



A NEW NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR LEARNING AND TEACHING

A report to the Department of Education and Training

Emeritus Professor Ross Milbourne AO

17 August 2015

Ms Jessie Borthwick
Acting Deputy Secretary
Department of Education and Training

Dear Ms Borthwick

I have pleasure in submitting my report on the new National Institute for Learning and Teaching. The report assesses the strengths and weaknesses of the Office for Learning and Teaching, finding overwhelmingly positive outcomes. Using the experience of the OLT and predecessor bodies, I have recommended a mission, a set of objectives, and a set of principles for the Institute, to maximise opportunities to address the future learning needs of our higher education students. Given the diversity of the Australian student body and our institutions I have also recommended a governance structure to meet the needs of all of the stakeholders.

I was very impressed with the engagement of the sector during the submissions and consultations, showing the passion that our institutions have for learning and teaching. It was also very clear that the sector valued enormously the on-going investment that the Australian Government has made in learning and teaching, most recently through OLT and dating back to the Carrick Institute and beyond.

I would like to thank members of your department for the support that they have given throughout this process, in particular James Hart, Adam Chapman, Di Weddell and Francine Bailey. Their warmth more than offset the chilly Canberra winter. I would also like to thank Mary-Anne Sakkara for her assistance with the report.

Yours Sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ross Milbourne". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Emeritus Professor Ross Milbourne AO

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Australian Government has announced the establishment of a new National Institute for Learning and Teaching to begin on 1 July 2016, replacing the existing Office of Learning and Teaching (OLT). This report follows extensive consultation with the higher education sector on the strengths and weaknesses of the current programme, the opportunities for the Institute to foster quality learning and teaching outcomes, the objectives of the new Institute, and governance and other arrangements to ensure the success of the Institute.

The response from the sector has been very positive, reflecting a deeply held conviction of the importance of learning and teaching within the higher education sector. There was also deeply held appreciation for the Government investment in learning and teaching and the importance of this investment in improving learning outcomes.

The Australian higher education sector has a much more diverse student population than most comparable countries. Our student population contains a high proportion of mature-aged and/or part-time, on-line and distance education students, as well as a rich multi-cultural student mix. These students engage with the learning process in different ways, and because there are very different mixes of students between institutions, there are a diversity of institutional approaches to learning and teaching. The sector has been very positive about how the Office for Learning and Teaching has approached this diversity, and have strongly endorsed this as a principle of the Institute.

The sector was strongly supportive of the OLT in facilitating systemic change in learning and teaching, assisting a changed culture within institutions, building capacity of staff, and establishing cross-disciplinary and cross-institutional linkages. Identified gaps included under-capitalised dissemination of funded projects, long time-lines on announcement of funding decisions, and a relative lack of long term evaluations of the effectiveness of programmes. Nevertheless, the overall assessment was extremely positive, with a belief that there had been outstanding outcomes from this Government investment in learning and teaching.

There was general agreement that the Institute needs to be pro-active, future-focused, and lead strategic discussions on learning and teaching in Australia and internationally. There was also agreement that the Institute needs to focus on student-centred learning in a diverse and challenging environment.

An important role for the Institute is to advocate to, and engage with, all stakeholders, and the extent that this is achieved is recommended as a measure of its success. Other recommended measures of its success include being able to demonstrate at least two areas in which the Institute has had sector-wide impact, and the extent of improvement in student learning outcomes.

Given the diversity of needs in the sector, the Report recommends governance arrangements that provide a strategic and sector-wide focus, so that the Institute does not become insular and pursue only the agenda of the host institution.

A number of matters raised in the consultations are operating issues for the Institute. As it is not the role of this report to micro-manage operational issues, the main points raised have been noted for the Director and the advisory bodies as feedback from the sector.

Finally, the sector has suggested a set of criteria to be considered in the process for the appointment of the Director and the host institution. These have been included.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

That the new National Institute for Learning and Teaching adopt the following, subject to refinement in consultations after the appointment of the Director of the Institute and the Host institution(s).

1.1 Mission

To support and enhance student learning outcomes in Australian higher education

1.2 Objectives

To provide leadership in learning and teaching in higher education by:

- leading the national and international conversation on student-focused learning and teaching
- brokering strategic partnerships with major stakeholders: the Australian Government, the higher education sector and its students, business and the community, and international institutions
- providing strong advocacy across its stakeholder groups
- enabling, connecting, communicating and disseminating in support of learning and teaching.

1.3 Principles

- be student-focused and champion learning
- promote strategic change in learning and teaching
- assist in raising the recognition of learning and teaching in the higher education sector and beyond
- be collaborative
- recognise diversity in the higher education sector

- focus on evidence-based outcomes
- be transparent, ethical and efficient.

Recommendation 2

That the measures of success of the Institute be:

- 2.1 The extent to which stakeholders are aware of, and fully support, the Institute and its impact.
- 2.2 The Institute being able to demonstrate at least two areas in which it has had major sector-wide impact.
- 2.3 The extent to which there has been improvement in student satisfaction, engagement, retention and employability.

Recommendation 3

- 3.1 There should be an **external stakeholder group** comprised of a small number of members to provide strategic advice and advise on performance. They should collectively possess the following skills:
 - senior leadership within the higher education sector including knowledge of learning and teaching issues
 - knowledge of the diversity of learning and teaching approaches within the higher education sector
 - knowledge of government policy and its implementation in relation to learning and teaching
 - knowledge of the key interrelationships between higher education and industry and higher education and the community
 - knowledge of international developments in learning and teaching and ability to advise on international linkages and interaction.
- 3.2 It is recommended that **the head of the host or lead institution** also be a member of the external stakeholder group.
- 3.3 There should be an **internal expert group** whose role is to provide recommendations on strategic priorities. This group should collectively possess the following skills:
 - expertise in future-focused learning and teaching
 - understanding of and respect for the diversity of the student population and institutions within Australian higher education
 - understanding of priority setting, grants processes, and allocation mechanisms
 - understanding of the student perspective in learning and teaching innovation.

3.4 There should be **strong and efficient peer review** in guiding funding decisions.

Recommendation 4

4.1 That the new Institute note the feedback received from the sector on the issues of:

- dissemination
- timelines
- evaluation of effectiveness
- the use of networks
- resource allocation between programmes
- transition arrangements.

Recommendation 5

5.1 It is recommended that the selection criteria for the **Director** include the following:

- proven track record as a strategic thinker and change agent
- achievements as a strong and effective advocate
- the ability to forge and maintain sector-wide partnerships and effective collaboration
- proven skills in communicating with and influencing relevant stakeholders
- commitment to, and a track record of, improving learning outcomes for students
- knowledge of, and the ability to engage with, learning and teaching diversity in the sector
- proven management track record.

5.2 It is recommended that the selection criteria for the **Host** or lead institution include:

- a strong reputation of the institution in learning and teaching innovation
- commitment to, and reputation of the head of the Host or lead institution in, fostering student learning
- if a consortium bid, the record of the partners working collaboratively
- capacity to host the Institute
- value for money.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Australian Government has announced the establishment of a new National Institute for Learning and Teaching to be located within the higher education Sector. The new Institute, to begin on 1 July 2016, replaces the Office for Learning and Teaching (OLT).

The purpose of this report is to provide a response to the following questions:

- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the grants, fellowships and awards and other programmes delivered by the OLT?
- What can be learned from the past experience of predecessor bodies and equivalent international organisations to assist the development of a new programme, within and across fields of study, for leading the promotion of learning and teaching in the sector?
- What are the opportunities for fostering engagement, innovation, enhanced quality and leading excellence in learning and teaching through a new Institute?
- Any other matters of interest, such as governance arrangements, raised in consultations.

This report follows extensive national consultation with the sector. This process began with a call for written submissions in relation to the formation of the new Institute. Forty-three submissions were received from higher education institutions, their representative bodies, as well as individuals. These were followed by face-to-face discussion sessions in Canberra, Sydney, Brisbane, Melbourne, Adelaide and Perth as well as nationally accessible webinars. More than 150 people, representing almost every Australian university and a number of non-university higher education providers, attended these sessions. Participants included Vice-Chancellors, Deputy Vice-Chancellors and current and former Fellows. In addition, a number of one-on-one interviews were held, as well as discussions with the Deputy Vice-Chancellors (Academic), and with international agencies responsible for learning and teaching. Following discussions, a number of further comments were submitted including from the OLT Expert Panel. A list of those who provided submissions is at Attachment A and a list of consultation sessions is at Attachment B.

The response from the sector was overwhelmingly positive, showing a deeply held conviction of the importance of learning and teaching within the Australian higher education sector. Moreover, there is also a deeply held conviction of the immense significance of government investment in teaching and learning initiatives and their impact.

2. LEARNING AND TEACHING IN AUSTRALIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

The learning and teaching function of our higher education institutions produces highly skilled graduates essential for social and economic development. These highly educated students are essential for a civil society; the education and social development of these students contributes to better health and wellbeing outcomes, and among other things, greater tolerance and the promotion of justice and equality. It also contributes substantially to a stronger economy, which raises living standards for all. In work being prepared by Deloitte Access Economics for Universities Australia, it is estimated that the learning and teaching function of Australian Universities provides \$140 billion per annum worth of direct benefits to Gross Domestic Product (GDP), which is approximately 8.5 per cent of GDP, compared to \$10 billion per annum direct benefits provided by research in higher education.

Investments in higher education, and particularly recently in learning and teaching, have given Australian higher education a strong international reputation. This is evident in the strong demand for Australian education by international students, which also enriches our society and provides substantial economic and political benefits. Moreover, these investments have made Australia a leader in many areas of learning and teaching, particularly in on-line and distance education.

At the centre of learning is the student, and the student experience and student engagement are essential for maximising outcomes from the investments made in higher education. More engaged students learn faster and more deeply, develop greater analytic and disciplinary skills, and engage with other students, building teamwork and communication skills, which are vital for employability. Student engagement also leads to higher completion rates. In the forthcoming report referred to above, Deloitte estimates that that a 1.9 per cent increase in university completion rates leads to a 1 per cent increase in GDP per person. Thus, future investments in this area must centre on student experience and engagement in order to leverage both government and students' investment effectively.

Australian higher education is unique among the advanced economies of the world in terms of the diversity of its students and higher education institutions. Unlike most countries, approximately 40 per cent of Australian higher education students are aged 25 or over; there is a significant proportion who are part-time; a significant proportion who are regional and remote and study via on-line and distance mode; a growing proportion who study in blended-learning mode, mixing the best of the information age, use of technology and face-to-face engagement; a growing proportion of students from low socio-economic backgrounds; a growing proportion from our Indigenous communities; and a high multi-cultural mix of both domestic and international students, many for whom English is not their first language.

These different categories of students need to engage with the learning process in different ways, and because different institutions have radically different mixes of students, there are very different philosophies and approaches to learning and teaching throughout the sector. Thus the new Institute must embrace this diversity and work for the whole sector, and the mission and objectives of the Institute, and its governance and organisational arrangements, must reflect this.

3. STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE CURRENT SYSTEM

In the sector-wide consultations, it was very clear how strongly and unanimously the sector viewed the enormous benefits that had come from the Australian Government's investments in learning and teaching over the last decade. This investment includes funding provided through the Carrick Institute, the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) and most recently, OLT, however Australian Government support for teaching and learning stretches back to at least 1992. The sector has also responded positively to additional investments in quality including the development of the Quality Indicators for Teaching and Learning (QILT) to provide clear information for students and families about the quality of the study areas and institution they are considering.

Strengths

The benefits and great strengths of the Carrick/ALTC/OLT continuum of investments have been identified by the sector to include:

1. the established momentum and systemic change in learning and teaching in the higher education sector
2. a changed culture in relation to learning and teaching within institutions:
 - giving prestige, visibility and credibility to those who value learning and teaching
 - leading to innovations throughout their institutions and beyond
 - the recognition of professional staff and the important role that they play in the learning process
 - the alignment of institutional awards and processes with those (particularly) of the OLT
3. the capacity-building of staff in general and specifically those who now lead debate about learning and teaching in the sector, with the role of the OLT/ALTC Fellows being specifically mentioned in this regard
4. the fairness and transparency with which the OLT and its predecessors have operated, supporting a diversity of approaches to learning and teaching
5. the cross-disciplinary and cross-institutional linkages that have been established, as well as the linkages with international and professional bodies

6. the extensive use of peer-review, and the obtaining of category 1 funding status which puts learning and teaching on an equal footing with research.

Gaps and weaknesses

During the consultations a number of gaps or weaknesses were identified including:

1. a belief that we have not capitalised by disseminating the results of funded research, thus hindering the embedding of outcomes and impact, and that this research needs to be curated
2. the long time-lines from application to outcome of funding decisions, and a recommendation that this be addressed
3. the lack of a systematic process of long term evaluations of impact from the programmes. There has been some commentary and drawing together of some of the work in the reports of Kwong Lee Dow¹ and Alison Johns² and others, but as yet no over-arching measure of impact
4. a feeling that the grants and fellowships have not been perfectly aligned
5. a feeling among some that individualistic behaviour has resulted in some repetition and inefficiency, and concern about current low success rates and what will happen in the future with a reduced funding envelope.

The OLT has recently called for academic secondments to address points 1 and 3 above, that is, to:

- develop an effective and accessible digital repository of OLT learning and teaching resources
- develop evaluations of key themes from OLT-funded projects.

Notwithstanding these gaps, the overwhelming view of the sector is one of near-unanimous praise for the OLT and what it has been able to achieve.

Evaluating impact from the Government's investment

Attempting to quantify the value of investment and its impact upon enhanced student learning from these programmes is difficult for a number of reasons. First, the lag between research, dissemination, implementation and then impact is long and variable - there are

¹ Lee Dow, K, *An evaluation of the Australian Learning and Teaching Council 2005-2008, a report for the Department of Employment, Education and Workplace Relations*, 2008.

² Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, *Higher Education Learning and Teaching Review*, November 2011.

many examples of where research undertaken 10 years ago is beginning to have its main impact on student learning now. Second, many in the sector see and report on impact in very narrow terms, seeing impact only in terms of what it has done for their publications or promotion. Third, many in the sector still focus the learning and teaching enterprise on the teacher, and therefore make an assumption that these benefits will automatically flow through to student engagement.

Nevertheless, in reviewing a large number of funded projects, it is possible to conclude that there has been some absolutely outstanding projects, also highlighted by the sector itself, which have had direct impact. Of particular note has been projects in relation to the first year experience, graduate employability, and work-integrated learning. The success of these projects is due to a common theme: they were embraced by the sector from start to finish, they were cross-sectoral with multiple partners, and they had a well-developed dissemination strategy with websites, DVDs and presentations.

In considering all of the above issues in terms of net benefit of the government investment in learning and teaching, the ultimate statistics that are important are student satisfaction, retention and employability.

In the last decade, the higher education sector has faced three real challenges in the learning and teaching domain. First is rising student expectations, especially given the increased information and choice now available to students. Second, the introduction of the demand-driven student system following the Review of Australian Higher Education (the Bradley Review) has substantially increased participation, bringing into the system students who at the margin are less prepared for higher education, and thus putting pressure on the student experience for all students. Third, there has been funding pressure for learning and teaching over the last decade.

Given these developments, it might be expected that student satisfaction and outcomes would have substantially declined. However the results from the Australasian Survey of Student Engagement have shown the opposite- a gradual sustained improvement in student outcomes. In my view, the government investment in learning and teaching initiatives have been substantially responsible for this improvement in student learning in the face of such challenges.

4. OBJECTIVES OF THE NEW INSTITUTE

Australia currently has, and needs to continue to enhance, a world-class system of higher education. The new National Institute of Learning and Teaching represents a great opportunity to foster learning and teaching across the whole higher education sector to meet future needs. This is particularly important because the future Australian economy, and the future opportunities and challenges will be different to those of the past. Technology challenges in relation to the integrity of assessment, and the need for greater

use of data and standardised information systems are examples of some of these opportunities that are recommended for the new Institute.

There has been very strong agreement in the sector throughout the consultation process that:

- the new Institute must be pro-active, future-focussed and innovative in the learning and teaching space
- it should not replicate or do things that higher education institutions can or should be doing themselves
- given the funding constraints it cannot just be a re-sized version of the OLT and needs to be strategic in its investments
- it should foster collaborative initiatives between institutions, foster networks and engagement both domestically and internationally, have very strong communication and dissemination roles, and recognise the diversity among the student body and institutions, and
- the Institute needs to be high impact and represent value for money.

There is also fundamental agreement that the Institute needs to provide leadership in learning and teaching, to be a lighthouse for 21st century student learning, and to lead the sector in embracing technology and other opportunities and challenges which are changing the face of learning and student engagement. There is less agreement on what this leadership entails.

One of the major disagreements in the sector is the extent to which the Institute's role should include the development of teaching capability, professional recognition and accreditation of teaching staff in our institutions, similar to what is done by the Higher Education Academy in the United Kingdom. This is not currently a remit of the OLT. Those in favour of this proposition argue that "lifting the bottom" of the teaching function is the best way to improve learning and teaching outcomes. Those opposed to having this as a specific objective of the Institute argue that the learning process focused on just the teacher is too narrow, that it does not sufficiently recognise the diversity of students in the sector, and that there is insufficient funding for this to be a major focus.

I share the majority opinion of the sector on this; that accreditation should not be a specific objective of the Institute. The Australian higher education sector is very different from that of the United Kingdom and other countries in terms of its diversity; instead I suggest that the matter be handled in the same manner as it is handled in New Zealand; that is, it would be eligible for project funding support if prioritised by the Director on advice from an expert peer review process.

In recommending a mission, objectives and (especially) principles, enlightenment is provided by the original intention of the Carrick Institute.

Recommendation 1

That the new National Institute for Learning and Teaching adopt the following, subject to refinement in consultations after the appointment of the Director of the Institute and the Host institution(s).

1.1 Mission

To support and enhance student learning outcomes in Australian Higher Education

1.2 Objectives

To provide leadership in learning and teaching in Higher Education by:

- leading the national and international conversation on student-focused learning and teaching
- brokering strategic partnerships with major stakeholders: the government, the higher education sector and its students, business and the community, and international institutions
- providing strong advocacy across its stakeholder groups
- enabling, connecting, communicating and disseminating in support of learning and teaching.

1.3 Principles

- be student-focused and champion learning
- promote strategic change in learning and teaching
- assist in raising the recognition of learning and teaching in the higher education sector and beyond
- be collaborative
- recognise diversity in the higher education sector
- focus on evidence-based outcomes
- be transparent, ethical and efficient.

5. MEASURES OF SUCCESS OF THE INSTITUTE

The Institute will have a short time frame in which to show its impact upon student learning outcomes and upon the sector. Given this time frame, rather than key performance indicators, it is more appropriate to consider a small number of success measures in order to assess the value of the Australian Government investment in this learning and teaching initiative. Given the recommended objectives, which concentrate on stakeholder engagement, providing impact across the sector, and a focus on student learning, the following three success measures seem appropriate.

Recommendation 2

That the measures of success of the Institute be:

- 2.1 The extent to which stakeholders are aware of, and fully support, the Institute and its impact.
- 2.2 The Institute being able to demonstrate at least two areas in which it has had major sector-wide impact.
- 2.3 The extent to which there has been improvement in student satisfaction, engagement, retention and employability.

6. GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

Given the diversity of the sector, the Institute must be strategic, outward-looking, future-focused, and engage with all stakeholder groups. In particular, it cannot be insular and pursue the agenda of the host institution. The governance and internal structures must reflect this.

For this reason it is recommended that there be an external stakeholder group to provide strategic advice and to advise on performance of the Institute. Second, it is recommended that there be an internal expert advisory group. Both of these groups should be chosen on the basis of skills. While reflective of diversity, the expert advisory group should not be chosen on the basis of "constituencies". This is because sub-optimal outcomes are produced when members represent their constituencies and vote according to the narrow interest of the constituency, rather than the interest of the whole enterprise.

In addition it is recommended that strong peer review continue to be the hallmark of the Institute's activities.

Recommendation 3

- 3.1 There should be an **external stakeholder group** comprised of a small number of members to provide strategic advice and advise on performance. They should collectively possess the following skills:
- senior leadership within the Higher Education sector including knowledge of learning and teaching issues
 - knowledge of the diversity of learning and teaching approaches within the Higher Education sector
 - knowledge of government policy and its implementation in relation to learning and teaching
 - knowledge of the key interrelationships between Higher Education and industry and higher education and the community
 - knowledge of international developments in learning and teaching and ability to advise on international linkages and interaction.
- 3.2 It is recommended that **the head of the host or lead institution** also be a member of the external stakeholder group.
- 3.3 There should be an **internal expert group** whose role is to provide recommendations on strategic priorities. This group should collectively possess the following skills:
- expertise in future-focused learning and teaching
 - understanding of and respect for the diversity of the student population and institutions within Australian Higher Education
 - understanding of priority setting, grants processes, and allocation mechanisms
 - understanding of the student perspective in learning and teaching innovation.
- 3.4 There should be **strong and efficient peer review** in guiding funding decisions.

The above recommendations are designed to give independence and transparency to decision making, and to work in the best interests of the whole sector. During the consultations many of the submissions and consultations called for a multi-institutional consortia in order to avoid the agenda being overly influenced by an approach which might not meet the needs of some of the sector. Given the independence and transparency of the recommended arrangements, a consortia is not necessary for this purpose.

Thus, this report is agnostic about the merits of a single institution versus multiple institution tender for the Institute.

7. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE INSTITUTE

It is not the intention that this report micro-manage the detailed operations of the new Institute. Thus, a number of matters raised in the consultations are more appropriate for the Institute itself to consider, both during the transition period to its establishment and once it is operational.

The first three of these are current perceived gaps identified in section 3:

- the need for previous work to be curated and disseminated to the sector
- the need to shorten timelines of the grants process and align processes with the academic year
- the need to evaluate the effectiveness of the programmes.

The first and third of these gaps are being addressed by the OLT secondment referred to earlier.

In relation to the second of these points (timelines), there is a strong view that there are possibilities for greater use of technology to speed up processes; a minority suggested that the Institute might consider sub-contracting the grants process to the Australian Research Council for efficiency, although this was not supported by the overwhelming majority of those in the consultations. In addition, it was also suggested that institutions might share the lead role in peer review for different programmes run by the Institute.

A fourth matter strongly endorsed was the need for the Institute to make use of networks – in particular, the existing Promoting Excellence Networks (PENS) - and to use Institutional Contact Officers (ICOs) as an efficient way of communication and dissemination. As a result of the issues raised, the sector is hoping that the staff of the Institute contains a specialist in information technology and communication officer(s) to liaise with PENS and ICOs.

An issue raised often during the consultations was options to increase the resources of the Institute. One suggestion was a subscription model, in which each institution must put up cash in order to be a “member” of the Institute. This was not supported by the majority; it is not in the spirit of the collaborative nature of the Institute; and presents contractual difficulties with the host or lead institution. For these reasons, this particular suggestion is not supported.

In relation to resource enhancement, a further suggestion was made that industry and the professional bodies might co-contribute to the work of the Institute. A specific suggestion favoured a programme similar to the Linkage Grants of the Australian Research Council, in which industry and the professional bodies co-contribute to research projects.

An issue raised by the review of project outcomes is that the definition of impact is not well understood in the sector. Some of those in the consultation process regarded the government investment in learning and teaching as primarily a grants process designed to

support their academic careers, and viewed this as the major outcome to be achieved. This shows up in those grants which had limited impact – those projects shared limited scope, weak links to student experience and a weak dissemination plan.

The sector was quite divided about the appropriate relative funding between fellowships, awards, grants and citations. There was general agreement that grants and fellowships need to be aligned. However, those who felt that the sector had benefited enormously from the fellowship programmes were balanced by those who felt that the programme was too expensive. Those who felt that small seed grants should be eliminated and more emphasis put on larger strategically-directed funding were balanced by those who agreed that smaller seed funding helped build careers of young academics and served the sector well. Also, while there was unanimous agreement on the value of citations, there was an even split of opinion about whether these should be accompanied by cash - with those arguing for cash believing that it gave incentives to apply and those arguing against believing that the citation was recognition in itself and the funding could be given to other activities.

The Report makes no recommendations on these issues other than for the Institute to note this feedback and suggestions arising from the consultation process. The Institute must be strategic and address major issues which have sector-wide support and must reflect this in its decisions about resource allocation and programme funding.

Given that the Institute must hit the ground running on 1 July 2016, transition arrangements need to be managed. The Institute needs to take over the curation of existing completed projects, take over the evaluations processes begun by OLT, and take guardianship of those grants in the pipeline. Many institutions have aligned their citations and award processes with those of OLT, and the sector has requested that should the current programmes all continue, due consideration and consultation take place before any change to process is made.

Recommendation 4

That the new Institute note the feedback received from the sector on the issues of:

- dissemination
- timelines
- evaluation of effectiveness
- the use of networks
- resource allocation between programmes
- transition arrangements.

8. SELECTION OF THE DIRECTOR AND HOST

There was general agreement during the consultations that the Director of the Institute is the most important appointment. This person needs to be a strategic thinker, a strong and effective advocate, excellent at networking and communication, have a commitment to improving learning outcomes for students, and a proven management track record.

In terms of the host institution (or lead institution in a consortium bid), the feedback from the consultations was that the reputation of the institution in learning and teaching innovation was important. Obviously the capacity of the institution to host the Institute in terms of highly visible space, staffing, IT and administrative support is also critical. A third criterion mentioned was value for money. Finally, a number of people suggested that the reputation and commitment of the host Vice-Chancellor or head of institution to learning and teaching innovation needs to be a significant factor in the selection process. There were two reasons given for this. First, the need for the Institute to have visibility and support within the institution so that it does not lose its way; second, that if administrative blockages emerge which hinder the full value of the Government's investment being realised, the head of the host institution will intervene.

Recommendation 5

5.1 It is recommended that the selection criteria for the **Director** include the following:

- proven track record as a strategic thinker and change agent
- achievements as a strong and effective advocate
- the ability to forge and maintain sector-wide partnerships and effective collaboration
- proven skills in communicating with and influencing relevant stakeholders
- commitment to, and a track record of, improving learning outcomes for students
- knowledge of, and the ability to engage with, learning and teaching diversity in the sector
- proven management track record.

5.2 It is recommended that the selection criteria for the **Host** or lead institution include:

- a strong reputation of the institution in learning and teaching innovation
- commitment to, and reputation of the head of the Host or lead institution in, fostering student learning
- if a consortium bid, the record of the partners working collaboratively
- capacity to host the Institute
- value for money.

Written submissions received as part of the consultation process

Organisation/individual

Australasian Council of Deans of Arts, Social Sciences And Humanities (DASSH) (2 submissions)
 Australian Business Deans Council
 Australian Catholic University
 Australian Council of Engineering Deans
 Bond University
 Central Queensland University
 Central Queensland University – Helen Huntley
 Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development
 Council of Private Higher Education
 Deakin University
 Edith Cowan University
 Griffith University
 James Cook University
 La Trobe University
 Macquarie University
 Melbourne Polytechnic
 Monash University
 Murdoch University
 NWS/ACT Promoting Excellence Network
 OLT Chemistry Discipline Network
 OLT South Australian/Northern Territory Promoting Excellence Network (SANTPEN)
 Professor Nigel Bond
 Queensland University of Technology
 Regional Universities Network
 RMIT University
 The Australian National University
 The Council of Australian Postgraduate Associations (CAPA)
 The University of Newcastle
 The University of Notre Dame
 The University of Queensland
 The University of the Sunshine Coast
 Universities Australia
 University of South Australia
 University of Tasmania
 University of Technology, Sydney
 University of Wollongong
 Victoria University

An additional 5 submissions were submitted anonymously

Attachment B

Face-to-face consultation sessions held

Canberra – face to face and webinar. Approximately 20 attendees

Brisbane. Approximately 35 attendees

Sydney. Approximately 20 attendees

Melbourne. Approximately 25 attendees.

Adelaide. Approximately 15 attendees.

Perth. Approximately 20 attendees

Regional Universities Network webinar. Eight attendees.

Deputy Vice Chancellors (Academic) teleconference. Nine attendees.