

AGENDA ITEM 11**Report of the Learning and Teaching Committee****11.2 Report of the Learning and Teaching Committee meeting held on 13 February 2007**

The Committee met on Tuesday, 13 February 2007 when there were present: the Chair (Associate Professor Robyn Ewing) presiding, Professors D Armstrong, D Guest, B Sutton and K Trigwell, Associate Professors D Airey, C Collyer, M Freeman, P McCallum, P McGreevy and G Ryan, Drs D Collins, S Cumming, M Edmond, D O'Connor, B Rooney and C Taylor, and Ms K Barnsley, Ms J Gavan, Ms S Hanfling, Ms J Jones, Mr B Meikle, Ms K Sodersten and Ms T Thornley. Miss E R Ring was in attendance.

11.2.1 Academic Board Faculty Reviews**(1) Faculty Progress Reports (pages G4-G18)**

The Committee received and noted the progress reports from the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning and the Sydney College of the Arts, in response to recommendations from the Academic Board Phase Two Faculty Reviews.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the Faculty Progress Reports from the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning and the Sydney College of the Arts, as set out in the report presented.

(2) Timing of Board Faculty Reviews and Professional Accreditation Reviews

The Committee noted a report from the Chair of the Board about Phase 3 Reviews and the innovations envisaged. During discussion, members highlighted the amount of work required for both Academic Board Faculty Reviews and the requirements for professional accreditation and observed that there needed to be greater rationalisation of this work. The Committee agreed to draw to the Board's attention the need for alignment of Academic Board reviews and professional accreditation reviews.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board note the need for alignment of Academic Board Faculty Reviews and professional accreditation reviews.

11.2.2 Proceedings of the Committee**(1) Plagiarism Detection Working Party**

The Committee had received a paper from the Plagiarism Detection Working Party outlining its thoughts to date. The Chair of the Working Party, Associate Professor Ryan, expanded on a number of issues in the paper and sought the Committee's feedback as a basis for further discussion by the Working Party prior to its submission of a formal report and recommendations to the Committee. He reported also that the use of plagiarism detection software was only one small component of a much bigger issue, and that the Working Party had been considering recommendations beyond the scope of its remit.

There was a lengthy discussion about a number of issues, including the importance of:

- developing student awareness of what constituted plagiarism,
- the need for a systematic approach across the University, from all levels down to unit coordinator and unit of study, and

- improvement in assessment practices in order to prevent plagiarism, with detection as the next step.

(2) Assessment Working Party

The Chair of the Assessment Working Party, Associate Professor Ewing, reported that the Working Party had met once, with preliminary discussions focussing on the enormity of the task, the anticipated outcomes and the need for a statement on assessment, as well as a set of principles and equitable procedures which would encourage consistency of approach across the University. Areas of concern had been noted, as had the variety of assessment strategies used by the various faculties.

(3) Identifying and Supporting Students at Risk

The Committee noted reports from several members who, while acknowledging the importance of the new policy, expressed concern about the lack of sufficient administrative resources in their faculties to identify the students at risk and academic staff resources to act as counsellors. It was also observed that insufficient data were available from FlexSIS.

It was agreed that this would be an issue for discussion at the next meeting.

(4) Report of the Academic Board

The Committee noted a written report on the meeting of the Academic Board held on 13 December 2006.

Professor Sutton also reported on the following matters:

- the preparation for the Phase 3 Faculty Reviews and the innovations envisaged for this round of reviews,
- work being performed on the development of Key Performance Indicators, and
- the work of the Working Party on Course Approvals.

(5) Report of the Acting Deputy Provost (Learning and Teaching) and Pro-Vice-Chancellor

Professor Armstrong referred to the breadth and depth of the key issues to be addressed by the University, with learning and teaching being central to many of them. He highlighted the following areas that the University needed to address urgently:

- improvement in performance and outcomes, and how it would measure the outcomes,
- maximisation of learning and teaching resources and their strategic use to improve and reward outcomes, with the development of a clear view of the University's future directions, and consideration given to external factors, such as accreditation, the development of KPIs and budgetary incentives,
- the organisation of support systems to maximise best practice, taking account of differences between faculties in the determination of what should be done centrally, what locally, and how this should be integrated,
- improvement in Teaching Performance Fund outcomes, which were important as both a source of income and in terms of Sydney's reputation within the tertiary sector, with consideration given to how the University/faculties rewarded outcomes, and

- development of better information retrieval and data collection systems.

(6) Report of the Director, Institute for Teaching and Learning

The Committee received a report from Professor Trigwell on the ITL timetable of courses and working group meetings in 2007. In speaking to his report, Professor Trigwell expressed some concern that the feed-back to the faculties from these groups did not always result in action being taken by the faculties, and indicated that he wished to discuss this at a future meeting.

(7) Other Reports/Work in Progress

- Working Party on the use and creation of multimedia recordings of lectures
- Statistical information from the Plagiarism Register
- Feedback on the outcomes from the “Students at Risk” program trialled by the Faculty of Pharmacy.

FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE, DESIGN & PLANNING

PROGRESS REPORT NO. 2 ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PHASE TWO

<p>Recommendation 1 PHASE 2 – from FIRST PROGRESS REPORT</p>	<p>The Review Team recommends that the Faculty ensures that Academic Staff focus on faculty strategic directions and the delivery of teaching and learning and research and that strategic project teams include relevant General Staff to ensure underlying enabling support is available to assist implementation of project outcomes. (Section 3.6.6)</p>
<p>Action taken by the Faculty</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informal reviews held of faculty strategic plans, with the Learning and Teaching Strategic Plan as an example. • These showed that the aims were difficult to achieve, and reviews were necessary, especially in line with the new University Strategic plan. • Academic staff in leadership positions took part in a College retreat where University, College and faculty strategic plans addressed, and a further workshop for all academic staff followed. • Faculty reviewed strategies for involving Academic and General staff in developing strategic directions for the faculty, and focusing on these, and proposed revised approaches for 2006 (see below). • Faculty appointed a full time general staff member as Teaching and Learning Support Officer, to implement projects in Teaching and Learning. This staff member resigned in early 2005, and following a review of the duties involved, a part-time position was created fulfilling the similar duties. • Research Support duties were allocated to a member of the General Staff in 2005. These duties are currently being reviewed with the appointment of a part-time position being considered for 2006. • General staff have been included in project teams e.g. the Development manager is included in a proposed talented Student Program • General staff in the Academic Support Centre have been freed to provide support to projects through the transference of part-time budget duties to faculty staff.
<p>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty has a new Dean, Professor Tom Kvan, taking up the position in January 2005, with a faculty retreat planned for late February 2006 when strategic directions for the faculty will be addressed. • All academic and general staff will participate in this retreat, when the strategic directions for the faculty will be developed. • Development of strategic plans with fewer and more tactically aligned and achievable strategic goals. • General staff support positions in Teaching and learning, and in Research to continue.
<p>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</p>	<p>Faculty evaluation following future planned action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of strategic plans at the end of each 12 month period (beginning of year) to check goals achieved and progress of remainder. • Review staff to check understanding of strategic directions. PM&Ds help align personal performance with strategic directions. • Monitor outcomes of projects with general staff involvement against any without.
<p>Recommendation 1 PHASE 2 – SECOND PROGRESS REPORT</p>	<p>The Review Team recommends that the Faculty ensures that Academic Staff focus on faculty strategic directions and the delivery of teaching and learning and research and that strategic project teams include relevant General Staff to ensure underlying enabling support is available to assist implementation of project outcomes. (Section 3.6.6)</p>
<p>Action taken by the Faculty</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic plan: development and process to achieve implementation thereof <p>Planning retreat for each year held in mid to late February annually.</p>

All staff involved.
Key goals agreed by faculty and steps to achieve these and evaluate their success.
Strategic plan 2006 – 2010 developed through faculty-wide consultation
Implementation process developed through annual retreat.

• Learning and Teaching
Strategic Goal:
To develop and articulate research-led teaching to engage students in knowledge discovery.

- Developed Faculty Research-led Teaching and Scholarship of Teaching Grant Scheme
- Improved 2005 over 2004 Teaching Scholarship Index
- Achieved one large TIES grant and three small grants in 2006 (see below)
- Developed process to implement Key Graduate Attributes in coursework programs (see below) with pro forma trialled and circulated.
- Developed coursework plan to measure quality of teaching using USE, SCEQ and CEQ data (see below).

To align program curricula and units of study with research goals and strengths

- Developed scholarship of Teaching and Research-led Teaching support Plan and Party.
- Initiated Faculty Research-led Teaching and Scholarship of Teaching Grant Scheme

To support inter-disciplinary learning and the scholarship of teaching

- Initiated through Faculty Research-led Teaching and Scholarship of Teaching Grant Scheme (see below)

To provide a flexible learning environment, including e-learning

- Initiated through Faculty Research-led Teaching and Scholarship of Teaching Grant Scheme

To integrate culturally diverse approaches in research-led teaching

- Initiated through Faculty Research-led Teaching and Scholarship of Teaching Grant Scheme
- Achieved for example in undergraduate Design Practice 2A/2B, 3A/3B in BDesArch, BArch Integrated and Open Studio and in graduate Urban Design, Sustainability, Urban Planning and Digital Media.

1. Faculty Learning and Teaching Committee Teaching Scholarship Index Research-led Teaching and Scholarship of Teaching Grants. The L&T committee designed and established this grant scheme, which will award annually valued at \$5,000 each through the competitive submission of grant proposals. Supported by the Teaching Scholarship Index funds received by the Faculty, the grants aim to encourage more research-led teaching exploration and improve Teaching Scholarship Index to achieve the Faculty's strategic goals.
2. Process implemented for faculty-wide workshops on key learning and teaching strategic initiatives held each semester. First was on research-led teaching.
3. Process initiated for events to mark teaching achievements, e.g., 'End of Year Scholarship of Teaching Party and Awards' for articles reflecting on research-led teaching strategies or the understandings of scholarship of teaching.

• Research and Innovation
Strategic Goal: To place research at the centre of our scholarly activities.
To identify core areas of research excellence including a focus on the

	<p>Asia Pacific region, emphasising interdisciplinarity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas identified in planning, urban design, digital media, history and theory, design cognition, acoustics, and focused teaching around these e.g. curriculum design of Master of Architecture (replacing BArch in 2008), and implementation of research-led studios in BDesArch and graduate Design Computing programs. <p>To achieve greater staff participation in research related to national research priorities leading to increased income from competitive grants, industry and international linkages and commercialisation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieved with five new ARC grants (more than ever before in the Faculty) totalling over \$1,000,000 – (see below). <p>To improve communication of research activities within the Faculty to increase opportunities for collaboration across disciplines, developing distinctive capabilities that improve the research profile of the Faculty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieved through regular, publicised discipline-based seminars, and end-of-year events such as research ‘Carnivale’. <p>Process in place for general academic staff to contribute to achieve key strategic goals– e.g. annual planning retreat, in developing initiatives, as part of TIES grant teams, in research, and in learning and teaching scholarship, as IT support officer.</p>
<p>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of strategic plan 2007 Planning retreat is scheduled for 2007 on 19-20 February • Learning and Teaching Implementation objectives for 2007: <i>To take the following steps to implement the faculty research-led teaching strategic goal:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To administer Faculty Research-led Teaching and Scholarship of Teaching Grant Scheme • To improve Teaching Scholarship Index by 2% and Teaching Performance Index overall by 2 points. • To raise quality of teaching measured against USE, SCEQ and CEQ data by 2 points. • To align programs with research goals and strengths through Faculty Research-led Teaching and Scholarship of Teaching Grant Scheme and Graduate Attributes in coursework programs, through gaining Academic Board approval of Master of Architecture (replacing current BArch program) for 2008 implementation, and completing review of other masters coursework programs. <i>To take the following steps to support inter-disciplinary learning and the scholarship of teaching, provide a flexible learning environment, including e-learning, and integrate culturally diverse approaches in research-led teaching:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support through Faculty Research-led Teaching and Scholarship of Teaching Grant Scheme • Continue development in all appropriate programs of e-learning and flexible learning environments (Program Committees to implement) • <i>To implement key generic graduate attributes</i> Develop and report their key graduate attributes to the secretary of the faculty Learning and Teaching Committee by 17 July 2007. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. through the Coursework Evaluation Plan and Unit of Study Evaluation Plan. Evaluate research-led teaching strategies in 2007 for 2006. 2. through the Unit of Study Evaluation Plan Implement website for staff to provide feedback to students’ USE survey responses by re-enrolment 2007. This will be demonstrated to Faculty on 21 March 2007.

	<p>• Research and Innovation Implementation objective for 2007: <i>To take the following steps to implement the faculty research strategic goal:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To identify core areas of research excellence including a focus on the Asia Pacific region, emphasising interdisciplinarity. • To develop these areas identified in planning, urban design, digital media, history and theory, audio and acoustics, design cognition, and evaluate teaching around these e.g. curriculum design of Master of Architecture
<p>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</p>	<p>• Learning and Teaching : 1. Teaching Scholarship Index for 2004 was \$16, 500. Report on 2005 is that it will be \$26, 500 which achieves more than the aimed for 2% increase. 2. TIES: Faculty received one large grant \$57,500 and three small grants totalling \$20,000</p> <p>Faculty will be better able to evaluate success of actions in learning and Teaching through the development of Evaluation and Quality Assurance plans: which have been implemented in 2006-</p> <p>(i) Coursework Evaluation Plan An extensive report on undergraduate and postgraduate CEQ and SCEQ scores for coursework courses, from 2000 to 2004/5 for our Faculty (prepared by Peter Smith) was presented to Faculty. SCEQs and CEQ show steady state for undergraduate areas and variable responses for graduate. Implementation of research-led teaching strategies will be evaluated in 2007 for 2006.</p> <p>(ii) Unit of Study Evaluation Plan Faculty has established a three year evaluation plan for all units of study. A database has been prepared with a history of USE dates for each current unit of study. USE feedback on most faculty units of study for 2006 has been collected and implementation of a website that will enable staff to provide feed back to student USE survey responses is underway. This website is to be available by re-enrolment 2007 and will be demonstrated to Faculty on 21 March 2007.</p> <p>• Research and Innovation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved number of ARC research grant applications, and successes (5 successes for 2007 funding, 2 successes for 2006, 3 successes for 2005, 0 successes for 2004) • Improved grant value success with ARC grants totalling over \$1,000,000 (highest total grant value for the Faculty in recent years, if not ever) – in the Disciplines of Planning, Architecture and Design Computing. • In 2006, four academic staff made successful applications to the University of Sydney Research & Development grant scheme, under the Early Career Researcher category. • Feedback on discipline-based seminars, and end-of-year 'Carnivale' very positive, with useful information on how these can be further improved.
<p>Recommendation 2 PHASE 2 – from FIRST PROGRESS REPORT</p>	<p><i>The Review Team recommends that the Faculty liaise with the Sydney College of the Arts and the Universities of Melbourne and Hong Kong to learn how those institutions evaluate their studio units. (Section 3.9.3)</i></p>
<p>Action taken by the Faculty</p>	<p><i>This has not yet been done (see below). Faculty has used a qualitative review format for studio units and studio teaching (The ITL publication, Synergy, has invited comments on this for 2006), and will review its success in 2006. See below for faculty plan.</i></p>
<p>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if</p>	<p>• <i>Contacting the recommended institutions will be undertaken in 2006. New Dean is from University of Hong Kong and will be commenting on studio evaluation there when he takes up the position in 2006.</i></p>

appropriate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty plans to take new strategic directions in 2006 under the new Deanship, and studio units will be responding to this, including more research-based teaching in its studio units in 2006
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	<p>Faculty evaluation following future planned action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review qualitative evaluations and decide on future use in studio units and degrees. • Review evaluation questions from suggested institutions and decide on action: to revise evaluations, use similar, or not to add.
Recommendation 2 PHASE 2 – SECOND PROGRESS REPORT	The Review Team recommends that the Faculty liaise with the Sydney College of the Arts and the Universities of Melbourne and Hong Kong to learn how those institutions evaluate their studio units. (Section 3.9.3)
Action taken by the Faculty	<p>In 2006 the university and the faculty discontinued student exchange and memorandum of understanding with Hong Kong University.</p> <p>The studio evaluation system of the Sydney College of the Arts were examined, but the criteria measured different aspects of the studio projects as a result of their unit objectives. The projects themselves differed considerably between the two faculties.</p> <p>Melbourne University, University of Western Australia, University of Tasmania, and Newcastle architecture faculties were benchmarked by Professor Tom Heneghan in relation to studio hours, number of permanent and part-time teaching staff in studios, staff-student ratios, and assessment and evaluation.</p> <p>Through ITL's Dr. Paul Ginns, the faculty has developed additional methods and USE questions for studio and other units.</p> <p>These methods include: qualitative questions on success and improvements to studio teachers teaching and to studio projects.</p>
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	<p>The 2006 – 2010 Faculty Strategic Plan has changed the Faculty's direction to research focused studio teaching and evidence-based design. The University of Sheffield is a potential benchmarking partner in this, as they have an outstanding record in the RQF equivalent in the UK and have a research focussed approach to studio and studio teaching. Professor Brian Lawson of Sheffield and a visiting professor to the Faculty, is a key contact in this process. Melbourne University Faculty of Architecture's new Dean has agreed that benchmarking between our two faculties will be productive and proposes that this process be developed in 2007/2008.</p>
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	<p>USE responses for studio units in 2006 (4 units evaluated in semester 1 and 5 units in Semester 2) were rated by all the coordinators to be very useful, as compared to one-third of the coordinators considering they were useful in 2004.</p> <p>Qualitative evaluations on tutors and studio teachers performance, particularly mid-semester evaluations were considered by all the tutoring staff to be useful, and student feedback in USEs showed this with on average 85% approval / agreement for this in Good Teaching.</p>
Recommendation 3 PHASE 2 – from FIRST PROGRESS REPORT	The Review Team recommends that in addition to inclusion of Generic Attributes in the Faculty Handbook and on the template for Unit of Study description, that academic staff make explicit to students in the first lecture of the semester the Graduate Attributes developed by successful completion of the Unit of Study. (Section 4.2.4)
Action taken by the Faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduate (Generic) Attributes have been included on template for Unit of Study descriptions. • Academic staff are required to acquaint students with unit objectives and

	<p><i>explicitly graduate attributes.</i> <i>See below for further actions.</i></p>
<p>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty plans to review its current policies, and update these in line with Academic Board policies, which may change information in faculty handbook. • Update faculty handbook. • Faculty is aiming to develop more explicit policies on ensuring Graduate Attributes are embodied in a unit and explicitly discussed with students, through its Learning and Teaching Committee • Develop a staged Unit Evaluation program as part of a program for improving teaching, including peer review process
<p>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</p>	<p>Faculty evaluation following future planned action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Graduate Attribute section of units for clarity and compliance, in sequence over the next three years, or as they come up for revision. • Check through students responses in USEs.
<p>Recommendation 3 PHASE 2 – SECOND PROGRESS REPORT</p>	<p>The Review Team recommends that in addition to inclusion of Generic Attributes in the Faculty Handbook and on the template for Unit of Study description, that academic staff make explicit to students in the first lecture of the semester the Graduate Attributes developed by successful completion of the Unit of Study. (Section 4.2.4)</p>
<p>Action taken by the Faculty</p>	<p>Staff members tell students about Generic Attributes at the beginning of each unit and this is evident in the USEs and SCEQs and CEQs.</p> <p>However, a revised process to develop and embed <i>program specific</i> Generic Attributes in each of the Faculty's programs (undergraduate and graduate) has been developed. A <i>pro forma</i> has been developed and tested in Planning and in 2007 this will be circulated to each program for implementation.</p>
<p>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</p>	<p>The process for implementation of <i>program specific</i> Generic Attributes in 2007 requires each program group to identify key generic attributes for that program, and then to identify the mandatory units in which those generic attributes are implemented. This process will be managed by the Faculty Learning and Teaching Committee throughout 2007, developed in the Faculty Planning Retreat in February.</p>
<p>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</p>	<p>USEs, SCEQs and CEQs for 2005 rated Generic Attributes highly on the appropriate scales on average, with an increase of several points over previous years. However Faculty considers that it can do better in this area, especially with the new focus on research-led teaching, and aims to embed the development of skills and knowledge in research and innovation in program and appropriate unit of study objectives.</p>
<p>Recommendation 4 PHASE 2 – from FIRST PROGRESS REPORT</p>	<p>The Review Team recommends that the Assoc Dean (Graduate Studies) use the move to 6 Credit Points to review the Faculty's Postgraduate Coursework offerings. (Section 4.3.8)</p>
<p>Action taken by the Faculty</p>	<p>The Board of Graduate Studies has reviewed units currently on offer and revised offerings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This Board will examine if further rationalisation of units or programs is needed. The budget constraints have resulted in actions to cycle some units over two years.
<p>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</p>	<p>See above</p>
<p>Faculty's evaluation of the success of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student feedback on course content • Review of student numbers in units on offer in any one year

action taken	
Recommendation 4 PHASE 2 – SECOND PROGRESS REPORT	The Review Team recommends that the Assoc Dean (Graduate Studies) use the move to 6 Credit Points to review the Faculty’s Postgraduate Coursework offerings. (Section 4.3.8)
Action taken by the Faculty	<p>The Faculty used the translation to 6 credit point subjects to amalgamate and eliminate a few of its graduate units of study. Since then the Associate Dean (Graduate Studies) commenced a review of all of the Faculty’s graduate programs in late 2006. Three programs (Design Computing, Digital Media and Facilities Management) are being reviewed and the reviews will be completed in February 2007. Each program has a review committee consisting of staff involved in the program, other staff from outside the discipline concerned and members of the Professional Advisory Committees which have been previously established for each program.</p> <p>The Review Committees are making use of Student Feedback Questionnaires, unit of study enrolment data and data on program enrolment and completion histories. A SWOT analysis for each program is being undertaken to determine appropriate actions regarding each program including adjusting the structure and content of curriculum, future staffing and resource requirements and the rationalisation of unit offerings with low enrolments.</p>
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	<p>The remainder of the graduate programs will be progressively reviewed during 2007 and 2008:</p> <p>2007 Semester 1: Building, Building Services, Heritage Conservation 2007 Semester 2: Urban and Regional Planning, Sustainable Design, Illumination Design 2008 Semester 1: Audio and Acoustics, Architectural History, Theory and Criticism, Architectural Design and Urban Design</p>
Faculty’s evaluation of the success of action taken	<p>It is too early to evaluate the success of this process, however it is envisaged that it is likely that one and possibly two programs will be discontinued and that there will be unit of study rationalisations in most programs.</p> <p>Criteria used for evaluating programs include continuing buoyant student demand, critical mass of staff teaching in the area and connections between teaching and research in the area.</p>
Recommendation 5 PHASE 2 – from FIRST PROGRESS REPORT	<i>The Review Team recommends that the Faculty collects broader research performance data, beyond the DEST figures, to more accurately identify and reward staff research performance, by measures such as providing relief from teaching. (Section 6.1.3)</i>
Action taken by the Faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broader research and creative works output will be collected after consultation with new Dean. • Individual Discipline Groups already collect additional material (of the kind that may be required by the RQF).
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation with new Dean.
Faculty’s evaluation of the success of action taken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual academics will produce a ‘research portfolio’ which will be centrally monitored.
Recommendation 5 PHASE 2 – SECOND PROGRESS REPORT	The Review Team recommends that the Faculty collects broader research performance data, beyond the DEST figures, to more accurately identify and reward staff research performance, by measures such as providing relief from teaching. (Section 6.1.3)
Action taken by the	Broader research performance data is being collected by the Faculty through

<p>Faculty</p>	<p>its workload model.</p> <p>In some cases staff have had teaching relief to concentrate on research activity.</p> <p>A reward scheme has been established by the Faculty with a \$150k budget to provide incentives for research activity. This includes a conference travel scheme, that has two categories of funding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staff with No External Research Grants: Travel grants, to present research papers at conferences, up to \$3.5K/year for a maximum of two years, upon submission of a copy of the paper acceptance, the paper, full referees' reports and publication details (i.e. papers that meet DEST inclusion requirements). 2. Staff with External Research Grants: Travel grants, to present research papers at conferences, up to \$2.5K/year, upon submission of a copy of the paper acceptance, the paper, full referees' reports and publication details (i.e. papers that meet DEST inclusion requirements). <p>The scheme also includes incentives for research students to complete on time, to supplement PRSS funding and for the publication of journal papers.</p>
<p>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</p>	<p>Further coordination of data collection with RQF requirements</p>
<p>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</p>	<p>Monitoring of research portfolios</p>
<p>Recommendation 6 PHASE 2 – from FIRST PROGRESS REPORT</p>	<p><i>The Review Team recommends that the Faculty work to ensure that all 5 research groups offer active research seminar series and have regular social activities available to both research students and staff. (Section 6.2.6)</i></p>
<p>Action taken by the Faculty</p>	<p><i>Each Discipline Group asked to arrange regular research seminars.</i></p>
<p>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</p>	<p><i>Further publicise these seminars.</i></p>
<p>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</p>	<p><i>Each Group now has weekly or fortnightly research seminars.</i></p>
<p>Recommendation 6 PHASE 2 – SECOND PROGRESS REPORT</p>	<p><i>The Review Team recommends that the Faculty work to ensure that all 5 research groups offer active research seminar series and have regular social activities available to both research students and staff. (Section 6.2.6)</i></p>
<p>Action taken by the Faculty</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discipline Groups have been encouraged to continue their regular research meetings, in most cases resulting in seminars sustained throughout the year • A week-long 'Research Carnivale' was run in 2006 for the first time, involving presentation of research by almost all research students <p>Four Faculty-wide seminars were held in 2006 on general research-related topics (such as 'how to write a research grant' and 'how to land an academic job') open to staff and research students – social gatherings associated with these.</p> <p>For example, the Design Computing and Cognition discipline runs a regular</p>

	seminar series on Wednesdays from 2-3pm. Notice of seminars are sent one week in advance to all staff and students. The discipline generally runs social events such as hikes and barbeques, particularly around Australian holidays. Research students in the discipline have regular "beer nights" to socialise outside of the research centre.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop the Research Carnivale further and hold it annually • Develop an online research student directory with a brief profile of each student's topic, to further encourage communication between research students • Continue to encourage Discipline heads to maintain research seminars
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research student annual interviews (questions on research culture and seminars included in every interview). Student comments in December 2006 interviews were overwhelmingly positive. • SREQ Open Comments
Recommendation 7 PHASE 2 – from FIRST PROGRESS REPORT	<i>The Review Team recommend that the Faculty clarify its relationship with the Research Centres and the Faculty and ensure that there are appropriate reporting and monitoring mechanisms in place. (Section 6.4.2)</i>
Action taken by the Faculty	• <i>Review criteria have been established. Reviews of each centre being arranged.</i>
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	• <i>Reviews to be carried out.</i>
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	• <i>Review reports followed by responses from Centre directors.</i>
Recommendation 7 PHASE 2 – SECOND PROGRESS REPORT	<i>The Review Team recommend that the Faculty clarify its relationship with the Research Centres and the Faculty and ensure that there are appropriate reporting and monitoring mechanisms in place. (Section 6.4.2)</i>
Action taken by the Faculty	• Following reviews, the Research Centres are reporting to the Faculty through the Dean.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	• Some fine-tuning of the relationships are needed, particularly with regard to CPD units (wrt credit and finances).
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	• Reports from Centre directors and monitoring by finance officer and Associate Dean (Graduate Studies).
Recommendation 8 PHASE 2 – from FIRST PROGRESS REPORT	<i>The Review Team recommends that the Faculty investigate means of providing opportunities for BDesComp students to develop specialisations. (Section 8.1.4)</i>
Action taken by the Faculty	• <i>The Faculty has advertised and filled two additional academic positions in digital architecture within the BDesComp. These additional positions will provide the resources needed to introduce specialisations.</i>
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	• <i>Informal review of course to determine specialisations in 2006 - 2007.</i>
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Student USEs responses.</i> • <i>Professional advisory group advice and responses to any proposed changes</i>

Recommendation 8 PHASE 2 – SECOND PROGRESS REPORT	The Review Team recommends that the Faculty investigate means of providing opportunities for BDesComp students to develop specialisations. (Section 8.1.4)
Action taken by the Faculty	<p>There are two paths to specialisation for BDesComp students.</p> <p>The first is a recommended set of electives provided to the students advising them of unit of study in the Faculty and in other faculties that the students should take in order to specialise in an area such as animation, computer games, or electronic arts. These electives also enable the students to complete their required electives for graduation.</p> <p>The second path is the postgraduate programs in Design Computing and Digital Media. Each of these postgraduate programs specialise in different areas, Design Computing in computational design and entertainment computing, and Digital Media in animation, modelling and video.</p>
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	The clustering of the Faculty with the School of IT in the Faculty of Engineering may provide other areas of specialisation in the future.
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	Students are well-advised of their unit of study selections to enable them to specialise in areas for which they would like to have a career. Faculty will monitor USEs, SCEQ and CEQ responses.
Recommendation 9 PHASE 2 – from FIRST PROGRESS REPORT	<i>The Review Team recommends that a means of building a scholarly and learning community be included in the structural review mooted by the Dean. It is also recommended that Senior Faculty Staff as well as Disciplinary Leaders be involved in this discussion. (Section 9.1.3)</i>
Action taken by the Faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No action taken. Awaiting new Deanship from January 2006.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new Dean, Professor Tom Kvan, will be taking up his position at the beginning of January 2006, and will be reviewing the structure and strategic directions of the faculty for the next five years. • There is a Faculty retreat planned for February 2006.
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and evaluate strategies for developing research and leaning community in faculty structure and strategic plan.
Recommendation 9 PHASE 2 – SECOND PROGRESS REPORT	The Review Team recommends that a means of building a scholarly and learning community be included in the structural review mooted by the Dean. It is also recommended that Senior Faculty Staff as well as Disciplinary Leaders be involved in this discussion. (Section 9.1.3)
Action taken by the Faculty	<p>Faculty retreat held for all staff, <i>Velocity</i> exhibition of graduate programs, research Carnivale.</p> <p>All staff are engaged in developing the Strategic Plan by an iterative process</p> <p>The School was dissolved into a unified Faculty.</p> <p>A remarkable cultural change has taken place, accepted throughout the Faculty – prioritising research, including in the teaching culture. There is a far greater level of collegiality involving diverse sectors of the Faculty.</p>
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	A reorganisation of the general staff is needed following the dissolution of the school (and a number of other factors, including job-sharing and improved career paths).
Faculty's evaluation	Too early for a formal evaluation of this.

of the success of action taken	New academic staff appointments in 2006 have often been cross-disciplinary.
Recommendation 10 PHASE 2 – from FIRST PROGRESS REPORT	<i>The Review Team recommends that the Faculty Strategic Plan be widely consulted across the Faculty and its stakeholder groups. (Section 9.3.2)</i>
Action taken by the Faculty	See above. No action taken in 2005 awaiting new Deanship.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a Faculty retreat for Academic and general staff planned for 21 and 22 February 2006 to start this process collaboratively.
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	See above, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and evaluate strategies for developing research and leaning community in faculty structure and strategic plan.
Recommendation 10 PHASE 2 – SECOND PROGRESS REPORT	<i>The Review Team recommends that the Faculty Strategic Plan be widely consulted across the Faculty and its stakeholder groups. (Section 9.3.2)</i>
Action taken by the Faculty	All staff, student representatives the RAI A and the alumni association (which has a major representation in professional architecture) have been consulted.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	To involve external stakeholder groups (other professions directly served, accreditation bodies and the wider professional and policy bodies).
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	<p>The Strategic Plan has received far more consultation than any previous plans, with positive feedback.</p> <p>It is expected that greater stakeholder support would be an indicator of relevance of the Plan.</p>

SYDNEY COLLEGE OF THE ARTS

PROGRESS REPORT NO. 2 ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PHASE TWO

Recommendation 1	The Review Team recommends that, given the University's acknowledgement of the equivalence of creative works with research in the criteria for Academic promotion, that the Faculty seek to lobby the College for an equivalent change in the budget formula. (Section 3.2.3)
Action taken by the Faculty	The recent review and subsequent restructure of the University funding model has necessitated a wait and see approach by the faculty in the understanding that previous lobbying had registered with SEG. The Dean is a member of the recently constituted Research Strategy Group, chaired by the DVC (Research). With the concept of shared services yet to be fully implemented it is still to be determined what the final financial impact on the Faculty will be.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	The process of RQF promises to bring success in this field with the firm establishment of the category for creative works.
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	As Above
Recommendation 2	The Review Team recommends that SCA liaise with the Koori Centre and other relevant indigenous bodies, to devise mechanisms to encourage the participation of indigenous Australian students. (Section 5.1.4)
Action taken by the Faculty	<p>Dr Danie Mellor and Ms Christina Davidson both SCA Lecturers have been involved in outreach programs with the Koori Centre over the course of 2006. The lecturers have also liaised with the MCA in their public programs aimed at indigenous youth.</p> <p>A group of Year 9 - 12 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander visual arts students visited SCA as part of the Djurali Youth Art Careers Workshop run by Keith Munro, Curator of Indigenous Art at the MCA. The three-day intensive careers workshop presents various aspects relating to the areas of visual arts, graphic design and museum careers. There is a tentative booking for repeat for this program at some point later in 2007.</p> <p>In addition there were notable presences and presentations at SCA last year by leading Indigenous professionals with national and international profiles of some merit, including Ms Fiona Foley (artist in residence in Sculpture), Research Professor Djon Mundine OAM (curator), Ms Terri Janke (lawyer, barrister and protocols and copyright specialist), Ms Tess Allas (curator), and Mr Mervyn Bishop (photographer and artist)...all in all an amazing contribution by these people.</p> <p>SCA has also been an active partner in the MCA's Bella Arts program, this program while not solely focussed on indigenous students does focus on groups of young people from rural communities aged 5-18 years old with specific needs or disadvantage. Student groups with physical, intellectual, behavioural, and sensory disabilities, or who have little or no access to museums due to financial or social disadvantage are involved in the workshops. One of the goals of the workshops is to show these groups of students that it is possible to consider tertiary study in the field of visual arts.</p>
Further action planned but not yet implemented	The faculty will continue to expand involvement with relevant bodies to develop mechanisms that encourage the participation of indigenous Australian students in visual art studies over the course of 2007.

(if appropriate)	
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	Increasing the number of indigenous enrolments requires a long term strategy. Although current enrolments from indigenous Australians remain low, SCA believes that the programs currently in place will be successful in creating opportunities for indigenous Australian students to participate in the field of visual arts over the longer term.
Recommendation 3	The Review Team recommends that SCA proceed with its planned evaluation of its flexible entry admissions process and that measures for equity categories be established and monitored. (Section 5.2.5)
Action taken by the Faculty	After evaluation of the admissions process, SCA has implemented some revisions to procedures. The use of an interview and portfolio score in conjunction with the UAI provides a flexible admissions program for entry into the BVA.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	SCA will monitor annual admissions and ensure equitable conditions for entry. No further revision of the admissions process is planned at this stage.
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	A brief statistical analysis of commencing students has shown very little correlation between UAI and first year results. SCA will continue to admit students on the basis of interview scores and assessment of portfolios to ensure equitable conditions for all applying students.
Recommendation 4	The Review Team recommends that SCA increase the number of places for SSP Leave as a means of increasing the research climate of the faculty. (Section 6.2.2)
Action taken by the Faculty	SCA was not in the financial position to increase the number of SSP places due to the considerable reduction in research funding the Faculty received. As a result of this unexpected University cut in research funding SSP places were decreased.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	Further action on this recommendation will be discussed at the SCA planning forum in February.
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	SSP places granted to-date have failed to make any impact on the level of research funding received by the Faculty and new, more appropriate research activities/strategies must be investigated.
Recommendation 5	The Review Team recommends that SCA provide a more systematic and equitable access to teaching for PhD students. (Section 6.5.2)
Action taken by the Faculty	SCA continues to prioritise providing casual teaching opportunities to research candidates and has been employing candidates on a regular basis. However, no additional action on this recommendation was taken by the faculty over the course of 2006 due to the change in management.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	Further action on this recommendation will be discussed at the SCA strategic planning forum in February.
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	In 2006, SCA employed 15 of it's 80 research candidates in casual positions throughout the Faculty. In addition, a further 8 casual roles were filled by recent PG graduate, resulting in 53% of our casual teaching places being filled by either recent graduates or current research candidates.
Recommendation 6	The Review Team recommends that SCA consider greater use of internships and opportunities for practical engagement for students with their industry and

	professions. (Section 8.2.3)
Action taken by the Faculty	Three of the eight SCA studios currently manage active internship programs to encourage students to engage with industry and the professions; Film and Digital Art, Glass and Photomedia. SCA Gallery and the Faculty Marketing and Communications Office provides internship opportunities for students studying in the Faculty of Arts' Museum Management and Curatorial Studies and Media and Communications programs. The Faculty Marketing and Communications Office has also devised and offered 'real life' projects to students currently enrolled in the MIT at the Faculties of Engineering, Architecture and IT in 2007.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	Further action on this recommendation, including the possibility of extending the programs to other studios, will be discussed at the SCA strategic planning forum in February.
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	The internship programs currently offered to Film and Digital Art, Glass and Photomedia students have proven popular with students and provided them with professional development experience that has enhanced their study and future prospects.
Recommendation 7	The Review Team recommends that the Dean provide a regular "state of the union" address to both staff and students to communicate his vision for SCA. (Section 9.1.3)
Action taken by the Faculty	There has been a change in deans and management structures at SCA. The introduction of a monthly all staff forum has provided the opportunity for the Dean to communicate his vision for SCA to all staff on an ongoing basis, and in a discursive environment.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	In 2007 two new student/staff committees will provide the opportunities for a broad cross-section of the student body to be better informed about, and contribute to, the Faculty vision.
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	The all staff forums have provided the opportunity for the Dean to inform staff of formed of changes taking place within the University as well as the Faculty and to respond to feedback from staff on a variety of issues.
Recommendation 8	The Review Team recommends that SCA continue to review its Workload Formula. The current average of eighteen teaching contact hours per FTE is high relative to the rest of the University. (Section 9.2.4)
Action taken by the Faculty	The workloads model has been completely revised by the incoming Dean and the average teaching contact hours has now been revised to approximately 14 contact hours per FTE.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	No further changes to the workloads model are planned at this time
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	Full implementation of the revised model takes place in 2007. Evaluation of the success of this reduction can only take place at the end of this year and will be measured in research outcomes.
Recommendation 9	The Review Team recommends that SCA monitor the effect of the new staff positions on service provision and culture in the admissions and enrolments processes. (Section 9.5.4)
Action taken by the Faculty	The addition of a new staff member to deal directly with phone and counter enquiries has improved the response time in student administration. The quality work from the UG and PG student advisors has also improved as they

	are able to focus on their portfolios rather than attending to more general issues.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	Review and modification of roles in Student Administration is ongoing and will be considered again 2007 in order to meet changing demands of the student body.
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	The planned local survey of students did not take place so it is difficult to evaluate although the SREQ results show an overall improvement in this area. In general, the service provision culture in the admissions and enrolments processes has improved.