



**Australian OHS Education  
Accreditation Board**

# OHS Program Accreditation

## Recommendations for change

PO Box 2078, Gladstone Park VIC 3043 | P 03 8336 1995 | E [registrar@ohseducationaccreditation.org.au](mailto:registrar@ohseducationaccreditation.org.au)  
[www.ohseducationaccreditation.org.au](http://www.ohseducationaccreditation.org.au)

# Pre-reading



PROFESSIONS  
AUSTRALIA



UNIVERSITIES  
AUSTRALIA

Joint Statement of Principles for Professional Accreditation



**Australian OHS Education  
Accreditation Board**

Review of Implementation of Accreditation of OHS  
Professional Education in Australia  
June 2015

<http://www.ohseducationaccreditation.org.au/about-us/>



**Australian OHS Education  
Accreditation Board**

Alignment of OHS Accreditation Standards with (Draft)  
Australian Higher Education Standards Framework, 2015



**Australian OHS Education  
Accreditation Board**

# Proposed changes

- Areas for improvement based on Review
  - Deficiencies noted in reports
  - Observations of Education Advisor
- Changes to the accreditation standards
  - To accommodate areas for improvement
  - New HESF
- Changes to annual review process



# OHS Accreditation Review

## Criteria



# Critical criteria – impact on accreditation

Criteria		Common deficiency
1.4	Structure and learning activities appropriate to level of award	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Depth of content and activities not at appropriate level (partic. for Masters)</li> </ul>
1.5	Content addresses OHS BoK concepts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited scope of hazards addressed</li> <li>Inadequate attention to control (emphasis on hazards/risk assessment)</li> </ul>
4.4	Sessional staff an integral part of the assessment process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employment arrangements do not allow for induction or include sessional staff into the university culture, technology or processes</li> </ul>
4.9	Student:staff and student:peer interaction enables development of skills, knowledge and understanding of entry-level OHS professional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited use of student engagement tools in LMS results in off-campus students have few opportunities for engagement</li> <li>As records not available difficult to assess level of student engagement</li> </ul>
4.10	Remote/distance delivery supports interaction equivalent to that expected for on-campus models of delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be parity of expectations, content, and standards, but teaching and assessment have to be recast.</li> </ul>

# Program deficiencies frequently requiring action

Criteria		Common deficiency
1.1	Program information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-enrolment information not clearly describing the course structure, expected time commitment including that on-campus, technology or workplace requirements</li> </ul>
1.7	Theoretical underpinning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few program teams able to enunciate the underpinning educational philosophy - the students' 'learning journey'</li> </ul>
2.2	Learning resources current, available suitable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Materials frequently not current, sometimes national reports unreferenced, little guidance as to how to work with large volume of information. LMS used by both on and off-campus students but too often simply a store for resources.</li> </ul>
5.1, 5.2	Assessment is effective and expected student outcomes achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment not adequately addressing key knowledge and skills</li> <li>• Inadequate/inconsistent information provided to students on assessment requirements.</li> <li>• Limited use of software for plagiarism checking</li> <li>• Delay in feedback to students inhibiting formative value of assessment</li> </ul>
6.2	Review process includes past and present students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While most programs have some arrangements for industry input review processes do not always involve students. This is seen to be difficult for off-campus modes</li> </ul>

# Criteria issues identified through review interviews

- Review criteria to eliminate any repetition
- Review guidelines for OHS BoK to clarify requirements
- Review schedule for BoK development to give priority to 'health' related chapters



# Accreditation Priorities

## Teaching and Learning





# Four areas of concern

- Philosophy of Teaching and Learning
- Program planning
- The reliance on casual teaching staff
- The role of industry and the profession



# Philosophy of teaching

- Possibly the least successful element of applications for accreditation to date
- The AQF requires that
  - The approach to teaching and learning and assessment is clearly enunciated and evident both in teaching arrangements and support provision
    - The Board interprets 'approach' as the philosophy of teaching
- What might it contain?
  - Putting it succinctly, it should be a narrative that includes:
    - Your conception of teaching and learning
    - A description of how you teach
    - Justification for why you teach that way
- Why?
  - Because such a statement can:
    - Demonstrate that you have been reflective and purposeful about your teaching
    - Communicate your goals as a teacher and your corresponding actions in the classroom
    - Provide a basis for determining how successful you are in supporting student learning



# Source

Adapted from

‘Writing a Philosophy of Teaching Statement’ prepared  
by the University Center for the Advancement of  
Teaching at The Ohio State University, 2015.  
([ucat.osu.edu](http://ucat.osu.edu))



**Australian OHS Education  
Accreditation Board**

# How to prepare such a statement of teaching philosophy

– In a collaborative way, the teaching team should consider their responses to the following:

- How do people learn?
- How do we facilitate that learning?
- What goals do we have for our students?
- Why do we teach the way that we do?
- What do we do to implement these ideas about teaching and learning in practice?
- Are these things working? Do students meet the goals?
- How do we know they are working?
- Do our answers hold across the whole program?



# Source

Chism, N.V.N. (1988), 'Developing a philosophy of teaching statement' in *Essays on Teaching Excellence 9 (3)*, 1-2 Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education.



**Australian OHS Education  
Accreditation Board**

# Program planning (1)

- The apparent quality of program planning (*curriculum development*) in applications varied enormously.
- The assessment panels take a limited approach and seek evidence of:
  - Clarity about the expected learning outcomes for students
  - A sequential series of units that show cumulative development of knowledge, skills and understanding through the program
  - Structured learning opportunities for students that reflect the intended outcomes and progressive development of capability, including the provision of study resources
  - The inclusion in learning opportunities of activities related to workplace practice
  - Assessment that informs students of their progress, allows for remediation of capability, and provides assurance that intended outcomes have been met

(continues)



**Australian OHS Education  
Accreditation Board**

# Program planning (2)

- And, critically, that
  - Program planning is regarded and undertaken as a collegial activity and not the sum of individual contributions
  - Members of the profession are centrally involved in shaping program proposals
  - All teaching staff have opportunities for input to the program, and are supported in understanding its philosophy, sequencing, cumulative development of capabilities and assessment practices and in acquiring the skills necessary for implementing them



# The reliance on casual staff

- Need to distinguish between the occasional guest lecturer who is invited to bring specialist professional expertise to the program *and* staff who are employed by term/semester to carry a significant teaching or assessment responsibility within a course.
- The latter are our focus of concern
- The expectation is that they should be inducted into the emphases and sequencing of the program and receive sufficient support such that they are not required to operate in isolation from other staff or without adequate understanding of program developments
- Further, they should be employed sufficiently early such that all necessary infrastructure (particularly IT and library access) are in place before teaching commences and, where possible, have some role in shaping the delivery of the course involved





# The role of industry and the profession

- Universities commonly now assert the importance of their links to industry and the professions and use this position for promotional purposes.
- Industry representatives have not uncommonly decried university programs as not providing ‘job-ready’ graduates.
- There have been a number of sector-wide responses to such criticisms, including ‘Graduate Qualities’, ‘Generic Attributes’ and ‘work-integrated learning’. The test of how real these are is reflected in student assessment.
- One mechanism is the Program Advisory Group, whereby professional input into program proposals, revisions, etc., is discussed.
- Such an initiative is only likely to succeed if (a) the membership of such bodies has a preponderance of industry representatives and (b) the advisory group sees proposals before they have been to university decision-taking bodies for sign-off. *The Board has built such conditions into the assessment requirements*



# **Revised OHS education accreditation standards**



**Australian OHS Education  
Accreditation Board**

# Criteria

- Reflect Professions Australia/Universities Australia draft agreement
- Address issues raised in review
- Structured to align with new HESF to be implemented January 2017



# Body of Knowledge criterion

- All concepts to be addressed
- University to demonstrate they address the OHS BoK from an advanced theoretical & technical perspective with both breadth and depth in some areas with rationale for selection of depth v breadth
- Content, approach and assessment reflect AQF level of the qualification
- OHS BoK mapping to include new topics identified but not yet written



Discussion, questions on  
proposed criteria changes



# Revised Annual Review



# Annual review

## Currently

- Statement of student numbers, changes to program, resources
- Status report on action plan

## Issue

- 5 year period is a long time between in-depth reviews
- Credibility of process requires closer monitoring an on an annual basis
- Opportunity to review aspects not addressed in accreditation assessment
- Current practice across accreditation bodies has greater depth in annual review



# Proposed annual review process

- ▶ Process for monitoring and reporting student progression through the programs

## Year 1

As per current annual review, ie: focus on action plan report

## Year 2

Action plan should be completed. Report on any item listed 'For Monitoring'

## In each of Years 2, 3 and 4

All accredited institutions will be asked to

- Report against a common content theme,
- Report on assessment activity relating to that theme,
- Submit an assessment rubric for associated assignments, and
- Provide 4 de-identified marked assignments (fail, pass, credit, distinction)

An educational aspect may be included in the review



an OHS Education  
Education Board



Discussion, questions on  
proposed changes to annual  
review

