

Collaborative Service Teaching Procedure

Section 1 - Purpose and Scope

(1) This Procedure enacts the [Collaborative Service Teaching Policy](#) and set outs the requirements for managing collaborative service teaching arrangements.

(2) This Procedure applies to all instances of collaborative service teaching at The University of Queensland (UQ or the University). While it is acknowledged that non-academic units may contribute to the University's teaching and learning efforts, this Procedure applies explicitly to academic and research units.

(3) This Procedure does not apply to the delivery of programs, courses and professional development to non-enrolled students (refer to the [Consultancy Procedure](#) clauses 16-19).

Section 2 - Process and Key Controls

(4) Key processes and controls for managing collaborative service teaching arrangements include:

- a. Collaborative service teaching arrangements are documented through a collaborative service teaching agreement, negotiated and established in accordance with the 'Collaborative Service Teaching Agreements' provisions in section 3; and
- b. Disagreements are managed and resolved in accordance with the dispute resolution process set out in the 'Dispute Resolution' provisions in section 3.

Section 3 - Key Requirements

Funding

(5) Funding splits must be negotiated by the Heads of School, or relevant heads of academic/research unit, and signed off by the relevant Executive Dean(s).

(6) EFTSL is the default basis for collaborative service teaching funding splits.

Collaborative Service Teaching Agreements

(7) The following general principles apply when considering whether collaborative service teaching should be documented by a collaborative service teaching agreement.

- a. A collaborative service teaching agreement is required where:
 - i. a course is developed for a specific cohort in another school or faculty's program, or
 - ii. a service teaching provider is providing core content in another school or faculty's program, or
 - iii. there is any concern about the continuity of course delivery, or
 - iv. eligible staff are engaged under the [Framework for Teaching Opportunities](#), Pilot Funding Scheme.
- b. A collaborative service teaching agreement is not required where a course is offered as a general elective or

program elective in more than one program.

- c. A collaborative service teaching agreement may be required for guest lecturing events.
- d. A collaborative service teaching agreement must be established between the host school and the service teaching provider(s) prior to the approval of a new course. The agreement must be provided with the program approval documentation and must accompany approval of the course through University committees (see section 2 of the [Collaborative Service Teaching Policy](#)).

(8) To ensure a clear understanding between the host school and the service teaching provider(s), collaborative service teaching agreements must include:

- a. course details including learning objectives, assessment, location and delivery mode;
- b. responsibilities of the host school and the service teaching provider(s), including the provision of resources, teaching schedule, and the specific requirements of content delivery (for example, scope, contextual requirements);
- c. the remuneration arrangement, typically an EFTSL split for the provision of collaborative service teaching and the basis on which it has been determined;
- d. the term of the agreement;
- e. arrangements for consultation and review of the program/course;
- f. timelines that accommodate the academic and technical staff delivering the course; and
- g. agreed measures of success.

(9) The agreement is to be prepared using the relevant proforma: [Collaborative Service Teaching Agreement Form](#) or [Collaborative Service Teaching Agreement Form \(Research-focused\)](#).

Changes to a Collaborative Service Teaching Agreement

(10) The host school and the service teaching provider(s) are responsible for consulting about any proposed changes that will impact on the collaborative service teaching agreement.

(11) Where it is determined (e.g. through the program review process) that a change in service teaching is required, the proposing party is responsible for providing the other parties with timely notification of relevant changes and/or new course requirements that impact on the collaborative service teaching agreement.

(12) The Heads of School, or equivalents, are responsible for ensuring all decisions and agreements are communicated to and within the relevant schools or academic units.

Dispute Resolution

(13) Transparency is a feature of the dispute resolution process. A concise record of key points and the agreed outcomes must be documented at all stages of the dispute resolution process.

(14) It is acknowledged that disputes could include disagreements about:

- a. an element of an existing collaborative service teaching arrangement (such as the quality of the service teaching or sharing of funding);
- b. details of proposed courses to be included in a new or revised program;
- c. the restructuring of an existing program that includes service taught courses; and
- d. the duplication of teaching expertise and courses across schools or the academic unit in which the expertise for a given discipline most appropriately belongs.

(15) In the event of a disagreement between the host school and the service teaching provider(s), the collaborative

service teaching dispute resolution process outlined below must be followed.

- a. In the first instance, the parties concerned must endeavour to resolve the issues informally through discussion. Where either the host school or the service teaching provider(s) are dissatisfied with some aspect of the collaborative service teaching arrangement, all parties concerned, in consultation with the relevant Associate Dean (Academic), will be responsible for determining mutually agreed arrangements and strategies for their achievement.
- b. Where a dispute remains unresolved, the relevant Executive Dean/s and Unit Lead (if applicable) must be notified in writing of the details under dispute, including a chronological account of the background circumstances. Formal discussions about the problem areas must be held between the parties concerned, the Associate Dean (Academic), the Heads of relevant schools or academic/research units, and the Executive Dean/Unit Lead.
- c. Where the dispute is not resolved by the Executive Dean/s and Unit Lead (if applicable), the Provost in consultation with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) will be the arbitrator and final decision-maker.

(16) Any academic policy issues that emerge out of the dispute resolution discussions must be reported to the Committee for Academic Programs Policy for consideration.

Section 4 - Roles, Responsibilities and Accountabilities

Position	Responsibility
Provost	Arbitrator and final decision maker in dispute cases between the host school and the service teaching provider(s) and dispute is not able to be resolved by the relevant Executive Deans.
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)	The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) provides input into academic quality thresholds and assurance of high-quality program, plan and course offerings at the University.
Executive Dean	Signs off on collaborative service teaching funding splits as negotiated by the Heads of School and/or Academic Unit. Initial decision-maker in the case of dispute cases between the host school and the service teaching provider(s)
Head of School or equivalent within an Academic Unit	Negotiates collaborative service teaching funding splits
Host unit	The school or academic unit (for example, faculty) that is generally aligned with the program that requires the delivery of service teaching and/or provides service teaching opportunities.
Program owner	The faculty that administers the program into which service teaching is being delivered.
Service teaching provider	The school, academic unit (for example, faculty) or research unit (for example, institute or centre) with the recognised discipline expertise that collaborates with a host school to design and deliver service teaching.
Committee for Academic Programs Policy (CAPP)	Consider any academic policy issues that emerge out of the dispute resolution discussions Review and compliance-monitoring of this Procedure.

Section 5 - Monitoring, Review and Assurance

(17) All collaborative service teaching arrangements must be reviewed as part of the cyclic academic program review process or as required by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic).

(18) Quality of collaborative service teaching is further assured through implementation and follow-up of:

- a. the central academic program approval process;
- b. the annual academic quality assurance process;
- c. the comprehensive cyclical review of academic programs;
- d. regular student feedback and student evaluation, such as student satisfaction surveys; and
- e. program and course approval processes within schools and faculties, in accordance with the [Program Approval Procedure](#).

(19) The Committee for Academic Programs Policy (CAPP) is responsible for monitoring university-wide compliance with, and review of, this Procedure for its effectiveness and ongoing relevance.

Section 6 - Recording and Reporting

(20) A copy of the approved Collaborative Service Teaching Agreement must be kept by both the host school/academic unit and the service teaching provider(s). Agreements are recorded in the University's curriculum management system and SI-net in accordance with the [Information Management Policy](#).

Section 7 - Appendix

Definitions

Term	Definition
Collaborative service teaching	Teaching of or into a course offered in a specific program, for example a core course, by one or more service teaching providers other than the host school or academic unit generally aligned with administering the program.
Collaborative Service Teaching Agreement	An agreement between a host school/academic unit and the relevant service teaching provider(s).
Discipline expertise	<p>A school, faculty, institute or centre may be recognised as having discipline expertise through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Either:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- its leadership in teaching and research in the discipline; or- its leadership in teaching and research in the application of disciplinary knowledge in a professional context; and- acknowledgement by the University.

Status and Details

Status	Current
Effective Date	13th August 2024
Review Date	13th December 2027
Approval Authority	Vice-Chancellor and President
Approval Date	2nd August 2024
Expiry Date	Not Applicable
Policy Owner	Kathryn Blyth Director, Academic Services Division and Academic Registrar
Enquiries Contact	Academic Services Division