Carrick Leadership Program
Closing the Gap in Curriculum Development Leadership

Abstract
The proposed project is to design systems, including staff development programs, to support and enhance leadership skills for conveners of majors, program directors and others of their ilk who have carriage of the implementation of many of a university’s fundamental strategic directives in learning and teaching. In particular, these staff are in charge of developing, managing, and evaluating those sequences of study that represent a student’s most vivid identification during their period of study. (“I’m majoring in X.”) Notwithstanding the importance of this staff cohort, they are relatively poorly supported by existing staff development programs in Australian universities. Furthermore, university personnel policies—e.g. those relating to workload and promotion—seldom appropriately acknowledge their significant intellectual contribution and commitment of time and energy.

The crucial outcome for this project is enhanced capacity for academic leadership, and, especially, leadership in curriculum and program development and management, among the strategically crucial but structurally neglected cohort of middle-level academic leaders.

To achieve this outcome, the project will deliver:
1. an integrated staff development program targeting, for members of this cohort, their leadership capacities for curriculum development and management;
2. changes to University staff policies and procedures to ensure appropriate recognition, remuneration, and resourcing of middle-level academic leaders;
3. a set of incentives for members of the targeted cohort to participate in this program;
4. a dissemination plan;
5. two evaluation measures; and
6. scholarly contributions to the literature on academic leadership in higher education.

1. Strategic background
Strategically important structures in undergraduate degree programs
In generalist degrees such as Bachelors of Arts and of Science, and even in highly prescribed degrees such as Engineering, Information Technology, and the like, the major is a more natural focus than either individual units of study or entire degree programs for implementation of an institution’s fundamental strategic objectives in learning and teaching, for example

- the development of learning communities;
- the embedding of graduate attributes;
- internationalisation;
- flexible learning;
- research-based teaching;
- recruitment for honours and post-graduate study;
- the development of alumni relations;
- benchmarking of institutional activities against the performance of national and international partners and competitors;
- curriculum review and renewal;
- preparation for lifelong learning;
- enhancing the first-year experiences;
- commercial, industrial, and community networking;
- reference group scrutiny of curriculum development and learning outcomes, including professional accreditation and certification;
- management of attrition and of student progress;
- delivery of careers advice, mentoring, and pastoral care.
It is at this level, the sequence of study, rather than the individual unit of study (or the degree program as a whole), that it is most appropriate to concentrate institutional resources in pursuing such objectives.

Although the major per se may play a lesser role in some undergraduate professional degrees, or even in more or differently structured generalist degrees, there is usually, in these programs of study, some analogue to the major, e.g., at the University of Queensland, sequences of compulsory core units of study in degrees such as the Bachelors of Commerce, of Applied Science, or of Behavioural Studies. Again, these analogous structures provide a natural point of focus in the strategic pursuit of learning and teaching objectives.

**Academic staff development for curriculum management**

Given the strategic importance of sequences of study such as majors, we might expect that academic staff development programs would cater to the middle-level leaders who are in charge of these sequences. It is our experience, however, confirmed by examining academic staff development websites for Australian Go8 and some overseas universities, that the primary focus of curriculum-relevant staff development is on the design and delivery of individual units of study. This is understandable, of course, as most staff development programs are designed for academic staff who are new to teaching and hence have responsibility only for individual units of study and rarely, if ever, for strategically important sequences of study.

**The strategic disparity**

What this analysis suggests is that there is a strategic gap in teaching-related staff development programs at Australian universities and, in particular though by no means exclusively, at the University of Queensland. The locus of strategic significance is the major but staff development programs are available only in relation to its constituent courses. At Australian universities, there is typically nothing available to promote leadership capacities for staff in charge of sequences of study.

2. **The purpose of the project**

**Rationale**

The purpose of the proposed project is to close the gap between the strategic importance and the structural neglect of academic leaders of the middle rank, and to do so by building leadership capacity among this cohort at the University of Queensland, and then disseminating this expertise and the packages in which it is embodied, to other universities. The project thus implements one of the University of Queensland’s key teaching and learning enhancement strategies, the provision of “professional development opportunities for further learning about effective curriculum design”, and one of the Carrick Institute’s overarching objectives, to “promote and support strategic change in higher education institutions for the enhancement of learning and teaching, including curriculum development and assessment.”

**Proposed Outcomes and Deliverables**

The crucial outcome for this project is enhanced capacity for academic leadership, and, especially, leadership in curriculum and program development and management, among the strategically crucial but structurally neglected cohort of academic “middle managers”.

To achieve this outcome, the project will deliver:

1. an integrated staff development program targeting, for members of this cohort, their leadership capacities for curriculum development and management;
2. changes to University staff policies and procedures to ensure appropriate recognition, remuneration, and resourcing of middle-level academic leaders;
3. a set of incentives for members of the targeted cohort to participate in this program;
4. a dissemination plan;
5. two evaluation measures, as described below, which will enable us to assess and, as need be, improve the program; and
6. scholarly contributions to the literature on academic leadership in higher education.

Point 2 above is, we believe, crucial. If there are inadequate incentives for academics to participate in the leadership development activities which we design and implement, then too few staff will participate and, accordingly, there will be little or at least not enough capacity building.

**Evaluation Strategy**

As point 2 and our explication of it make plain, our aim is not primarily to design and implement a leadership program. Rather, it is to design and implement a leadership program that actually produces (measurable) effects by being embraced by the staff for whom it has been designed. Accordingly, **uptake** is an important evaluation measure for such a project. What percentage of members of the relevant cohort actually take up the opportunity to participate in the leadership program which we design and implement? (Uptake through dissemination to other providers via the Carrick Institute’s Creative Commons mechanism is also an important measure of success.)

While uptake is a necessary condition for the program to produce a measurable effect on leadership capacity, even a high degree of uptake is not tantamount to a demonstration of **efficacy**, however. Accordingly, a second crucial element of our evaluation strategy will be the development of a measure to determine, for those members of the cohort who participate in the development program, the improvement in their leadership capacity that can be attributed to their participation.

Of course, improved leadership capacity in curriculum development is not an end in itself. Improved capacity is valuable because or to the extent that it leads to improved curriculum development and management and, accordingly, improved outcomes for students in the various majors and programs which staff administer. Ideally, then, we might also attempt to measure the efficacy of the program by measuring the improvement in student outcomes that can be attributed to the participation of middle-rank academic leaders in the program. It is not clear, antecedently, whether this will be feasible, though, clearly, it remains a desideratum. Alternatively, we might look at improved performance, in the targeted cohort, in relation to the strategic objectives of the University’s Teaching and Learning Enhancement Plan—roughly speaking the dot-points at page 1 above.

**3. Approach and Methodology**

We propose a whole of University approach to the project that integrates the office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic); the Academic Board, particularly its Appointments and Promotion Committee; Human Resources, particularly in relation to staff policy and procedure; the Teaching and Educational Development Institute (TEDI); the University Teaching and Learning Committee; and, crucially, members of the targeted cohort of middle-rank academic leaders. TEDI’s contribution will be particularly significant given its role—“to provide leadership and support for enhancing the practice and scholarship of all aspects of teaching and learning in higher education, particularly in curriculum development and renewal, educational design, assessment, evaluation” and its operational objectives—to wit:

- supporting staff in their teaching and learning and workplace endeavours by providing current and timely advice, information, resources, and programs;
- conducting research and providing professional, resource and policy development; and
- contributing to, and offering future directions for, the development of the University’s teaching and learning and professional development activities.
Crucially, members of the targeted cohort of middle-rank academic leaders will participate, in Phases 1 and 2 especially, as participant-researchers. They will, in other words, be involved during these phases not simply as informants or experimental subjects, but, rather, as researchers engaged in identifying the approach to be taken to precisely the leadership program that is to be delivered to them and their fellows. We are especially anxious to recruit staff from programs which are further advanced in supporting curriculum development and in recognizing the academic leadership issues that are associated with it. They will play a valuable mentoring role in designing a staff development program for curriculum leadership.

This project will also, crucially, directly address a gap in educational leadership knowledge, which is currently deficient in relation to the higher education sector. It will do so by

1. drawing on existing research and theory of educational leadership;
2. developing evidence-based strategies for identifying and documenting the attributes, knowledge, skills, processes and abilities required of academic educational leaders, specifically in the role of conveners of majors; and
3. designing and implementing a professional development program for upskilling existing coordinators in the areas of educational leadership; and related attributes such as curriculum development.

A key assumption of our proposed approach is that academic leadership, e.g. by conveners of majors, is bound up with the effective performance of certain key tasks. For example, middle-rank leaders might have charge of curriculum development for a sequence of units of study, an accountability that involves personnel management as well as curriculum design issues—e.g. how can we coordinate the development, by individual staff, of the various units of study that have to be brought together effectively to make a coherent sequence of study?

This emphasis on key tasks determines the entire approach to be taken.

Participant-researchers, TEDI staff and others will therefore be engaged, as unavoidable preliminaries to further, more detailed work, in the following Phase 1 projects.

**Phase 1: Organisation (6 months)**

1. The formation of the project team and, especially, the recruitment and initiation into the project of participant-researchers drawn from the target cohort. The allocation of team members to one or more Phase 1 Working Parties organized to consider the following three threshold issues.
   a) Development of position descriptions for targeted leadership roles. Conveners of majors, program directors, and chairs of undergraduate studies committees appear, typically, not to have formal duties statements. Development of such position descriptions is partly a matter of functional analysis (what, according to University policies and larger strategic imperatives, should such staff be deputed to do?) and partly a matter of empirical enquiry (what, typically, do such staff actually do?). In fact, the development of position descriptions is a sine qua non for the project as a whole. Without agreed position descriptions, we do not know the range of duties for which appropriate leadership development programs needs to be designed.
   b) Identification of incentives for participation, by middle-rank academic leaders, in staff development programs that build leadership capacity. This follows from the point, made above, about uptake and its crucial role in judging the success of the project.

---

1 In Phase 3, we will need to amend existing University policy relating to staff duties and to ensure the dissemination of these amendments to academic organisational units with budgetary and personnel responsibilities for staff playing these roles.

2 It is important to note that the issue of providing incentives for participants in this project is not the same as that of providing incentives for potential participants in the staff development program which it is an aim of this project to design and implement. This item refers to the latter of these matters.
ticipating the results of our enquiries, we can expect issues of workload allocation, financial remuneration, and recognition for the purposes of promotion, permanency, study leave, and the like to figure prominently in those enquiries.

c) For Phase 2 work, survey and collect existing literatures and other resources about
- curriculum development in higher education;
- staff development for academic managers; and, in particular,
- staff development to support leadership in curriculum development.

2. Bring the Working Parties together to devise plans for the design project per se. This element of Phase 1 is vital for a smooth transition to Phase 2. The key deliverable of the project is a staff leadership development program, consisting of a number of properly designed and resourced workshops, which will be made available, upon implementation of the plan, to the targeted cohort. To develop such a program is the main work of Phase 2 of the project. To plan for the development of such a program is the final, and a crucial element, of Phase 1 of the project. Planning for the design project will crucially involve the identification of the key accountabilities of middle-rank academic leaders. What tasks do they have to have to able to undertake? What do they need to know and what skills do they need to have to perform these tasks? How can we assist the members of this cohort to enhance their skills and knowledge in these ways? Planning for the design project therefore involves

- Identifying and prioritizing tasks that are, according to newly developed position descriptions, key accountabilities for members of the targeted leadership cohort. These might include curriculum review, course approval, liaison with professional and community organizations, etc.
- Identifying, for each of these key tasks, the skills, attitudes, and knowledge that are necessary for the role occupant to discharge them effectively.
- Constituting a Phase 2 Working Party for each of these position-relevant tasks whose members will be deputed to develop curriculum and resources for a workshop that will deliver the task-relevant skills and knowledge.

We note that universities are knowledge-intensive organisations and that leadership in such organisations is managed through the cultivation of values and attitudes in potential leaders rather than through their being drilled in correct procedures or other rule-bound routines. This is a crucial framing assumption for designing a leadership program.

**Phase 2: Development of the Program (2 years)**

The key to the program development phase is that academic leadership for middle-rank staff has been conceptualised in terms of key accountabilities and the specific tasks that these imply. A vital Phase 2 activity is therefore to

1. Convene Working Parties for one-day “retreats” to
   - review the dimensions of their assigned task, the state of existing knowledge about improving performance for this task, and the state of existing pedagogy for delivering a learning experience that, for this task, enhances leadership capacity for those charged with performing it;
   - develop a plan of action for the achievement of the assigned goals, including an indicative timetable;
   - allocate work to the members of the Working Party.

Other important Phase 2 activities are:

---

3 In Phase 3, implementing a feasible system of incentives will require costings and, again, amendment of existing University staff policies.
2. Recruit an Oversight Panel, with membership from each of the Phase 2 Working Parties and from other relevant “practice audiences” (see §7 below), to set (timetabled) goals for and monitor performance by the various Working Parties.

3. At six months and eighteen months, Oversight Panel review of Working Parties’ progress against agreed goals.

4. At twelve months, convene an assembly of Working Parties’ members, chaired by members of the Oversight Panel. This assembly should
   • evaluate progress to date, with a special emphasis on the feasibility, within budget and scheduling limits, of each Working Parties’ self-developed plan of action;
   • identify synergies, substantive and pedagogical, among the activities of the various Working Parties;
   • reallocate resources if the agreed plans of action are not feasible or if progress against targets is not adequate.

5. Between eighteen and twenty-four months (from commencement of Phase 2), develop learning packages for each feasible leadership development workshop.

**Phase 3: Preparation for Implementation (6 months)**

1. Amend existing University policy relating to staff duties to incorporate agreed duties statements for conveners of majors, program directors, and chairs of undergraduate studies committees. Disseminate these amendments to academic organisational units with budgetary and personnel responsibilities for staff playing these roles, and ensure that relevant internal procedures provide appropriate incentives, recognition, and support.

2. Cost and build into the budgets of appropriate academic organizational units the remuneration, relief, and other monetary elements of support for the targeted staff cohort.

3. Analyse the duties timetables of targeted staff to determine an optimal, task-oriented timetable for the roll-out of staff development workshops. (For example, if conveners of majors have responsibility for curriculum review reporting and that is normally due in March, then a staff development workshop supporting leadership in curriculum review would be scheduled with this due date in mind.)

4. Beta-test the Workshops with real-time run-throughs.

5. Consult affected practice and policy audiences. (See §7 below.)

6. Finalise learning packages.

7. Develop a dissemination plan. (See §8 below.)

8. Develop evaluation measures, as indicated in §2 above.

**4. Human Resources and Infrastructure**

The proposed project is wide-ranging and has whole of University implications. It is vital, to ensure visibility, credibility, and uptake at the project level, that the Project Leader be a senior member of academic staff. Secondment to the project at 20% (one day per week) represents a basic minimum. Since the core deliverable for the project is a staff development program for academic leadership in curriculum development, this implies participation by both (a) experts in curriculum development for tertiary study, and (b) experts, in UQ’s case TEDI-based experts, in the design of staff development packages. Accordingly, a senior TEDI staffer will be designated, at 50%, Project Director and an expert in curriculum development from the School of Education will be seconded at 20%. For the Phase 1 survey of existing practice and relevant literatures, we require, for six months, a full-time level 3 research assistant. For the Phase 3 preparation for implementation, a 50% HEW6 Project Officer.
To support the work of Phase 1 and Phase 2 Working Parties, it is proposed to conduct their meetings in the UQ Focus Group Research Lab, which uses advanced speech recognition technology to produce a full-text transcript of meetings of up to ten people. A data mining tool (developed at UQ) produces a full text summary and a conceptual map, representing the main ideas from the text and how they are related, is automatically generated and available at the end of the meeting.

To support the Phase 3 beta-testing of the workshop programs, we propose using the University’s Collaborative Learning Centre Teaching Rooms, which are equipped with Keepad software to facilitate real-time feedback from participants and thus assist in fine-tuning the timing and presentation of the program materials and exercises.

We anticipate that a minimum of fifteen academic middle managers will need to be recruited to participate in the project during Phases 1 and 2. They will need to be bought out of tutoring and marking to facilitate their participation.

5. **Institutional Support**

The University of Queensland will support from strategic funding items 1 and 3 and 6 in the indicative Budget (see below). These represent, respectively, the participation of the Project Leader and the Curriculum Expert and venue costs for specialised and highly capitalised UQ work spaces. Participating schools and faculties will fund item 7, the teaching buy-outs that will facilitate participation by members of the targeted cohort in the development project. Upon approval of the staff development packages (Phase 3, 5th task), the University will support, from recurrent TEDI funding, the provision of staff development workshops for academic middle managers. Schools and Faculties will, consequential to the costings identified in the Phase 3, 2nd task, provide appropriate levels of workload support and/or financial remuneration for these staff.

6. **Project Management**

Operational project management will be undertaken by the Project Leader and the Project Director with the strategic guidance of the University Teaching and Learning Committee, from which this proposal emanates, and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic). Crucial Phase 1 projects establish a clear vision of the project through wide-ranging consultation with key stakeholders. The Phase 2 Workshops develop operational goals and indicative timetables. Monthly progress reporting to the Teaching and Learning Committee will ensure that timetables are met and that focus is maintained on the key deliverables. Financial and staff management will be vested in the Project Leader. Evaluation strategies are a key Phase 3 deliverable.

7. **Policy and Practice Audiences**

The primary practice audience for this project consists of the cohort of middle-rank academic leaders which we have identified—conveners of majors, program directors, and chairs of school-level undergraduate studies committees. An important secondary practice audience for the project are staff development and curriculum development professionals at the University of Queensland. Another important secondary practice audience for the project are the functionaries, associated primarily with Human Resources and the Academic Board, but also including Heads of Schools, who have carriage of staff management policies and procedures, including workload management, staff promotion policies and the like. All these practice audiences will be drawn on for Phase 1 preliminary “scoping” tasks and for post-Phase 3 evaluation of the staff development program per se.

The primary policy audience for this project are
• the University Teaching and Learning Committee, which has initiated the project and will receive monthly progress reports;
• the Academic Board, which has oversight of such staff policy as is vital to uptake of the project, and which will be engaged in task 1 of Phase 3;
• academic staff development planners nationwide, who will be engaged through the dissemination plan (see §8 below).

8. **Dissemination**

After Phase 3 development work, the University will offer the leadership program and provide incentives for middle-rank academic leaders to attend the workshops that constitute this program. After evaluation (see §2 above), the University will convene an Effective Teaching and Learning Conference on the theme of “Staff Development for Curriculum Leadership”. This conference is an annual event conducted jointly with the Queensland University of Technology and Griffith University. Such an occasion will permit critical scrutiny by third parties of the workshop packages and programs and hence will enable further fine-tuning of their contents and approaches. Thereafter, the University will support TEDI staff to conduct workshops on the staff development program at other Australian universities and, through the Carrick Institute’s Creative Commons mechanism, will make the staff development packages available for other institutions to adopt. The Project Director will be supported, from recurrent TEDI funding, to attend international conferences at which information about the project could appropriately be disseminated. After full evaluation of the project and fine-tuning of its workshop programs and packages, these materials and activities will be re-packaged for flexible learning delivery into the University’s Graduate Certificate in Education (Higher Education).

9. **Other Work in the Area**

In Australia, most staff development bearing on learning and teaching is focused on lecturing and assessment at the level of the individual unit of study (or “course”, in UQ’s terminology). This is not unexpected since, typically, most staff development in Australia bearing on learning and teaching is targeted at new or early career staff, whose main immediate contribution to their university’s learning and teaching activities will be to teach in such individual units of study. Accordingly, “curriculum development” means, in most Australian universities, the development of a unit of study for presentation to students. The programs below are typical of the sector as a whole.

- [http://www.itl.usyd.edu.au/programs/3day/outline.htm](http://www.itl.usyd.edu.au/programs/3day/outline.htm)

ANU’s Centre for Educational Development and Academic Methods

- [http://info.anu.edu.au/StudyAt/_CEDAM/Postgraduate/Courses/_EDUC8003.asp](http://info.anu.edu.au/StudyAt/_CEDAM/Postgraduate/Courses/_EDUC8003.asp)

This does appear to offer study opportunities in curriculum design at the program level, while Adelaide University’s Centre for Learning and Professional Development


offers study for Leadership in University Teaching, and this includes some elements of curriculum review for a program of study.

**Brief literature review**

Educational leadership to date has been viewed primarily as a set of fixed traits or skills (Antonakis, Cianciolo & Sternberg, 2004). The literature in particular emphasises the benefits of
transformational and transactional leadership styles (Avolio, Bass and Jung, 1999). Much of this literature has emerged from school-based contexts (Storey, 2006; Norris, 2004; Sternberg, 2005; Stroud, 2005) and identifies qualities and attributes of leadership drawn from the practice of school principals, department heads, or teams of teachers involved in educational change, or more broadly from organisational learning domains based largely in theory and methodologies of organisational psychology (Waldman, Keller & Berson, 2006).

Transformational models of leadership are considered appropriate for achieving and sustaining organisational growth and relevance (House, 1995). Identified components of transformational leadership include high levels of cohesion, commitment, trust, motivation and performance (Avolio, Bass & Jung, 1999). Also important are our understandings of developing authenticity in leadership styles and processes (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Others argue that in addition to the traits some models articulate, educational leadership requires a highly dynamic, synthetic and creative process of contextualised decision-making and implementation (Sternberg, 2005), which, as a form of expertise, relies upon intellectual and affective qualities (Chi, Glaser, and Farr, 1988; Riggio, Murphy, and Pirozzolo, 2002) applied in unique ways to specific contexts (Sternberg, 2005).

While this literature is prolific and insightful, there are methodological and contextual issues that may limit the transferability of this literature to the higher education environment. Dealing with these limitations will be a major issue for Phase 2 project work.

**Methodological limitations**

Current research in educational leadership/leadership in general have relied heavily on survey based methodologies. Recently, the construction of items used widely to model and identify transformational and transactional leadership qualities were shown to have limitations in wider applications (Avolio, Bass & Jung 1999). Also, the construction of leadership attributes, skills and qualities draws heavily on conceptually-based models or is derived from identified exemplary leaders so that results are not easy to generalise beyond their original context. The challenge remains to find ways in which to identify and measure exemplary leadership in ways that can transcend the limitations of survey tools – and to find ways in which to develop them over time within organizations (Avolio, Bass & Jung 1999). There is also, crucially, the question of the transferability of models developed from pre-tertiary situations to the university sector.

**Contextual limitations**

It has been noted that educational leadership within the higher education context may involve knowledge, skills, and attributes that while similar to those required in the school context, may present a unique set of challenges and issues (Benoit and Graham, 2005; Miller and Newman, 2005; Wepner, D’Onofrio, and Wilhite, 2005; Diamond, 2000). Academics come to university teaching with disciplinary expertise but often little teaching, curriculum development or leadership experience (Gardiner, 2000) yet are involved in curriculum leadership and management as part of their professional role. Academics in research-intensive universities face additional environmental factors that involve emphases on research outcomes and governance that can overlook the needs of university curricula, teaching and learning (Miller and Newman, 2005).

The literature on academic educational leadership is emerging and documented rigorously in scholarly journals and networks. However, as with the school-based literature, much more needs to be done to identify, explore, document and examine sustainable practice in educational leadership in the higher education context (Miller and Newman, 2005), in particular for academics working at the coalface of learning and teaching (Benoit and Graham, 2005; Wep-
ner and Whilhite, 2004), since they are concerned with both pedagogical as well as leadership and management issues.

Recently, conceptions of educational leadership also argue for a stronger focus on the pedagogic nature of educational leadership. In one conceptual model, the notion of pedagogic leadership is distinguished by an emphasis on the integration of knowledge about teaching and learning and knowledge about leadership, assessment, evaluation and implementation of school-wide, institutional initiatives (MacNeill, Cavanagh & Silcox, 2005). Models such as this have great potential for academic educational leadership development – and may prove helpful in expanding our understandings of the nature of academic educational leadership, particularly in the research-intensive environment (Miller and Newman, 2005).
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## ATTACHMENT 1: Budget and Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>UQ/Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Leader, 20% of Level E academic starting at $119,247.89 + 26.408% on-costs for three years, increasing by 3% each in years two and three</strong></td>
<td>$30,148</td>
<td>$31,052</td>
<td>$31,984</td>
<td>UQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Director, 50% of Level B(6) academic at $74,529.99 + 26.408% on-costs for three years, increasing by 3% each in years two and three</strong></td>
<td>$47,105</td>
<td>$48,512</td>
<td>$49,747</td>
<td>Funding requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum Development Expert, 20% of Level E academic at $122,825.33 + 26.408% on-costs for two years, increasing by 3% in year three</strong></td>
<td>$31,051</td>
<td>$31,983</td>
<td>UQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Assistant, 100% of HEW 4 $40,479.99 + 16.028% on-costs for six months</strong></td>
<td>$23,484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Officer, 50% of HEW 6 at $50,545.54 + 16.028% on-costs for six months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,661.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Venue costs, Focus Group Research Lab at $132.50 per hour times three Phase 1 and five Phase 2 Working Parties at 10 hours each</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>UQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching buy-outs for fifteen academic staff at twelve hours tutoring at $86.19 per hour and thirty hours marking per person at $28.73 per hour plus 16.028% on-costs.</strong></td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For visibility and credibility, the Project Leader must be a senior academic. One day per week represents a minimum commitment given the scope of the proposed project, which will involve liaison with all seven faculties at the University of Queensland, as well as the Teaching and Educational Development Institute and the Academic Board.

The Project Director must have staff development and curriculum development expertise and experience in designing a program of staff development workshops. To ensure wide coverage at a comprehensive university, considerable liaison and workshopping will be required.

To design and implement a staff development program to support those people charged with the design and management of curriculum across sequences of units of study, it is vital to have expert guidance from a skilled and experienced educationist working in the area of curriculum for higher education.

A crucial element in Phase 1 activities is the review of existing literature and other resources. Again, the scope of the proposed project requires a dedicated assistant working exclusively to this project.

In Phase 3, pre-implementation activities require policy amendment, budgeting, and timetabling. Given the scope of the project, this requires a relatively senior and project-specific appointment.

Getting the most out of wide-ranging free-form discussions during the crucial Phase 2 workshopping activities will be facilitated by the use of these state of the arts facilities.

Effective workshops depend on motivated participants and, to ensure an appropriate commitment, release from other duties is imperative.
TIMETABLE

Phase 1: Organisation (6 months)
Organize three Phase 1 Working parties to
   a. Develop position descriptions
   b. Identify incentives
   c. Survey and collect literature
Devise plans for the design project, including
   d. Identify key tasks for academic leaders
   e. Identify key skills and knowledge required for these tasks
   f. Identify a Phase 2 Working party for each key task

Phase 2: Development of the Program (2 years)
Identify Oversight Panel
Retreat for each Working Party
Six month and eighteen month oversight
Twelve month assembly
Devise Staff Development Workshop packages

Phase 3: Preparation for Implementation (6 months)
Amend University policies
Cost and budget for incentives for participation
Timetable Staff Development Workshops
Beta-test the Workshops
Finalise Workshop packages
Develop dissemination plan
Develop evaluation measures
Attachment 2: Project Leaders and Team

The *pro tem* Project Leader is Dr Fred D’Agostino. He is Reader in Humanities and Director of Studies in the Faculty of Arts. He is a Fellow of the Australian Academy of Humanities. While working at the University of New England (1984-2004), he won the Vice-Chancellor’s Award for Teaching Excellence. He chairs the Teaching and Learning Committee of the Faculty of Arts and is leading the implementation of the recommendations of the 2005 Review of the Bachelor of Arts.

The project team also includes:

1. Dr Mia O’Brien: Lecturer in Higher Education, Teaching and Educational Development Institute.
2. Mrs Kim Lamb: Senior Manager, Academic Administration.
3. Professor Helen Chenery: Deputy President, Academic Board; Professor of Speech Pathology; sometime Director of Studies, Faculty of Health Sciences.
4. Associate Professor Caroline Crosthwaite: Director of Studies, Faculty of Engineering, Physical Sciences and Architecture; winner of a University of Queensland Award for the Enhancement of Student Learning for work on Project Centred Curriculum in Chemical Engineering.
5. Professor Susan Hamilton: Director of Studies, Faculty of Biological and Chemical Sciences; Project Director for Bright Minds program which aims to attract bright high school students to science, to inform their teachers and others about careers in science and to support students with advanced study opportunities in science.
6. Dr Julie Duck: Senior Lecturer in Psychology; Director of Studies, Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences; winner of a University of Queensland Award for Teaching Excellence.
7. Dr Colin Birch is Senior Lecturer in Crop Agronomy and Director of Studies in the Faculty of Natural Resources, Agriculture and Veterinary Science. He is a Fellow of the Queensland Academy of Arts and Sciences. He chairs the Board of Studies and Teaching and Learning Committee of the Faculty of Natural Resources, Agriculture and Veterinary Science and has led the reviews of several academic programs in the Faculty. He has participated in reviews of the School of Animal Studies and UQ Library, and has taught, by invitation at Wageningen University, The Netherlands.
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