

## TRIGGERS

- Discussed top down and bottom up drivers, also responsiveness to market place (increasingly the driver)
- USYD/ Melbourne approaches compared, as was incrementalist vs. paradigm- shifting approach
- Some faculties won't have Dean or individual staff to drive change. Some don't have accreditation bodies to drive change. There are impediments to reform
- Institute for Teaching and Learning as central body with Faculty Teaching and Learning – worthwhile strategy – universal and discipline specific
- Academic Board taking life-cycle approach – setting boundaries to maintain/ enhance academic standards and removing existing financial disincentives
- Processes used for reform – Faculty Economics and Business – focus groups (students, industry, staff) driven also by Board of Advice
- Discussed cross disciplinary teaching and learning and fact that Melbourne's 25% breadth approach was based on pedagogy not market driven. Watch this space
- New evaluation tools are necessary when introducing new approaches
- Melbourne process was about consensus building – only one vote at Academic Board. Distinctively new way to converse – from faculties, to university wide