

FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE

SECOND PROGRESS REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PHASE TWO

<p>Recommendation 1 PHASE 2 – from FIRST PROGRESS REPORT</p>	<p><i>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)</i></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 eg 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

FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE

SECOND PROGRESS REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PHASE TWO

	<i>without.</i>
--	-----------------

<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"> • <i>Strategic plan: development and process to achieve implementation thereof</i> Planning retreat for each year held in mid to late February annually. 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. • <i>Learning and Teaching</i> <i>Strategic Goal:</i> <i>To develop and articulate research-led teaching to engage students in knowledge discovery.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiated through Faculty Research-led Teaching and Scholarship of Teaching Grant Scheme (see below) To provide a flexible learning environment, including e-learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiated through Faculty Research-led Teaching and Scholarship of Teaching Grant Scheme To integrate culturally diverse approaches in research-led teaching <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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, eg, 'End of Year

FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE

SECOND PROGRESS REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PHASE TWO

	<p style="text-align: center;">Scholarship of Teaching Party and Awards' for articles reflecting on research-led teaching strategies or the understandings of scholarship of teaching.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and Innovation <p>Strategic Goal: To place research at the centre of our scholarly activities. To identify core areas of research excellence including a focus on the 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 eg 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) totaling 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, publicized 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– eg 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>

FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE

SECOND PROGRESS REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PHASE TWO

	<p>Develop and report their key graduate attributes to the secretary of the faculty Learning and Teaching Committee by 17 July 2007.</p> <p>1.through the Coursework Evaluation Plan and Unit of Study Evaluation Plan. Evaluate research-led teaching strategies in 2007 for 2006.</p> <p>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> <p>• Research and Innovation</p> <p>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 eg curriculum design of Master of Architecture
<p>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</p>	<p>• Learning and Teaching :</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 200/4/5 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 totaling 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.

FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE

SECOND PROGRESS REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PHASE TWO

Recommendation 2 PHASE 2 – from FIRST PROGRESS REPORT	<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>
Action taken by the Faculty	<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>
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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> • <i>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</i>
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	<p><i>Faculty evaluation following future planned action:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Review qualitative evaluations and decide on future use in studio units and degrees.</i> • <i>Review evaluation questions from suggested institutions and decide on action: to revise evaluations, use similar, or not to add.</i>

Recommendation 2 PHASE 2 – SECOND PROGRESS REPORT	<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>
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)	<i>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</i>

FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE

SECOND PROGRESS REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PHASE TWO

	proposes that this process be developed in 2007/2008.
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	<i>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)</i>
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 explicitly graduate attributes. <p><i>See below for further actions.</i></p>
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	<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
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	<p><i>Faculty evaluation following future planned action:</i></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.

Recommendation 3 PHASE 2 – SECOND 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	<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</p>

FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE

SECOND PROGRESS REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PHASE TWO

	to each program for implementation.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	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.
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	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.

Recommendation 4 PHASE 2 – from FIRST PROGRESS REPORT	<i>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)</i>
Action taken by the Faculty	<i>The Board of Graduate Studies has reviewed units currently on offer and revised offerings.</i> <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.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	<i>See above</i>
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student feedback on course content • Review of student numbers in units on offer in any one year

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	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.

FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE

SECOND PROGRESS REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PHASE TWO

	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.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	The remainder of the graduate programs will be progressively reviewed during 2007 and 2008: 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
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	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. 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.

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 Faculty	<p>Broader research performance data is being collected by the Faculty through its workload model.</p> <p>In some cases staff have had teaching relief to concentrate on research activity.</p>

FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE

SECOND PROGRESS REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PHASE TWO

	<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 (ie 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 (ie 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><i>Recommendation 6 PHASE 2 – from FIRST PROGRESS REPORT</i></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><i>Action taken by the Faculty</i></p>	<p><i>Each Discipline Group asked to arrange regular research seminars.</i></p>
<p><i>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</i></p>	<p><i>Further publicise these seminars.</i></p>
<p><i>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</i></p>	<p><i>Each Group now has weekly or fortnightly research seminars.</i></p>

FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE

SECOND PROGRESS REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PHASE TWO

Recommendation 6 PHASE 2 – SECOND PROGRESS REPORT	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)
Action taken by the Faculty	<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 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.</p>
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>
<i>Action taken by the Faculty</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Review criteria have been established. Reviews of each centre being arranged.</i>
<i>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Reviews to be carried out.</i>
<i>Faculty’s evaluation of the success of action taken</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Review reports followed by responses from Centre directors.</i>

FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE

SECOND PROGRESS REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PHASE TWO

Recommendation 7 PHASE 2 – SECOND PROGRESS REPORT	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)
Action taken by the Faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following reviews, the Research Centres are reporting to the Faculty through the Dean.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports from Centre directors and monitoring by finance officer and Associate Dean (Graduate Studies).

<i>Recommendation 8 PHASE 2 – from FIRST PROGRESS REPORT</i>	<i>The Review Team recommends that the Faculty investigate means of providing opportunities for BDesComp students to develop specialisations. (Section 8.1.4)</i>
<i>Action taken by the Faculty</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>
<i>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Informal review of course to determine specialisations in 2006 - 2007.</i>
<i>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</i>	<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>

FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE

SECOND PROGRESS REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PHASE TWO

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.

<i>Recommendation 9 PHASE 2 – from FIRST PROGRESS REPORT</i>	<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 (anmd a number of other factors, including job-sharing and improved career paths).
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	<p>Too early for a formal evaluation of this.</p> <p>New academic staff appointments in 2006 have often been cross-disciplinary.</p>

FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE

SECOND PROGRESS REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PHASE TWO

<i>Recommendation 10 PHASE 2 – from FIRST PROGRESS REPORT</i>	<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>
<i>Action taken by the Faculty</i>	<i>See above. No action taken in 2005 awaiting new Deanship.</i>
<i>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>There is a Faculty retreat for Academic and general staff planned for 21 and 22 February 2006 to start this process collaboratively.</i>
<i>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</i>	<p><i>See above,</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Identify and evaluate strategies for developing research and leaning community in faculty structure and strategic plan.</i>

Recommendation 10 PHASE 2 – SECOND PROGRESS REPORT	The Review Team recommends that the Faculty Strategic Plan be widely consulted across the Faculty and its stakeholder groups. (Section 9.3.2)
Action taken by the Faculty	All staff, student representatives the RAIA 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>