

CSU Subject Implementation and Communication Plan

The CSU Subject

In May 2010, Senate accepted the recommendations of the CSU Subject Working Party as set out below. At the same time it charged the Working Party to bring back to the September meeting an outline of any changes that follow from the Subject Working Party's recommendations accepted by Senate and that are required to be made to systems in order to implement the introduction of the CSU subject as defined in the recommendations, and as impacting on a range of areas across the University.

Following Senate's acceptance, the Faculty of Science considered the implications for some of its processes of the changes to student workload for a CSU Subject, and has brought to the attention of the Working Party a number of issues that resulted in a decision to note the following in relation to the implementation and communication plan:

- Consideration may need to be given to establishing an implementation group with different members,
- The implementation plan needs to be mindful of the workload implications for staff and a workable timeframe for the introduction of any changes to subjects,
- It would be beneficial if the implementation of the CSU Subject definition could be integrated into the implementation of other initiatives that are currently occurring (such as the DI & student experience, annual course report process),
- The introduction of the CSU Subject definition should not be retrospective. Rather it should apply to future practice within the university. This acknowledges that substantial curriculum design has been undertaken in courses without consideration of the future implementation of a CSU subject definition. It is appropriate to consider the CSU subject definition in future course design for new subjects and at the time of course reviews rather than having to retrofit this requirement to existing curricula.
- In implementing changes to existing teaching practices to enable them to conform to the agreed notion of a CSU subject workload for students, and in communicating information about these to students, other issues & challenges, such as those raised by the Faculty of Science, are likely to come to light & will need to be addressed. However the Working Party was strongly convinced that where Faculties choose for valid reasons to permit variations from the recommended guidelines for a CSU subject in terms of student workload, students must still be advised that such subjects either exceed or require less than the recommended workload for a CSU Subject as defined by Academic Senate.

Not all of the Recommendations require detailed implementation plans, though in the table that follows, indication of the work that needs to be undertaken to achieve the recommended outcome is indicated.

Senate Recommendation for the CSU Subject	Implementation Steps
<p>Recommendation 1</p> <p><i>A subject is a CSU Subject and can receive a CSU grade if CSU has governance responsibility for the subject. This does not mean that all subject elements must be developed or delivered by CSU, but that CSU must have overall responsibility for the subject, including quality assurance of each of the associated subject processes including requirements about recommended student workload.</i></p>	<p>This Recommendation clarifies the definition of a CSU Subject and remains on record.</p> <p>Faculties should begin a process of rolling audit of all subjects currently on the SAL in courses not under review. While this will naturally overlap and complement the ongoing process of Comprehensive Course Reports (CCR) and the Course Review process, this audit is to determine which subjects are actually in CASIMS, and to prepare a report for APC on the numbers, level, name and designation (workplace or non-workplace learning) of subjects that are 0, 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 16, 32 or other Points. This audit process should begin in 2011 with Level 1 subjects, using reports from CASIMS to verify subject details and might continue through 2012, 13, 14 with subjects at Levels 2, 3, 4 and above unless overtaken by scheduled Course Reviews. Subjects whose coordinators indicate that they may fall outside of the recommended student workload should be tagged in Course Reports for attention in Course Review.</p>
<p>Recommendation 2</p> <p><i>Any subject that has a CSU code, no matter for which purpose it is to be used, should be in CASIMS. The CASIMS v2 project should allow for attributes to be identified for each subject, to capture both the principles of curriculum design that have informed subject development as well as all of the possible permutations of partner, administrative etc. subjects in accordance with other recommendations below.</i></p> <p>(eg., Recommendations 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11)</p>	<p>CASIMS fields should be expanded to include the following:</p> <p>Field W: Learning Design: what are the principles of curriculum and learning that have informed the development of this subject? This will result in the addition of a text field to subject profiles so that this data may be reused by other systems such as marketing, MSI and incorporated into CCR.</p> <p>Field X: Does this subject conform to Academic Senate recommendations that students will normally spend between 140-160 hours engaged in the specified learning and assessment activities in this subject? <i>If No, what workload expectation is designed into this subject? What is the justification for this variation from the CSU Subject recommendation?</i> This will require the addition of a radio button [yes/no] and the addition of a text field to be editable if the subject does not conform to Senate policy. This data may be reused by other systems such as marketing, MSI and incorporated into CCR.</p> <p>Field Y: Is this subject designed with an assumption of prior knowledge on the part of students, which would impact on the workload of students who do not possess this knowledge? <i>If Yes, what is this knowledge, and how should students prepare and support themselves to acquire the assumed knowledge outside of the workload of the subject?</i> This will require the addition of a radio button [yes/no] and the addition of a text field to be editable if the subject does require prior knowledge. This data may be reused by other systems such as marketing, MSI and incorporated into CCR.</p> <p>Field Z: Does this subject require students to travel away from their study base, purchase specialised resources or equipment, negotiate with agencies outside of CSU to seek approval for activity from an ethics committee, industry, public or professional agency and/or notify such agencies of any CSU provided insurance cover required for those students? <i>If Yes, Detail the nature of and rationale for the external negotiation.</i> This will require the addition of a radio button [yes/no] and the addition of a text field to be editable if the subject requires the above</p>

	<p>details. This data may be reused by other systems such as marketing, MSI and incorporated into CCR.</p> <p>The working party considered that these changes to subject profiles may have implications for the conduct of Faculty Courses Committees because of the requirements for vigilance in checking these new fields in subject profiles until staff members become familiar with their use and meaning. Some Faculties have already introduced procedures of allocation of responsibility for the checking of specific sections of agenda materials in order to reduce the general reading load of committee members.</p>
<p>Recommendation 3</p> <p><i>A CSU (8 point) Subject should be designed with the expectation that students will normally spend between 140-160 hours engaged in the specified learning and assessment activities. Subjects that do not conform to this range need to provide justification within the subject outline. Reasons for any variation from this standard must be included in any Subject Profile presented for approval, and all variations must be approved by the Faculty.</i></p>	<p>Faculty Learning and Teaching Committees should communicate the content and import of this recommendation across all areas of the Faculty, and Course Coordinators/Directors work with this in the review and renewal of courses and subjects.</p> <p>From 2011, Subject Coordinators should include a description of the learning design and associated expectations of students in terms of time and activity in Subject Outlines, using the Learning Design Field available in MSI. Please see Attachment A as a suggested model for templates that cover a range of appropriate descriptions.</p> <p>A systematic method for evaluating student work hours should be identified/developed for sharing with Faculties and Schools for this process – including detailed suggestions as to what can be considered student work (The University currently has available the resources of A. Prof. Leonora Ritter in an Adjunct role attached to L & T. She expects to be available to consult on this process if requested by Schools and especially to ensure such a process is one of Curriculum Renewal)</p>
<p>Recommendation 4</p> <p><i>As part of the Academic Senate's subject approval process, all CSU Subject profiles should be adjusted to indicate an indication of the prior knowledge assumed in the design of the subject, and an estimation of how many hours of student workload is involved.</i></p>	<p>CASIMS fields should be expanded to include the following:</p> <p>Field Y: Is this subject designed with an assumption of prior knowledge on the part of students, which would impact on the workload of students who do not possess this knowledge? <i>If Yes, what is this knowledge, and how should students prepare and support themselves to acquire the assumed knowledge outside of the workload of the subject?</i></p> <p>This will require the addition of a radio button [yes/no] and the addition of a text field to be editable if the subject does require prior knowledge. This data may be reused by other systems such as marketing, MSI and incorporated into CCR.</p>
<p>Recommendation 5</p> <p><i>CSU Subject Outlines shall contain a statement that 'students will normally spend between 140-160 hours engaged in the learning and assessment activities provided'. Subjects that are approved with variations from this standard shall provide within the Subject Outline explicit indication of the workload expectation of the subject and reasons for the variation from the</i></p>	<p>The Learning Design Field of MSI should be utilised to include a statement as suggested in Attachment One.</p>

<p>standard.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 6 <i>Subject Evaluations of Teaching at CSU shall include a core question asking students to estimate the number of hours they spent on the total of all of the required activities for the subject, and the extent to which they found this adequate, above, or below the suggested time of 140-160 hrs for an 8 point subject.</i></p>	<p>The CSU Learning and Teaching Committee should develop a set of appropriate questions for inclusion in the compulsory section of subject and teaching evaluation surveys.</p>
<p>Recommendation 7 <i>The definition of Fieldwork Education as articulated in the Theme 2 AUQA Report – Professional Education and Practice-Based Learning: Green Paper (Higgs et al. 2009) should be adopted as a sufficient definition for practical aspects of teaching and learning that are incorporated into a CSU Subject.</i></p>	<p>The definition of a Workplace Learning Subject as approved by Academic Senate in September 2010 assumes a suggested time of 140-160 hrs per 8 subject points.</p>
<p>Recommendation 8 <i>Where subjects vary from the CSU standard workload by greater than 20 hours, and this is approved by the Faculty for reasons of structured attention to fieldwork education requirements across a suite of subjects, so that the normal session workload for the course does not exceed 640 hours, subject profiles and outlines of all affected subjects must explain this as an element of course design.</i></p>	<p>The implementation of this recommendation will be achieved through the course report, review and renewal process within each Faculty. Course Directors will be supported by the Learning and Teaching Committee to develop a shared understanding of the range of ways that course design can accommodate variations from the recommended workload for a CSU subject when this is deemed necessary and appropriate for the particular context and situation of the course.</p> <p>CASIMS fields to be expanded (added?) to include the following: Field W: Learning Design: what are the principles of curriculum and learning that have informed the development of this subject? This will result in the addition of a text field to subject profiles so that this data may be reused by other systems such as marketing, MSI and incorporated into CCR.</p> <p>Field X: Does this subject conform to Academic Senate recommendations that students will normally spend between 140-160 hours engaged in the specified learning and assessment activities in this subject? <i>If No, what workload expectation is designed into this subject? What is the justification for this variation from the CSU Subject recommendation?</i> This will require the addition of a radio button [yes/no] and the addition of a text field to be editable if the subject does not conform to Senate policy. This data may be reused by other systems such as marketing, MSI and incorporated into CCR.</p>

<p>Recommendation 9</p> <p><i>That there is an upper limit in terms of workload expectations to be established for subjects that vary from the 'standard' 8 point subject definition and which contain a fieldwork expectation component without contextual course alignment, so that if a subject is to contain more than the upper limit of workload expectations hours without contextual course alignment then it must be approved as a higher subject point subject (e.g.: as a 16 point subject etc).</i></p>	<p>The implementation of this recommendation will be achieved through the course report, review and renewal process within each Faculty. Course and Subject approval processes will be the responsibility of Faculty Boards.</p> <p>CASIMS fields to be expanded to include the following:</p> <p>Field W: Learning Design: what are the principles of curriculum and learning that have informed the development of this subject? This will result in the addition of a text field to subject profiles so that this data may be reused by other systems such as marketing, MSI and incorporated into CCR.</p> <p>Field X: Does this subject conform to Academic Senate recommendations that students will normally spend between 140-160 hours engaged in the specified learning and assessment activities in this subject? <i>If No, what workload expectation is designed into this subject? What is the justification for this variation from the CSU Subject recommendation?</i> This will require the addition of a radio button [yes/no] and the addition of a text field to be editable if the subject does not conform to Senate policy. This data may be reused by other systems such as marketing, MSI and incorporated into CCR.</p>
<p>Recommendation 10</p> <p><i>That there is a lower limit in terms of workload expectations to be established for subjects that vary from the 'standard' 8 point subject definition without contextual course alignment, so that if a subject is to contain less than the lower limit of workload expectations hours without contextual course alignment then it must be redesigned to include sufficient workload to be approved as standard subject.</i></p>	<p>The implementation of this recommendation will be achieved through the course report, review and renewal process within each Faculty. Course and Subject approval processes will be the responsibility of Faculty Boards.</p> <p>In relation to the Subject Profile, CASIMS fields to be expanded to include the following:</p> <p>Field W: Learning Design: what are the principles of curriculum and learning that have informed the development of this subject? This will result in the addition of a text field to subject profiles so that this data may be reused by other systems such as marketing, MSI and incorporated into CCR.</p> <p>Field X: Does this subject conform to Academic Senate recommendations that students will normally spend between 140-160 hours engaged in the specified learning and assessment activities in this subject? <i>If No, what workload expectation is designed into this subject? What is the justification for this variation from the CSU Subject recommendation?</i> This will require the addition of a radio button [yes/no] and the addition of a text field to be editable if the subject does not conform to Senate policy. This data may be reused by other systems such as marketing, MSI and incorporated into CCR.</p>
<p>Recommendation 11</p> <p><i>CSU Subjects that require students to expend time and/or money to access specialist equipment or resources, or travel away from their term-time residence</i></p>	<p>In relation to the Subject Profile, see above at recommendation 2.</p> <p>CASIMS fields to be expanded to include the following:</p>

<p><i>in order to complete the specified learning and assessment activities provided need to provide justification within the Subject Profile and the Subject Outline and such information should be included in course brochures and information.</i></p>	<p>Field Z: Does this subject require students to travel away from their study base, purchase specialised resources or equipment, negotiate with agencies outside of CSU to seek approval for activity from an ethics committee, industry, public or professional agency and/or notify such agencies of any CSU provided insurance cover required for those students? <i>If Yes, Detail the nature of and rationale for the external negotiation.</i></p> <p>This will require the addition of a radio button [yes/no] and the addition of a text field to be editable if the subject requires the above details. This data may be reused by other systems such as marketing, MSI and incorporated into CCR.</p> <p>In relation to the Subject Outline: The Learning Design template at Attachment 1 will include an indication of any requirements of expenditure of time and/or money to access specialist equipment or resources, or to travel away from a term-time residence in order to complete the specified learning and assessment activities that are designed into the subject as part of content, syllabus or assessment.</p> <p>In relation to marketing: For marketing purposes this should be communicated to students as <i>course level</i> information in online and paper course brochures. This would assist in the institutionalisation of course level thinking and planning in CSU practices. Further, this will fit with the intended implementation of the CSU subject as part of the course renewal process. The subject working party has recommended that contextual course alignment is an acceptable approach to distributing workload across subjects in a session where excessive workload is required for proposed professional accreditation. Course Directors should ensure that information relevant to each course can be collected in template form by the Division of Marketing and communicated at the course level, with direction for students to refer to individual subject outlines for specific details of time, travel, equipment and other associated costs of study.</p>
<p>Recommendation 12</p> <p><i>Academic Senate will monitor the impact on student and staff workload where students take advantage of the USM to accelerate their progress by enrolling in additional subjects within one academic year. Senate will determine measures of reporting data that will identify those, and monitor the workload in those subjects that vary from the 'standard' subject definition.</i></p>	<p>This recommendation places on Senate the responsibility to monitor the effects of changes (and lack of change) on student and staff workload and well-being. Such monitoring needs to be undertaken as part of the overall evaluation and feedback needed for the implementation of the raft of teaching and learning activities assembled and rolled out at CSU over the period 2007-2015.</p> <p>The Working Party suggests that a CSU project Monitoring Change Effects in Learning and Teaching (MCELT?) sponsored by the DVC Academic be set up to plan and implement this process.</p>

Attachment 1 Learning Design exemplars – indicative range of subject types – for illustration only

a) Subjects that conform to the CSU Subject workload recommendations

This subject is offered in the following courses: BXX, BXXX.

CSU requires that *students will normally spend between 140-160 hours engaged in the learning and assessment activities provided in the learning design of all subjects (Academic Senate dated reg).*

In this course this subject meets the workload requirement for its academic content and/or workplace learning, and is designed to support students to complete XXX hours of study and assessment in the following manner:

SUBJECT (LEVEL 1?) (8 Points)		SUBJECT WPL (20 days placement) (8 Points)			
Lecture	12 hours	Lecture	10 hours	or	
Assigned reading	36 hours	Assigned reading	2 hours	SUBJECT LEVEL 1 (8 Points)	
Tutorial assistance	24 hours	Tutorial assistance		Assigned reading	48 hours
Laboratory Work		Laboratory Work		Guided study	24 hours
Peer group research/study	24 hours	Peer group research/study		Peer study	
Online activity	12 hours	Online activity		Online activity	24hours
Individual research/study	24 hours	Work Place Learning WPL (4 weeks)	148 hours	Individual research/study	18 hours
Assignment Preparation	24 hours	Individual research/study		Assignment Preparation	24 hours
Work Place Learning WPL		Assignment Preparation	(assessed in WP)	Work Place Learning WPL	
TOTAL	156 hours	TOTAL	160 hours	Residential School	32 hours
or		or		TOTAL	160 hours
SUBJECT (LEVEL 1?) (8 Points)		SUBJECT (LEVEL 2/3?) (8 Points)			
Lecture	12 hours	Lecture	12 hours	or	
Assigned reading	24 hours	Assigned reading	30 hours	SUBJECT LEVEL 2/3 (8 Points)	
Tutorial assistance	24 hours	Tutorial assistance	24 hours	Assigned reading	8 hours
Laboratory Work	24 hours	Laboratory Work		Guided study	4 hours
Peer group research/study		Peer group research/ study		Peer study	
Online activity	24 hours	Online activity	12 hours	Online activity	12 hours
Individual research/study	24 hours	Individual research/study	18 hours	Individual research/study	
Assignment Preparation	24 hours	Assignment Preparation	48 hours	Assignment Preparation	12 hours
Work Place Learning WPL		Work Place Learning WPL		Work Place Learning WPL	120 hours
TOTAL	156 hours	TOTAL	144hours	Residential School	24 hours
or		or		TOTAL	156 hours
SUBJECT (LEVEL 1?) (8 Points)		SUBJECT (LEVEL 3/4?) (8 Points)			
Lecture		Lecture		or	
Assigned reading	36 hours	Assigned reading	30 hours	INTERNSHIP SUBJECT (16 points)	
Tutorial assistance	24 hours	Tutorial assistance		Work Place Learning WPL (10 weeks)	350hours
Laboratory Work		Laboratory Work		TOTAL	350hours
Peer group research/study		Peer group research/study	48 hours		
Online activity	24 hours	Online activity	48 hours		
Individual research/study	24 hours	Individual research/study	18 hours		
Assignment Preparation	24 hours	Assignment Preparation	12hours		
Work Place Learning WPL	24 hours	Work Place Learning WPL			
TOTAL	156 hours	TOTAL	156hours		

b) Subjects that do not conform to the CSU Subject workload recommendations

This subject is offered in the following courses: BXX,

While CSU requires that *students will normally spend between 140-140 hours engaged in the learning and assessment activities provided in the learning design of all subjects*, the Faculty of XXX Board has, for the purposes of professional accreditation, approved the design of this course to support students to complete a total of XXX hours of study, workplace learning and assessment across this session. To best support student learning, this subject is aligned with the subjects XXX, XXXX, and XXXXX in terms of an adapted workload for academic content and workplace learning, to which this subject contributes in the following manner:

SUBJECT XX222 for students in BXXX where students will demonstrate learning outcomes through associated WPL subject

Lecture	12 hours
Assigned reading	24 hours
Tutorial assistance	24 hours
Laboratory Work	
Peer group research/ study	
Online activity	12 hours
Individual research/study	18 hours
Assignment Preparation	12hours + other assessed in WP
Examination	3 hours
Work Place Learning WPL	(see WPL 222)
Residential School	24 hours
TOTAL	129 hours

or

INTERNSHIP SUBJECT WPL222 (16 points)

Work Place Learning WPL (12 weeks)	420 hours
TOTAL	420 hours

SUBJECT XX223 for students in BXXX where students will demonstrate learning outcomes through associated WPL subject

Lecture	
Assigned reading	24 hours
Tutorial assistance	24 hours
Laboratory Work	24 hours
Peer group research/ study	
Online activity	36hours
Individual research/study	24 hours
Assignment Preparation	
Examination	3 hours
Work Place Learning WPL	(see WPL 222)
Residential School	
TOTAL	135 hours