works
- Unreliable evidence
- Few studies on effective teaching in higher education

Angela Carbone, Director Education

Excellence, Monash University, in The Conversation, 18 October 2016

References


Johanna Macneil
APPENDIX 3: 2016 Conference of the Law & Society Association of Australia and New Zealand PowerPoint

Overview
1. The meanings of ‘equity’ in this research;
2. Three key concepts in blended learning;
3. What we can say about how blended learning might better ensure the success of equity cohorts; and
4. A case study of blended learning in Public International Law.

Meanings of equity
- ‘Non-technical’ meaning in law, ie fairness/justice
- Equity in legal education
  - Social justice
  - Law in society
  - Inclusion of diverse perspectives
- Equity in higher education
  - Equal access and participation
  - Ensuring success of under-represented groups

Effective blending is said to occur by ‘integrating the most appropriate learning and teaching strategies, technology and/or media to provide meaningful, flexible learning experiences to achieve learning outcomes.’
- (Glenn, Jones and Fox, 2010).

Operationally blended learning in the Faculty of Business and Law, University of Newcastle
1. Constructive alignment of courses;
2. Mix of online and face-to-face learning, with technological support;
3. Lower-order learning online, higher-order learning in class;
4. Linking concepts/theories to real-world examples.

Commitment to equity and social justice in teaching
- HEPPP funding secured to study the effect of a move to blended learning on low-SES background students (24% of FBL) and first-in-family students (50% of FBL)
- Risks/concerns for these student cohorts:
  - Harder to adjust to group work and writing tasks;
  - Lower emotional (physical) wellness;
  - Greater need to attend class but lower satisfaction with teaching;
  - Significant outside-university commitments;
  - Lower social/cultural capital, and
  - May not see themselves reflected in course case studies.

Case Study: blended learning in Public International Law
- Learning design as flexible as possible
- Improved pre-class knowledge base for students = assists in building confidence
- Class time focused on active/social learning and higher order skills development
- Students exposed to a wider range of case studies

Model adaptation of blended learning
What conceptual tools can we use as teachers, to ensure that we adopt blended learning practices mindfully and in inclusive ways?
APPENDIX 4: Blended Learning Plan 2017-2018

Faculty of Business & Law Blended Learning Plan 2017-2018
7 OCTOBER 2016

1. Purpose of this document

The Faculty of Business & Law is the first Faculty in the University to move to blended learning, with other Faculties to follow. Building on our efforts since 2014, the purpose of this FBL Blended Learning Plan 2017-2018 is to guide the completion of the Faculty’s transition to blended learning for undergraduate teaching.

Adopting blended learning as the preferred pedagogy for undergraduate teaching in the Faculty of Business and Law (FBL) is an opportunity to leverage our quality teaching into a more effective and engaging student learning experience. This will help us to better equip our students to “make a difference” in their chosen professions. As we make this change, we will be aware of the impact of the change on staff and students. We will ensure that the manner in which we make the change demonstrates and further improves our commitment to equity (New Futures Strategic Plan 2016-2025).

2. Background

The Faculty has been implementing blended learning since 2014 in preparation for its relocation to the NeW Space CBD campus in mid 2017. Three previous papers on Blended Learning have been prepared. At the behest of the PVC Learning and Teaching an initial plan was drafted (New Approaches to Teaching Draft Plan 2014-2017, August 2014). This document was updated in 2015 (Update: New Approaches to Learning and Teaching, July 2015). (Both documents are available on request to FBL T&L QA Officer.) In 2016, the Faculty issued guidelines to support continued implementation of blended learning (see Appendix 1: FBL Principles for Implementation of Blended Learning, April 2016). The Faculty and the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) have also provided extensive resources, training, one-to-one support to assist academic staff in designing and developing blended learning courses and associate materials (see Appendix 2: Overview of support provided to FBL staff in blended learning, September 2016).

This plan seeks to build on these efforts and further evolve and define the Faculty strategy with regards to blended learning.

3. Definitions and educational rationale

Blended learning is defined by the Faculty as “a combination of on-line learning and face-to-face class activities designed in an intentional, pedagogically valuable manner” (Arbaugh 2014: 785). Blending occurs by “integrating the most appropriate learning and teaching strategies, technology and/or media to provide meaningful, flexible learning experiences to achieve learning outcomes” (Mirriahi et al, 2015).

Learning to build basic knowledge and comprehension (that is, lower order learning) relies on technology/on-line delivery out of the classroom, requiring students to work independently and at their own pace to undertake this type of learning before or after class. This allows the most effective use of face-to-face class time. This time is used primarily for active learning and/or social (group) learning activities that address higher order learning
needs, that is, learning where students analyse, synthesise, evaluate and create knowledge (Abeysekera and Dawson 2015:3; Honeycutt and Garrett, 2013).

There is evidence that

- the blended learning environment can be more motivating for students (Abeysekera & Dawson, 2014), requiring them to engage in more metacognition, and resulting in higher course grades (Klein et al., 2006); and
- students may be more satisfied with blended courses, compared with traditional face-to-face and fully online modes of education (York & Murtha, 2013; Martínez-Caro & Campuzano-Bolarin, 2011).

However, these positive results rely on careful course design closely and clearly linking learning activities to topic and course learning outcomes. Good results are highly dependent on how well technology is used and integrated in the learning process, the degree of control students are given over when and where they learn, and the variety and quality of learning resources and tools used to facilitate learning.

4. Principles

This plan is informed by seven principles. This plan seeks to ensure that the transition to blended learning takes account of these separate challenges, and also finds a balance between them.

1. The Faculty is committed to blended learning pedagogies for all undergraduate teaching.

Blended learning in the Faculty of Business and Law will:

1. Reflect the principles of constructive alignment, so that all pre- and post-class, on-line and face-to-face learning activities and assessment tasks directly address topic learning outcomes and overall course learning outcomes;
2. Include a blend of on-line learning and face-to-face learning, supported by technology;
3. Deliver most or all lower-order learning outside the classroom, so that time in the classroom is mostly or all spent on active/social, higher-order learning; and
4. Emphasise linking concepts/theory to real-world examples (including field-based learning).

The diagram below shows how constructive alignment of topic learning outcomes, learning activities, and assessment of learning outcomes, and the use of real-world examples, can inform a blended learning lesson plan.
The move to blended learning is a matter of degree rather than complete transformation. All students in the Faculty already do some active/social, higher order learning in class time, whether it be in tutorials, workshops, or small, interactive lectures. All undergraduate courses in the Faculty already have a BlackBoard site, on which lecturers place various learning materials and resources, or ask students to participate in discussions, or submit and receive feedback on assessment items.

Implementing blended learning will be more challenging in some circumstances; for example, when it is being done simultaneously with the introduction of a new course, so all materials must be created from scratch; where the bulk of class time has traditionally been devoted to developing knowledge and comprehension, rather than in active, higher order learning; or where the courses are taught by a range of people with different approaches, some of whom are sessional lecturers who should not not expected to undertake major course redevelopment. Including WIL in blended course design can be highly effective, but also presents some challenges to ensure all students receive an equivalent learning experience. Moreover, changes in the learning outcomes, delivery or assessment in one course may have implications for the learning outcomes, curriculum and assessment in other, related courses. Disciplines, Discipline Heads and Program Convenors are responsible for ensuring that these challenges are properly addressed.

2. The standard blended learning model for all undergraduate courses in the Faculty will be a two hour workshop plus an additional two hours guided/directed learning, facilitated on-line, per week (or the equivalent over the teaching term).

The standard course handbook entry for courses taught in blended mode reads as follows:
Workshop

Face to Face On Campus 2 hour(s) per Week for Full Term

Students will be required to complete four hours of guided learning via online preparation, lectures, interactive workshops, tutorials, discussion groups or self-directed learning and an additional 6 hours of independent study per week.

Per the FBL Principles for Implementation of Blended Learning (Appendix 1), distributed to all staff in April 2016, variations to this standard session duration can be made, with the approval of the relevant Head of School, and following the process set out by the Head of School.

For example, depending on the level of the course, the requirements of the student cohort, or the demands of the curriculum, additional or fewer hours may be scheduled; for example:

- a three hour blended learning workshop per week;
- an additional (separately timetabled) hour for a workshop, lecture, or other learning activity;
- periodic additional sessions – ie. not every week, but depending on requirements; or
- a three hour blended learning workshop per fortnight.

Moreover, disciplines may seek additional support which is not part of the formal course timetable eg. PASS sessions, specific-purpose workshops, etc.

A proposal for a variation from the standard blended learning model must be accompanied by a clear rationale, and a detailed explanation of how the additional hours /support will be used. It will not be sufficient to make reference to other courses, or previous offerings.

It is expected that, barring formally agreed exceptions which will be subject to annual review, all undergraduate courses in the Faculty will be offered in this two-hour workshop plus two hours guided/directed learning format from Semester 1, 2017.

3. Operational issues, including available teaching space, timetabling principles and cost, are necessary considerations in deciding any variations to the standard blended learning model.

Completing the change in pedagogy for all undergraduate courses to blended learning mode requires complex modelling of variables, including class sizes, rooms available, timetables, travel time (particularly for students or staff moving between campuses), teaching mode, number of staff involved and their roles, etc. (See, for example, Appendix 4: Room Sizes in NeW Space for information on the change in focus to smaller rooms, mostly set up for social learning.)

These operational considerations will be important throughout the transition, and will be taken into account in making decisions about any variations to the standard model.

4. The Faculty will be proactive in responding to student needs and shaping student expectations about blended learning.

The Faculty has intensified its efforts to capture and respond to student feedback on courses and teaching as changes are made. We will continue to identify students who are
less engaged with the blended learning approach, understand their needs, and find ways to meet these needs and improve their chances of academic success.

One specific need that will be met through the move to blended learning workshops, and an aspect of blended learning about which students are overwhelmingly positive, is the move to a single teaching block for each course. This will become more important with the move to NeWSpace, with travel and parking challenges.

Completing the move to blended learning for undergraduate courses in 2017-2018 will enable the Faculty to be more proactive in shaping student expectations about blended learning. This will begin at (or even before) orientation. Clear, early communication with students about what blended learning means within courses, within majors, and within programs will help set shared expectations.

Where there are exceptions to the standard model, the rationale will also be explained. Communication with students will be reinforced by the fact that all teaching spaces are specifically designed to support active/social, higher order learning.

5. **As blended learning will be the expected mode of teaching in all undergraduate courses, all staff members will be supported in designing and teaching blended courses.**

The Faculty and the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) have offered staff various kinds of assistance to design or redesign their courses for the purpose of moving to blended learning (see Appendix 2: *Overview of support provided to FBL staff in blended learning*, September 2016). These training and support activities will continue/escalate in 2016-2018, with the secondment to the Faculty from October 2016 of a full-time member of CTL, who will work closely with the academic staff and School and Faculty leaders.

The Faculty has initiated mechanisms to provide training and peer support for lecturers to make a successful transition to blended learning. A Blended Learning Working Group, open to all academic staff, provides practical, peer support and reports to the FBL Teaching & Learning Committee. Additional resources have been allocated by the Faculty and Strategy, Planning and Performance (SPP) to collect student feedback data to support early intervention in new blended learning courses. The Faculty, often in conjunction with CTL, runs workshops and has an annual Teaching and Learning Day for all academic staff. Faculty members are currently conducting research on T&L issues related to blended learning. Encouragement will be offered to foster more scholarship of teaching and learning in this critical time. All of these efforts are designed to support evidence based improvements.

The following specific types of training and support will be required for some or all staff, including sessional staff:

- training and support for constructively alignment of new/existing courses, and across courses;
- orientation to the blended learning approach for Faculty academic staff, but also others affected (eg. professional staff, ELICOS and Foundation staff, Learning Support Unit staff);
- training and support in developing on-line resources and assessment;
- orientation to the technology and teaching spaces in NeWSpace;
- support in developing facilitiation skills for active/social learning, including skills for shared facilitation;
6. Blended learning design will consider, and where possible reduce, inequities for students from all backgrounds.

The Faculty is proud of its record for attracting and supporting first-in-family students, students from low-SES backgrounds, mature age students and other equity cohorts. In 2015, 50% of FBL domestic undergraduate students were first-in-family at university; 22% of students were from low-SES backgrounds; and 16% were from regional/remote areas. Twelve per cent came through Mature Age Special Entry; 11% through VET and 13% through enabling programs. Those who self-reported with a disability comprised 6%; those who spoke a language other than English (LOTE) at home comprised 4%; and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander (ATSI) students comprised 3%.

Appendix 3 shows the relative success of different equity cohorts in the Faculty in 2015. If blended learning is implemented well, it has the potential to improve success rates for at least some cohorts. For example, students who have substantial non-university family or work commitments, including low-SES students, or Mature Age Special Entry (MASE) students may find blended learning better suits their circumstances, and the flexibility improves their retention and success.

If the Faculty can reduce attrition and improve success for these groups, it helps the individual students, improves our overall performance and reputation on equity, and has a beneficial effect on the Faculty’s finances (ie. by reducing marginal costs and increasing revenue). We will seek to identify any problems early, and make evidence-based changes to address them.

It is important that blended learning be directly linked to and inform other Faculty strategies (eg. PASS) designed to improve student equity and student performance.

7. The Faculty is committed to monitoring, reporting on, and continuously improving blended learning implementation.

Successful implementation of the previous six principles require that we carefully monitor performance, and are prepared to respond and/or adjust this plan should the need arise. The sections below on Implementation, Monitoring and Reporting provide more detail about how this will occur.

5. Implementation

Implementation of this Blended Learning Plan 2017-2018 for staff and students is one of the Faculty’s lead strategies for 2017.

Some disciplines have moved nearly all their courses to blended learning whereas other disciplines have moved only a few or none. There are reasons why some courses have not moved to blended learning but it is important that, as a general rule, plans are made for all 1000, 2000 and 3000 level courses to be offered in blended mode in 2017.

CTL resources will be embedded in the Faculty and CTL will provide direct, intensive support for constructive alignment of courses, the design and creation of learning resources, and
training in the use of technology. Blended learning design conducted by ongoing and fixed-term contract staff members will be governed by the Faculty Workload model.

Successful implementation of blended learning will rely on keeping internal (Faculty) stakeholders properly informed. Much of this communication will come from the Deans of the two Schools and their Deputy Heads of School (Teaching and Learning). Regular Faculty updates will be also be issued.

Successful implementation will also rely on keeping external stakeholders affected by or required to support the changes properly informed. These include, but are not limited to:

- the PVC Learning and Teaching and the DVC Academic, at whose original instigation blended learning is being implemented in the Faculty;
- Centre for Teaching and Learning staff, who will be providing direct support including through the BOLD Lab, curriculum development, technology support, and learning support;
- staff in portfolios that recruit and support students, including International and Advancement, office of the Academic Registrar, ELFS, Student Central, & Equity and Diversity;
- staff in SPP, who provide support in research design, data collection and analysis to evaluate blended learning efforts;
- the PVC and staff at UON Singapore, who will also be implementing blended learning; and
- Assistant Deans T&L in other Faculties with whom FBL shares students.

6. Monitoring

To evaluate the overall efficacy of the Plan, and in particular to ensure that the principles are being appropriately balanced, performance in relation to the seven principles will be monitored through:

- collection of evidence on efficacy of blended learning;
- analysis of student feedback on courses and teaching; and
- evaluation of the effect of blending on student retention and success.

Per Appendix 1: FBL Principles for Implementation of Blended Learning, April 2016, all course coordinators of blended learning courses will be expected to work, when requested, with the School and Faculty T&L Team, CTL and SPP to collect formative and summative qualitative data and quantitative data from students about their experience in the first few course offerings. This data will not be used in PRD discussions, unless the staff member requests that it be included.

The purpose of this data is to learn about and improve practice. It will be provided to the Heads of Discipline to improve course design and delivery. It will also build an evidence base, to improve the overall FBL approach to implementing blended learning, and to evaluate our progress in meeting the University’s T&L objectives.

In particular, key measures of success in achieving the educational objectives of the New Futures Strategic Plan 2016-2025 are as follows:
For Graduates who make a difference ....
Our outstanding staff inspire and support students. The UON student experience prepares our graduates to be global citizens, leaders and entrepreneurs who are eager for life's challenges and will change their world for the better.

Key measures of success 2020
UON will be competitive in the attraction and retention of talented students based on its focus on a vibrant student experience and ensuring the employability of its graduates. UON will be in the top 5 of Australian universities for overall student satisfaction, teaching quality and generic skills, and in the top 10 for graduate employability.

An enduring commitment to equity and social justice ....
We ensure students from under-represented backgrounds can enter university, graduate and succeed. We collaborate with partners to provide global leadership in the field of equity in higher education through pioneering research and practice. We break new ground and work tirelessly to challenge persistent inequalities in higher education.

Key measures of success 2020
We will achieve parity of participation of students from low SES and Indigenous backgrounds or with a disability with the proportion of these populations in our regions. We will achieve parity of retention and success across all of our student cohorts.

7. Reporting
As a lead strategy for 2017, blended learning and the Faculty’s progress in implementing this plan will be reported formally through the following mechanisms:

- Regular all-staff email updates on progress and issues arising
- Blended learning working group (meeting bi-monthly)
- FBL Teaching & Learning Committee (meeting bi-monthly)
- FBL Faculty Executive group (quarterly)
- FBL Faculty Board (quarterly)
- University Teaching and Learning Committee (quarterly).

Information will be provided in other forums, inside the Schools/Faculty, on request.
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Appendix 1: FBL Principles for Implementation of Blended Learning, April 2016

Faculty of Business & Law, The University of Newcastle
Principles for Implementation of Blended Learning 2016

OVERALL PRINCIPLES

The Faculty of Business and Law is committed to implementing a blended learning approach in NBS and NLS undergraduate courses at Callaghan and Ourimbah over the next two years. These changes will be mirrored by a commitment to ensuring that postgraduate courses also encourage active learning, and continued efforts to build quality and consistency of all FBL courses across campuses and with online offerings.

For the Faculty to implement blended learning effectively, relevant skills and knowledge must be drawn from:

- the discipline groups, providing content expertise and experience in discipline-based teaching;
- FBL and CTL staff, providing specific experience and expertise in designing and facilitating blended learning; and
- Faculty leaders, especially the Heads of School and Discipline Heads, giving staff confidence their contribution of time and effort will be recognised.

DISCIPLINE RESPONSIBILITIES

Blending a course should be treated as a discipline responsibility, not the responsibility of individual staff members.
This will help to ensure that changes made to any single course are consistent with overall disciplinary, major and/or program objectives.

It will also help to ensure that no one or two members of the discipline carry a disproportionate responsibility in the change process.

Disciplines are also responsible for ensuring that all sessional lecturers and tutors and conjoint staff are inducted into the learning approach used for each course in their discipline.

Postgraduate: Staff members teaching postgraduate courses should also be encouraged to form course teams, particularly a) when there are three or more offerings of a course in a single year, and b) where a new course is being offered or an existing course requires a major review.

COURSE TEAM NOMENCLATURE, AND PAY RATES

Rooms at Callaghan currently custom-designed for blended learning take 56, 57, 58 and 85 students, respectively. At Ourimbah, the rooms take between 30 and 60 students. There will be a range of rooms of differing capacities in the NeW Space building. Some staff also conduct blended learning sessions in rooms that are not custom-designed.

Currently, for undergraduate courses in NBS, when a blended learning session has more than 60 students enrolled, the course co-ordinator can request assistance.

Currently, blended learning sessions in NLS have only one staff member allocated.

The Faculty has carefully considered possible staffing of blended learning seminars in light of stringent budget constraints and is unable to provide any more assistance than this on a general basis. However, where a staff member is concerned that lack of additional teaching assistance is seriously impacting student learning, the relevant Head of School should be contacted to discuss possible options. It should also be noted that, as available teaching spaces may not accommodate large numbers, it may not be necessary to have many large classes, especially in NeW Space.

Where a teaching team operates (that is, more than one person responsible for delivering the course), staff members other than the course co-ordinator may be called ‘teaching team members’, ‘teaching assistants’ or ‘tutors’.

In 2016, it is important that a common title/set of titles be used across all courses, to help avoid confusion amongst students and staff.

The role of the other members of the teaching team is to work as directed by the course co-ordinator to do one or more of the following:

- manage on-line learning environment (eg. facilitate discussion boards, mark online quizzes, review and summarise prior-to-class work)
- assist with the facilitation of in-class blended learning sessions; and
- assess learning outcomes

For these tasks, pay is at standard rates for Tutor. In some instances, for example where members of the teaching team are involved in development of course materials, a higher
rate of pay may be appropriate. This is a matter for discussion and agreement with Head of School before any work is conducted.

**Postgraduate:** Postgraduate courses, timetabled in three-hour lecture/workshop sessions at the Newcastle city and Sydney campuses, are currently split when class size reaches 70 students. However, a course coordinator with the support of the Program Convenor can request that this restriction be lifted in special circumstances eg. for introductory courses, or for particularly challenging courses. In these cases, the request might be to split a smaller class (eg. at 55 or 60) or to have additional workshops or staff to support students. These requests are considered on their merits by the Director of Postgraduate Studies and Head of School.

**STANDARD HOURS**

The standard blending learning session for NBS will be two hours per week per teaching period. **However, variations to this standard session duration can be made, with the approval of the relevant Head of School.**

For example, depending on the level of the course, the requirements of the student cohort, or the demands of the curriculum, additional hours may be scheduled; for example

- a three hour blended learning session per week;
- an additional (separately timetabled) hour for a workshop, lecture, or other learning activity; and/or
- periodic additional sessions – ie. not every week, but depending on requirements.

For some courses – for example, capstone courses – the number of hours scheduled may be fewer overall than two hours per week per teaching period.

A proposal from the Discipline Head to the Head of School for any variation from the standard blended learning session must be accompanied by a clear rationale, and a detailed explanation of how the additional hours /support will be used. It will not be sufficient to make reference to other courses, or previous offerings.

For NBS postgraduate courses or for any NLS courses, the standard blended learning session may differ. Again this is a matter for discussion and agreement with the Head of School.

**REPORTING**

The Blended Learning Working Group, which reports to the Faculty Teaching & Learning Committee, will continue to operate in 2016. All co-ordinators of blended learning courses will be invited to join.

To ensure that staff members involved in blended learning are kept informed of progress, and also that they are able to raise any issues associated with implementation of blended learning in a timely manner, implementation of blended learning will be a regular item at the following meetings:

1. School Executive for NBS and NLS
2. Faculty Teaching & Learning Committee
3. Faculty Board.

Where required, specific items may also be brought to Faculty Executive.
Through the University’s Student Experience Committee and the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee, the AD T&L is required to report regularly on progress in implementing the blended learning model.

EVALUATION AND IMPROVEMENT

Heads of School will take into account the issues associated with transition to blended learning in considering SFC and SFT data from the early offerings of blended learning courses in PRD discussions.

All course co-ordinators of blended learning courses will be expected to work with the Faculty T&L Team, CTL and SPP to collect formative and summative qualitative data, and quantitative data, from students about their experience in the course, where requested. This data will not be used in PRD discussions, unless the staff member requests that it be included.

The purpose of this data is to learn about and improve practice. It will be provided to the Heads of Discipline to improve course design and delivery. It will also build an evidence base, to improve the overall FBL approach to implementing blended learning, and to evaluate our progress in meeting the University’s T&L objectives.

WORKLOAD

FBL recognises that redesigning a course to be offered through blended learning, or designing a new course to be offered through blended learning, represents a significant investment of time by staff members.

Some investment in curriculum design and development is a normal aspect of academic work. However, where the workload is disproportionately heavy, this needs to be recognised and managed.

Staff members with responsibility for designing and/or delivering a blended learning course are encouraged to keep a record of the activities and hours they spend. This information can inform discussions with Heads of School about a reduction in teaching hours; marking relief; future teaching allocations; or other forms of support.

TRAINING

FBL and CTL have been offering, and will continue to offer, support to individuals, small groups, disciplines and Schools.

To date, this has taken the form of CTL workshops, small group and one-to-one training sessions, payments for sessional staff to help in course development, presentations by FBL staff members with experience in blended learning, attendance at workshops elsewhere, or subsidies to bring academics from elsewhere to Newcastle to present on related issues.

Individual staff members, and the discipline groups to which they belong, are strongly encouraged to ask their Heads of School, the Faculty T&L Team or CTL for help, when they need it.
APPLICATION OF ALL-IN LECTURE RECORDING POLICY

All rooms with lecture capture capabilities are listed at: http://www.newcastle.edu.au/currentstaff/teaching-and-research/teaching-resources/uonline-for-staff/venues-for-lecture-capture.

Any teaching event defined as a ‘lecture’ in the University’s timetabling system – Syllabus Plus, will be automatically captured in an Echo-enabled room. It is possible for Course Coordinators to ‘Opt-in’ for other teaching events in an Echo-enabled room. Where the teaching team in a particular course is keen to develop online materials, including short lectures, they may find it helpful to request that some/all of their sessions are recorded, for later editing and posting.

SEED GRANTS FOR T&L SCHOLARSHIP

The Faculty will aim to provide small, seed grants to individuals and groups interested in conducting research on the nature and impact of changes in course design and delivery.

Assistant Dean, Teaching and Learning, Faculty of Business and Law
April 2016

Appendix 2: Overview of support provided to FBL Staff for Blended Learning

Workshops and presentations


Workshops:

- Blended and Flipped Workshop, conducted by CTL, 20 July 2015
- Critical Pedagogies seminar, organised and conducted by CEEHE, 9 November 2015
- Using UONline tools in the classroom: integrating Blackboard and Collaborate into your classroom activities, organised by FBL and conducted by CTL, 11 November 2015
- Online Student Presentations: shifting student presentations out of class time to free more
- F2F time for other classroom activities, organised by FBL and conducted by CTL, 11 November 2015
- Creating engaging online learning activities, organised by FBL, conducted by CTL, 7 April 2016
- Creating engaging in-class learning activities, organised by FBL, conducted by CTL, 7 April 2016

Presentations:


Other opportunities

Participation in the Blended Learning Working Group:
• a Working Group of the FBL Teaching and Learning Committee, chaired by the AD T&L, meeting 4-5 times a year;
• objectives are to provide peer support and advice; and to advise the Faculty on blended learning matters; and
• open to all members of Faculty, but specifically for those who have blended courses and/or are in the process of blending courses

Access to a range of resources about blended learning

  o teaching and learning resources
    - blended teaching and learning resources

FBL Assistance for Undergraduate Courses (ie. by Adrian Zaslona)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>FBL ASSISTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACFI1001</td>
<td>• Recording, editing, and uploading course videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training lead/support academics in use of classroom technology (hardware/ software)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• IT troubleshooting support during classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFI1003</td>
<td>• Consultation on video formats for course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training lead/support academics in use of classroom technology (hardware/ software)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• IT troubleshooting support during classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFI2003</td>
<td>• Recording, editing, and uploading of course videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consultation on video formats for course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON1002</td>
<td>• Recording, editing, and uploading of course videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training lead/support academics in use of classroom technology (hardware/ software)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRHR1002</td>
<td>• Training lead/support academics in use of classroom technology (hardware/ software)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• IT troubleshooting support during classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRHR3035</td>
<td>• Recording, editing, and uploading of course videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training lead/support academics in use of classroom technology (hardware/ software)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• IT troubleshooting support during classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKTG1001</td>
<td>• Recording, editing, and uploading of course videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consultation on video formats for course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training lead/support academics in use of classroom technology (hardware/ software)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• IT troubleshooting support during classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKTG3004</td>
<td>• Consultation on video formats for course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training lead/support academics in use of classroom technology (hardware/ software)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• IT troubleshooting support during classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNGT1001</td>
<td>• Recording, editing, and uploading of course videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training lead/support academics in use of classroom technology (hardware/ software)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• IT troubleshooting support during classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNGT1002</td>
<td>• Recording, editing, and uploading of course videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training lead/support academics in use of classroom technology (hardware/ software)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• IT troubleshooting support during classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURSE</td>
<td>FBL ASSISTANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPSM2000</td>
<td>• Recording, editing, and uploading of course videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training lead/support academics in use of classroom technology (hardware/ software)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• IT troubleshooting support during classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Course content consultation and revision (in conjunction with CTL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Centre for Teaching and Learning**

The following list of undergraduate courses are those where there was some form of interaction, ranging from initial discussions only, to some minor assistance, to significant assistance.

- ACFI1002
- ACFI3018
- ECON1002
- ECON2002
- IRHR1002
- IRHR3035
- LAWS1001AB
- LAWS2004AB
- LAWS4004/LAWS6009
- LAWS4012
- LAWS4012/LAWS6013
- LAWS4055B/LAWS6015B
- LAWS5024
- LEGL2002
- TOUR1000
- TOUR2002
- IBUS3002
- IBUS3003
- MNGT1001
- MNGT2005
- MNGT1002
Appendix 3: FBL Success rates for equity cohorts

![FBL Success Rates Chart]

Appendix 4: Room Sizes in NeW Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL OCCUPANTS</th>
<th>NO OF SPACES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lectorial Theatre</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersive Theatre</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Theatre</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moot Court</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Studio Teal</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Collaborative Teal</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Teal</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Teal</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexi Teal</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesting Teal</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booth Teal</td>
<td>30+3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mock Boardroom</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5: Research Poster

Not all learning is created equal: Exploring the equity potential for blended learning

Blended learning has been defined as 'a process of integrating the most appropriate learning and teaching strategies, technology and/or media to provide meaningful, flexible learning experiences to achieve learning outcomes' (Mimnah et al, 2015).

Three components are generally seen as integral to blended learning:
1. A blend of face-to-face teaching and learning supported by technology
2. The delivery of lower-order learning outside the classroom, and the delivery of higher-order learning in the classroom
3. The facilitation of collaborative/social learning both in and out of the classroom

Blended learning and low-SES background first-in-family students

This mixed-methods project is investigating the affect of blended learning on students’ learning experiences, retention levels, and academic success. It is particularly focused on first-in-family and low socio-economic status (SES) domestic students in their first year of study, two groups known to have higher attrition from university compared to their peers.

Early findings suggest that the blended course delivery helps students balance study with other commitments such as paid work by giving students more control over where and when they learn. Blended learning can also support low-SES background and first-in-family students to bring their own social and cultural capitals into the classroom. However, achieving these objectives relies on careful attention to blended course design.

Significance
The development of this evidence base will enable better operationalization of blended learning in the Faculty of Business and Law; and inform recommendations for policy implementation elsewhere in the sector, helping to ensure that the promise of a more student-centred approach to teaching and learning inherent in blended learning is successfully delivered, and improving outcomes for first-in-family, low SES students.
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