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Executive summary

The Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) has provided awards, grants and fellowships programs, the establishment and mobilisation of existing networks and communities and the provision of leadership and expertise to enhance and to advocate for learning and teaching in Australian universities since 2005. These have stimulated a noticeable engagement of academic staff in enhancing teaching and learning in higher education, from the local and institutional level to the discipline and national level.

Revitalising the academic workforce to enhance the teaching and learning in Australian universities will require more than this. The academic workforce in Australian universities faces the looming retirement of a significant number of experienced academics and leading teachers. The attrition rate for female academics in their late 20s and 30s rivals that of academics at retiring age (Vamvakinou, 2008). Australian universities now compete with Australian firms and Australian public sector research organisations to attract researchers from the workforce to their research programs. Although Australia was considered to have sufficient capacity to meet its anticipated research needs (Hugo & Morriss, 2010; Vamvakinou, 2008), there is now “evidence of emerging weakness in domestic supply channels” (Australian Government Department of Innovation Industry, Science and Research, 2011, p. xi). This will exacerbate the already insufficient capacity to meet anticipated teaching needs (Coates & Goedegebuure, 2010; Hugo & Morriss, 2010).

A ‘lost generation’ of potential leaders, particularly female leaders, is of particular concern given the higher proportion of females taking teaching-only academic positions. There is a challenge to engage a higher proportion of males in teaching-only roles and to increase the proportion of Indigenous males in both teaching-focused and teaching-and-research positions. Challenges exist in the status of teaching, perceptions of the academic profession, coping with the challenges of the probationary period and in supporting and encouraging minority groups in the academic workforce. Once recruited, new academics can suffer from the frenetic pace of academic life and the expectations associated with meeting probationary requirements. This appears to lead to choices to favour research over teaching, especially by male academics. Co-mentoring and coaching are helpful for new academics negotiating these pressures.

The challenge is to equip all academics, not just some, with teaching responsibilities for effective learning by their students in the 21st century. This requires rethinking how to raise the status of teaching in universities and how to enhance the pool of individuals from which academics with teaching responsibilities are drawn, their recruitment and initial preparation before they start, their induction into and monitoring of their teaching, their continuing education and professional development, how their compensation is structured and promotion supported, how the performance of struggling teachers is improved, how the best performing teachers are given opportunities to acquire more status and responsibility, and how all can be engaged in the educational reform needed to address the educational issues and matters emerging for higher education in the future.

This report has two parts:

- **Part 1** provides an overview of matters associated with the current and anticipated future academic workforce in Australian higher education. Information is drawn from a review of key national reports, government statistics and the literature, and an analysis of the projects in relation to five key topics is presented. Areas of strength and opportunities for new initiatives are identified.

- **Part 2** provides a summary of each of the 65 ALTC projects and fellowships grouped under the key topics:.
  - The academic workforce;
- Recruitment and induction of academics for teaching;
- High quality professional development for formal leaders;
- Academic teaching evaluation and recognition;
- Engaging academics in education reform.
List of recommendations

Recommendation 1
In the category of the academic workforce, future initiatives could consider:
• Building the status and attractiveness of teaching in higher education.
• New models for the academic workforce.
• Effectively harnessing the wisdom, knowledge, insights and experience of ageing academics who are able and willing to continue in the academic workforce.

Recommendation 2
In the category of recruitment and induction, future initiatives could consider:
• Engaging and training higher degree research students for teaching responsibilities in higher education.
• Engaging more males, particularly a higher proportion of Indigenous males, in teaching-focused academic positions.
• Retaining female academics in their late 20s and 30s in the academic workforce.
• Effectively harnessing the wisdom, knowledge, insights and experience of ageing academics who are able and willing to continue in the academic workforce.
• Providing attractive ‘sessional teaching’, ‘teaching-focused’ and ‘teaching and research’ careers that build the status of teaching in higher education.
• Coaching and mentoring models and practices for early career academics especially in the probationary period.

Recommendation 3
In the category of professional development, future initiatives could consider:
• Engaging senior levels of leadership in education reform, particularly the head of school level.
• Developing the leadership capacity of female academics, particularly those in their late 20s and 30s, but also those returning to the workforce post-family.
• Coaching and mentoring models and practices for different periods of the academic life cycle
  – Career choices for higher degree research students
  – Academics in the probationary period
  – Leadership
  – Co-mentoring.
• Learning and teaching centres: effective dialogue, consultation and engagement between key stakeholders.
Recommendation 4
In the category of academic teaching evaluation and recognition, future initiatives could consider:

- Effective management of academic performance and engagement in teaching, particularly targeting capacity building in this area at the head of school level.
- Capability development of probation and promotions committee members in evaluating teaching portfolios and/or the teaching component of a probation/promotions application.
- Capacity building for, and dissemination and uptake of, peer feedback and peer/expert review as practices to support enhanced teaching and learning and academic promotion.
- Career incentives and recognition for teaching in higher education.

* * *

Recommendation 5
This area is one of the strengths in the ALTC projects to date. In the category of engaging academics in education reform, future initiatives could consider:

- Leadership development—from consulting to involving academics in education reform.
- Facilitating dialogue, collaboration and consensus about education reform.

* * *
Part 1: Overview

This section presents an overview of the literature and significant reports related to revitalising the academic workforce under five topic categories:

1. The academic workforce
2. Recruitment and induction
3. Ensuring high-quality professional development
4. Academic teaching evaluation and recognition
5. Engaging academics in education reform.

Findings from the analysis and summary of projects are presented. Areas of strength and opportunities for new initiatives are identified.

All academics with teaching responsibilities in Australian higher education are facing a number of significant issues over the next 10–15 years, including matters related to changing legislation as well as those consequent upon the 2008–2009 financial crisis. Historically, working in the Australian higher education sector has required an academic to be a dual professional—a researcher in their discipline as well as a teacher of university students who wish to achieve a qualification in the discipline, with the purpose of entering a profession, or maintaining their currency, as a practitioner, or of progressing into research or academia themselves. In recent years, however, some universities have begun ‘unbundling’ academic work by introducing ‘teaching-focused’ positions for those staff who wish to choose an academic career with a strong focus on the teaching and the scholarship of teaching of their discipline. Industry or real-world perspectives continue to be introduced into the formal learning environment through the use of industry professionals providing guest lectures or taking roles as sessional staff and tutors. Estimates suggest that sessional teachers are responsible for as much as half the teaching load, performing a range of duties from casual marker to subject coordinator (Percy et al., 2006).

Following the Review of Australian higher education (Bradley, Noonan, Nugent, & Scales, 2008), there are a number of changes impacting on teaching in higher education, including goals that low socioeconomic status (SES) students will comprise 20 per cent of tertiary students by 2020, that 40 per cent of 25–34 year olds will have a bachelor degree or higher by 2025 and an increase in international student numbers. Teaching in higher education will be further affected by the new national teaching and learning indicators to be assessed by the recently established Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA), the setting of academic standards and the implementation of the revised Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF).

The challenge is to equip all academics, not just some, with teaching responsibilities for effective learning by their students in the 21st century. This requires rethinking how to enhance the pool of individuals from which academics with teaching responsibilities are drawn, their recruitment and initial preparation before they start, their induction into and monitoring of their teaching, their continuing education and professional development, how their compensation is structured and promotion supported, how the performance of struggling teachers is improved, how the best performing teachers are given opportunities to acquire more status and responsibility, and how all can be engaged in the educational reform needed to address the educational issues and matters emerging for higher education in the future.
1.1 Today’s academic workforce

The academic workforce in Australian universities faces the looming retirement of a significant number of experienced academics and leading teachers. Australian universities now compete with Australian firms and Australian public sector research organisations to attract researchers from the workforce to their research programs. Although Australia was considered to have sufficient capacity to meet its anticipated research needs (Hugo & Morriss, 2010; Vamvakinou, 2008), there is now “evidence of emerging weakness in domestic supply channels” (Australian Government Department of Innovation Industry, Science and Research, 2011, p. xi). This will exacerbate the already insufficient capacity to meet anticipated teaching needs (Coates & Goedegebuure, 2010; Hugo & Morriss, 2010).

1.1.1 An ageing workforce

Hugo and Morriss (2010) were commissioned by Universities Australia to conduct a study to determine whether existing research addressed the issue of whether there will be sufficient suitably qualified academic staff to teach university courses to prepare future professionals, and to meet universities’ future educational and research needs. Hugo and Morriss noted that, with 56 per cent of its staff in the baby boomer age group, the academic workforce is considerably older than the total Australian workforce, which has 42 per cent in the baby boomer category (see Figure 1).

The higher education sector faces a substantial replacement task of over half of its workforce at the same time as an expected net growth in demand as professions seek to replace their workforce and as government expects the proportion of 25–34 year olds gaining tertiary qualifications to increase from 30 to 40 per cent. While Skills Australia (Access Economics, 2009) anticipates that between 83,603 and 106,396 university and vocational teachers will be needed by 2025 to meet the anticipated net growth in demand, Hugo and Morriss (2010) note these figures do not take into account the number needed to replace the retiring workforce. All academic areas that support professional training, for example, appear to be impacted by an ageing workforce, with nursing and education having the highest proportions of their academic staff in the older age groups. A number of discipline-based workforce planning studies are currently underway to determine whether there will be sufficient academics to train the next generation to enter the professions, including for the health sector, nursing, engineering, education and accounting. See, for example, Australian Council of Deans of Education, 2009; Birrell and Rapson, 2005; Chen, 2008; Engineers Australia, 2008; KPMG, 2009; Ridout, 2008. There is widespread concern in Australian universities about their ageing workforce and what strategies to deploy to define the issue and to deal with it.

Similarly, Coates and Goedegebuure (2010) observe, “The growing significance of the academic profession is juxtaposed, almost in perfect counterpoint, by its shrinking capacity. In Australia today, fewer academic staff are available to do a growing amount of work” (pp. 1–2). The briefings of both Hugo and Morriss (2010) and Coates and Goedegebuure (2010) provide useful summaries of the demographic data relevant to the Australian academic workforce.
1.1.2 A gendered workforce

Higher education statistics drawn from the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (2009, 2010a, 2010b) indicate that, for the whole academic workforce, a higher proportion of females are in teaching-only positions and a higher proportion of males are in research-only or teaching-and-research positions (see Figure 2). The attrition rate for female academics in their late 20s and 30s rivals that of academics at retiring age (Vamvakinou, 2008). While the Australian Academy of Science (Vamvakinou, 2008) attributes this trend to women’s additional family responsibilities, Moss and Daunton (2006) note that the slowdown in women’s careers, relative to that of men, starts before the arrival of children and that men are fast tracked through the higher education system.

In the Indigenous academic staff workforce, a higher proportion of Indigenous females is in each category (see Figure 3). More male academics than female academics have a doctorate by research degree as their highest qualification, with the proportion of females higher than males for holding all other categories of qualifications (see Figure 4).

A review of the Universities Australia (2011) database indicates the proportion of males is higher than females in senior management positions of deputy/pro vice-chancellor (teaching and learning), deputy/pro vice-chancellor (research) and vice-chancellor, current at May 2011 (see Figure 5). Hare (2010) reports that a presentation of key data to Universities Australia (UA) revealed that “most categories of senior women [in universities] would fall well short of the 2006–2010 UA Action Plan for Women” (p. 8). Hacket states that “the momentum for women in senior positions in higher education has dropped away” (Hare, 2010, p. 19).
Figure 2: Proportion of doctoral completion students (2009) and FTE academic staff by function and gender (2010), Australia

Figure 3: Proportion of doctoral completion Indigenous students (2009) and FTE Indigenous academic staff by function and gender (2010), Australia
Figure 4: Proportion of academic staff by highest qualification and gender (2010), Australia

Figure 5: Proportion of deputy/pro vice-chancellor (teaching and learning), deputy/pro vice-chancellor (research) and vice-chancellor by gender (2010), Australia
While more males are employed in academic positions than females, Richardson (2009) observes that the Australian academic workforce is feminising. Figures 6 and 7 illustrate the proportion of men and women in a typical academic career in Australian universities in 2000 and 2010. Older retiring academics are mainly male. New young academics are mainly female. She predicts that this will lead to a declining status of the profession. The academic feminisation process in Australia follows a ‘scissor curve’ pattern familiar to that in European universities (see, for example, Le Feuvre, 2009). Strachan, Whitehouse, Peetz, Bailey and Broadbent (2010) are currently undertaking an Australian Research Council Linkage Grant to investigate the ongoing impediments to gender equity in employment in the university sector. The career life cycle of women in senior academic, professional and management positions in universities is of particular interest in the investigation, which is expected to be completed in 2013 (Strachan, Broadbent, Whitehouse, Peetz, & Bailey, 2011).

There appears to be little research or consideration of how the wisdom, knowledge, insights and experience of ageing academics who are able and willing to continue in the academic workforce may best be utilised and human resources practices adapted to their particular needs.

Figure 6: Proportion of men and women in a typical academic career (2000), Australia
1.2 Recruitment and induction of academics for teaching

As noted by Schleicher (2011), “Teaching quality is strongly affected by the pool of talent from which teachers are recruited” (p. 8). In the face of these widespread anticipated shortages, intelligent and effective recruitment and incentive structures are needed to attract the best candidates into teaching in higher education. These include raising the status of teaching in higher education, competitive compensation through pay levels and incentives, offering real career prospects to those choosing teaching-focused roles, and giving academics responsibility as professionals and leaders of reform.

1.2.1 The status of teaching and attractiveness of working in Australian universities

New academics are recruited from a number of channels including undergraduates, postgraduates, mid-career professionals, returning expatriates and overseas migration. Australian universities rely heavily on international migration with 40.5 per cent of academic staff being born overseas compared to 25.7 per cent of the total workforce and 23.9 per cent of the total population being born overseas (Hugo and Morriss, 2010, p. 10).

Hugo and Morriss (2010) note “There would appear to be some real issues relating to the attractiveness of the academic profession in Australia which are impinging on recruitment and retention of academics” (p. 14). Coates, Dobson, Friedman, Goedegebuure and Meek (2009) in their review of national statistics collections and a number of recent studies consider that “the settings are not right for engaging and replenishing Australia’s academic workforce” (p. 2). Their analysis shows that Australian academics, when compared with their overseas peers and professionals in other fields, are less satisfied with their work than overseas colleagues, work among the longest hours per week—particularly those in senior ranks—and report one of the highest propensities for job change, either out of the profession or the country.
Universities have traditionally conferred more status and reward on research achievements, and teaching in universities is acknowledged to have a lower status and therefore less access to rewards and recognition in comparison (Chalmers, 2011, p. 34). The status of teaching in higher education is not a static attribute of culture. Vigorous and targeted intervention can make a big difference. Finland, for example, raised the social status of teaching to a level where “university professors are the most highly regarded of all professions and even the word teacher is the same for school teachers as for university professors … teaching [is] one of the most sought after professions” (Schleicher, 2011, p. 11).

1.2.2 The probation (tenure) period

Referring to the K–12 sector in Singapore, teaching talent is identified and nurtured, not left to chance. During their first three years of teaching, novice teachers are assessed annually to determine which career path would suit them—master teacher, specialist in curriculum or research, or school leader. Potential school leaders, for example, are moved to management teams, receive management training, have opportunities provided to demonstrate their capability, such as sitting on committees, and are fast-tracked into head of department positions at an early stage of their career (Schleicher, 2011, p. 9).

The probation or tenure period for academics does not appear as nurturing. Hirschkorn (2010) observes that “attaining tenure is a significant stress and source of motivation for new faculty … the process varies with each institution, candidate and year”, and writes of the insidious pressure on tenure track academics “feeling the need to do anything and accept everything so as to minimise the chances that they may irritate the wrong people or be perceived as not doing enough” (p. 41). He observed smart people made choices about the way they used their time, choosing, for example, to do a journal article or grant application rather than becoming involved in an innovative curriculum development project in their discipline. They were guided by the question of ‘What will look good on my tenure application whatever the institutional rhetoric about teaching and learning?’ How the accomplishments of different academics were announced also gave an indication of where to put one’s effort. Does winning a teaching grant get the same accolades as winning a research grant?

Pente and Adams (2010) ask “can we really afford the feverish pace the university seems to demand of us as pre-tenured faculty? Who or what does frenetic activity ultimately serve?” and notes that:

> Within the milieu of academia, the pressure to perform with regard to publishing, student evaluation scores, awards, services and grants can result in stressful work conditions and unhealthy pressure on new faculty … a high pressure standard of scholarship is desirable in our work, but the amount of work that is expected continuously increases … (p. 117)

Deans employ tenure coaching—when to apply, what to do to align applications with institutional plans—while they recognise the criteria for judging the quality of the tenure applications are not static nor are they self-evident, leading to applicants being suspicious of the process (Hirschkorn, 2010). Hirschkorn notes the frustration caused by the bias towards research that most universities perpetuate through the tenure process, thus raising the unspoken question: What sort of tenure coaching regarding teaching do these academics receive?
Marshall and Rothgeb (2011) note there have been few systematic investigations of issues related to tenure. In their study of factors that contribute to the denial of tenure in political science departments in the United States, they examined the effects of five variables: teaching; research and publication; service; the tenure review procedures; and the characteristics of both the department and the college/university. They found that, in departments where the chair says that teaching and substantive publications are not equal factors in the tenure decision, they are more likely to deny tenure than are other departments. Apart from that factor, candidates enhanced their chances of being awarded tenure by focusing on activities such as publishing numerous articles, demonstrating an interest in student advising, creating new courses, and teaching required classes. Knight and Trowler (2000) also found departmental leadership to be the key to improving approaches to teaching and student learning in higher education.

1.2.3 Supporting diversity

In the ten years following the implementation of an academic development program for unrepresented minority staff in 1998, Wingard, Reznik and Daley (2008) found recruitment and retention of unrepresented minority staff had increased. Unrepresented minority staff are more likely to mention a role model in choosing their career path, and choose to participate in professional development more often, usually through personal contacts and invitations to participate. Mentoring engenders a strong sense of collegiality and ownership among the discipline-based professional communities involved in the process of initial teacher development (Mathias, 2005).

In a comprehensive literature review, Diggs, Garrison-Wade, Estrada and Galindo (2009) found that marginalisation, racism and sexism emerged as unintended barriers to the successful negotiation of tenure by academics of colour. Mentoring was of particular importance, and the lack of racial, gendered or cultural matches was not a challenge for academics of colour to working on professional relationships in their institutions. Formal mentoring programs for women are also a popular strategy to combat some of the difficulties women face in a male-dominated environment. de Vries, Webb and Eveline (2006) found that men involved as mentors in the Leadership Development for Women program at The University of Western Australia (UWA) increased their understanding and sensitivity regarding gendered processes in the workplace and this led to their active engagement in culture change strategies.

1.3 Ensuring high-quality professional development for academics with teaching responsibilities

The essence of professional work is that a professional has the knowledge needed to make the important decisions about what services are required and how those services are to be provided. A professional has considerable discretion to diagnose what a client needs and how those needs are to be addressed. While academics enter their roles with high levels of expertise within their discipline areas, not all have similar levels of knowledge and expertise in ensuring the learning of their students. McLean, Cilliers and Van Wyk (2008) focused specifically on professional development of academic staff in medical faculties within universities. They view professional development as a means of professionalising teaching in universities by enhancing and extending the educational practices of academics in different disciplines, developing educational scholarship and educational leadership.
1.3.1 Maximising the impact of professional development

A range of forms of academic development programs are reported in the research literature. Following on from the work of Prebble et al. (2004), Southwell and Morgan (2009) grouped these into two broad sections: group-based academic staff development programs and individual-based academic staff development programs. The quality and nature of professional development activity is critical with the most effective forms being longer programs that lead to qualifications, involve collaborative research into improving teacher effectiveness, involve collaboration with others to improve practice, and where teachers contribute personally to the costs of professional development (Schleicher, 2011).

In their review of the literature, Southwell and Morgan (2009) reported that new academics who received training show a range of positive changes in themselves and in their students, in contrast to a lack of change, or negative changes, in untrained teachers from the control group; that centrally developed academic development programs can ‘challenge the taken-for-grantedness of local ways of operating’; that mid-career lecturers have rather different developmental needs the novices who are often the targets of academic development programs, and that any lasting learning from academic development programs requires participation in well-developed professional communities of practice through mentoring, reflective practice and action learning.

Despite many articles focused on mentoring, few models of mentorship exist, or how to build the capability of mentors (Hellsten, Prytula, Ebanks, & Lai, 2009). Hellsten, Prytula, Ebanks and Lai (2009) observe that induction programs, including mentorship, serve to bridge the transition from pre-service to in-service teaching, yet there is a lack of research focused on the design and process of induction and enculturation of new staff or on mentoring and relationship-building with another person. Co-mentoring and a deliberate decision to cultivate and sustain time with at least one other colleague who was also walking the same journey were considered pivotal in negotiating the pre-tenure period (Hellsten, Martin, & McIntyre, 2010; Hibbert et al., 2010; Kawaiilak & Groen, 2010).

1.3.2 Academic development units

Lueddeke (1997) observes that “change is fundamentally about people and, while national committees decide the fate of higher education”, it is the academic developer who must deal with “the decision makers and academics ‘on the frontline’ for whom much of what is happening appears unsettling” (p. 13). Academic development has generally been defined as the systemic support of the improvement of the quality of teaching in higher education (Knight & Wilcox, 1998). Different countries use different terminology: ‘staff development’ and ‘educational development’ (Britain, Australasia, Hong Kong), ‘instructional development’ (Canada) and ‘faculty development’ (USA) being some of the most common.

First established in the early 1970s, academic development units (ADUs) originally drew developers from the psychology and education disciplines and were primarily concerned with developing academic staff in the area of teaching and learning and in leadership and administration. The main means of development were, and continue to be, workshops, short courses or programs, individual and departmental consultancies, developing print and media resources, trialling and monitoring educational innovations, and evaluating teaching and program outcomes (Knapper, 1997). Central units are increasingly expected to monitor and audit strategies in order to account for the use of funds to senior management (Ingram & Gilding, 2002).
ADUs serve a number of masters: the government, the university management, the academic staff, students, parents, employers and members of the community (Isaacs, 1997; Hicks, 1998). Academic development programs must also attend to the interests and needs of the faculties and departments. Universities use academic development as a way of achieving strategic goals. Equally, any academic development activity needs to be conducted in the context of supportive organisational change and development strategies (Cannon & Hore, 1997). The need to support long-term structure and process change within universities means ADUs must seek models that support long-term change in a climate where increasingly faculties and departments are reluctant to support centrally-based services.

Fullan (1991, cited in Asmar, 2002) is “critical of professional development activities, seeing attendance at workshops and conferences as largely a waste of time, with few ongoing benefits either to the individual or to the institution” (p. 19). Knapper (1997) raises as a fundamental issue the question of “whether academic development is best offered through a central university-wide program or should be a decentralized activity” (p. 6). Academic development programs must meet the needs of academics. Programs that situate the academic development activities within the academics’ teaching are seen as more effective in the long term in transforming teaching within a university (Hart, 1997). In a review of the literature, Ryan, Hannahan and Duncan (2000) found that “professional development that is supported at the local level by staff with the appropriate background in terms of discipline knowledge is likely to be more relevant and productive than a centralised, decontextualised approach” (p. 2).

Mintz (1997) and Fraser (1998) raise the issue of the accreditation of academic developers themselves. Interestingly, while academic developers are often at the forefront of calls for academic staff to be accredited, Mintz (1997) states the subcommittee of the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD) “did not see that the lack of unified standards or guidelines for academic developers constitutes a problem” and felt no need for accreditation themselves (p. 22). There is still no formal requirement of qualification for academic/educational developers.

### 1.4 Academic teaching evaluation and recognition

Pente and Adams (2010) suggest:

> In today’s market driven, ranking-obsessed corporate universities of excellence, the possibility of dysfunctional patterns taking root in … academics’ performances increases dramatically. Given the pervasive attitudes toward performance in the field — that scholars never have enough publications, grants, and awards … it is the spirit of scholarship and teaching that may quietly suffer. (p. 118)

#### 1.4.1 Maximising academic performance management

Because academic promotion and tenure are intertwined with academic performance reviews, the review process needs to be reliable, valid, useful and relevant to academics. At its best, performance management of teaching that is supportive and leads to academics self-improvement and involvement in enhancing their teaching practice is welcomed by teachers (Schleicher, 2011).

Any effective motivating performance review must be conducted in a positive work environment marked by the application of best practice. Filetti (2009) observes “much of the important work of a department chair is comprised of supporting and guiding, offering helpful supervision and timely feedback” (p. 343). Appropriate training to conduct effective performance management is needed, but ultimately the strength of the academic–head of school relationship is far more important than the correct performance review method (Mathison and Vinya, 2010).
Academic performance and engagement in teaching is critical to student success “particularly in the online environment where students need ongoing support and targeted educational guidance” (Dana, Havens, Hochanadel, & Phillips, 2010, p. 33). Dana et al state “it is imperative that academic department chairs and administrators find a way to effectively and efficiently review, remediate, coach and commend faculty for their performance in the online classroom” (p. 29) and call for “a study of the relationship between the use of technology-enabled coaching and faculty performance/faculty satisfaction as well as the use of technology-enabled coaching and teaching measures” (p. 33).

In the last 70 years, extensive research has been conducted into student evaluations of teaching and their validity, and results consistently show that “with careful attention to measurement and theoretical issues, [student evaluations of teaching] are: multidimensional; reliable and stable; primarily a function of the instructor who teaches a class rather than the class that is taught; relatively valid against a variety of indicators of effective teaching; relatively unaffected by a variety of variables hypothesised as potential biases, such as expected class grades, class size, workload and prior subject interest; and demonstrably useful in improving teaching effectiveness when coupled with concrete enhancement strategies in specific areas that teachers target for improvement” (Cheng and Marsh, 2010, pp. 694–695). Students take course evaluations seriously and think that academics use course evaluations to improve courses. Academics use data for personal and professional development and for promotion and advancement (Haan, Britt, McClellan, & Parks, 2010).

Multiple measures, however, need to be used. Peer feedback and review of teaching is encouraged by academic development units but still does not have the level of acceptance and traction as student evaluations of teaching. In 2006, to address the need for an agreed approach to recognising and rewarding quality teaching in higher education, the ALTC embarked on the Teaching Quality Indicators project to develop and implement a framework, identifying indicators and outcomes of teaching quality at the international, national and individual levels. Much discussion and work continues in this area.

The criteria used in performance review need to be linked to rewards, fair and applied in ways that involve the academic teaching profession. We now turn to consider a particular form of reward and recognition: awards, grants and fellowships.

1.4.2 Reward and recognition

Teaching awards, grants and fellowships are used to recognise outstanding contributions to learning and teaching, encourage innovation, and raise the status of teaching and learning in universities. Schemes range from school, faculty and institutional levels to national schemes such as those offered by the ALTC, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in the United States, and the Fund for the Development of Teaching and Learning in higher education in the United Kingdom. (Smeal, Southwell, & Locke, 2011). Australia has a chequered history of national initiatives to reward, recognise and foster quality teaching, including the National Priority Reserve Fund (1990); the Commonwealth Staff Development Fund (CSDF) (1990); the Committee for the Advancement of University Teaching (CAUT) (1992); Committee for University Teaching and Staff Development (CUTSD) (1997); and the Australian Universities Teaching Committee (AUTC) (2000).
The Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education was established in 2004, and renamed the Australian Learning and Teaching Council in 2008. The creation of the ALTC was a watershed in the history of Australian higher education with an investment of approximately $27 million annually to advance, in a systemic and systematic way, learning and teaching in Australian universities. The budget of the predecessor body, the Australian Universities Teaching Committee, was approximately $1 million. However, in January 2011, the Australian Prime Minister Julia Gillard announced that the ALTC is to be abolished in December 2011 as part of the funding cutbacks to support the 2011 Queensland flood relief (Gillard, 2011). Smeal, Southwell and Locke (2011) observe:

The announcement sends a clear message to universities that national learning and teaching award and grant funding opportunities are both volatile and vulnerable. … In this current context and given Australia’s variable history of national funding to foster quality learning and teaching, the importance of resilient institutional systems, practices and governance that enable timely and systematic engagement with the programs afforded through bodies like the ALTC takes on vital significance. (pp. 2–3)

A review into support for Australian higher education learning and teaching recognised the significant contribution of the ALTC grants and awards programs in improving quality in learning and teaching (Johns, 2011). All of the review’s seventeen recommendations were accepted by the Minister for Tertiary Education, Senator Chris Evans. The Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) will administer funding for the grants and awards programs from 1 January 2012. In November, 2011, the Office for Learning and Teaching was established within the Higher Education Group in the Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (Evans, 2011). With funding of $50 million over four years, the role of the office is to promote excellence in learning and teaching in Australian universities.

1.5 Engaging academics in education reform

Changes to the status quo can trigger resistance from stakeholders. Because their professional identity is so tied to their discipline, academics may fail to notice impending changes that affect the academic community as a whole (Becher, 1989) but it is the “things that people hold dear: daily habits, loyalties, ways of thinking” that need to be given up if organisations are to be transformed (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002). Change can lead to a crisis of identity at both individual and group level, conflict between sub-groups, insecurity of reputation and competence, miscommunication, conflict, disorientation, self-doubt, anxiety and frustration, and a drop in the effectiveness of personnel (Bridges, 1995; Sullivan, 2000). Eccles and Nohria (1992) state, “the primary motivation of each person is to discover and to establish one’s own unique identity in the world” yet change creates situations in which identities are questioned (Sullivan, 2000). Henkel (2000) assumes that identity is central to individual academics and the working of academic systems. He argues that the reforms and change in higher education have led to a more structured environment and encouraged a new ‘professional’ academic identity.

1.5.1 Managing educational change

Academics are not exceptional in trying to protect the system they know in the face of uncertainty and the changing waves of attempts to bring about educational change. Without the active and willing engagement of academics, most education reforms will fail. The chances of successful reform can be improved by consultation with and engagement of academics in the planning and implementation of reform. Katajavuori et al. (2009), for example, report on a curriculum reform process in pharmaceutical education in Finland in
which the successful active engagement by teachers, students and stakeholders “formed an excellent basis for further development” (p. 6). Schleicher (2011) notes that “consultative policy processes are no guarantee against conflict when sensitive reforms are under consideration, but over time, such an approach seems to pay dividends” (p. 53).

1.5.2 Social dialogue about teaching and learning

Identity is fundamentally social (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998; Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002). We define who we are by negotiating the local ways that we belong to broader styles and discourses (Wenger, 1998). Communities of practice are social groups “who share their expertise and passion about a topic and interact on an ongoing basis to further their learning in this domain” (Wenger & Snyder, 2000, p. 3). Faculties, schools and academic departments are communities of practice that have had a dominating influence on academic identity formation and development (Henkel, 2000).

The Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel (2003) stated that “social dialogue is the glue for successful educational reform. Without full involvement of teachers … educational systems cannot hope to achieve quality education for all”. Schleicher (2011) observes that education systems that transform themselves “tend to provide effective systems of social dialogue” (p. 8).

1.6 Analysis of projects and recommendations

Sixty-three projects and two fellowships were allocated into one of the five topic categories discussed above:

1. The academic workforce
2. Recruitment and induction
3. Ensuring high-quality professional development
4. Academic teaching evaluation and recognition
5. Engaging academics in education reform.

Where appropriate, they were further allocated to sub-categories. See Table 1 for an overview of the categories and the number of completed and in progress projects associated with each topic category or sub-category.

Figure 8 provides a snapshot of the spread of the projects in relation to the topic categories. Most projects are in the topic categories of ‘professional development’ and ‘engaging academics in education reform’.

Figure 9 provides a snapshot of the spread of the projects in relation to formal leadership roles in the topic category ‘professional development’. Most ‘in progress’ projects are in the formal leadership roles of the course/program coordinator and the unit/subject coordinator, with considerable work done in the professional development of clinical educators.

Figure 10 shows a snapshot of the spread of the projects in relation to subject matter in the topic category ‘engaging academics’.

Following are matters for further consideration in future initiatives.
### Table 1: Number of ‘completed’ and ‘in progress’ projects and fellowships by topic category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic category</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>In progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic workforce</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession planning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness raising—discipline level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruitment and induction</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate deans (T&amp;L)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/program coordinators</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit/subject coordinators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical educators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, reflection and scholarship</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning and teaching centres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic evaluation and recognition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance review</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward and recognition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engaging academics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and assessment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities of practice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 8**: A snapshot of the spread of the projects in relation to the five topic categories
**Figure 9:** A snapshot of the spread of the projects in relation to the formal leadership roles in the topic category 'professional development'.

**Figure 10:** A snapshot of the spread of the projects in relation to the subject matter in the topic category 'engaging academics'.
Recommendation 1

In the category of the academic workforce, future initiatives could consider:

- Building the status and attractiveness of teaching in higher education.
- New models for the academic workforce.
- Effectively harnessing the wisdom, knowledge, insights and experience of ageing academics who are able and willing to continue in the academic workforce.

Recommendation 2

In the category of recruitment and induction, future initiatives could consider:

- Engaging and training higher degree research students for teaching responsibilities in higher education.
- Engaging more males, particularly a higher proportion of Indigenous males, in teaching-focused academic positions.
- Retaining female academics in their late 20s and 30s in the academic workforce.
- Effectively harnessing the wisdom, knowledge, insights and experience of ageing academics who are able and willing to continue in the academic workforce.
- Providing attractive 'sessional teaching', 'teaching focus' and 'teaching and research' careers that build the status of teaching in higher education.
- Coaching and mentoring models and practices for early career academics in the probationary period.

Recommendation 3

In the category of professional development, future initiatives could consider:

- Engaging senior levels of leadership in educational reform, particularly the head of school level.
- Developing the leadership capacity of female academics, particularly those in their late 20s and 30s, but also those returning to the workforce post-family.
- Coaching and mentoring models and practices for different periods of the academic life cycle
  - Career choices for higher degree research students
  - Academics in the probationary period
  - Leadership
  - Co-mentoring.
- Learning and teaching centres: effective dialogue, consultation and engagement between key stakeholders.
**Recommendation 4**

In the category of academic teaching evaluation and recognition, future initiatives could consider:

- Effective management of academic performance and engagement in teaching, particularly targeting capacity building in this area at the head of school level.
- Capability development of probation and promotions committee members in evaluating teaching portfolios and/or the teaching component of a probation/promotions application.
- Capacity building for, and dissemination and uptake of, peer feedback and peer/expert review as practices to support enhanced teaching and learning and academic promotion.
- Career incentives and recognition for teaching in higher education.

**Recommendation 5**

This area is one of the strengths in the ALTC projects to date. In the category of engaging academics in education reform, future initiatives could consider:

- Leadership development—from consulting to involving academics in education reform.
- Facilitating dialogue, collaboration and consensus about education reform.
Part 2: Overview of the ALTC projects and fellowships

This section presents an overview of the projects from the perspective of the topic of revitalising the academic workforce. Projects and fellowships have been allocated to similar topic headings to those used in Part 1 to allow the reader to peruse those projects of interest within each topic. The categorisation is indicative only—some projects and fellowships could fit into more than one category.
2.1 The academic workforce

The trends identified in the discussion above are the ageing workforce and the gendered workforce. Embedded in these are the changing nature of academic work, the need for succession planning and raising awareness of the importance of teaching. The projects in this section focus on aspects of ‘succession planning’ and ‘awareness and capacity building for teaching at the discipline level’.

2.1.1 Succession planning

2.1.1.1 Academic leadership capabilities for Australian higher education (LE6-1)

**Academic workforce category:** University leaders

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the selection and development of university leaders

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

University leaders need to be skilled at identifying and implementing the programs, initiatives, developments and changes required to underpin institutional engagement with their mission in relation to learning, teaching and research. This project identified the capabilities that characterise effective academic leaders in a range of roles and produced resources to develop and monitor these leadership capabilities. The core focus for leadership identified was effective change management and implementation.

Key outputs included:

- A validated capability framework for effective leadership in higher education that included an empirically and statistically determined set of higher education leadership capability domains and subscales
- A functional prototype of an online tool to enable future leaders in each role to complete the same survey as the 513 participants in the project study, and compare their responses—this was further developed in the ALTC project production of a prototype leadership learning tool and system for Australia’s universities (LE8-811)
- A set of role-specific case studies and proven methods for handling the key challenges identified for each role
- A mechanism to revise not only leadership selection but also its development in universities
- A set of quality checkpoints for ensuring academic leadership learning programs are productive and engaging.

**Resources**

The key resource emanating from this project is the final report *Academic leadership capacities for Australian higher education*.

Related information can be found in the following project resource:

- *Production of a prototype online leadership learning tool and system for Australia’s universities* (LE8-811).
2.1.1.2 Production of a prototype online leadership learning tool and system for Australia’s universities (LE8-811)

Academic workforce category: University leaders

Target reader: University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the selection and development of university leaders

Level: Higher education—sector wide

Summary

Actioning the outcomes and key recommendations from the earlier ALTC project ‘Academic leadership capabilities for Australian higher education’ (LE6-1), this project involved more than 600 experienced leaders in higher education, both within Australia and internationally, and produced a comprehensive Online Leadership Learning System (OLLS) for universities.

OLLS provides practical strategies for ensuring that the identification, selection, promotion and development of prospective leaders from within a university are focused, relevant, feasible and productive. It shows how the active, situated, experiential, ‘just-in-time’ and ‘just-for-me’ approaches to learning, development and support known to optimise university student engagement and retention can be applied to the selection and support of its leaders. In this way, the system enables our learning leaders to learn through first-hand experience what needs to be done with their students.

Resources

The two key resources emanating from this project are:

1. The final report *Production of a prototype online leadership learning tool and system for Australia’s universities*


Related information can be found in the following project resource:

- *Academic leadership capabilities for Australian higher education* (LE6-1).
2.1.1.3 Distributive leadership for learning and teaching: developing the faculty scholar model (LE6-9)

**Academic workforce category:** Aspiring leaders of university teaching

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the selection and development of university leaders

**Level:** Institution

**Summary**

This project developed and assessed the relevance and validity of the Leadership Capacity Development Framework (LCDF) in developing leadership capacity. The LCDF was underpinned by a distributive leadership perspective that promoted leadership as *the distribution of power through a collegial sharing of knowledge, of practice, and reflection within the socio-cultural context of the university*.

The LCDF was trialled in two universities that are similar in size, regional positioning, and current mission of developing a teaching and learning intensive culture within a research-intensive culture and then refined on the basis of these initial trials. The LCDF was subsequently trialled again in two additional universities using a cascade approach, whereby the facilitators and participants from the first-stage universities mentored and supported the second-stage universities. Project participants were at various stages of their career and assumed a range of leadership roles and responsibilities in their faculty, the institution and nationally.

The project found that distributive leadership:

- is most successful if the leadership roles and responsibilities are negotiated rather than delegated
- harnesses individual strengths and abilities appropriate for the required leadership, irrespective of formal position
- provides an opportunity to take a leadership role, ascertain leadership capability, and further develop aptitudes before acquiring a formal leadership position.

**Resources**

The three key resources emanating from this project are:

1. The final report *The GREEN report: The development of leadership capacity in higher education*
2. *The GREEN resource*
3. The GREEN website.

2.1.1.4 Sustaining distributive leadership in learning and teaching: cascade and perpetual effectiveness of the faculty scholar model (LE8-691)

Academic workforce category: Aspiring leaders of university teaching

Target reader: University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the selection and development of university leaders

Level: Institution

Summary

This project aims to refine and further develop the framework that has been developed in the project 'Distributive leadership for learning and teaching: developing the faculty scholar model' (LE6-9) to support capacity building for leadership in higher education. The outcomes for faculty scholars from 2007–2009 and from the current project will be evaluated in relation to the development of leadership capacity to ascertain the appropriateness and sustainability of the model.

Resources

The key resource emanating from this project is the final report, Sustaining distributive leadership in learning and teaching: Cascade and perpetual effectiveness of the faculty scholar model.
2.1.1.5 Succession planning at universities: program for preparing early leaders (PROPEL) (LE9-1210 — in progress)

**Academic workforce category:** Early career academics—aspiring leaders of university teaching

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the selection and development of university leaders

**Level:** Institution

**Summary**

Pro-active development of a new generation of effective leaders needs to start in the early stages of an academic’s career, well before they assume their first leadership roles. The program for preparing early leaders (PROPEL) project aims to develop, implement and evaluate a one-year intensive leadership program for early career academics, both locally and nationally. The project will identify a model that is transferable to other institutions. PROPEL’s major focus will be on breaking down the borders between disciplines, and closing the gap between learning, teaching and research. Collaboration and interdisciplinarity will be taught and demonstrated to program participants, who will work together with peers and academic leaders across all faculties and disciplines as they complete the six components of the program: (1) mentoring, (2) leadership skill, (3) interdisciplinary, (4) big picture, (5) active, and (6) reflection.

**Resources**

This project is currently in process and final resources are not available.
2.1.1.6 Academic leadership for succession: research and implementation across the arts, social sciences and humanities in Australia (LE10-1728 — in progress)

**Academic workforce category:** Aspiring leaders of university teaching

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the selection and development of university leaders

**Level:** Discipline—arts, social sciences and humanities

**Summary**

Building upon five earlier ALTC projects, this project will create a robust succession strategy for leadership in the university arts, social sciences and humanities sector. The project will review the literature and ALTC leadership projects, determine current and future leadership needs for the discipline across Australian higher education, conduct a gap analysis and develop a transformative leadership succession strategy to meet identified needs.

**Resources**

This project is currently in process and final resources are not available.
2.1.2 Awareness and capacity building for teaching at the discipline level

2.1.2.1 Raising the profile of teaching and learning: scientists teaching scientists (LE6-16)

**Academic workforce category:** Academic staff—science

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for raising the profile of teaching and learning within institutions especially at the discipline level

**Level:** Discipline—science

**Summary**

A survey of the literature, student satisfaction surveys and attendance levels of science academics at teaching and learning conferences clearly indicated that science academic staff need to improve their understanding of science education pedagogy, and that the number of science academic staff attending teaching and learning conferences, particularly those that are non-discipline specific, is considerably lower than that of their peers from other academic disciplines. A theoretical framework of what constituted leadership in science-based teaching and learning was developed from an analysis of the views of scientists and science education leaders who were also active researchers. The framework was then used to shape specific project activities which used the language, context and exemplars that were highly relevant to academic scientists and the conventions of scientific research—conferences, evidence-based activity, scientific method—were explicitly mirrored in many of the project activities. The approach undertaken is generalisable and the final report provides a useful template for similar activities to raise the profile of teaching and learning with academic staff at the discipline level.

**Resources**

The key resource emanating from this project is the final report *Raising the profile of teaching and learning: Scientists teaching scientists.*
2.1.2.2 Developing leaders of change in the teaching of large university chemistry classes (LE8-818)

**Academic workforce category:** Academic staff—science—chemistry

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for raising the profile of teaching and learning within institutions especially at the discipline level

**Level:** Discipline—chemistry

**Summary**

This project established a new direction in first-year chemistry teaching and represents a shift away from didactic teaching methods to more student-centred learning experiences for large classes. The project established three initiatives as the architecture upon which sustainable learning and teaching innovation will be built.

It established learning and teaching innovation in project leaders’ and colleagues’ classrooms to improve student learning, engagement, retention and performance in large chemistry classes, through increased use of student-centred teaching practice. It developed leadership capacity in the project leaders to equip them with skills to lead change at their institutions, followed by developing leaders and leading change at other local institutions.

**Resources**

1. An online science learning hub was formed to serve as a local and national clearinghouse for the development of institutional learning leaders and dissemination of the project outcomes.

2. A sharing resource database structure was finalised and will be populated with contributed materials.

*Note: this project was completed after this report was submitted. The information on this page was compiled by staff in the Office for Learning and Teaching.*
2.1.2.3 A national discipline-specific professional development programme for lecturers and tutors in the mathematical sciences (LE9-1248)

**Academic workforce category:** Academic staff—mathematical sciences

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for raising the profile of teaching and learning within institutions especially at the discipline level

**Level:** Discipline—mathematical sciences

**Summary**

Quality professional development is demonstrably successful in improving the effectiveness of teaching and learning. Mathematics education is a specialised teaching pursuit with its own forms, functions, representations and concepts; as such, it requires its own discipline-specific approach to professional development. This project, supported by the Australian Mathematical Society (AustMS), has produced an accessible, practical and evidence-based professional development program that is designed specifically for tertiary mathematics teachers. These materials were tested and refined through multiple iterations.

**Resources**

The project outcomes included:

- A criterion-based professional standards framework, which explicitly identifies performance indicators for teaching. This can be used as a model for professional standards for teaching in other disciplines.
- A professional development unit designed specifically for tertiary mathematics teachers and offered online on the AustMS website at [http://www.austms.org.au/Professional+Development+Unit](http://www.austms.org.au/Professional+Development+Unit)
- A professional development workshop series for tertiary teachers of mathematics.

Through its multi-faceted dissemination activities, the project has generated stronger and broader engagement with the benefits, challenges and methods of effective teaching and learning in tertiary mathematics education. Ongoing collaboration with AustMS and continuing iterations of revising and evaluation the unit and workshop series will extend the outcomes of the project.

*Note: this project was completed after this report was submitted. The information on this page was compiled by staff in the Office for Learning and Teaching*
2.1.2.4 Building university leadership capacity in the teaching of implant dentistry to dental students and local professional communities (LE9-1177)

**Academic workforce category:** Academic staff—dentistry

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for raising the profile of teaching and learning within institutions, especially at the discipline level

**Level:** Discipline—dentistry

**Summary**

Implant dentistry teaching has usually been based on limited input from uncoordinated disciplines, resulting in extreme diversity in the spectrum of knowledge and skills taught to the dental students. This project aimed to develop collaborative, cross-disciplinary leadership capacity for university learning and teaching in the field of implant dentistry. It formed a media team who used digital technologies (clinical video camera station, editing software) to develop quality digital learning materials.

**Resources**

The project:

- Identified and analysed the potential and challenges for the design and implementation of a multidisciplinary curriculum in implant dentistry for both undergraduate students and dental practitioners
- Developed a detailed framework of guidelines and learning objectives for the teaching of undergraduate and postgraduate implant dentistry
- Designed a multidisciplinary flexible, digital curriculum to achieve the identified and agreed learning objectives at the undergraduate level and for continuous professional development
- Developed a comprehensive teaching/leadership training program for postgraduate students and junior staff to prepare them for active teaching/mentoring roles in educating undergraduates and communities of local general practitioners.

*Note: this project was completed after this report was submitted. The information on this page was compiled by staff in the Office for Learning and Teaching.*
2.1.2.5 Developing cross-disciplinary leadership capacity for enhancing the professional education of multidisciplinary mental health workers (LE8-777)

**Academic workforce category:** Academic staff—health

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for raising the profile of teaching and learning within institutions, especially at the discipline level

**Level:** Discipline—health

**Summary**

This project investigated the extent to which cross-disciplinary education and training occurs between mental health disciplines in Australian universities and identified the barriers and challenges that universities face when attempting to facilitate cross-disciplinary learning activities.

The project found that while barriers and challenges to cross-disciplinary learning exist, there are many benefits for students to ‘Learn Together’ and for staff in health disciplines to ‘Teach Together’.

The project has produced a suite of resources to develop cross-disciplinary education opportunities and assist colleagues in the different disciplines to consider how they might develop their own university cross-disciplinary education for interprofessional learning.

**Resources**

The resources include:

- Teaching Together, Learning Together, Working Together workbooks
- PowerPoint Presentations of all Workshops

The iTunes application is required to view the DVDs.

*Note: this project was completed after this report was submitted. The information on this page was compiled by staff in the Office for Learning and Teaching.*
2.1.2.6 Developing and implementing a leadership capacity building program for teaching and learning in nursing (LE10-1659 — in progress)

**Academic workforce category:** Early career academics—nursing

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for raising the profile of teaching and learning within institutions, especially at the discipline level

**Level:** Discipline—nursing

**Summary**

This project aims to provide professional development for early career nursing academics (ECNAs) to support leadership of change in teaching practice, foster the development of communities of practice and enhance scholarly learning and teaching within the discipline. The outcomes of the project will have practical significance by extending our knowledge of the types of support that are effective and sustainable in supporting ECNAs to develop leadership capacity.

**Resources**

This project is currently in process and final resources are not available.
2.1.2.7 Create.Ed: strengthening learning and teaching in the creative arts disciplines (LE9-1246 — in progress)

**Academic workforce category:** Academic staff—creative arts

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for raising the profile of teaching and learning within institutions, especially at the discipline level

**Level:** Discipline—creative arts

**Summary**

This project aims to provide professional development for those in learning and teaching leadership roles nationally in the creative arts disciplines, including architecture, creative writing, design, performing arts (dance and music) and visual arts. Participants will work together strategically to enhance their leadership capability, to address issues of learning and teaching importance, and to contribute publications on leadership to the scholarship of teaching and learning as a strategic knowledge network: Create.ED.

**Resources**

This project is currently in process and final resources are not available.
2.2 Recruitment and induction of academics for teaching

The projects in this section focus on topics related to sessional staff and the early years of academic life.

2.2.1 Sessional teachers in Australian higher education (CG6-52)

**Academic workforce category:** Sessional academic staff

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the employment, induction, training and management of sessional staff

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

All universities depend heavily on sessional teachers. Estimates suggest that sessional teachers are responsible for as much as half the teaching load, performing a range of duties from casual marker to subject coordinator. Sessional teachers thus make a significant but largely invisible and undervalued contribution to the quality of teaching and learning in higher education. Typically, institutions are unable to report comprehensive and accurate data on the number of sessional teachers and their conditions of employment.

Building on the Australian Universities Teaching Committee project ‘Training, support and management of sessional teaching staff’ (Chalmers, Herbert, Hannam, Smeal, & Whelan, 2003), this project refocused attention on issues surrounding sessional teachers. The project analysed current national practice and established the extent of the contribution made by sessional teachers to higher education as well as identifying good practice examples for dissemination.

Primarily aimed at university staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the employment, induction, training and management of sessional staff, *The RED report—Recognition, enhancement and development—The contribution of sessional teachers to higher education* and its companion *The RED resource* discuss institutional quality enhancements of sessional teaching under five domains that emerged from the project: systemic and sustainable policy and practice; employment and administrative support; induction and academic management; career and professional development; and reward and recognition.

**Resources**

The three key resources emanating from this project are:

1. *The RED report*
2. *The RED resource*
3. the RED website.

Resources from the related national project funded by the Australian Universities Teaching Committee (AUTC) are also still available. Material on the website is still relevant but needs refreshing and more recent case studies developed:

- *Training, support and management of sessional teaching staff: Final report*
- The Sessional Teaching website.
2.2.2 An institutional leadership paradigm: transforming practices, structures and conditions in indigenous higher education (LE6-2)

**Academic workforce category:** Indigenous academic staff

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the professional and leadership development of Indigenous academic staff

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

Project participants agreed that current university practices are not consistent with the Indigenous values that are drawn from their strong community orientation. When Indigenous people enter universities, they perceive that they do not belong and may opt out. Universities lose a valuable opportunity to include Indigenous knowledge and practice and to co-create culturally safe working practices. The few Indigenous academics, usually employed at lower level positions, are enormously dedicated and committed but do not provide a critical mass to create sustainable, deep-seated institutional change.

A values-based Institutional Leadership Paradigm (ILP) was developed to guide and support participants in undertaking specific activities to modify some aspect of their institution’s practice, policy and/or conditions. The project-supported activities within participating institutions resulted in a range of changes to policies, practices and conditions. This strengthened capacity has supported and encouraged academics and administrators to transform institutional leadership practices, structures and conditions to more effectively advance excellence in Indigenous teaching and learning, generate new knowledge, and serve the community. The project team and participants recognised that change takes place incrementally and that while the value statement could assist in the transformation of institutions, institutional leaders needed to embrace and enact these values in order to affect change at the institutional level.

**Resources**

The key resource emanating from this project is the final report *An institutional leadership paradigm: Transforming practices, structures and conditions in Indigenous higher education.*
2.2.3 Preparing academics to teach in higher education (GI7-643)

**Academic workforce category:** Early career academics with teaching responsibilities

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the employment, induction, training and management of academic staff with teaching responsibilities

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

The focus of this project was the foundations programs used to induct new academic staff to the teaching and learning in the university. Its main aim was to produce a sector-wide framework for foundations of university teaching programs. The project focused on five areas underpinned by evidence-based information about foundations programs: benchmarking; impact models of successful practice for foundations programs; professional development of those responsible for teaching foundation programs; and resources for foundation programs. A number of resources were developed including guidelines for benchmarking, an articulated set of benchmark domains and good practice statements, an approach for evaluating the impact of foundations programs, case studies of different models of foundations programs and an online professional development resource for sharing resources in foundations programs. Although the project had a defined time frame, the project developed a shared set of expectations, understandings and resources to be used across the sector, particularly with the foundations community, with an expectation that they be enhanced and further developed by the community in future years.

**Resources**

The three key resources emanating from this project are:

1. The final report *Preparing academics to teach in higher education*
2. The online professional development resource *PATHE: Preparing academics to teach in higher education*
3. The online repository for sharing resources used in foundations programs, the *PATHE Database*.

While separate from this project, a related resource is the *Flinders University Foundations of University Teaching* website, which hosts the archives of the past Foundations Colloquia.
2.2.4 Developing our staff: an eight university collaboration for mapping and delivery of a shared professional development programme for tertiary educators (PP7-339)

**Academic workforce category:** Academic staff without a graduate certificate in higher education or equivalent

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the employment, induction, training and management of academic staff with teaching responsibilities

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

In the 2009–2010 Budget, the Australian Government announced that performance funding would be made available to universities as part of the higher education reform package. One of the proposed indicators for negotiating learning outcome statements with universities was the quality of learning outcomes with a proposed indicator of the proportion of teaching-only and teaching-and-research staff in faculties with a graduate certificate in higher education or equivalent (Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, 2009, p. 21). While such indicators are still under discussion, many Australian universities already recognised the need to improve teaching and learning within their institutions through professional development programs for academic staff. Most made a foundations course of teaching and learning a probation requirement for all new staff while others require a unit or a full graduate certificate course to be completed.

This project designed and developed a cross-institutional graduate certificate in tertiary education for new academic staff that enabled the creation of viable cohorts, and increased the number of students in each aspect of the program through a collaborative program instituted across five universities. A core unit, unique to each institution, was designed from shared aims and learning outcomes with one common assessment item for the purpose of moderation processes. Elective units hosted by each partner university are available.

**Resources**

The key resource emanating from this project is the website [Graduate Certificate in Tertiary Education](#).
2.3 High-quality professional development for formal leaders

The projects in this section focus on role-specific professional development and are categorised by role. Because of their role in the professional development of staff, learning and teaching centres have been included as a separate category within this topic.

2.3.1 Associate deans (teaching and learning)

Most curriculum leaders are not prepared for their roles and learn through trial and error in (and by surviving) their leadership and management experiences. Despite the need to include the broader perspective and to understand the complexity and the need for leadership in this area, when the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (then Carrick Institute of Learning and Teaching in Higher Education) first came into being, there appeared to be few programs specifically designed to develop the leadership skills of university staff with responsibility for teaching and learning. Most training models came from the management literature and were based on executive coaching and management models.

Few applications to the 2006 round of the Leadership for Excellence in Learning and Teaching Program showed a clear understanding of the complex elements of leadership and the need for "a wider and deeper understanding of the range of types of leadership and the elements in its practice" was identified (Anderson & Johnson, 2006).
2.3.1.1 ‘Caught between a rock and several hard places’: cultivating the roles of the associate dean (teaching and learning) and the course coordinator (LE5-19)

**Academic workforce category:** Associate deans (teaching and learning) and course coordinators

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with formal leadership roles

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

This project set out to identify strategies to build leadership capacity for excellence in learning and teaching at the level of the associate deans (teaching and learning) and course coordinators. The need for robust strategies to meet the needs of curriculum leaders locally and to also be scalable to the national level was met by the collaboration of institutions drawn from the Group of Eight (UNSW), the Australian Technology Network of Universities (QUT) and the New Generation and regional universities (CDU).

A set of strategies that builds leadership capacity at system and institutional level was developed through a cascading, developmental approach encompassing increasing knowledge and skills of the individual participants, working with participants to change functional relationships and impact in the organisation and infusing energy into the system through associate deans (teaching and learning) and course coordinators who are enthused about their role.

Three enabling conditions for effective curriculum leadership development were identified: strongly supportive organisational culture and conditions; comprehensive induction to, and mentoring in, the role of curriculum leader; and planned curriculum leadership development.

**Resources**

The two key resources emanating from this project are:

1. The final report ‘Caught between a rock and several hard places’: Cultivating the roles of the associate dean (teaching and learning) and the course coordinator
2. A self-directed professional development program—A framework for developing an institutional leadership in teaching and learning program.

2.3.2 Heads of school

2.3.2.1 Heads of school leadership—effective relationships as the cornerstone for teaching and learning improvement (LE8-802)

Academic workforce category: Heads of school

Target reader: University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with departmental/school leadership

Level: Higher education—sector wide

Summary

This project focused on the leadership role of heads of school to enhance learning and teaching within institutions. The study confirmed that heads of school are reasonably effective academic leaders who require the support of their line managers to perform well and further develop their academic leadership capabilities.

Resources

The project produced several resources for heads of school which provide:

• background information on academic leadership
• workshop materials and slides designed to assist users to interpret and respond to feedback in a resource book titled Building academic leadership capability: a resource book for heads of school and a CD of activities
• a CD that contains a suite of self-assessment activities and links to resources organised around Academic Leadership, the leadership roles associated with the Integrated Competing Values Framework (ICVF), and also references concerning 360° feedback processes
• a CD that contains a copy of the resource book.

The project also produced a dataset on the academic leadership capability of heads of school, its implications for the institution, and the development of academic leadership.

Note: this project was completed after this report was submitted. The information on this page was compiled by staff in the Office for Learning and Teaching.
2.3.3 Course/program coordinators

2.3.3.1 Building academic leadership capability at the course level: developing course coordinators as academic leaders (LE6-4)

**Academic workforce category:** Course/program coordinators

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with course/program and unit/subject coordination

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

Course/program coordinators are better able to manage the quality of the courses/programs for which they are responsible if they have increased awareness of academic leadership and improved leadership capabilities, ultimately enabling them to improve the student experience of learning and teaching. An inclusive and distributed model of leadership that recognised the crucial contribution of course coordinators in influencing learning and teaching outcomes for students was used to develop and trial an experiential cross-disciplinary academic leadership program designed to enhance the leadership skills of course coordinators. The project successfully developed, trialled and produced the Academic Leadership for Course Coordinators Program (ALCCP)—an extensive flexible resource designed to enable course coordinators to lead and manage course quality and their course team.

**Resources**

The two key resources emanating from this project are:

1. The final report Leading courses: Academic leadership for course coordinators
2. The website Academic Leadership for Course Coordinators, which includes
   a. the Academic Leadership Course Coordinators Program (10 online adaptable modules)
   b. the Academic Leadership Course Coordinators Program: A Guide to Coordination and Facilitation
   c. program resources.
2.3.3.2 Closing the gap in curriculum development leadership (LE6-05)

**Academic workforce category:** Course/program coordinators

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with course/program and unit/subject coordination

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

There is a paucity of material related to curriculum design and curriculum leadership targeting the course/program or major level (as opposed to individual units of study). This project designed and developed an integrated staff development program, including materials and mentoring opportunities, targeting the leadership capacities of middle-level curriculum leaders (for example, program directors or conveners of major sequences in generalist degrees) for curriculum development and management.

Outcomes included policy recognition of this leadership role in the host university staffing policy and teaching and learning plan, a scalable methodology for approaching curriculum design issues, successful cascading engagement of curriculum leaders in their own competitive leadership and strategic grant projects at the local and national level, and sector-wide engagement with curriculum renewal in other Australian universities.

**Resources**

The key resource emanating from this project is the final report *Closing the gap in curriculum development leadership.*
2.3.3.3 Improving the leadership capability of academic co-ordinators in postgraduate and undergraduate programs in business (LE6-11)

**Academic workforce category:** Course/program coordinators

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with course/program and unit/subject coordination

**Level:** Discipline—business

**Summary**

Course/program coordinators have direct and indirect impacts on the learning outcomes of large numbers of students. Academic development has usually focused on the development of teaching and learning skills of these staff, but leadership capability is also needed. This project developed and assessed the leadership capability of course/program coordinators in the business faculty of two Australian universities by:

- assessing the leadership capability of the academic coordinators in business in two Australian universities using the Integrated Competing Values Framework (ICVF)
- investigating how effective academic coordinators are and what factors impact on their performance and make their role more attractive
- designing and delivering professional development workshops and accompanying resources to further develop the leadership capability of the academic coordinators in business in two Australian universities
- designing and testing a professional development framework
- developing a website to support the project.

The report concludes that the academic coordinators in this study were capable of providing the academic leadership needed, even though they had no formal authority. These managers need ongoing support by senior managers and regular development opportunities if they are to continue to provide the kind of leadership that results in high-quality teaching and learning outcomes.

**Resources**

The two key resources emanating from this project are:

1. The final report *Improving the leadership capability of academic coordinators in postgraduate and undergraduate programs in business*
2. The professional development program resource book *Academic leadership: Fundamental building blocks*.

Related information can be found in the following project resources:

- *Academic leadership: Fundamental building blocks* (LE6-1)
- *Academic leadership development within the university sector by dissemination of a web-based 360° feedback process and related professional development workshops* (LE8-805)
- ‘Subject coordinators: Leading professional development for sessional staff’ (LE9-1212 — in progress).
2.3.3.4 Developing program leader networks and resources to enhance learning and teaching in multicampus universities
(LE8-810 — in progress)

**Academic workforce category:** Course/program coordinators

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with course/program and unit/subject coordination

**Level:** Institution

**Summary**

This project aims to develop an online, modularised good practice guide for program leaders and resources for policy-makers and those who induct and support program leaders.

**Resources**

This project is currently in process and final resources are not available.
2.3.3.5 Embedding and sustaining leadership development for course coordinators through tailored support during curriculum review (LE8-816 — in progress)

**Academic workforce category:** Course/program coordinators

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with course/program and unit/subject coordination

**Level:** Institution

**Summary**

The project aims to improve the capacity of course coordinators and other middle level managers to lead discipline-based curriculum review and to offer peer review of curriculum. The capacity of academic development staff to support leadership development for curriculum review and relate this to the cultural and conceptual context of discipline-based unit coordinators will be improved.

**Resources**

This project is currently in process and final resources are not available.
2.3.3.6 Enhancing frameworks for assuring the quality of learning and teaching in university offshore education programmes (CG7-378)

**Academic workforce category:** Policy makers, administrators, teachers travelling from Australia to conduct offshore education programs, locally-based (offshore) tutors

**Target reader:** Policy makers, administrators, teachers travelling from Australia to conduct offshore education programs, locally-based (offshore) tutors

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

The Commonwealth Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST) called for a national quality strategy for offshore education that would improve communication with stakeholders and lead to an improvement in quality, including in learning and teaching. In response, this project sought to develop a national quality strategy for offshore education.

The project had three objectives:

1. Compiling a database of relevant literature on the involvement of Australian universities in offshore education
2. Conducting an empirically-based qualitative study of the perspectives of key academic stakeholders on the delivery of Australian university offshore education programs across a range of models, which were reported as a set of individual case studies
3. Developing a framework to guide those concerned with
   a. quality assurance for transnational teaching by Australian universities
   b. conducting professional development programs for those working transnationally.

The framework is directed at four specific groups (policy makers, administrators, teachers travelling from Australia, and locally-based tutors) and addresses three main areas (welfare, curriculum and pedagogy). The framework is comprehensive and provides a useful overview of the many facets involved to assure quality transnational teaching by Australian universities. The framework covers the need for professional development of staff before they are deployed overseas and recommends that this be done on an annual basis covering all aspects of offshore experience and expected of both those newly appointed and those experienced in offshore work. The framework is available for trialling by individuals, organisations and institutions involved in transnational education.

**Resources**

The two key resources emanating from this project are:

1. The final report *Enhancing frameworks for assuring the quality of learning and teaching in university offshore education programs*
2. The *Enhancing Frameworks* website, which contains case studies, generalised principles from the case studies to inform practice, and a cross-section of key literature.
2.3.3.7 Learning without borders: linking development of transnational leadership roles to international and cross-cultural teaching excellence (LE9-1228 — in progress)

Academic workforce category: Policy makers, administrators, teachers travelling from Australia to conduct offshore education programs, locally-based (offshore) tutors

Target reader: Policy makers, administrators, teachers travelling from Australia to conduct offshore education programs, locally-based (offshore) tutors

Level: Higher education—sector wide

Summary

This project will work with subject convenors and program coordinators responsible for interacting with transnational partners for program delivery and quality assurance to identify, support and recognise leadership roles amongst academics at on- and off-shore Australian campuses. Development and support mechanisms will be trialled and evaluated, with a particular concern for effectiveness from the participants' perspective. The results will be used to develop and disseminate guidelines and good practice examples that will provide a framework for the development of academics in these roles within the partner institutions.

Resources

This project is currently in process and final resources are not available.
2.3.4 Unit/subject coordinators

2.3.4.1 Clarifying, developing and valuing the roles of unit coordinators as informal leaders of learning in higher education (LE8-824)

**Academic workforce category:** Unit/subject coordinators

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with course/program and unit/subject coordination

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

Previous studies have revealed that the responsibilities and expectations of unit coordinators are vague and undefined, leading those performing the role to feel undervalued and unsupported, with implications for the quality of the student experience. This project investigated the role of the unit coordinator as a leader of learning in higher education through searches of Australian university websites about the role of the unit coordinator, and focus groups and interviews with unit coordinators. Seven responsibilities, from which numerous examples of tasks derive, were moulded into a job description to clarify the role of a unit coordinator. A set of proformas including a statement of responsibilities, a job description, a person specification, a developmental framework, a developmental matrix, proposed induction and professional development, and probationary and promotional review criteria were developed.

**Resources**

The two key resources emanating from this project are:

1. The final report *Clarifying, developing and valuing the role of unit coordinators as informal leaders of learning in higher education*

2.3.4.2 Coalface subject co-ordinators (LE8-814)

**Academic workforce category:** Unit/subject coordinators

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with course/program and unit/subject coordination

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

This project focussed on the role and capabilities required by subject coordinators in higher education. The project differentiates subject coordinators from formal academic leadership positions, as subject coordinators often assume their ‘informal’ role at junior levels without a clear understanding of the skills and competencies required to be effective in their role. They are often the academics with the most influence on student learning but have the least authority.

Subject coordinators require a range of skills and competencies to be effective in their roles and have few resources targeted specifically to their needs. The team conducted face-to-face professional development workshop for the professional academic to build leadership and management capabilities.

**Resources**

Additional resources which proved useful for subject coordinators are as follows:

- A subject coordinator’s handbook which outlines responsibilities and provides advice about what needs to be done, when and how
- An online subject design toolkit to update existing subjects or prepare new ones, and provide guidance on reviewing, analysing, planning and development, and evaluation
- A framework constructed around assessment, feedback and online teaching techniques for subject coordinators.

*Note: this project was completed after this report was submitted. The information on this page was compiled by staff in the Office for Learning and Teaching.*
2.3.4.3 Subject coordinators: leading professional development for sessional staff (LE9-1212 — in progress)

Academic workforce category: Unit/subject coordinators

Target reader: University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with course/program and unit/subject coordination

Level: Higher education—sector wide

Summary

Building on The RED report, this project aims to influence institutional policies, guidelines and practices in leadership and management of teaching teams involving sessional academics, specifically including role and responsibility statements for subject coordinators. The project will develop a leadership capacity development framework that includes targeted professional development for subject coordinators, to enable them to create contexts for sessional staff to learn about teaching practice. The integrated competing values framework (ICVF) will be adapted for use by subject coordinators to develop their own leadership skills. Resources will be available through website developed to support subject coordinators in their leadership and management of teaching teams.

Resources

This project is currently in process and final resources are not available. Related information can be found in the following project resources:

- Academic leadership: Fundamental building blocks (LE6-1)
- Improving the leadership capability of academic co-ordinators in postgraduate and undergraduate programs in business (LE6-11)
- Academic leadership development within the university sector by dissemination of a web-based 360° feedback process and related professional development workshops (LE8-805).
2.3.4.4 ‘Just-in-time; just-for-me’ narrative support for unit coordinators
(LE10-1736 — in progress)

Academic workforce category: Unit/subject coordinators

Target reader: University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with course/program and unit/subject coordination

Level: Higher education—sector wide

Summary

This project builds the ALTC project ‘Clarifying, developing and valuing the roles of unit coordinators as informal leaders of learning in higher education’ (LE8-824), which revealed that there is little targeted support in place for unit coordinators to handle the many issues that arise from leading a unit of study. While there are relevant training resources under development, these do not meet the ‘just-in-time, just-for-me’ criteria recommended by Scott, Coates and Anderson (2008) for occasions that demand, more or less, immediate responses. This project will select narratives from a range of Australian unit coordinators that capture the relational experience and emotions at a particular time and in a similar context thus providing a tool upon which to base discussions with ‘fellow travellers’ that may potentially resolve similar problems.

Resources

This project is currently in process and final resources are not available. Related information can be found in the following project resource:

- Clarifying, developing and valuing the roles of unit coordinators as informal leaders of learning in higher education (LE8-824).

Note: this project was completed after this report was submitted. The information on this page was compiled by staff in the Office for Learning and Teaching
2.3.5 Clinical educators

Clinical experience is a core element of undergraduate education in a number of disciplines. Students consistently report that clinical placement plays a large part in their decisions to pursue careers beyond graduation. Despite this, clinical experiences do not automatically translate to positive learning experiences, or to the development of well-rounded novice professionals. There are significant differences in the cultures at the interface of the universities and industry learning settings. Given the opportunity for students to extend their university learning into experiential industry-based environments, it is imperative the university and industry partnerships and collaborations around student learning are enhanced to maximise the learning of students and graduates in these settings.

There are a number of levels of teaching in clinical education, for example, ‘coal face’ clinical educators (clinical facilitators, ward staff); ‘gatekeeper’ level (course convenors, nurse unit managers, clinical coordinators); and ‘strategic’ level (nursing directors, university-based heads of school and program convenors).

2.3.5.1 Leading for effective partnering in clinical contexts (LE6-14)

Academic workforce category: Unit/subject coordinators

Target reader: University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with course/program and unit/subject coordination

Level: Higher education—sector wide

Summary

This project aimed to develop an effective partnering model between universities and nursing clinical settings to improve clinical education. The project built on an existing agency–community partnering model, and applied it to the clinical education setting within the nursing discipline. A literature review of practicum education in human services, existing models of clinical education for nursing, medicine and physiotherapy, and leadership and management further refined the model. Through the learning circle approach, communication between university and hospital management, staff and students becomes explicit rather than implicit.

Four key areas were identified (such as attitudes and workload) where leadership could make a difference to student clinical learning outcomes. The four tangible outcomes each targeted a different domain within the clinical practicum experience: development of ‘tips’ for students prior to clinical experience; a short preparatory workshop for clinicians prior to the students’ arrival; an accessible prompt card for the clinical facilitator to assist in strategies useful in encouraging student learning; and alternate models organised by the nurse unit manager for placing students and their supervisor in the clinical practice area.

Over the period of the project, the number of students in clinical placements increased. There was no change to the student feedback via the clinical learning inventory. However, the clinical learning organisational climate as measured by the registered nursing staff improved.

Resources

The key resource emanating from this project is the final report Leading for effective partnering in clinical contexts.
2.3.5.2 Enhancing student learning in the workplace through developing the leadership capabilities of clinical supervisors in the nursing discipline (LE8-809)

**Academic workforce category:** All levels of clinical education

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with university—industry partnerships for work-based learning/clinical education

**Level:** Discipline—nursing

**Summary**

This project aimed to build the leadership capacity of clinical supervisors in the nursing discipline by developing, implementing and systematically embedding a leadership model in the structure and practice of student supervision. Working in partnership with three major metropolitan hospitals in Queensland, the project team developed a framework and professional development program incorporating leadership and clinical supervision.

The Leadership in Clinical Education (LaCE) Program consisted of two structured workshops complemented by individual personal development projects undertaken by participants with the support of a purpose-built website that provides access to a wide variety of information and other learning resources. The LaCE Program website provides a self-directed set of activities and resources that can be used or adapted by others.

Quantitative and qualitative evaluations indicated that the approach was highly valued by participants as it promoted useful peer dialogue, sharing of experiences and personal development in relation to assisting leadership development and student learning in the workplace.

**Resources**

The two key resources emanating from this project are:

1. The final report *Enhancing student learning in the workplace through developing the leadership capabilities of clinical supervisors in the nursing discipline*
2. The LaCE Program website.
2.3.5.3 COMPASS™ Directions: leading the integration of a competency based assessment tool in speech pathology learning and teaching (LE6-6)

**Academic workforce category:** Academics and clinical education leaders

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with university—industry partnerships for work-based learning/clinical education

**Level:** Discipline—speech pathology

**Summary**

COMPASS™: Competency Assessment in Speech Pathology is a psychometrically validated assessment tool based on sound educational theory and practice. The purpose of this project was to build the capacity of speech pathology academic and clinical education leaders to integrate COMPASS™ within learning, teaching and assessment practices in curriculum across 13 higher education programs, using assessment of work-integrated learning as a focus. COMPASS™ is now used across all Australian and New Zealand universities to assess speech pathology students’ competency against Competency-Based Occupational Standards (CBOS 2001) during field placements using the same assessment tool to assess their students’ performances on the practicum component of topics/subjects. This tool yields both qualitative and quantitative information on student performance that is rated by the clinical educators providing clinical placements in his/her workplace. COMPASS™ resources include a resource folder and an online assessment tool.

**Resources**

The key resource emanating from this project is the final report *COMPASS™ directions: Leading the integration of a competency based assessment tool in speech pathology learning and teaching*.

More information about COMPASS™ can be accessed from the Speech Pathology Australia website.
2.3.5.4 Building leadership capacity for work integrated learning: developing fieldwork coordinators as academic leaders (LE9-1234—in progress)

**Academic workforce category:** Fieldwork coordinators

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with university–industry partnerships for work-based learning/clinical education

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

Fieldwork, a form of work integrated learning (WIL), is an integral component of many courses. It provides students with an opportunity to build their graduate employability and consolidate their professional skills and confidence, as well as helping them develop positive, professional attitudes and qualities. The aim of this project is to design and implement an academic leadership development program for fieldwork coordinators from a wide variety of disciplines, to enhance their leadership capabilities, enabling them to provide high-quality fieldwork learning experiences through appropriate pedagogy and management.

**Resources**

This project is currently in process and final resources are not available.
2.3.6 Research, reflection and scholarship

2.3.6.1 The academic’s and policymaker’s guides to the teaching-research nexus: a suite of resources for enhancing reflective practice (CG6-35)

Academic workforce category: Academic staff

Target reader: Australian academics and policy makers

Level: Higher education—sector wide

Summary

Three trends impact upon the academic workforce in contemporary Australian universities:
1. Changes in their academic roles and career development
2. New understandings of the ways that students learn best
3. Changing ideas about the nature of knowledge and the role of universities in producing that knowledge.

The project sought to enhance understanding and awareness of how student learning outcomes improve through the use of appropriate teaching-research nexus (TRN) strategies. Academics, policy-makers and students across eight Australian universities viewed the connection between teaching and research as a fundamental, distinctive feature of university learning and teaching that sets it apart from teaching in further and vocational education settings. However, there was little evidence of formal evaluation of TRN initiatives and their impact on student learning. While the project focused for the main part on the potential benefit of the TRN to student learning, attention was also paid to the potential benefits of TRN for academic staff in developing their academic expertise and careers.

Three principal suggestions are offered: develop a personal pedagogy that optimises TRN; document the way that one’s personal research and broader academic scholarship informs one’s teaching and design and development of curriculum; and take a leadership role in exploring and implementing strategies to bring undergraduate students closer to the department and university research character.

Resources

The three key resources emanating from this project are:
1. The final report *The academic’s and policy-maker’s guides to the teaching-research nexus: A suite of resources for enhancing reflective practice*
2. The Teaching-Research Nexus website, which has resources developed during the course of the project, including examples of the TRN across discipline and year levels, the self-review framework and various TRN strategies
3. A booklet guide on best practice in teaching-research connections for academics and policy-makers.
2.3.6.2 Tiddas showin’ up, talkin’ up and puttin’ up: Indigenous women and educational leadership (LE6-17)

**Academic workforce category:** Indigenous academic women

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the professional and leadership development of Indigenous academic women

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

Indigenous women face a double barrier in negotiating a respected place for themselves within Australian universities: being Indigenous and being a woman. This project engaged Indigenous women in strategic and practical ways: planning and building their careers; choosing community participation with discernment; understanding and using university governance, structures and processes; furthering study; and accessing support from the community of Indigenous academic women. Indigenous women in universities throughout the nation were located and recruited through Indigenous higher education networks. Four workshops for recruits were held at the end of each semester in 2007 and 2008 with each workshop addressing a specific theme: learning and teaching; scholarship; university administration and management; and community engagement.

The project began to effect long-term systemic change, and strengthened and contributed to leadership capacity of Indigenous academic women within Indigenous communities, within higher education, and within the broader Australian society.

**Resources**

The key resource emanating from this project is the final report *Tiddas showin’ up, talkin’ up and puttin’ up: Indigenous women and educational leadership.*
2.3.6.3 Writin’ up: Indigenous women and educational leadership (LE10-1602)

**Academic workforce category:** Indigenous academic women

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the professional and leadership development of Indigenous academic women

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

The project focussed on developing the leadership capacity of Indigenous academic women in Australian universities. It built on the outcomes of a completed project: Tiddas showin’ up, talkin’ up and puttin’ up: Indigenous women and educational leadership project which revealed that the participation and profile of Indigenous women in academic publication needed to be strengthened. This project aimed to improve the Indigenous women’s knowledge of the processes and techniques of academic publishing, with a focus on publishing about learning and teaching and Indigenous knowledge.

The journal submission and refereeing process was used as a developmental opportunity for the women. It was hoped that these publications could be added to the repository of resources available on the Tiddas website hosted by Flinders University. However the contract for hosting the website expired and was not renewed.

**Resources**

The project:

- Conducted a successful writing workshop for 38 Indigenous academic women
- Published a collection of papers written by Indigenous academic women which focussed on educational leadership in a special edition of the Australian Journal of Indigenous Issues
- Established an Indigenous women’s leadership network
- Disseminated the findings and outcomes at various national and international conferences on Indigenous issues.

*Note: this project was completed after this report was submitted. The information on this page was compiled by staff in the Office for Learning and Teaching.*
2.3.7 Learning and teaching centres: roles and impact

2.3.7.1 Strategic leadership for institutional teaching and learning centres: developing a model for the 21st century (LE7-355)

**Academic workforce category:** Leaders of academic staff development units/learning and teaching centres

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with academic staff development

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

Most Australian universities have an institutional teaching and learning centre that provides a number of services for supporting university staff with responsibilities for the quality of teaching and learning in the university. Professor Tom Cochrane acknowledges that “the leading of academic staff development units is one of the more challenging assignments in university activity” (personal communication, 2009). This project set out to identify common factors in the effective strategic leadership of central organisational structures to enhance long-term learning and teaching performance, and to highlight how these factors are being dealt with contextually in contemporary Australian university settings.

The project found that strategic leadership is a major expectation of contemporary teaching and learning centres and that the search for strategic leadership in response to institutional expectations and external forces was leading to significant reviewing, restructuring and repositioning of centres across the sector. Current directors of institutional teaching and learning centres considered that the highest impact of their centres were in the areas of reward and recognition and the professional development of staff. Principal constraints identified were the lack of time of both academics and academic/education developers and the general perceptions of the role and function of the centre, which they considered to be incorrect and outdated.

The two key outcomes of the project were:

1. **A Strategic leadership Teaching and learning Centre Maturity Framework, which can be used as a basis for university staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with academic staff development to work through the stages needed to mature their model of operation.**

2. **A guide to support Australian university teaching and learning centres in strategic leadership for teaching and learning enhancement, structured around conceptualising strategic leadership; framing staff capability development for teaching and learning; implementing strategies for enhancing performance; considering emerging and future developments of centres; and gathering evidence from relevant stakeholders on centres’ roles, functions and effectiveness.**

**Resources**

The three key resources emanating from this project are:

1. The final report *Strategic leadership for institutional teaching and learning centres: Developing a model for the 21st century*

2. The resource *A guide to support Australian university teaching and learning centres in strategic leadership for teaching and learning enhancement*

3. A project information website.

2.3.7.2 Academic leadership development within the university sector by dissemination of a web-based 360° feedback process and related professional development workshops (LE8-805)

**Academic workforce category:** Academic/educational developers and their supervisors

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with academic staff development

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

The project focused on the professional development of those responsible for building leadership capacity in university staff with responsibilities for the quality of teaching and learning in the university.

Using the Integrated Competing Values Framework (ICVF), this project provided leadership development for academic developers across all Australian universities. Ninety-seven academic developers from 28 Australian universities attended a two-day workshop and completed a 360° feedback process using the Academic Leadership ICVF Survey. As part of this process, the academic developers conducted action learning projects, asking their colleagues to also complete the same survey and then designed and implemented development programs for the academics within their institution. The academic developer participants were effective as academic leaders, assisted in the development of the academic leadership capability by the project, and capable of developing their academic leadership capability further.

A key outcome, the facilitator’s guide, focuses on the processes used by those developing academic leadership programs, and includes information about conducting a 360° survey feedback process, conducting leadership workshops, embedding academic leadership within a university, developing personal action plans, and issues that may be encountered.

**Resources**

The two key resources emanating from this project are:

1. The final report *Academic leadership development within the university sector by dissemination of a web-based 360° feedback process and related professional development workshops*

2. The facilitator’s guide *Academic leadership: Building capacity*.


Related information can be found in the following project resources:

- *Academic leadership: Fundamental building blocks* (LE6-1)
- *Improving the leadership capability of academic co-ordinators in postgraduate and undergraduate programs in business* (LE6-11)
- ‘Subject coordinators: Leading professional development for sessional staff’ (LE9-1212 — in progress).
2.3.7.3 Identification and implementation of indicators and measures of impact on teaching preparation programs in higher education (SP10-1840 — in progress)

**Academic workforce category:** Academic/educational developers and their supervisors

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with academic staff development

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

Building on previous ALTC projects and other research, this project will identify the range, type and frequency of professional development programs offered by Australian institutions, identify indicators and measures of effectiveness and impact, develop an evaluation framework that can be applied across a range of professional development activities that take place in higher education, and trial these in different university contexts to test their veracity. This project has been unanimously endorsed by the members of the Council of Australian Directors for Academic Development.

**Resources**

This project is currently in process and final resources are not available.
2.3.7.4 Measuring and reporting teaching quality (SP10-1845 — in progress)

**Academic workforce category**: Academic staff

**Target reader**: University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the status and the quality of teaching at tertiary level

**Level**: Higher education–sector wide

**Summary**

A robust empirical appraisal of professional development activities in learning and teaching is needed as part of a university’s report on the improvements in teaching quality and the efficacy of professional development provisions in improving teaching quality. Using a quantitative research design, this project will produce measures of professional development efficacy and templates and resources that can be used by senior managers to assess professional development provision in learning and teaching in their institutions.

**Resources**

This project is currently in process and final resources are not available.
2.4  Academic teaching evaluation and recognition

The projects in this section focus on ways to recognise and promote academics on the basis of their teaching.

2.4.1  Maximising academic performance management

2.4.1.1  Peer review of teaching for promotion purposes: a project to develop and implement a pilot program of external peer review of teaching at four Australian universities (PP6-46)

Academic workforce category: Academic staff

Target reader: University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the status and the quality of teaching at tertiary level

Level: Higher education—sector wide

Summary

As universities move to develop teaching-only or teaching-focused positions, they also need to develop processes for the recognition and promotion of academics on the basis of their teaching. Summative peer review of teaching has the ability to improve the status and the quality of teaching at tertiary level by encouraging the promotion of exceptional teachers and academics engaged in the scholarship of teaching at all levels.

This project developed a robust process to foster and acknowledge excellent teaching and learning in Australian universities, particularly by integration with the promotion process. Grounded in a thorough review of the literature, processes, protocols and tools were developed for both internal peer observation of classroom teaching and external peer evaluation of written materials and documentation. These were trialled in pilot programs over two years, and feedback from participants was used to modify and refine all documentation. Model session agendas, video clips of classroom teaching, and sample promotion applications were developed and are available on the project website.

Resources

The two key resources emanating from this project are:

1.  The final report *Peer review of teaching for promotion purposes: A project to develop and implement a pilot program of external peer review of teaching at four Australian universities*

2.  The project website *Peer Review of Teaching for Promotion Purposes*, which contains all project resources.
2.4.1.2 Peer review of online teaching and learning (PP7-334)

**Academic workforce category:** Academic staff

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the status and the quality of teaching at tertiary level

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

Building on extensive work undertaken within Australia and overseas, this project developed an open-source, web-enabled peer review tool, accompanying user guide and systems documentation and a series of case studies illustrating the application of the system in both formative and summative review. The system incorporates an easy-to-use wizard enabling academics to construct banks of criteria focusing on different areas of learning and teaching, using built-in templates, while also retaining the option to custom design their own review templates. The supplied templates include custom reviews for online learning and teaching, face-to-face teaching and blended learning. Templates are also provided for particular areas of focus including first year experience, embedding research in the undergraduate curriculum, supporting student diversity, and internationalisation of the curriculum.

Trials have demonstrated the potential of the instrument in facilitating reflection in action by the teacher informed by students' self-reviews and by monitoring how students respond to and act on that feedback. The instrument has also been adapted as a scaffold for students undertaking courses in which they are required to make evaluative judgments about their work and the work of their peers.

**Resources**

The two key resources emanating from this project are:

1. The final report *Peer review of online learning and teaching*
2. The project website, [Peer Review of Online Teaching and Learning](#), where a preview of the PROTL system can be viewed.

Related information can be found in the following project resource:

- *Embedding peer review of learning and teaching in e-learning and blended learning environments* (PP7-332).
2.4.1.3 Peer review of teaching in Australian higher education: resources to support institutions in developing and embedding effective policies and practices (PP7-343)

**Academic workforce category:** Academic staff

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the status and the quality of teaching at tertiary level

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

While there is growing interest in the Australian higher education sector, peer review of teaching is not commonplace and the level of awareness and expertise is variable. This project aimed to encourage and support greater participation in peer review of teaching through the creation of resources to assist institutions in effectively implementing policies and programs that embody an Australian conception of the scholarship of teaching and that aligns with existing national initiatives for enhancing learning and teaching in higher education.

The project investigated current practices nationally, engaged the higher education community in discussion of the issue, and developed resources appropriate to the Australian context. With significant input toward the development of the framework for peer review from staff of 11 Australian universities, the resources accommodate the diversity of institutions, local environments and purposes, rather than providing a standard approach to peer review of teaching.

Outputs include a comprehensive handbook designed to support institutions in the development and embedding of programs of peer review. It presents a set of core principles defining peer review of teaching in the Australian context, while supporting diverse university contexts and approaches.

**Resources**

The two key resources emanating from this project are:

1. The final report *Peer review of teaching in Australian higher education: Resources to support institution in developing and embedding effective policies and practices*

2. The handbook *Peer review of teaching in Australian higher education: A handbook to support institutions in developing and embedding effective policies and practices.*

2.4.1.4 Social, communicative and interpersonal leadership in the context of peer review (LE9-1206 — in progress)

**Academic workforce category:** Academic staff

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the status and the quality of teaching at tertiary level

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

This project aims to provide professional development, resources and a community of practice for peer review of leaders focused on the social, communicative and interpersonal (SCI) skills required to be an effective leader in higher education.

**Resources**

This project is currently in process and final resources are not available.
2.4.2 Reward and recognition

2.4.2.1 Agents of change: using awards for teaching excellence to identify and develop new generations of leadership in learning and teaching, Winthrop Professor Mark Israel (2008 ALTC Teaching Fellow)

Academic workforce category: Academic staff

Target reader: University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the status and the quality of teaching at tertiary level

Level: Higher education—sector wide

Summary

This fellowship program identified the ways that institutional, disciplinary and national teaching award schemes have been used to develop new generations of leadership in higher education. In a rather ad hoc manner, award recipients have been used within their institutions, nationally and internationally as status symbols, teaching assessors, policy writers, drivers for change, mentors and motivational speakers. Institutions are encouraged to work with award recipients to enable recipients to maximise the impact of their award in ways that strengthen the recipient, institutions and the sector.

Resources

The key resource emanating from this project is the final report: *The key to the door? Teaching awards in Australian higher education.*
2.4.2.2 Sustainable leadership of teaching and learning initiatives: lessons from the promoting excellence initiative (LE10-1727 — in progress)

**Academic workforce category:** Academic staff

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the status and the quality of teaching at tertiary level

**Level:** Higher education sector

**Summary**

This project will undertake a benefit analysis of the ALTC’s Promoting Excellence Initiative (PEI), while focusing on the leadership skills required to lead with, through and around formal hierarchical structures to achieve objectives. The leadership challenges faced by the leaders and champions of the PEI will be distilled. Exemplars of those initiatives that have had the most positive impact within an institution will be highlighted. This project will identify what has been implemented and embedded through the PEI, and examine what extent initiatives have promoted institutional excellence and engagement in learning and teaching.

**Resources**

This project is currently in process and final resources are not available.
2.5 Engaging academics in education reform

The projects in this section focus on engaging academics in a particular aspect of education reform or in developing capacity to support social dialogue about education reform.

2.5.1 Engaging academics through curriculum and assessment improvement

2.5.1.1 Enhancing the student educational experience through school-based curriculum improvement leaders (LE6-10)

Academic workforce category: Academic staff

Target reader: University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with curriculum improvement for enhancing student learning

Level: Higher education—sector wide

Summary

Effective curriculum improvement enhances and strengthens students’ learning experiences and outcomes. The project adopted an inquiry-based qualitative approach to determine the feasibility of sustainable long-term curriculum improvement through school-based non-positional leaders. The project built the capacity of participants to work with their colleagues in effecting sustainable curriculum change aligned with university and school educational goals, strategic directions and priorities through both professional development and school-based projects that built upon existing initiatives. Key outcomes included curriculum improvement leaders who had the knowledge, skills and ability to lead sustainable curriculum change in their schools; improved learning and assessment activities and materials for students; greater flexibility of access for students; improved communication between students and staff. Time-release arrangements for participants and planned dissemination of outcomes through a cascading approach across the host university were disrupted by major institutional restructuring.

Resources

The two key resources emanating from this project are:

1. The final report Enhancing the student educational experience through school-based curriculum improvement leaders

2. The accompanying project website Curriculum Improvement Leaders Project.
2.5.1.2 Building capacity among emerging occupational therapy academic leaders in curriculum renewal and evaluation at UQ and nationally

Professor Sylvia Rodger (2010 ALTC Teaching Fellow)

**Academic workforce category:** Academic staff—occupational therapy

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with curriculum improvement for enhancing student learning

**Level:** Discipline—occupational therapy

**Summary**

The work undertaken as part of this fellowship involved the creation of a framework for curriculum development and renewal in occupational therapy.

At an institutional level, the fellowship engaged with stakeholders of curriculum reform/review processes and concerned tensions surrounding vested interests in particular content areas. It also developed mechanisms for evaluation/feedback for current and successive stages of implementation and investigated how to manage the process of change at UQ.

At the national level, the fellowship aimed to build curriculum leadership capacity within the occupational therapy profession by addressing:

- the educational theory and philosophy underpinning program level curriculum design
- pedagogical differences between undergraduate, graduate-entry and doctoral-entry program curriculum frameworks and practices
- educational issues associated with fast-track programs such as a two year graduate entry masters versus a four year undergraduate programs
- curriculum drivers.

**Resources**

This fellowship produced a set of quick reference Good Practice Guides and accompanying illustrative cases. It is anticipated that these resources will be useful for those in occupational therapy and other cognate fields who are engaged in curriculum design and development.

*Note: this project was completed after this report was submitted. The information on this page was compiled by staff in the Office for Learning and Teaching.*
2.5.1.3 Leadership and assessment: strengthening the nexus (LE6-12)

**Academic workforce category:** Academic staff

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the assessment of student learning

**Level:** Institution wide

**Summary**

At the start of the project, the host university had no assessment policy, the approach to assessment across the university was inconsistent and assessment practice followed the unconsidered and unchallenged precedents set in the past. The project adopted a distributed leadership and participant action research model to build leadership capacity in assessment and to develop a transparent and coherent policy framework for assessment and feedback. The Leaders in Effective Assessment Practice (LEAP) model has enabled leadership development that is now recognised across the university with leadership initiatives and activities continuing since the projects’ close.

New indicators were also developed by the project for use in evaluating participatory action research when framing projects with the aim of leadership capacity building. The piloting of these indicators provided informative data that now awaits further trialling in other projects.

**Resources**

The key resource emanating from this project is the final report *Leadership and assessment: strengthening the nexus.*
2.5.1.4 Teaching and assessing meta-attributes in engineering: identifying, developing and disseminating good practice (CG6-23)

**Academic workforce category:** Academic staff—engineering

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the assessment of student learning

**Level:** Discipline—engineering

**Summary**

Academics in Australian engineering faculties are under pressure from industry, the professional body, and their home institutions to embed graduate attributes in undergraduate degree programs. Prior to this project, innovative responses to this pressure tended to be isolated and short-lived; rigorous evaluation of the impact on student learning of graduate attributes was rare; and the identified attributes tended to be poorly aligned with the realities of engineering practice. Workshops and seminars by the project team engaged 140 participants, some of whom cascaded their learning by running workshops in their local regional context. Two heuristics were developed and refined: the graduate attribute assessment ‘Engineering graduate capabilities continuum: a continuum of learning outcomes’ and the ‘Engineering curriculum review: process overview’. Participation in the project by the 10 project team members influenced their career trajectory and their capacity for making change in engineering education development of national leadership for curriculum change in engineering.

**Resources**

The key resource emanating from this project is the final report *Teaching and assessing meta-attributes in engineering: Identifying, developing and disseminating good practice*, which contains copies of the two heuristics.
2.5.1.5 Facilitating a whole-of-university approach to Indigenous curriculum
development: leadership frameworks for cultural partnership
(LE9-1219 — in progress)

**Academic workforce category:** Academic staff

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with
curriculum improvement for enhancing student learning

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

The project aims to develop, implement and evaluate a leadership framework for a culturally
appropriate and sustainable whole-of-university approach to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander curriculum development, based on a distributive model of leadership. Multi-level
working partnerships and governance structures between local elders and communities,
senior management, Indigenous and non-Indigenous academic staff, and students will be
developed. A leadership–partnership model and best practice resources will be developed
and systematically evaluated and improved by faculty curriculum development advisers.
Within this project, the cultural authority of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples is
paramount.

**Resources**

This project is currently in process and final resources are not available.
2.5.2 Engaging academics through reflection on student feedback

2.5.2.1 Developing multi-level leadership in the use of student feedback to enhance student learning and teaching practice (LE6-7)

**Academic workforce category:** Academic staff

**Target reader:** University leaders responsible for the policies and practices associated with the effective use of student feedback to improve learning and teaching

**Level:** Institution wide

**Summary**

A multitude of staff are involved with the various aspects of the use of student feedback. Because of the lack of clarity on the leadership and responsibility of staff involved, the individual academic teacher is usually regarded as having the central responsibility for improving student feedback. This project emanated from the two needs of improving student feedback and providing greater clarity on the leadership and responsibility of staff across the university in relation to student feedback.

The project adopted a distributed leadership and participant action research model to engage a vertical slice of leaders from various levels across the university. The positive approach adopted by all participants ensured that the action research process achieved the desired outcomes. In particular, the active sponsorship of the deputy vice-chancellor (academic) was critical to the development and support of the change management process. Two models were developed as well as a set of resources.

The PACED Distributed Leadership Model provides a framework adaptable across both the higher education sector and a variety of issues beyond that of using student feedback to enhance student learning and teaching practice. The five leadership elements identified are participative, accredited, collaborative, engaged and devolved leadership.

The REALISED Change Management Model is related to the PACED Model and recognises the leadership context as well as the individual academic in enhancing student learning and teaching practice. The eight elements of the model are recognition, encouragement, acknowledgement, leadership, integrated, systems, environment and dissemination.

**Resources**

The two key resources emanating from this project are:

1. The final report *Student feedback and leadership*, which contains an outline of the process, outcomes and case studies of implementation
2. The *Student feedback and leadership: Resource portfolio*, which contains frameworks, resources, templates and examples.
2.5.2.2 Leadership for implementing improvements in the learning and teaching quality cycle (LE6-13)

**Academic workforce category:** Academic staff

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with implementation of improvements in the learning and teaching quality cycle

**Level:** Institution wide

**Summary**

Most universities identify the provision of excellence in learning and teaching as a key priority. This project addressed the challenge of how best to drive and coordinate leadership of excellence in education, and how to translate theory and rhetoric into practice, by developing and refining an institution-wide, strategic leadership framework to facilitate change and improvement in learning and teaching, and then applying it to the specific case of student feedback. The development and refinement of the Engaging Leadership Framework (ELF) was informed by case study trials; the wider leadership literature; expert and user consultations and application workshops in which the model was applied by academic staff wishing to address underperformance in a particular unit as evidenced by unit evaluation data; and graphic representation. Planned post-project activities included the embedding of the framework within university planning, procedures, professional development and self-review processes.

**Resources**

The key resource emanating from this project is the final report *Leading excellence*.

Related information can be found in the following project resource:

- *Leading Excellence—application of the ELF framework to new higher education sites and contexts* (LE9-1215).
2.5.3 Engaging academics through support for students

2.5.3.1 Australian Law Postgraduate Network (ALPN) (LE6-3)

**Academic workforce category**: Supervisors and managers of postgraduate law students

**Target reader**: Supervisors and managers of postgraduate law students

**Level**: Discipline—law

**Summary**

Postgraduate research courses in law have low numbers and suffer from a range of factors such as poor supervisory training and practice, intellectual isolation of students from one another, difficulty in finding multiple suitably qualified supervisory staff within the one institution, difficulty in identifying suitable examiners, lack of methodological training and experience of supervisors (particularly in social science research methodologies), inability to move beyond the master/apprentice supervisory models, and the opportunity cost of failing to seek research and supervisory collaborations across institutions.

The project established a network and supporting website for supervisors and managers of postgraduate law students. Law schools, particularly small schools and those in rural and regional areas that do not have a large pool of supervisors, gained significant advantages from the network including access to supervisory practice resources and development; access to experienced supervisors in specific area of student interest regardless of location; and greater opportunities for networking and collaboration.

**Resources**

The two key resources emanating from this project are:

1. [Australian Law Postgraduate Network final report](#)
2. [Australian Law Postgraduate Network website](#)
2.5.3.2 Keeping on track: teacher leaders for Indigenous postgraduate coursework students (LE10-1608 — in progress)

Academic workforce category: Academic staff

Target reader: University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with Indigenous postgraduate students

Level: Higher education—sector wide

Summary

In 2008 there were 1527 Indigenous postgraduate students representing approximately 0.54 per cent of the student body and lower than the accepted benchmark of around 3 per cent. There has been significant work in the area of supporting Indigenous researchers and supervisors. This project will focus on similar issues for Indigenous students and their teachers within postgraduate coursework programs. The project will identify and develop a teacher leadership framework consisting of a series of leadership capability statements informed by the data.

Resources

This project is currently in process and final resources are not available.
2.5.3.3 Embedding peer review of learning and teaching in e-learning and blended learning environments (PP7-332)

Academic workforce category: Academic staff

Target reader: University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the status and the quality of teaching at tertiary level

Level: Higher education—sector wide

Summary

This project sought to develop, implement and evaluate a scholarly framework, processes and resources for peer review of learning and teaching in online and blended learning environments for improvement, and for recognising and rewarding good teaching. It addressed two issues related to the widespread change in learning and teaching environments. The first is a desire to enhance our capacity to improve the quality of teaching and learning in blended learning environments. The second is the need to extend the range of evidence for good teaching in blended learning environments and, more generally, to include scholarly peer review processes that can be embedded in institutional practices for recognising and rewarding teaching.

Resources

The key resource produced by the project is a framework for peer review based on the adapted version of the qualities of scholarly work described by Glassick, Huber, Maeroff (1977), associated review protocols and guidelines.


Note: this project was completed after this report was submitted. The information on this page was compiled by staff in the Office for Learning and Teaching.
2.5.3.4 Quantitative diversity: disciplinary and cross-disciplinary mathematics and statistics support in Australian universities (LE6-15)

**Academic workforce category:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the development of learning support for students in mathematics and statistics

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the development of learning support for students in mathematics and statistics

**Level:** Discipline and cross-discipline—mathematics and statistics support

**Summary**

Due to many factors, including changing requirements and perceptions of mathematics in the K–12 sector and alternative pathways to tertiary education, there is increasing diversity in the numeracy and mathematical skills and knowledge of students entering tertiary education. This has led to changes in learning and teaching across all disciplines, including mathematics and statistic degree courses, but more particularly those courses that rely on students having basic mathematical and statistical knowledge, skills and confidence. Academic staff teaching in these courses are now having to address the poor mathematical and statistical literacy of students in their courses.

There has not been a systematic and systemic approach to the issue of mathematics and statistics skills support for students, nor have there been cross-intuitional networks established to enable this.

The project focused for the main part on the establishment of communication, networks and cross-institutional collaboration in order to develop leadership capacity, and on the development of sustainable systems to provide students with access to learning support in mathematics and statistics. An appendix to the final report, *Learning support in mathematics and statistics in Australian higher education: A guide for the university sector*, includes the history, analysis of the nature of and need for learning support, synthesis of the findings of the project, and recommendations for the provision of support. Section 4.4, ‘Nature of support and staffing’, provides recommendations on the mixture of staffing and the requirement that full-time and fractional staff should be academic staff. The demand on leaders in recruiting, training, monitoring and mentoring of sessional staff is noted but there are no further guidelines in relation to these.

**Resources**

The key resource emanating from this project is the final report *Quantitative diversity: Disciplinary and cross-disciplinary mathematics and statistics support in Australian universities*, which contains *Learning support in mathematics and statistics in Australian higher education: A guide for the university sector* as an appendix.
2.5.3.5 Building leadership capacity for development and sharing of mathematics learning resources across disciplines and universities (LE8-783—in progress)

**Academic workforce category:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the development of learning support for students in mathematics and statistics

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the development of learning support for students in mathematics and statistics

**Level:** Discipline and cross-discipline—mathematics and statistics support

**Summary**

This project aims to provide leadership capacity development for leaders of mathematics learning support across two institutions through the development, acquisition and sharing of mathematics learning support resources across institutions. The initial ‘leaders in the making’ will engage and mentor others, as leaders, to become fully engaged in the task. The impact on student learning and educational culture will be assessed. The project culminates in a national symposium and the initiation of others into the network of developing leaders to enhance mathematics learning support.

**Resources**

This project is currently in process and final resources are not available.
2.5.4 Engaging academics through learning and teaching communities

2.5.4.1 Promoting learning and teaching communities (LE5-18)

**Academic workforce category:** Early to mid-career university staff who seek to effect change in teaching and learning

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for raising the profile of teaching and learning within institutions

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

A challenge faced by early to mid-career academics is how to effect change in teaching and learning within an institution. This project sought to test the use of communities of practice as a means to build the leadership capacity of early to mid-career academic staff committed to enhancing learning and teaching within the institution. Over the period of its implementation, the project largely operated ‘under the radar’ of formal university structures and management. A key learning was that changing practice is not simply a matter of getting practitioners to change, but that it requires the social, discursive and practical conditions that support and structure practice to also change. Consequently, the project shifted its capacity development strategy away from individual skill development to an inquiry-based group learning approach targeting group process, personal agency and distributed leadership. Approaches, conditions and capabilities that can assist others in thinking though establishing and sustaining these communities are contained within the final report.

**Resources**

The key resource emanating from this project is the final report *Promoting learning and teaching communities: Institutional leadership project.*
2.5.4.2 Identifying, building and sustaining leadership capacity for communities of practice in higher education (LE10-1734—in progress)

**Academic workforce category:** Academic staff

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for raising the profile of teaching and learning within institutions

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

Communities of practice (CoPs) provide a context for academics to engage in supportive and sustained learning situated in their teaching practice. Well-led and structured CoPs are successful in leading change and transforming teaching and learning practice, but there is little attention to the leadership needs of these groups in the higher education context. For such communities to be successful, they need to develop informal leadership structures and foster leadership skills that effectively meet the needs of teaching academics, while negotiating the institutional leadership terrain. This project focuses on building the leadership capacity of facilitators of CoPs for learning and teaching.

**Resources**

This project is currently in process and final resources are not available.
2.5.4.3 Community, domain, practice: facilitator’s catch-cry for revitalising learning and teaching through communities of practice, Associate Professor Jacquie McDonald (2010 ALTC Teaching Fellowship)

**Academic workforce category:** Academic staff

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for raising the profile of teaching and learning within institutions

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

Communities of practice (CoPs) are cited in higher education literature and ALTC applications as a successful way of building and sharing a scholarly approach to enhancing learning and teaching practice. Academic CoPs operate differently from institutionalised higher education work groups, and the facilitator’s role differs from the familiar chairperson’s role. This fellowship will identify key aspects of the facilitator’s role and create digital re-enactments to enable critical analysis of the role. Facilitator capacity-building will expand on existing collaboration with Australian academics implementing CoPs, and will also include workshops by an international expert and a facilitator’s start-up handbook.

**Resources**

This project is currently in process and final resources are not available.
2.5.5 Engaging academics through technology

2.5.5.1 Development of distributed leadership capacity in online learning and teaching (LE6-8)

Academic workforce category: Academic/educational developers (online advisors)

Target reader: University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the policies and practices associated with academic staff development

Level: Higher education—sector wide

Summary

Effective, sustainable implementation and use of learning technologies requires well-developed leadership of complex and multifaceted change management. The project defined leadership as providing direction and exercising influence, and focused on developing distributed institutional leadership capacity in the pedagogical and evaluative dimensions of online learning and teaching in the host university. The multicampus setting of the host university and a supportive framework highlighted the importance of communication and relationships in the development of leadership capacity.

Six academic staff (online advisers) were engaged in specialised training in pedagogical and evaluative dimensions of online learning and teaching and in leadership and undertook a range of activities at campus, faculty and university levels through which they applied their developing leadership capacities. At the close of the project, the participants were still continuing their leadership roles at the faculty and university level.

The transferability of the approach adopted in the project to other institutions will depend on the extent to which it can be tailored to address specific needs and contexts, and the extent to which a supportive framework such as that experienced at the host university is available.

Resources

The two key resources emanating from this project are:

1. The final report Development of distributed institutional leadership capacity in online learning and teaching project
2. An independent evaluation report.

2.5.5.2 Leading rich media implementation collaboratively: mobilising international, national and business expertise (LE7-377)

**Academic workforce category:** Staff using rich media technologies (video conferencing) in their teaching

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the purchase, implementation or support of rich media technologies

**Level:** Higher education—sector wide

**Summary**

Rich media technologies are the range of synchronous and asynchronous video-conferencing technologies that facilitate interactive communication between users. Survey respondents believed that rich media technologies could help alleviate the cost of funding travel and give staff more flexibility in teaching. The literature highlighted the question of how institutions will decide which technologies to support in the improvement of teaching and learning for their students.

Few institutions have an obvious strategy or policy framework underpinning the purchase, implementation or support of rich media technologies. Those few who do have a master plan for campus-wide implementation also showed maturity and integration of their business planning processes and direct links to their university’s strategic goals for teaching and learning. While some implementations of rich media technologies were well executed there was little evidence of sustained embedding. The project found that rich media technologies are not well defined or well exploited for their potential and that there is no firm data on sustained best practice in Australian industry, government bodies or tertiary institutions.

**Resources**

The two key resources emanating from this project are:

1. The final report *Leading rich media implementation collaboratively: Mobilising international, national and business expertise*

2. The project website [Video Communications in Higher Education](#), which contains case studies, references, resources, reports, publications and tips and professional development (online information and YouTube video clips for staff new to using rich media technologies).
2.5.5.3 Professional staff as leaders in enhancing student engagement: building capacity in emerging technologies through cascade and viral leadership (LE9-1231—in progress)

**Academic workforce category:** Professional staff using rich media technologies (video conferencing) in their teaching.

**Target reader:** University staff responsible for the policies and practices associated with the purchase, implementation or support of rich media technologies.

**Level:** Higher education—Western Australia.

**Summary**

This project aims to establish and develop an ongoing Western Australian-based network of professional staff leaders who foster student engagement through emerging technologies supported by web-based resources. The network will be developed through mentoring, networking and community activities, under the auspices of a new cascade and viral leadership model.

**Resources**

This project is currently in process and final resources are not available.
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