

ACADEMIC BOARD PHASE THREE REVIEW

Faculty of Economics and Business 2009 Annual Progress Report



building and sustaining the leading learning community in business, economics and public sector management in Australia and its region

30 July 2009

[This page is blank]

FACULTY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS

REPORT ON ACADEMIC BOARD PHASE III RECOMMENDATIONS: 2009

<p>Rec. # 1</p>	<p><i>The Faculty consider how it can better ensure that all staff and students are engaged with and supportive of the culture promoted by the Faculty's flatter single-school structure.</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Section 2.1(a)</p>
<p>Action taken by the Faculty</p>	<p>Understanding and support of the Faculty's 'single school', multi-disciplinary culture is being enhanced by a number of means, including the following.</p> <p>1.1. The Faculty's increasingly multi-disciplinary environment, which is resulting in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ initiatives being taken within and between Disciplines to promote multi-disciplinary learning, such as multi-disciplinary units of study and majors. ○ the appointment of Program Directors (see Rec. 2) who operate across Disciplines to provide academic leadership to a program, regardless of its discipline content. ○ encouragement for staff to apply for collaborative Faculty/ARC research funding aimed at increasing multi-disciplinary research on an ongoing basis. ○ identification and facilitation of research that combines contributions from a range of disciplines, while not weakening the strengths of individual disciplines. <p>1.2. Faculty branding exercise, being conducted with Lipman Hearne. Phase I (discovery and assessment) and Phase II (market validation, testing the value proposition) were completed in 2008/early 2009 and included situation and competitor analysis; interviews with staff, current and prospective students and alumni; online focus groups/surveys; and preliminary reporting.</p> <p>1.3. Steps being taken to ensure greater engagement with and responsiveness to student feedback will help inculcate a more participative culture (see Rec. 8). The appointment of Program Directors (see Rec. 2), for example, will help to integrate/coordinate the interface with students across the Faculty as a whole.</p> <p>1.4. The Corporate & International Relations Office is establishing more effective strategies and campaigns aimed at communicating a Faculty message which is unified and reflective of Faculty culture – a message of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ intellectual leadership (eg. campaigns which will raise stakeholder/corporate awareness of the Faculty's research profile) ○ quality and continuous improvement (promotion of accreditations such AACSB, EQUIS) ○ international excellence (promotion of CEMS membership) ○ knowledge and innovation (Faculty as home to national teaching and research centres) <p>1.5. Faculty culture and mission emphasise engagement with government, business and the professions. This is reflected in the type of support, development and relationship building initiatives in which students and staff participate. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the Careers & Employer Relations Office (CEO) builds relationships with local and international employer partners to provide experiences that are beneficial to students, the Faculty, employers, and the corporate and professional communities as a whole. <p>1.6. Students are increasingly engaged with the organisational culture through active membership of the Faculty Board, revitalised participation in the L&T Student Reference Group and through the CEO's Student Advisory Board.</p>
<p>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</p>	<p>Several initiatives that will see further engagement with and support of the Faculty's culture are continuing or planned, but not yet implemented/completed. They include the following.</p> <p>1.7. Contingent upon stabilisation of economic conditions, the Faculty is positioned to introduce its multi-disciplinary global EMBA program and executive education short courses through 2009/10. These programs will invigorate relationships with the corporate world, an essential component of the Faculty culture, and crucially enhance the Faculty's stature as a leading business school in the region.</p> <p>1.8. Faculty branding exercise – Complete Phase III, which will include the definition of concrete marketing objectives, target markets, competitor sets and priority audiences, strategy development and implementation planning, and final delivery of all project components.</p> <p>1.9. Explore the possibilities for enhancing even further student participation in Faculty decision making, including greater participation of local postgraduate coursework students.</p>

FACULTY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS

REPORT ON ACADEMIC BOARD PHASE III RECOMMENDATIONS: 2009

<p>Rec. # 1</p>	<p><i>The Faculty consider how it can better ensure that all staff and students are engaged with and supportive of the culture promoted by the Faculty's flatter single-school structure.</i></p> <p align="right">Section 2.1(a)</p>
	<p>1.10. Implement broader academic mentoring (see Rec 6) and leadership development opportunities (eg. as program directors), with a particular focus on early career academics and addressing diversity/ gender issues</p> <p>1.11. Ongoing design, development (2009), and construction (2010–2011) of the new Faculty building, due for occupancy from Semester 1, 2012. Design principles for the new building are aimed at fostering the Faculty's multi-discipline and inclusive culture by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ bringing casual, sessional and early career staff more closely in contact with colleagues, ○ fostering communication and informal encounters between staff, and ○ allowing students to be more closely engaged with academics in small-group learning environments.
<p>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken (aligns with above numbered points)</p>	<p>Specific measures of success for the above numbered points (will) include the following.</p> <p>1.1. Success in relation to multi-disciplinary teaching, learning and research. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the number of enrolments and feedback on interdisciplinary units such as <u>CISS 2001 Business in the Global Environment</u> or <u>IBUS5011 Foundations of Entrepreneurship</u>. ○ the number of enrolments and feedback on cross disciplinary majors within the Master of Commerce (revised program introduced in 2011). ○ an increasing proportion of staff applying for and receiving funding for multi/cross-disciplinary research. For 2008, Faculty funding for such projects totalled \$37,000; ARC discovery grants \$440,000 (for period 2009–2011). ○ an increasing proportion of research that combines contributions from a range of disciplines. Total publication output for 2008 was 332, including 29 (or 8.7%) multi/cross-disciplinary publications (4 book sections, 10 journal articles, 7 conference papers, and 8 conference proceedings). In addition, of the 15 Faculty research groups, ten are involved in multi/cross-disciplinary research. <p>1.2. Successful completion of the Faculty Branding Exercise (also 1.8), which will see the articulation and communication of the Faculty's distinctive identity; consolidation of the Faculty's position nationally and internationally as a leading business school; and the facilitation of relations with other business schools, corporate and professional organisations.</p> <p>1.3. A more participative Faculty student culture, including greater responsiveness to student feedback (see Rec. 8) and ongoing/increased formal student participation in Faculty decision making bodies (see also 1.6 and 1.9) as appropriate.</p> <p>1.7. Successful and timely launch and strong positive feedback for the new EMBA, along with invigorated relationships with the corporate world.</p> <p>1.11. Timely completion and relocation to the new Faculty building. Successful use of design principles that foster the Faculty's multi-discipline and inclusive culture.</p>

FACULTY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS

REPORT ON ACADEMIC BOARD PHASE III RECOMMENDATIONS: 2009

Rec. # 2	<p><i>The Faculty ensure that mechanisms are invoked in the development and deployment of strategy to enable all staff to have an opportunity to inform the process and to be made aware of the implications for their own work of specific strategies. Section 3.2(c)</i></p>
Action taken by the Faculty	<p>A number of participative mechanisms are already in place, with many being enhanced.</p> <p>2.1. Continued refinement of the role of Discipline Chair and their role in the development and deployment of strategy through establishment of the Faculty Academic Management Committee. For example, Chairs convening Discipline meetings and taking Discipline-level issues and proposed initiatives up to the FAMC meeting or individually to the Pro-Dean. It is expected that at least one whole-of-Discipline meeting be held per semester.</p> <p>2.2. For the annual budgeting process, Discipline Chairs are required to reflect on Faculty priorities and prepare information on major issues/activities that underpin their budgetary proposals. This is followed by a meeting with the Director of Finance and Pro-Dean to discuss resourcing and key objectives.</p> <p>2.3. Each of the Faculty Standing Committees continue to report formally at each Faculty Board meeting, giving staff the opportunity to understand and participate in strategic directions. Members of the Committees are renewing their efforts to promote a broader engagement from all staff, and the relationship between each committee is the subject of ongoing dialogue.</p> <p>2.4. Managers, directors and Chairs all have an ongoing responsibility in this area. Eg. Discipline/unit strategy days, the development and discussion of area operational plans, and through the PM&D process and development of performance objectives.</p> <p>2.5. Appointment of Program Directors who provide academic leadership to their particular program; contribute to strategic leadership through membership of the USB and GSB; and facilitate broader (across Disciplines and staffing levels) strategy deployment/involvement.</p> <p>2.6. Involvement of staff members from across the Faculty, either directly and/or via submission, in key initiatives and decision-making processes. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ in 2008/2009 the Faculty Research Committee convened a Journal Rankings Working Group, charged with providing a list that ranks all journals and not simply those that belong to the 'top tier'. All Disciplines and Centres were invited to make evidenced-based submissions for the inclusion/ranking of specific journals, and Chairs or their nominated representatives were consulted throughout the process. ○ collaborative development of the pilot Teaching Dividend policy. One of the six KPIs in the Faculty Teaching Dividend (used to allocate funds received from Faculty contributions to the national Learning & Teaching Performance Fund) is an indicator that can be developed and addressed by Disciplines in relation to their L&T strategic challenges. (See also 2.8) ○ use of an anonymous staff survey provided the academic staff a voice on matters of direct concern to them, such as diversity, equal opportunity, professional development and workplace relations. <p>2.7. Increased availability/deployment of information to assist people at all levels engage with larger strategic issues relevant to the Faculty. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the deployment of key information and 'work in progress' updates via the Staff Intranet and All Staff emails/bulletins (eg. Faculty Journal Rankings lists, assurance of learning and accreditation updates). ○ the sharing of data used to inform strategic decision making has been facilitated by the introduction of Digital Measures, a hosted database solution for collecting, managing and reporting on academic staff research, teaching and service activities for research reporting, strategic planning, accreditation and performance management purposes.
Further action planned but not yet implemented	<p>In light of the University's strategy review and the conclusion of the term of the current Dean at the end of 2009 (with a new Dean to commence in 2010), active development/deployment of new strategy at the Faculty level has been suspended. The current emphasis is on consolidation and continuity. The above mechanisms will continue to be maintained and enhanced. For example:</p> <p>2.8. Identification and development by each Discipline of one KPI from the Faculty Teaching Dividend that will be used by the Faculty to reward Disciplinary efforts to address their L&T</p>

FACULTY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS

REPORT ON ACADEMIC BOARD PHASE III RECOMMENDATIONS: 2009

<p>Rec. # 2</p>	<p><i>The Faculty ensure that mechanisms are invoked in the development and deployment of strategy to enable all staff to have an opportunity to inform the process and to be made aware of the implications for their own work of specific strategies. Section 3.2(c)</i></p>
	<p>strategic challenges. (See also 2.6, 5.3 and 7.13)</p> <p>2.9. Investigate and pilot an extension of Digital Measures (see 2.7) to enable Program Directors and UoS Coordinators to adopt a more rigorous approach to assuring that learning outcomes are met and that they contribute to program learning goals. Digital Measures should enable identification of each degree program, the goals of each program, the learning outcomes associated with each goal, and track assessment types used for demonstrating learning.</p> <p>2.10. The Director, Office of Learning & Teaching (OLT) is seeking feedback from Discipline Chairs on the best possible approach for providing support to Disciplines. Accordingly, OLT will be re-organised so as to provide greater emphasis on Discipline-based support.</p>
<p>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken (aligns with above numbered points)</p>	<p>Specific measures of success for the above numbered points (will) include the following.</p> <p>2.1. In addition to the FAMC, some Chairs of larger Disciplines have established senior leadership teams from the Discipline representatives on major Faculty committees, where academic strategies are debated and developed. Such teams liaise with academic colleagues within the Discipline about key matters being discussed in the Faculty-level portfolio areas including Learning and Teaching and Research. In smaller Disciplines, the representatives have a responsibility to brief and consult Discipline colleagues about the matters under discussion and to seek feedback.</p> <p>2.2. Much closer alignment between the articulation of Faculty strategy/strategic priorities and the formulation of Discipline/Centre/area budgets.</p> <p>2.5. Program Directors are working actively to deliver cross-disciplinary outcomes and are facilitating broader (across Disciplines and staffing levels) deployment of / involvement in a number of program-related strategies. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Faculty-wide assurance of program learning goals and outcomes in undergraduate and postgraduate programs over 2008–10. o promotion of a multi-disciplinary focus where appropriate (eg. revised MCom). o collaborative development (A/Deans, PDs, UoS coordinators, etc) of degree program learning goals and outcomes, and identification of where assessment for program assurance of learning (AoL) will occur. o achieving a program-wide approach to course planning, AoL and satisfaction, which will promote greater engagement with and responsiveness to student feedback <p>A capacity building program for Program Directors to be piloted and evaluated in semester 2, 2009 by OLT.</p> <p>2.6. High response rates from the anonymous, online survey have informed broader discussion of issues such as workload (Rec. 5) and mentoring (Rec. 6). Outcomes have been used to provide recommendations to the Dean and Faculty Executive on matters of direct concern to staff.</p> <p>2.7. Digital Measures has, most recently, enabled the generation of 2–3 page summary profiles for academic staff members in the Discipline of Economics. These have been provided as supporting information to members of the external Economics Review Panel. DM has also provided all academic staff with a very effective and easy way in which to access and update their own research and scholarship activities and to facilitate preparation for the ERA exercise across the Faculty.</p> <p>2.8. The Faculty Teaching Dividend policy will enable Discipline-based identification of their L&T strategic challenges, thus providing the best opportunities for 'return on investment' efforts. The policy will also enable clearly articulated responsibilities and rewards, and will recognise both improvement and achievement in relation to a limited number of Discipline and Faculty-based learning and teaching goals.</p> <p>2.10. Enhanced reach by the Office of Learning & Teaching into Disciplines, enabling greater collaboration on the development/deployment of L&T strategies and more targeted support.</p>

FACULTY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS

REPORT ON ACADEMIC BOARD PHASE III RECOMMENDATIONS: 2009

Rec. # 3	<i>The Faculty review its policies on the granting of credit for undergraduate studies to students enrolled in postgraduate programs.</i> Section 4.1(a)
Action taken by the Faculty	<p>The University Academic Reform process has gained considerable traction in this regard. In particular, the new /revised Academic Board policies on coursework, advanced standing and credit now prohibit the granting of credit for undergraduate study in postgraduate coursework programs. These reforms, along with observations from international accreditation bodies and Faculty consideration of its strategic positioning, have resulted in the following.</p> <p>3.1. The elimination of credit for UG study in all postgraduate programs from semester 2, 2009.</p>
Further action planned but not yet implemented	<p>3.2. No further action is planned as the Academic Board has disallowed the possibility of credit for undergraduate studies and the Faculty has complied.</p> <p>3.3. The 2009 review of the Master of Commerce is likely to recommend a tightening of provision for waivers (cf credit) for foundational units. Students with background study in MCom subjects will be required to study substitute units. Where student background is not appropriate, extra units will be required.</p>
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	<p>Specific measures of success for the above numbered points (will) include the following.</p> <p>3.3. Academic Board approval of the restructured, zero-credit MCom by late 2009, with implementation of the new program in 2011. The impact of the zero-credit rule on demand for particular programs, especially the MCom, may act to enhance the quality of applicants.</p>

Rec. # 4	<i>The Faculty ensure it provides adequate opportunity for students to consult academic advisors at the critical early stages of their undergraduate programs.</i> Section 4.2(c)
Action taken by the Faculty	<p>The Faculty has undertaken a number of steps to ensure students receive sufficient information about academic advisers – and adequate opportunity to consult with them – at the critical early stages of their undergraduate programs.</p> <p>4.1. Program and planning advice is provided to commencing students at the start of each semester, throughout the year, and by dedicated Program Advisers. New students also receive broader information regarding extra-curricular services and support during University and Faculty orientation programs.</p> <p>4.2. Since Semester 1 2009, Faculty orientation have included program-specific orientation sessions. This was in response to feedback from new students that they found it difficult to understand the structure of their program, how to select majors and more generally what is expected of them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Significant effort is made to inform students of Faculty expectations, how to approach their time at university, and the range of services available to them to help support them. o The Careers and Employer Relations Office arranges employer panels to give advice to students on “What can I do with a BCom / BEc?” o Program Advisers give students advice on degree planning. <p>4.3. Designated Program Directors have also been appointed for each program. They are responsible for the provision of academic and strategic leadership for the program, as well as for providing program-wide advice and support to students in that program.</p>
Further action planned but not yet implemented	<p>4.4. The Faculty has identified the re-enrolment period at the end of first year as the critical stage for UG student to receive more in-depth academic advice. The BCom and BEc Program Directors are organising a ‘majors fair’ for the end of each October to counsel students as they make critical decisions for the following year about their major areas of study.</p> <p>4.5. As part of its program reviews, the Faculty is making programs more standardised (eg. number of units in a major of the BCom and MCom). This move will assist students with degree planning and ‘self-diagnosing’.</p>

FACULTY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS

REPORT ON ACADEMIC BOARD PHASE III RECOMMENDATIONS: 2009

Rec. # 4	<i>The Faculty ensure it provides adequate opportunity for students to consult academic advisors at the critical early stages of their undergraduate programs.</i> Section 4.2(c)
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	<p>Specific measures of success for the above numbered points (will) include the following.</p> <p>4.1. Positive feedback from undergraduate students indicating that they received (i) sufficient information about academic advisors, and (ii) adequate/timely opportunities to consult with them. For example, feedback from the Student Reference Group will be actively solicited and aggregated with feedback channelled through the Program Advisers and feedback web page.</p> <p>4.2. Academic-led program-specific orientation sessions (at both the UG and PG levels) have had very strong attendance in both Semester 1 and 2, 2009.</p> <p>4.3. Number of students seeking advice from the designated Program Director (recorded, for example, via a log of enquiries) and positive feedback received.</p> <p>4.4. Measure the number of students attending the BCom and BEc 'majors fair' to be held at the end of October and evaluate its success in terms of timing and completeness of information provided to students. Feedback solicited via an exit survey, for example, with positive feedback received. (Also 4.5)</p>
Rec. # 5	<i>The Pro-Dean consider the range of factors that might impact on the quality of teaching when reviewing the workload policy.</i> Section 6.1(a)
Action taken by the Faculty	<p>The Faculty is taking steps to develop agreed academic workload principles to be applied consistently across the Faculty. Steps taken to date:</p> <p>5.1. The Pro-Dean is a member of the DVC (Education) committee looking at workload policies across the University.</p> <p>5.2. The Pro-Dean has discussed this matter at FAMC meetings and has requested all Discipline Chairs to prepare a formal statement of the current practice in the allocation of teaching and for these to come forward to him before the end of September 2009.</p>
Further action planned but not yet implemented	<p>5.3. The Pro-Dean will oversee a process of consultation across academic groups with the aim of reviewing and documenting consistent principles for the Faculty, while ensuring that management of the allocation and negotiation of workload remains at the Discipline level. In this process, enhancing the quality of L&T effectiveness will be a critical determinant and the group will consider all relevant factors and take advice from relevant parties.</p> <p>5.4. It is anticipated that workload principles will be progressively documented and adopted across the Faculty through 2010.</p> <p>5.5. Implementation of the Faculty Teaching Dividend policy, approved in mid July 2009, may have implications for the allocation of teaching workload. The Dividend will be used to differentially reward Disciplines for specific forms of evidence in relation to effective teaching, improvement and Discipline-based improvement strategies. The implementation of the policy will be formally reviewed during 2010. (See also 2.6, 2.8 and 7.13)</p>
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	<p>Specific measures of success for the above numbered points (will) include the following.</p> <p>5.1. Timely and relevant recommendations from the DVC (Education) committee.</p> <p>5.3. Timely and transparent process of consultation with all academic groups in the Faculty, resulting in the development of agreed workload principles which will address good practice and the quality of L&T effectiveness.</p> <p>5.4. Workload principles articulated and adopted, with Disciplines demonstrating equity, transparency and good practice in allocation of teaching responsibilities from the end of 2010.</p>

FACULTY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS

REPORT ON ACADEMIC BOARD PHASE III RECOMMENDATIONS: 2009

<p>Rec. # 6</p>	<p><i>The Faculty investigate how it can implement a more inclusive and consistent program of staff mentoring.</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Section 6.2(d)</p>
<p>Action taken by the Faculty</p>	<p>The current Academic Mentoring program commenced in 2005 and is offered through the Office of Learning & Teaching. It is open to <i>all permanent academic staff</i> in the Faculty, who are invited to submit expressions of interest each year. If there are more expressions of interest than places, preference is given to new staff, staff who are not already in a Faculty mentoring relationship, staff who have not already participated in the program as a mentee, and those whose mentoring goals are about developing their teaching and/or research-enhanced learning. Past participants have repeatedly acknowledged their appreciation of the Faculty’s support through this 7-month mentoring program. See http://www.econ.usyd.edu.au/Learning/academics/academic_mentoring</p> <p>The Faculty plans to support the mentoring relationships formed in the present scheme and to extend it into the Disciplines to enhance the extent and value of mentoring. To support the development of a mentoring culture more broadly, a number of steps have been taken/proposed:</p> <p>6.1. Previous mentors and mentees from the above program are invited to attend a lunch – usually with a senior university academic and highly experienced mentor – and encouraged to continue the mentoring relationship.</p>
<p>Further action planned but not yet implemented</p>	<p>6.2. Further integration of the above program with the New Lecturers support program is being considered. Evaluation of the New Lecturers program (which has been oversubscribed) has been very positive. A more integrated, systemic orientation and support program is planned for 2010, with new(er) academics encouraged to engage in a mentoring relationship as in 6.3.</p> <p>6.3. The Pro-Dean proposes to establish a broader mentoring obligation on all senior academics in order to provide a more sustained effort to complement the current mentoring program offered through the OLT.</p> <p>6.4. Roll out of a collaborative ‘peer review of teaching’ support/mentoring strategy across the Faculty, with the first Faculty-wide workshop held on 21 July. An intensive ‘peer review of teaching’ pilot will be conducted in the Finance Discipline in Semester 2, 2009, with groups of three colleagues developing ‘hands on’ teaching skills, as well as ways to evaluate and further enhance their teaching in a collaborative context.</p>
<p>Faculty’s evaluation of the success of action taken</p>	<p>Specific measures of success for the above numbered points (will) include the following.</p> <p>6.3. Engagement levels will be monitored to determine the increase in the number of academic staff participating in mentoring relationships in the Faculty. Enhanced reference to academic opportunity and support during the promotions processes conducted in the Faculty. Survey feedback from participants in relation to achievement of the goals of the program will also be monitored.</p> <p>6.4. The collaborative peer review (CPR) training workshop was very positively evaluated, potential collaborations were explored and one Discipline is establishing CPR amongst its newer staff. A subsequent meeting in September between participants will enable further refinement of this process. Overall, a measure of success will be the evaluation of the impact/success of the CPR of teaching pilot and its adoption across the wider Faculty, with an increase in the number of staff within each Discipline engaged in peer observation and review.</p>

FACULTY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS

REPORT ON ACADEMIC BOARD PHASE III RECOMMENDATIONS: 2009

<p>Rec. # 7</p>	<p><i>The Faculty consider:</i> 1) <i>the methods of instruction and assessment used in and for group work, in order to address students concerns; and</i> 2) <i>implementation of mechanisms to help ensure consistency of quality of tutorials and lectures across the Faculty.</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Section 7.1(b)a</p>
<p>Action taken by the Faculty</p>	<p>A number of structured strategies have been put in place to encourage more in-class group work, to develop related collaboration skills, and to enhance the quality of instruction and assessment measures used.</p> <p>7.1. Dr Larry Michaelson (international expert and Senior Fulbright Scholar) has visited the Faculty for two periods over the last 12 months and has conducted workshops/fora in Disciplines and in the Faculty to promote the embedding of team based learning (TBL).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In his first visit he led four Faculty Forums (over 75 attendees) and 1-on-1 meetings with 23 academics (including 9 program directors) and different groupings of academics. ○ In his second visit he held one forum (23 participants) plus 1-on-1 meetings with 13 others. <p>The TBL approach incorporates both individual and group accountability for the functioning and effectiveness of the group as well as promoting peer learning. TBL has now been introduced/implemented in 8 units of study. In the Master of Management program, for example, an integrated business experience project (in team-based learning mode) was piloted.</p> <p>7.2. Faculty group work policy has been changed in two ways: (i) compulsory monitoring of the individual student contribution to group work if the weighting is >30%; and (ii) clarity on the role of self- and peer-ratings in the grading and appeals processes.</p> <p>7.3. Improved dissemination of generic support for students used to develop an awareness of and practice in group work related skills is provided through the orientation handbook, transition sessions, and the student/staff group work websites (see http://www.econ.usyd.edu.au/Learning).</p> <p>7.4. A pilot of the SPARK^{PLUS} group learning tool took place in Semester 1, 2009. This online self- and peer-assessment program aims to facilitate student awareness of their own/other group members' contributions to group work and how this might be further improved. Further piloting will take place in Semester 2, 2009.</p> <p>7.5. Consistency of quality in tutorials and lectures across the Faculty requires the provision of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ generic and Discipline-based support mechanisms, ○ greater integration between tutorials and lectures, and ○ mechanisms to investigate the effectiveness of both in terms of student learning. <p>The Tutor Development Program (TDP), with 7 modules each semester, focuses on the development of skills and knowledge associated with effective learning environments. It incorporates CPR of teaching between participants. During Semester 1, 2009, 132 tutors (94% of the Faculty's tutors) participated in at least one TDP module. Of tutors surveyed, 84% agreed that the TDP "helped with my teaching" and "helped me to feel part of the Faculty".</p> <p>7.6. Research recently conducted by the Faculty identifies perceived inequity in group-work tasks and assessments as a source of concern amongst domestic postgraduate coursework students, particularly with respect to group allocation and language/cross-cultural issues. Accordingly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the Faculty has taken a number of steps to better manage student admission quality and diversity and, most importantly, to further enhance the quality of student learning experience, including quality of tutorials and lectures. (See also 8.11) ○ at the aggregate level the Faculty is reviewing admission standards, moving to apply competitive merit-based selection, seeking to further diversify our student intake through targeted marketing, and, in conjunction with CET, working to improve the learning-readiness of students admitted via package offers. (See also 8.11) ○ at the class-room level, Discipline-based L&T resourcing will allow lecturers to apply formative modes of group assessment, equitable and reliable forms of peer assessment, and inter-culturally sensitive modes of group task work.

FACULTY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS

REPORT ON ACADEMIC BOARD PHASE III RECOMMENDATIONS: 2009

<p>Rec. # 7</p>	<p><i>The Faculty consider:</i> 1) <i>the methods of instruction and assessment used in and for group work, in order to address students concerns; and</i> 2) <i>implementation of mechanisms to help ensure consistency of quality of tutorials and lectures across the Faculty.</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Section 7.1(b)a</p>
<p>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</p>	<p>The different Disciplines in the Faculty have different needs for achieving their L&T aims and outcomes. While efforts have been made in this area (eg. sharing good practice resources, funded L&T Associates), further steps will be undertaken to ensure consistent quality of teaching (group work, tutorials and lectures) and, in turn, of the student learning experience.</p> <p>7.7. Further dissemination/sharing of alternative approaches to fostering and monitoring group work skills and participation through sessions such as the ‘Newer Academics’ lunches.</p> <p>7.8. In Semester 2, the Faculty will pilot a process for formative evaluation by students of the tutorial experience, including a survey tool and a one-page reflection that will form the basis of confidential conversations between the tutor and unit co-ordinator. This pilot will identify good practice and issues relating to curriculum, coordination and the tutorial experience.</p> <p>7.9. A new program in L&T for part-time practitioner lecturers is being developed, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, for implementation in 2010. The program will add the specific identified L&T needs of this group of educators in an accessible and timely manner.</p> <p>7.10. The issue of selection criteria for tutor appointments will be discussed, initially by the Faculty Academic Management Committee, and documented across the Faculty.</p> <p>7.11. The Teaching Dividend policy (see also 2.6, 2.8 and 5.3) incorporates six performance indicators that differentially rewards Disciplines for specific forms of evidence in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ effective teaching (USE good teaching % agreement; USE feedback assisted % agreement), ○ improvement (in the above USE % agreements) and ○ discipline based improvement strategies (% staff engaged in professional development; disciplinary customised indicator). <p>As such, the Dividend will help to ensure consistent quality of lectures and tutorials by providing clearly articulated responsibilities and rewards; establishing minimum levels and appropriate evidence of good teaching; and by identifying effective L&T exemplars that can be shared to enhance L&T across the Discipline and used in data for the Teaching Dividend.</p> <p>7.12. The collaborative ‘peer review of teaching’ pilot being undertaken in the Finance Discipline in Semester 2, 2009 aims to encourage the sharing and identification of teaching practices associated with effective student learning (see 6.4 for further information).</p>
<p>Faculty’s evaluation of the success of action taken</p>	<p>Specific measures of success for the above numbered points (will) include the following.</p> <p>7.1. Positive evaluation and feedback on methods of instruction and assessment used in group work, including embedded team-based learning exercises (in 8 units of study), through subsequent USE, SCEQ and CEQ data (not yet available).</p> <p>7.4. Positive results from the trials of SPARK^{PLUS} with formal adoption of the online self- and peer-assessment tool for Semester 1, 2010.</p> <p>7.5. Continual increase in the number of new tutors successfully completing the TDP and achievement of a standard level of tutor qualification and experience across the Faculty through development of agreed selection criteria for tutor appointments (see 7.10).</p> <p>7.11. The Teaching Dividend policy was approved by the Faculty L&T Committee and Faculty Executive in mid July 2009 (see also 2.6, 2.8 and 5.3), for implementation from September. The DVC (Education) has agreed to be part of selection panel evaluating Discipline submissions in November 2009.</p>

FACULTY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS

REPORT ON ACADEMIC BOARD PHASE III RECOMMENDATIONS: 2009

<p>Rec. # 8</p>	<p><i>The Faculty develop a clear strategy, working with the ITL, to address the factors impacting on its low CEQ scores.</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Section 7.1(c)a</p>
<p>Action taken by the Faculty</p>	<p>The Faculty is aiming to achieve a one percent per annum improvement on the Student Experience CEQ scores as indicated by the University KPI template. In particular, the Faculty has taken steps to increase engagement with and responsiveness to student feedback at the program level.</p> <p>8.1. Appointment of Program Directors (see Rec. 2) who operate across Disciplines to coordinate the interface with students and engage in program/course reviews and continuous improvement. The provision of analysed student data to Program Directors, along with support from OLT for further investigation of the data (eg. through focus groups), will foster a sense of ‘ownership’ and responsibility for improving the results achieved.</p> <p>8.2. The Faculty has negotiated a number of changes with ITL, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ agreement by ITL to provide sample and provide SCEQ results by program. ○ USE item 12, ‘free response’, altered to align with SCEQ and CEQ items ‘best aspects’ and ‘needs improvement’, thus allowing improved data analysis using CEQuery. ○ approval to provide USE data analysis by program to Program Directors. <p>8.3. Clearly articulated responsibilities and rewards – such as the annual Teaching Dividend – for engaging with and reporting on actions taken in relation to student feedback.</p> <p>8.4. Provision of professional development support for reflective teaching practice, including an annual Faculty forum to disseminate effective practice; a network of Program Directors to enable the sharing of concerns, strategies and resources; and resources that support staff in gathering, triangulating and interpreting varying sources of feedback on their teaching and their students’ learning..</p> <p>8.5. Provision of analysed 2005–2007 CEQ and SCEQ qualitative data and results to A/Deans UG and PG and Program Directors for use in program reviews.</p> <p>8.6. UoS Outline template amended so that specific attention is drawn to feedback from past students, actions applied and proposed feedback methods.</p>
<p>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</p>	<p>The Faculty recognises the need for greater emphasis on the quality of the learning and teaching experience at a <i>program level</i>. Specifically, there is now a need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ focus on program integration and coherence; ○ ensure that program learning goals are aligned with Faculty strategic goals; and ○ ensure students have the opportunity to develop and demonstrate overall attainment of program goals, including generic attributes. <p>These steps will in turn enhance the student experience of their overall program. The following actions are continuing or planned, but not yet implemented/completed.</p> <p>8.7. The Faculty has successfully negotiated with ITL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ a change strategy for sampling the SCEQ such that sampling is program focused. The SCEQ is a lead indicator for the CEQ. This will be applied in October 2009 for the first time on a limited number of PG and UG programs. ○ for provision of quantitative analysis of the student experience (USE, SCEQ, CEQ) in formats that highlight strengths and areas for development at the unit, major and program level and to triangulate with other sources of data to identify areas for continuous improvement. <p>8.8. Development and implementation of an early intervention/communication strategy that will engage recent graduates in quality assurance feedback as a lead in to the CEQ survey.</p> <p>8.9. In collaboration with ITL, the Faculty continues to promote improved collection methods for program/CEQ data at the University level (eg. as a component of graduation).</p> <p>8.10. Further assistance will be provided by the OLT to Program Directors to utilise USE, SCEQ and CEQ data as part of the program review and improvement process, specifically in the review of the Faculty’s two flagship programs (BCom, MCom) and specialist programs in which quality issues have been identified.</p>

FACULTY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS

REPORT ON ACADEMIC BOARD PHASE III RECOMMENDATIONS: 2009

<p>Rec. # 8</p>	<p><i>The Faculty develop a clear strategy, working with the ITL, to address the factors impacting on its low CEQ scores.</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Section 7.1(c)a</p>
	<p>8.11. Planned reviews of Faculty admission standards and processes will contribute to better alignment between program learning goals and outcomes; student quality and diversity; and the expectations and learning experience of students. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o implementation of more broadly-based selection criteria, grounded in the principle of competitive entry, as the preferred mode of admission to postgraduate coursework programs. o a review of minimum entry standards, particularly IELTS minima and GPA equivalences for international bachelors qualifications. o committee-based reviews of several key PG programs in Sem 2, 2009 (MIB and MPAcc) will reconsider admission standards and others issues such as student diversity, program learning goals and outcomes, program length, professional accreditation compliance. <p>8.12. Planned changes to Faculty degree program/planning advice (eg. the BCom and BEc majors fair at the end of each October – see Rec 4) and expansion of program-specific orientation will contribute to better alignment between program learning goals and outcomes and the expectations and learning experience of students.</p> <p>8.13. The review of the Master of Commerce currently taking place (changes to be implemented by 2011), is a specific example of placing greater emphasis on the quality of the learning and teaching experience at a <i>program level</i>. The new program will focus on the learning needs of students seeking to pursue a ‘new direction’ in university study. It will be structured in a ‘T’ configuration ensuring, that all students graduate with a combination of breadth and depth knowledge in the commerce/business domain.</p>
<p>Faculty’s evaluation of the success of action taken</p>	<p>While the Faculty’s performance in relation to good teaching used in public rankings (ie. CEQ) declined in 2008 and is still well below that of all but one university in the Go8, USE feedback for good teaching within units of study has consistently increased (from 59% agreement in 2003 to 70% agreement in Semester 1 2009).</p> <p>Further specific measures of success for the above numbered points (will) include the following.</p> <p>8.2. Negotiated changes to result in improved analysis, alignment (between items), dissemination and utilisation (eg. by Program Directors) of feedback data.</p> <p>8.7. Successful and timely results from trials of program-focused sampling of the SCEQ, to be applied in October 2009 for the first time on a limited number of PG and UG programs.</p> <p>8.8. Early intervention/communication with graduates trialled and proven to be a reliable indicator of results from the subsequent CEQ survey.</p> <p>8.11. Adoption of more rigorous selection criteria for admission to key PG programs by 2011; revised IELTS and international GPA equivalences by 2011.</p> <p>8.13. Academic Board approval of the restructured MCom and BCom by late 2009, with implementation of the new programs in 2011.</p>

FACULTY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS

REPORT ON ACADEMIC BOARD PHASE III RECOMMENDATIONS: 2009

<p>Rec. # 9</p>	<p><i>The Faculty:</i> 1) <i>consider how greater consistency can be achieved in the experiences of doctoral students across the Faculty;</i> 2) <i>provide more opportunity for research students to develop professional skills relevant to future careers as academics.</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Section 7.2(b)</p>
<p>Action taken by the Faculty</p>	<p>The Faculty is moving towards a relatively small but outstanding doctoral program that is consistent with international best-practice, is dedicated to excellence in research training, and provides a high-quality learning experience for all HDR students. A number of steps have been taken to date with the aim of ensuring greater consistency of both experience and of opportunity.</p> <p>9.1. The appointment of a dedicated Director of Doctoral Studies working across the whole Faculty, and a HDR student coordination and administration team working with the Director.</p> <p>9.2. The positioning of HDR activities within the Faculty Research Unit in order to facilitate the development of high-level research skills and ensure that research students have access to essential information about research funding opportunities.</p> <p>9.3. The introduction of compulsory coursework units to improve research training and provide the appropriate balance of structured learning, breadth of knowledge, and standardisation across the Disciplines such that the best possible academic experience is facilitated during students' candidatures. All commencing PhD candidates must now complete six units of coursework which includes the core unit, Research Design. The other five units are decided on the basis of the student's previous academic record and intended area of research. All students must complete at least one unit of study in qualitative and one in quantitative methods.</p> <p>9.4. Processes have been implemented to improve the quality of incoming candidates and to ensure oversight and adherence with academic entry requirements to the HDR program.</p> <p>9.5. Introduction and monitoring of the standardised thesis proposal defense process, which will provide for more consistency in requirements across Disciplines and improved completion rates. From 2009, students will have 2.5 years after completing their proposal defence to complete their thesis (currently, 63% of completions are in 4 years; 34% within 3.5).</p> <p>9.6. Enhanced processes have been put in place for the completion of annual performance reviews (APRs). Candidates receiving marginal or unsatisfactory progress are more closely monitored and subject to another review six months later.</p> <p>9.7. Additional processes have been put in place at the Faculty level to enhance the quality of supervision; ensure supervisors have acknowledged expertise in the thesis topic area; monitor supervisor loads; and to limit primary supervisions to a maximum of five students.</p> <p>9.8. Increased candidate support through the introduction of a fieldwork funding scheme.</p>
<p>Further action planned but not yet implemented</p>	<p>9.9. Consider further options for managing the size of the program and further improving the quality of incoming candidates (including possible targeting of top performing Honours students to encourage progression into the PhD program).</p> <p>9.10. Investigate the viability of a Masters by Research (prepare a plan for introduction if required), following guidelines to be announced by the Research and Research Training Committee.</p> <p>9.11. A proposal has been submitted to the Research and Research Training Committee to increase the Faculty IELTS section minimum from 6.0 to 6.5 within the existing overall IELTS of 7.</p> <p>9.12. The introduction of additional monitoring of students who receive marginal or unsatisfactory APR progress, including the preparation of a clear work plan with six-monthly goals.</p>
<p>Faculty's evaluation of the success of the action taken</p>	<p>Specific measures of success for the above numbered points (will) include the following.</p> <p>9.1. The Director has worked closely with colleagues to enhance admissions, supervision and review processes to ensure a more consistent practice across different Disciplines.</p> <p>9.3. The success of compulsory coursework units is being monitored in 2009, via student and instructor feedback. Findings will be analysed in Sem 1, 2010.</p> <p>9.5. Also 9.6. Improved completion rates: target achieved of 80% of completions within 4 years by end 2012 (the first cohort finishing under the new structure).</p>