

PORTFOLIO - Sample 2

Original Document	Edited Document (with mark-ups)
<p>Assignment from Professional Editing course at Mount Royal University</p>	<p>NOTE TO AUTHOR:</p> <p>I will share with you my overall observations that can be used in this and future documents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When using acronyms, make sure explain an acronym such as ADPP, the first time it is used. For example, the first line does not explain ADPP, but it is explained in the second paragraph. The voice of the document moves between active and passive voice. Since this document is trying to persuade the LTC (which is not explained in the document, and required additional research as the editor), I suggest using the active voice to be more direct and convincing. There are spelling errors and misuse of words which I have corrected. <p>Thank you for allowing me to edit your proposal.</p>
<p>ISSUE Outline of Staff development idea and possible implementation into the ADPP.</p> <p>BACKGROUND A core commitment of both Charles Sturt University (CSU) and the New South Wales Police Force (NSWPF) is the ongoing development of staff. CSU and NSWPF work together to facilitate the delivery of the Associate Degree in Policing Practice (ADPP) to policing students, on-line and face to face. As a result, the cohort of teachers have differing backgrounds, knowledge, and aptitude. The LTC believe there is great strength in this diversity and have formulated the following development strategy for staff to learn from each other while delivering the ADPP. This will be formalised in documentation that can be used corporately to record staff development.</p> <p>COMMENT Over the course of a week, two staff members will be assigned to work as a teaching unit. Both staff members will prepare for and attend the same classes. In the first class (E.g. 17.1), staff member A will take the teaching role where staff member B critically analyses the delivery, communication and engagement of staff member A. This is to allow staff member B to reflect on their own delivery, communication and engagement with students and consider alternatives to their delivery (as displayed by staff member A). At the conclusion of the class staff member B debriefs staff member A giving feedback for staff member A to reflect on. This can be recorded on a standard form to allow for corporate development records to be maintained.</p> <p>Ideally this teaching unit would be rostered to teach the same class (17.1) again where the roles are reversed. Staff</p>	<p>ISSUE Outline of a <u>Staff-staff</u> development idea and <u>possible</u> implementation into the <u>Associate Degree in Policing Practice (ADPP)</u>.</p> <p>BACKGROUND A core commitment₁ of both Charles Sturt University (CSU) and the New South Wales Police Force (NSWPF)₂ is the ongoing <u>development of staff</u>. CSU and NSWPF <u>will work</u> together to facilitate the delivery of the <u>Associate Degree in Policing Practice (ADPP)</u> to policing students, <u>both on-lineonline</u> and face-<u>to--face</u>. <u>As a result, the cohortResulting in a group</u> of teachers <u>have-with</u> differing backgrounds, knowledge, and aptitude. The <u>Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC)</u> believes₃ there is great strength in <u>this</u> diversity and have formulated the following <u>development developmental</u> strategy for staff to learn from each other while delivering the ADPP. This will be formalised in documentation <u>that can be usedand used</u> corporately to record staff development.</p> <p>COMMENTPROPOSAL Over the course of a week, two staff members will be assigned to work as a teaching unit. <u>and Both staff members</u> will prepare for and attend the same classes. In the first class (E.g-17.1), <u>staff member Ainstructor A</u> will take the teaching role where <u>staff memberinstructor B</u> critically analyses the delivery, communication₂ and engagement of <u>staff memberinstructor -A</u>. This <u>is-towill</u> allow <u>staff memberinstructor B</u> to reflect on their own delivery, communication₂ and engagement with students and consider alternatives to their delivery (<u>as displayed by staff member A</u>)<u>by instructor A</u>. At the conclusion of the class <u>staff memberinstructor B</u> debriefs <u>staff memberinstructor A by</u></p>

Commented [A1]: Since this is the first time using the ADPP acronym, it is best to use the full words with the abbreviation in parenthesis. Afterwards, you can use the acronym with out using the full words.

Commented [A2]: It is unclear if the development is for teaching staff at CSU and/or NSWPF.

Commented [A3]: It is best to first describe acronyms using the full words with the abbreviation in parenthesis.

Commented [A4]: I suggest using the active voice with your verbs and avoid "would", "should", etc.

Commented [A5]: Based on the context of the document, I suggest using the word 'Proposal' as the heading.

Commented [A6]: Because you use "staff member" several times when referring to the teachers, I would suggest changing the word to 'instructor' to make it clear that the staff member will be instructing the class.

<p>member B would take on the teaching role as staff member A conducts the critical analyses and debrief.</p> <p>This would continue for a week giving each staff member 3 to 4 instances of presenting and analysing each other's performance. Ideally the two staff members in the teaching unit would be chosen based on their differing history and skill set. This is to allow the maximum cross-pollination of approach and ideas, resulting in mutual benefit. This would occur once a year where the staff members are placed in the teaching unit with different staff each year.</p> <p>This concept is not an opportunity for both staff members to Co-teach the lessons (to improve the students experience in that lesson). The intention is for staff member A to teach while staff member B is engaged in critical analysis of how staff member A presents the curriculum and uses that analysis as a self-reflective tool for development.</p> <p>This is not an assessment by one staff member of another. It is a collaborative endeavour where self-assessment and feedback are equally important to both members of the teaching unit. It is expected that this will engage the staff members in each other's professional development and foster camaraderie.</p> <p>This is an extended conceptualisation of the proven staff assessment addressed by current Managerial Observations. It is viable in an online environment as well as face to face. As a result it should not pose a significant issue in relation to staff acceptance, understanding and implementation.</p> <p>The cost to CSU and NSWPF would be minor as two staff would work together for a week, slightly increasing the workload to other staff members. The benefits are expected to be reflected in staff development (and recording of such) and standardisation in the delivery of the ADPP.</p>	<p>giving feedback for staff memberinstructor A to reflect on. This can-will be recorded on a standard form to allow for corporate development records to be maintained.</p> <p>Ideally thisEach teaching unit would-will be rostered to teach the same class (17.1) again where the roles are reversedreverse. Staff memberInstructor B would-will take on the teaching role as-while staff memberinstructor A conducts the critical analyses and debrief.</p> <p>This would-will continue for a week giving each staff member 3(three to 4four) instances of presenting and analysing each other's performance. Ideally theThe two staff members in theeach teaching unit would-be chosenare selected based on their differing history and skill set. This is to allow the maximum cross-pollination of approach and ideas, resulting in mutual benefit. This would-will occur once a year where thestaff members are placed into theteaching units with different staff each year.</p> <p>This concept is not an opportunityoccasion for both staff members to Coco-teach the lessonslessons but (to improve the students experience in that lessonlesson). The intention is for staff memberinstructor A to teach while staff memberinstructor B is engaged in critical analysis of how staff memberinstructor A presents the curriculum and uses that analysis as a self-reflective tool for development.</p> <p>This is not an assessment by one staff member of another butratherit is a collaborative endeavour where self-assessment and feedback are equally important to both members of the teaching unit. It is expected that thisThe expectation is that it will engage thestaff members in each other's professional development and foster camaraderie.</p> <p>This is an extended conceptualisationconcept of the proven staff assessment addressed by current Managerial Observationsmanagerial observations. It is viable in an online environment as well as face_to_face. As a result, it should not pose a significant issue in relation to staff acceptance, understanding and implementation.</p> <p>The cost to CSU and NSWPF would-beis minor as two staff wouldwork together for a week, onlyslightly increasing the workload to other staff members. The expectedbenefits areexpected-towill be reflectedreflect in staff development (and recording of such) and standardisation in the delivery of the ADPP.</p>
--	--

Commented [A7]: Typically, numbers under 10 are spelled out in full

Commented [A8]: While 'lessons' is a word, based on the context, I have substituted with the word 'lessons'.

ISSUE

Outline of a staff development idea and implementation into the Associate Degree in Policing Practice (ADPP).

BACKGROUND

A core commitment, of both Charles Sturt University (CSU) and the New South Wales Police Force (NSWPF), is the ongoing development of staff. CSU and NSWPF will work together to facilitate the delivery of the ADPP to policing students, both online and face-to-face. Resulting in a group of teachers with differing backgrounds, knowledge, and aptitude. The Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) believes there is great strength in diversity and have formulated the following developmental strategy for staff to learn from each other while delivering the ADPP. This will be formalised in documentation and used corporately to record staff development.

PROPOSAL

Over the course of a week, two staff members will be assigned to work as a teaching unit and will prepare for and attend the same classes. In the first class (17.1), instructor A will take the teaching role where instructor B critically analyses the delivery, communication, and engagement of instructor A. This will allow instructor B to reflect on their own delivery, communication, and engagement with students and consider alternatives to their delivery by instructor A. At the conclusion of the class instructor B debriefs instructor A by giving feedback for instructor A to reflect on. This will be recorded on a standard form to allow for corporate development records to be maintained.

Each teaching unit will be rostered to teach the same class (17.1) again where the roles reverse. Instructor B will take on the teaching role while instructor A conducts the critical analyses and debrief.

This will continue for a week giving each staff member three to four instances of presenting and analysing each other's performance. The two staff members in each teaching unit are selected based on their differing history and skill set. This is to allow the maximum cross-pollination of approach and ideas, resulting in mutual benefit. This will occur once a year where staff members are placed into teaching units with different staff each year.

This concept is **not** an occasion for both staff members to co-teach the lessons but to improve the students experience in that lesson. The intention is for instructor A to teach while instructor B is engaged in critical analysis of how instructor A presents the curriculum and uses that analysis as a self-reflective tool for development.

This is not an assessment by one staff member of another but rather a collaborative endeavour where self-assessment and feedback are equally important to both members of the teaching unit. The expectation is that it will engage staff members in each other's professional development and foster camaraderie. This is an extended concept of the proven staff assessment addressed by current managerial observations. It is viable in an online environment as well as face-to-face. As a result, it should not pose a significant issue in relation to staff acceptance, understanding and implementation.

The cost to CSU and NSWPF is minor as two staff work together for a week, only slightly increasing the workload to other staff members. The expected benefits will reflect staff development (and recording of such) and standardisation in the delivery of the ADPP.