The mission of the ITL is to work with members of the University community to enhance and help assure the quality of teaching and student learning experiences.
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“The University of Sydney … demonstrates a strong commitment to ensuring the quality of teaching through world-class evaluation systems and an increasing emphasis on teaching professional development, especially for new academic staff” (AUQA Audit Report for University of Sydney 2004, p. 4).

The primary role of the Institute for Teaching and Learning (Institute) is to work collaboratively with the University community to enhance and to assure the quality of learning and teaching. Implementing world class evaluation systems and offering professional development for teaching are central in the work of the Institute.

In 2005 the Institute pursued the strategic initiatives identified in its strategic plan for 2003-2006 and supported Colleges, Faculties, Schools, Departments, and individual members of academic and general staff to achieve the teaching and learning goals and objectives in the University’s Strategic Plan and Faculty Teaching and Learning Plans.

The Institute continued to pursue its goal to be a leading academic development unit in the world during 2005. Among the indicators of such leadership are the national and international benchmarking it has with leading research universities around the world, invitations to present academic development and quality assurance workshops at leading international conferences, and invitations to publish descriptions of our successes in important journals and books. These presentations and publications are listed at the end of the text. We also note that the Institute’s achievements have attracted the attention of one of the leaders in the field of higher education studies who wrote that it is rare that:

“Rarely does ‘A single university teaching development institute have such an extensive impact on thinking in Europe about university teaching and learning, and how to improve it, as has the University of Sydney’s Institute. The Institute for the Advancement of University Learning at the University of Oxford aspires to research-informed educational policy and practice and looks up to the Institute as a model’”

Graham Gibbs, Professor of Higher Education, Oxford University

It is a continuing challenge for the Institute to live up to this high praise.

One of the main tasks for the Institute in 2005 was to address the recommendations of the University’s Academic Board review of it. The results of the review were very positive, yet there were a few areas that needed work, specifically: heightening the profile of the Institute across the university, strategies to recognize achievements in the Institute, and increasing collaboration with faculties to mount tutor training programs for neophyte teaching staff. Parts from the Institute’s report on Phase Two of the Review are in the text and whole report is an appendix.
Among the major achievements of the Institute in 2005 were:

1. Twenty-eight members of the University’s academic staff completed the Institute’s Graduate Certificate in Educational Studies (Higher Education). That is a one hundred percent completion rate.

2. Three members of the University’s academic staff completed a Masters degree in Educational Studies (Higher Education)

3. One member of the Institute’s academic staff completed a PhD in Higher Education.

4. Twenty staff successfully completed the Masters Unit of Study Designing Flexible Learning environments.

5. The Institute’s collaboration and benchmarking with Oxford University continues. The University of Sydney is the only Australian university to participate in this international consortium investigating leadership and management of teaching in research-intensive universities with such universities as Edinburgh, Utrecht, Princeton, Queens, Cornell, Lund, and MIT.

6. Continued smooth operation of the survey research operation. In 2005 we processed more than 107,000 questionnaires, meeting deadlines and targets for publication, providing over 1,800 individual reports to Unit of Study coordinators

7. Hosted and organized a major international conference, Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia with 460 participants, including more than 100 with international addresses

8. Maintained an active research seminar program with participants from across the university, others from elsewhere in Sydney, and visitors from Australian and abroad.

9. Offered the Principles and Practice Program, a criterion of confirmation of employment for all new academic staff, four times with a total of 128 participants. The evaluations of the Program continue to be excellent, about 4.5 on a 5 point scale.

10. Completed a major review and redesign of the Research Higher Degree Supervision program, including creating a unit of study with academic credit in the Faculty of Education. One hundred and fourteen supervisors completed the Program in 2005.

11. Begin to develop benchmarking relations with the University of British Columbia and Nagoya University, Japan.

12. Initiated presentations to new academic staff with the SSDU on the Institute service in 2005, making two presentations.

13. Convened a meeting of all members of the Institute strategic working parties to facilitate networking among them

14. Executed two external contracts for training, one with Moore Theological College and one in Saudi Arabia at King Fahd University of Petroleum and Engineering.

15. Created an Alumni Chapter for Graduate Certificate and higher degree graduates so that they may continue to network and support each other

Key strengths
The close working relationship between the Pro-Vice Chancellor (Learning and Teaching), the Chair of Academic Board, the Chair of the Academic Boarding Teaching and Learning Committee, and the acting Director continue to be very important in keeping the Institute’s efforts strategically aligned with the University’s mission. The Institute is better integrated into institutional teaching and learning structures that like units in other Australian universities. Evidence for this conclusion arises from conversations with the directors of these units meet each year and also in the 2004 AUQA report on the University.

In addition, the University’s regime supporting learning and teaching gives the Institute fertile ground on which to work. This regime includes the Scholarship in Teaching Index, teaching performance indicators, teaching improvement grants, teaching excellence awards in schools, faculties, and the University. These measures make the University the envy of the directors of comparable units at other Australian universities, and are virtually unique in the context of the universities in the Oxford project in dot point five above.

For its own part, the Institute’s strong, internationally recognized research provides a solid, scholarly and evidence-base for its survey research and academic development work related to teaching and learning enhancement in the University. Further, the Institute’s research success adds to the credibility of Institute in the University of Sydney’s research-intensive environment.

Effective management, strong leadership, ongoing quality enhancement and the stability of staff has provided a congenial and collegial working environment that has enabled the Institute rapidly to take on new challenges as they have arisen.

Key challenges
During 2005 one challenge was staffing. The Institute still had an acting director, one senior lecturer on unpaid leave, and another seconded to the office of the Pro-Vice Chancellor (Learning and Teaching). At the same time, the Institute is responding to new challenges, for example, to provide support to the University’s strategic plans on assessment and to improve postgraduate pedagogy. It is has been difficult to pursue new initiatives while maintaining current projects. As a consequence, progress has not always been fast.

Our work is closely aligned with the strategic priorities for teaching and learning in the University but to maintain this requires constant vigilance. That makes a permanent director devoted solely to the Institute’s business essential. We need to adapt rapidly to changing circumstances, for example, when the University’s structure or priorities change. Maintaining morale at such points is a challenge.

The Institute’s activities have grown and its staff has increased since occupying the premises in the Carslaw Building in 1993. At that time the Institute had three academic staff and two general staff, a total of five. At that time it did not have responsibility for survey research that it now has. Today in the same floor space there are now seven academic staff and six general staff. To accommodate an ARC research assistant or a visitor means sharing offices. With good will and creative use of space the Institute has managed to date, but the limit is near.
The abolition of the colleges means the Institute will have to adjust many of its procedures to align with the emerging new university structure.

Steps were taken in 2005 to insure that the Institute receives income from research publications. It is still not clear that it receives income from PhD completions, and fee-paying Graduate Diploma and Masters level enrolments. For several years we have tried to ensure that the Institute receives income earned through this work and in 2005 the acting director made collaborative efforts to set up systems for this. However, to date such systems have proved elusive and it seems that no income has been received. This will be pursued in 2006.

**Projects**

The Strategic Projects made important strides in 2005.

**Evaluation and Quality Assurance**

In 2005 the Institute continued to provide support to the University community in the evaluation and enhancement of teaching through various initiatives.

**Degree Program Evaluation**

The Institute was responsible for the collection and reporting of data on current students' experiences of teaching and learning in their degrees using the Student Course Experience Questionnaire (SCEQ) and the Student Research Experience Questionnaire (SREQ). The surveys report data on the educational experiences of undergraduate and postgraduate coursework students as well as research higher degree students. This information supports the university's teaching quality assurance processes and informs key institutional and faculty-based, strategic teaching and learning enhancement initiatives. The Institute has continued in its role of managing the University's participation in the national Graduate Destination Survey (GDS) and Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) as well as the Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (PREQ).

**Unit of Study Evaluation**

In 2005 the Institute continued to work in supporting faculties in using the Unit of Study (USE) system first introduced in 2001. The Unit of Study (USE) system provides a university wide resource and the growing use of the system represents a major development of the existing Institute evaluation service. The USE system provides one way by which faculties can implement University's policy on the evaluation of Units of Study. The system links students' experiences of individual units of study with their experiences of courses and degrees as revealed in the SCEQ.

By the end of 2004, the USE system had been implemented systematically by most faculties and USE surveys were in use in all but two of the 17 faculties. This represented a considerable increase in work for the Institute Teaching Evaluation Service with 80,760 Unit of Study Evaluation surveys processed in 2005. This figure does not include the degree course surveys or the individual feedback surveys discussed below.

The Institute continued to work with faculties through the Evaluation and Quality Assurance working group to support them in planning internal systems to manage unit of study evaluation and the reporting and planning of curriculum development initiatives using the USE data.

**Feedback for Individual Teachers**

The Institute continued to support staff choosing to gather feedback on their own teaching through the Feedback for Teachers Service. This aspect of the Institute Teaching Evaluation service includes standard scanned surveys, standard and customized open response surveys, resources to support data collection processes such as focus groups and structured group interviews. In 2005 the Institute implemented a revision of the existing standard surveys and developed new surveys to support staff gathering feedback in flexible learning modes, small group teaching, laboratory teaching and distance education settings. These new resources were used in 2005.

In sum, the Institute prepared for the university community 2491 reports involving 93,671 respondents on its major survey items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large Group teaching</th>
<th>Tutorial teaching</th>
<th>Unit of Study Evaluation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reports Cases</td>
<td>Reports Cases</td>
<td>Reports Cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>5724</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>2491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6187</td>
<td></td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>93671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specifically as to the Unit of Study Evaluation, 95% of orders were filled within two weeks.

**Evaluation and Quality Assurance Working Group**

The Evaluation and Quality Assurance working group includes a nominee appointed by the Dean of each Faculty, members of the ITL and the Pro Vice Chancellor (Teaching and Learning). The EQA working group facilitates consultation on the university's quality assurance activities and provides another forum in which staff of the university can collaborate in interpreting and using evaluation data to support teaching improvement. Through this group the Institute supports faculties in using evaluation and quality assurance data to develop their teaching and learning plans and in planning curriculum initiatives and strategies to address aspects of the student experience. Through this working group the ITL supported the revision of the Scholarship Index and contributed to the development of the new benchmarking guidelines. The group also initiated a project examining the processes used by faculties to assure standards of grades awarded in support of the university's move towards standards based assessment. This group has also provided the impetus for numerous teaching research and development initiatives across the university and informs much of the Institute's own research-led academic development work.
Rewarding Excellence

In 2005 the Institute again supported the university’s excellence in teaching and research higher degree supervision awards. The Institute provided seminars for intending applicants and support for colleagues in preparing their applications. In addition the Institute again supported the university community in preparing applications for Australian University Teaching Committee awards and developed a website promoting the university winners of the Australian College of Educators (ACE) Quality Teaching Awards.

Research-led Teaching and Scholarship of Teaching

The Research-led teaching and scholarship of teaching working group continued to meet and develop faculty plans for the development of this initiative. In 2005 the working group

- Investigated ethical requirements for undergraduate research projects including liaising with the ethics office, examined pro forma used in other universities and discussed ethical issues in undergraduate research are managed.
- Discussed the effects of the RQF on research led teaching (led by Professor Alan Jenkins, Oxford Brookes University).
- Collated and disseminated information about undergraduate research schemes in the University.
- Collated faculty plans for the development of research-led teaching.
- Examined factors limiting the growth of research-led teaching initiatives and fed this information into a new development plan to be discussed in 2006.
- Collated information on faculty research grant schemes.
- Encouraged and reported on Faculty discussions re liaison between teaching and learning committees and research committees.
- Encouraged liaison of faculty representatives on the RLT and the Graduate Attributes Working Groups.

Institute staff continued research on ways in which research-led teaching is understood in different university contexts and on students' experiences of research in the University of Sydney.

Generic Graduate Attributes

The aim of the Graduate Attributes project was initially to review the existing policy statement of generic graduate attributes and the implementation of this policy, with a view to enhancing the achievement of such attributes. The development of the revised policy and the faculty interpretations has been a collaborative undertaking between the Institute and members of the academic community. The Graduate Attributes working group has drawn on a conceptual framework identified through research conducted at the University and existing best practice internationally. As part of the policy development process in 2004, the Project has sought extensive consultation, both on the faculty statements through disciplinary and professional networks identified by the faculties, and of the central statement through peak national higher education bodies. The aim of the consultation process was to ensure the relevance of our statement of generic attributes to future employers of our graduates and to society-at-large.

In December 2004 the new policy of Generic Attributes of Graduates of the University of Sydney was approved by Academic Board. This revised statement embodies the University’s scholarly values as a research-intensive university with a global outlook. The revised institutional statement of generic attributes also allows for disciplinary interpretation of the attributes.

In 2005 the Project began to address implementation of the new policy. New terms of reference were developed for the Working Group and an Orientation Pack for new Working Group members. The Working Group identified several implementation projects for the year.

The group investigated how graduate attributes might be assessed in units of study. This investigation identified the need to support staff in writing better learning outcomes as a precursor to considering assessment. Through the Working Group the project developed strategies to orient students to the university’s new Generic Graduate Attributes and identified strategies to support the development of Foundation skill levels of attributes in First Year students. This included developing a resource to inform students and staff of available Foundation Skills programs from Centres such as the Library and Learning Centre and the orientation strategies in place in several faculties. The work on Foundation strategies led to the development of a Student Portal which includes student interview sound bytes explaining the graduate attributes (with more to come), and information about resources for students. Links to this website have been placed in several locations on the general Sydney website. The project continues to develop the database of best practice to support staff in developing generic attributes curricula. The project established a listerv to support the Working Group’s role in dissemination and to link staff to graduate attributes curricula resources developed through TIF projects. From 2005 the project has used Unit of study quality assurance surveys (USEs) to monitor development of graduate attributes in units of study across the university (item 3). In 2005 the Project developed a new scale for the institutional quality assurance surveys to monitor generic attribute development in courses (SCEQ) (items 36,37,39,42 & 48) http://www.itl.usyd.edu.au/SCEQ/secure/RRR.cfm

Flexible and Online Learning and Teaching
eLearning

eLearning technologies, including online learning and video-conferencing, are being used at the University of Sydney to support a predominately campus-based, blended student learning experience, along with some post-graduate distance programs.

- the eLearning Working Group (discussed below)
- the eLearning workshop series; Beginner and Intermediate. (See Appendix 7 for evaluation statistics.)
- the Academic Programs and eLearning (shared teaching in masters unit)
- the development of web-resources for eLearning that integrates with the University’s eLearning strategy (see TandL ICT website)
- staff development in video-conferencing (with staff from ICT)
Increasingly the graduate programs taught by the Institute incorporate appropriate pedagogical uses of eLearning technologies to support flexible learning processes. Units of Study in the Graduate Certificate program integrate online discussions, course information, e-mail, assignment submission, and electronic access to readings via the Library’s online CORRS service via a WebCT interface.

The Graduate Studies in Higher Education Masters unit of study Designing Flexible Learning Environments (EDPR6012), which ran again in Semester 2 2005, attracted 20 university staff participants, and modelled the integration of both online and video-conference components. Eight participants on the Cumberland campus joined twelve participants at the Camperdown campus via a series of live, video-conferenced sessions. This unit of study also provides a significant site for the critical evaluation of eLearning resources supporting other units of study within the University. Similar collaborative evaluation also takes place in the WebCT workshop series, and at network and Working Group meetings. The teaching in this unit is shared by colleagues from the College of Health Science, USyd eLearning, the Office of the PVC Learning and Teaching and the Institute.

Development of web resources for eLearning

The Institute has maintained its academic development support for the use of eLearning via its Teaching and Learning with ICT (TLandICT) website and through eLearning consultancy services to faculties, project teams and staff. In addition the theory and practice of eLearning are integrated into all of the Institute’s programs for teachers, beginning with an online orientation and materials in the 3-Day Principles and Practice of University Teaching and Learning program.

In 2005, the Institute established a moderated eLearning mailing listserv which now advertises relevant events and information to over 80 subscribers across the University.

Staff development in video-conferencing

During Semester 1, the Institute co-ordinated a series of seminars at which staff and project managers in the USyd eLearning Project, ICT services and other interested parties previewed and evaluated a range of Desktop IP and bridging software programs with a view to future planning and integration.

In collaboration with staff from the University’s ICT Services, the Multimedia and Educational Technologies in Arts (META) Centre, and the Faculty of Pharmacy , the Institute organised and co-ordinated three video-conference teaching workshops in February (1) and July (2). More than 20 university staff participated in the two workshops, which included ‘hands-on’ micro-teaching sessions between separate venues on campus. These sessions were very highly evaluated by participants.
In 2005 over 128 University of Sydney academics from various faculties and other non-academic areas, including the Library and Careers Centre, attended a Principles and Practice of University Teaching and Learning course (a 14% increase from 2004). The program has continued to be offered regularly throughout the year with an average intake of 40 participants and regular waiting lists. Of participants attending in 2005 on average 61% were new to university teaching.

During 2005 the program was modified and offered to two external organizations in response to their requests; one to the King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals, Saudi Arabia, and the other to the academic staff of Moore Theological College, Newtown. This new initiative was extremely successful and allowed the teaching team to develop new strategies and further develop the learning materials and presentation options.

The program continues to receive excellent feedback. The average evaluations (Agree and Strongly Agree categories) of the University of Sydney 2005 programs indicated that 94% of participants were ‘satisfied with the overall program’.

The following table indicates the number of staff completing the program in 2005 broken down by College, the number of staff required to complete the program and their overall evaluation of the program. More detailed evaluations are available from the Institute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>% of staff required to complete</th>
<th>Completion</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other includes participants from TESOL, Learning Centre, Library, and Moore Theological College

In 2005 the Graduate Certificate in Educational Studies (Higher Education) continues to meet the aims of providing university teachers with opportunities to reflect on educational theory and student learning research from the perspective of their own teaching experiences through the scholarship of teaching and learning. The program supports staff in developing their professional expertise as university teaching in order to better understand and enhance the learning of their students. All units of study are offered through the Faculty of Education and Social Work and are taught by staff of the Institute. The quota for the course remains at 35 participants per intake. Twenty-
eight university staff graduated from the Certificate course in 2005, including one fee-paying participant.

The following Table indicates the number of staff completing the Graduate Certificate Units of Study in 2005 and their overall satisfaction with the program. More detailed evaluations are available from the Institute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Overall satisfaction on USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EDPR5001</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>95.2% agreed, 100% broadly agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EDPR5002</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>95.2% agreed, 100% broadly agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EDPR5003</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65% agreed, 80% broadly agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EDPR5011</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65% agreed, 80% broadly agreed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increasingly the graduate programs taught by the Institute integrate appropriate pedagogical uses of e-learning. Units of study in the Graduate Certificate program integrate online discussions, course information, email, assignment submission and electronic access to readings via the Library’s online CORRS service via the University of Sydney’s learning management system (WebCT) interface.

The Institute is extremely pleased to note that Dr Simon Barrie and Tai Peseta among four recipients of a 2005 Teaching Excellence Award from the Faculty of Education and Social Work. Simon and Tai were nominated for their work teaching in the first semester units of study in the Graduate Certificate in Educational Studies (Higher Education). The award is initially student nominated -- and then is later supported by an application, followed by a peer reference.

**Master in Education (Higher Education)**

Twenty members of the academic staff proceeded to the Masters program. Three units of study were taught by Institute staff in 2005:

The Academic Profession: Challenges and Changes in Higher Education (Semester 1). Three academics completed this independent study unit guided by an Institute staff member. This provides advanced leadership study of aspects of higher education and the context for learning and teaching.

Individual Professional Learning Portfolio. (Semesters 1 and 2). 5 staff completed the Research Higher Degree Supervision Development Program as a pathway to achieving this unit of study (see below).

Designing Flexible Learning Environments (EDPR6012), (Semester 2). This unit attracted twenty university staff participants, and modelled the integration of both online and video-conference components. Eight participants on the Cumberland campus joined twelve participants at the Campdenown campus via a series of live video-conference sessions. This unit of study also provides a significant site for the critical evaluation of ICT resources supporting Units of Study within the University.

**PhD Program**

Institute staff continued to supervise PhD candidates, one of whom graduated in 2005.

**Research Higher Degree Supervision Development Program**

The major review and redesign of the Research Higher Degree Supervision program continued throughout 2005. It became clear during 2005 that the new policy on research supervision training was having an impact both on enrolments and on completions. All supervision modules have now been re-written to take account of the changed policy context, the requirements for supervision registration, new research and scholarship on supervision, new resources that have become available and the objective of increasing the number of program completions. The new modules are being integrated into the newly designed website which is due for launch in May 2006. The new website also includes improved navigation, direct links to library resources, an improved discussion forum, and improvements to the administrative section of the site.

Steps were taken in 2005 to clarify requirements for completion of the program, for example, by introducing the program in the introductory workshops held twice in the year, in the monthly online sessions and in discussions with postgraduate coordinators in some faculties.

114 supervisors enrolled in the program in 2005 bringing the total enrolments to 420 supervisors from all of the faculties. This number comprises 206 females and 207 males and 7 of unknown gender. They represent a wide range of ranks: 8 Professors; 16 Associate Professors; 322 academics with doctorates; one reader and 10 supervisors of unknown rank. Table x shows how these are spread across the faculties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Science</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Humanities and Social Science</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rural Management (now at CSU)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Economics and Business</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Education and Social Work</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SUPRA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In completing the Recognition Module, participants are required to write up their experience and goals as supervisor in the form of a case study which forms the major part of their assessment. In 2005 twenty-four graduates of the program were asked whether they would agree to have their case study published on the HRD Supervision Program site. Nineteen consented and participated with Institute staff in their case being studies reviewed, revised as needed and edited for publishing on site in early 2006.

The nineteen case studies reflect a range of supervisor experience from neophyte to well-experienced across various faculties, reflecting on such themes as setting up the first meeting with the student, aligning student-supervisor expectations, developing a research community and overall management of the process. These case studies will augment the collection already available online at http://www.itl.usyd.edu.au/pg/casestudies/ written and published in 2001.

Priorities for 2006 include:

1. Finalizing integration of the new modules into, and completing, the newly designed website which is due for launch in March 2006.

2. Disseminating information about the new website through:
   a. Further discussion with postgraduate coordinators to clarify the scope and expectations of the program and its relationship to Supervisor Registration
   b. A further issue of the ‘Supervisor’ newsletter planned for later in 2006.

Seminars and Workshops

Workshops and seminars continued to be conducted upon request. These were either connected with specific projects such as Teaching Excellence Awards (for both undergraduate teachers and postgraduate supervision), or were at the specific request of Faculties and Departments. Development programs facilitated in collaboration with faculty academics were implemented for tutors in the big faculties (Economics and Business, Science, and Arts). Institute staff were asked to present on teaching and learning issues at Faculty retreats, University-wide events, and external events.

In 2005 the Institute hosted the Annual International Conference of the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia (HERDSA). There were 460 delegates; the largest number of any HERDSA conference to date. That number included more than one hundred with an international address. Keynote addresses were presented by leading academics of world renown, namely: Professor Graham Gibbs (Oxford University; Professor Dai Hounsell (Edinburgh University. The presentations included 60 by University of Sydney staff. Refereed conference papers were published by the Institute in a 600 page book.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of completions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 months or less</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months or less</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 months or less</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research and Development Seminar Program

The Institute continued to run a successful program of fortnightly research and development seminars during 2005. In Semester 1 we held five research and two development seminars. In Semester 2 the program comprised six research seminars and one development seminar. Research seminars provided a forum for academic and research staff with an interest in higher education learning and teaching to test ideas, share works-in-progress and conference papers. Topics in 2005 included: Diversity and achievement; Promoting the success of non-traditional students in Higher Education, Research and teaching; Beyond the divide, How people react to student feedback, and Academic work: Exploring stories of everyday practices.

Development seminars continue to be collegial informal gatherings where Institute staff, and colleagues from allied units across the University, come together to share information and progress about relevant policy and infrastructure developments, projects, and other activities. Development Seminar topics in 2005 included, for example: College-based strategic e-learning projects, and Instructional designers: Converting what − or who?

Our 2005 program was launched in March with a presentation by UK National Teaching Fellow, Kate Kirk, from Manchester Metropolitan University. This also signaled an expansion of our program, which in the past has tended to showcase the research and development work of the Institute. In 2005 we also welcomed speakers from other faculties of The University of Sydney (including Veterinary Science, Architecture, Medicine, and the Faculty of Health Sciences), and academic developer colleagues from the University of Canberra, the University of Technology, Sydney, the University of New South Wales, and the University of Western Sydney.

Increasingly our seminar program is attracting more diverse audiences, with representation from across the faculties, as well as colleagues from local universities. Advertising encompasses Faculty Associate Deans (Learning and Teaching), academic development units in local universities, and subscribers to the ‘Friends of the Institute’ mailing list, which includes working group representatives and graduates of our teaching programs.

During 2005, Institute research continued to be published in prestigious international journals, book chapters and refereed and other conference presentations. The number and level of these publications and the number of research grants has steadily grown. This research continues to provide a scholarly basis for broader discussions of teaching and learning in the Institute’s academic development work.

Synergy

In 2005, two issues of Synergy were produced. Synergy continues to be a mechanism by which those new to writing about their curriculum innovations as university teachers can begin to begin to disseminate the outcomes of their work. Writing for Synergy continues to earn points on the University’s Scholarship Index.

In the June issue, colleagues from English, Education and Social Work, Dentistry, Italian and Veterinary Science all contributed scholarly articles. In the November, Synergy profiled the work of colleagues in Medicine, Economics and Business, History, and the College of Sciences and Technology e-Learning initiative. In all cases, these articles were evidenced-based and scholarly contributions to the field of university teaching and learning.

Both issues continued to highlight the research and scholarship of the ITL, together with major curriculum initiatives taking place across the university. In 2006, the ITL plans to further extend this work. Visit Synergy at http://www.itl.usyd.edu.au/synergy.

Research

During 2005, Institute research was published in prestigious international journals, book chapters and refereed and other conference presentations. The number and level of these publications and the number of research grants has steadily grown. This research continues to provide a scholarly basis for broader discussions of teaching and learning in the Institute’s academic development work.

Members of the Institute’s staff are frequently consulted on national and international research projects, for example, ESRC projects in the UK. In 2005 one member of staff is a member of an international group working towards a European Union funded project on higher education and working life, another is be a reviewer for the annual ICT in education prize for Pearson Education Ltd, and one member of staff is an international reviewer for the Australian Research Council. Staff continued to examine PhD theses for Australasian Universities.

Staff of the Institute with highlights for 2005.

The Institute consists of seven academic staff: Professor, associate professor, three senior lecturer, and two lecturers. There are six general staff to support the extensive survey research program.

Academic Staff

Ann Applebee worked with colleagues to develop and pilot unit of study evaluation (USE) questions on the use of Information Communication Technologies (ICT) in teaching and learning and continued her investigations and research into developing blended learning communities, reporting on the organizational initiatives undertaken at the University of Sydney as they continue to address the issues of coordinating information and communication technologies (ICT) in a devolved teaching and learning system.

Dr Christine Asmar was on secondment to Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.

Dr Simon Barrie continues to investigate the attributes of graduates of research higher degrees and also students’ and teachers’ experiences of teaching and learning through his research in the evaluation and quality assurance of teaching. He has several research articles in press.

Associate Professor Angela Brew continued her work on the relationship between teaching and research and completed a book entitled Research and Teaching: Beyond the Divide. She presented a keynote address at the prestigious international colloquium Research and teaching: closing the divide? in the UK in March and was invited to give seminars in the Universities of Exeter, Oxford, Westminster, and Anglia Polytechnic University in the UK; Linkoping University, Sweden; and Queen’s University, Canada.
Dr Rob Ellis published studies on inquiry-based learning, learning science through writing, and on open-source eLearning technologies with colleagues in Engineering, Science and Veterinary Science. He won a second large ARC Linkage grant with Professor Peter Goodyear, Dr Michael Prosser and colleagues from the NSW Department of Education and Training. He gave invited presentations on eLearning for campus-based universities at University College London and Manchester Metropolitan University.

Professor Michael Jackson, PhD, continued his work on student learning with publishing two refereed conference papers, one for HERDSA. He also received an extraordinary teaching excellence award in the Faculty of Economics and Business. In his field of study he published three refereed journal articles and one book chapter in 2005. He also visited the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development in Paris twice to advise on teaching materials for its ethics program. He contributed to the Oxford University project on leadership in research intensive universities.

Dr Paul Ginns continues to work with Institute staff and international collaborators on a variety of projects, leading to several peer-reviewed publications in 2005 on teaching evaluation in higher education. He has also continued work in his doctoral field of Cognitive Load Theory, publishing one review article on mental practice in highly cognitive domains in education, and a meta-analysis of the modality effect. He regularly provides advice on research methods in education to Institute and University colleagues.

Kim McShane made substantial progress on the PhD thesis. In February she presented a paper (since published) on academics’ perceptions of virtuality and reality in blended teaching in England. Kim ran a session on the methods and meanings of teaching metaphors at the Learning & Teaching Unit, Manchester Metropolitan University, and a workshop on issues in blended curriculum design for development and teaching staff at Edinburgh University. At the HERDSA conference in Sydney in July 2005, Kim conducted a readers’ workshop based on her research, and also presented a paper in the Challenging Academic Development (CAD) symposium in virtual collaboration with two (still unseen) Canadian colleagues.

Dr Tai Peseta completed a PhD ‘Learning and Becoming in Academic Development: an autoethnographic inquiry’ which was awarded in 2005. She continued her work with the Challenging Academic Development (CAD) Collective and led a symposium ‘Conceptual Transgressions: Furtive Explorations in the scholarship of academic development’. Papers from the symposium will be published in a Special Issue of the International Journal for Academic Development in the latter half of 2006.

General Staff

Silvana Daher is an Administrative Assistant for the Institute for Teaching and Learning. Silvana’s duties include organisation and database management of courses and seminars run by the Institute, reception duties and administrative assistance to the Director, Manager Administration and Finance and ITL staff. Silvana is currently on maternity leave and is replaced by Stacey Gentilcore.

Dr Paul Ginns is the survey officer for the Institute for Teaching and Learning. He is responsible for the design and reporting of the various large scale surveys the Institute conducts. These include the Graduate Destination Survey, the Course Experience Questionnaire, and the Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (for graduates of the University), and the Student Course Experience Questionnaire (for current undergraduate and postgraduate students).

Kelly Hong is an Administrative Assistant for the Institute for Teaching and Learning. Kelly’s duties include project management of the Teaching Evaluation Service, Graduate Certificate in Educational Studies (Higher Studies) & Principles and Practice programs as well as assisting with finance and administration management when required.

Brooke Hughes is a part time Administration Assistant who provides support to the Teaching Evaluation Service. Brooke assists with ordering, dispatching and scanning of all the ITL surveys.

Sue Robinson is an Administration Assistant for the Evaluation and Quality Assurance, First Year Experience, Graduate Attributes and Research-led Teaching & Scholarship of Teaching Working Groups. Sue’s duties include the organisation and support to the Working Group meetings as well as administrative support to the ITL staff.

Jennifer Ungaro is the Manager Administration and Finance. Jennifer is responsible for running the administration and finances for the Institute for Teaching and Learning. Jennifer also manages the Teaching Evaluation and Enhancement Service which comprises the Unit of Study and Feedback for Teachers as well as other large scale surveys that the Institute for Teaching and Learning conducts. These include the Graduate Destination Survey (GDS), Student Course Experience Questionnaire (SCEQ), Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ), Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (PREQ), Student Research Experience Questionnaire (SREQ), Moore College Student Course Experience Questionnaire and Unit of Study and College of Nursing Student Course Experience Questionnaire and Unit of Study.

Rachel Williams is the Web and Publications Manager for the Institute for Teaching and Learning. She is responsible for the development, maintenance and Project Management of all ITL websites. Rachel is also responsible for the production of Synergy magazine and all other publicity materials for the Institute.
Appendix Two: Committees served

Members of the Institute served on these University standing committees, and contributed to a great many more ad hoc committees and working parties.

Academic Board
Academic Board Learning & Teaching Committee
Academic Board Learning & Teaching Committee Library Sub-committee
University eLearning governance committee
University Management Reference Group for eLearning
University Learning and Teaching Spaces committee
Faculty of Education and Social Work Division of Graduate Studies Committee
Faculty of Education and Social Work Postgraduate Course Work sub-committee,
Faculty of Education and Social Work Faculty Learning & Teaching Committee
Faculty of Economics and Business Faculty Learning & Teaching Committee
Faculty of Pharmacy Teaching and Learning Committee
ICT Committee, Access and Support Working Party

Appendix One: Visitors to the Institute. A total of nineteen from nine countries and Australia.

Dr. Mansor Ahmad
University Putra
Malaysia

Elsie Anderberg
Lund University
Sweden

Professor Sahel Abduljauwad
King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals
Saudi Arabia

Professor Tom Angelo
Victoria University
New Zealand

Dr. Abdullah bin Ibrahim
University College of Engineering and Technology
Malaysia

Dr. Chang Kyun Chae,
Korea Research Institute
South Korea

Dr. Ming Cheng
National Ocean University
Taiwan

Professor Graham Gibbs
University of Oxford
England

Dr. Graham Hendry
Visiting Fellow
University of Sydney

Ms Atusko Hisada
Nagoya University
Japan

Dr. Miki Horie
Nagoya University
Japan

Professor Dai Hounsell
Edinburgh University
Scotland

Dr Allan Jenkins
Oxford Brookes University
England

Kate Kirk
Manchester Metropolitan University
England

Professor Christopher Knapper
Oxford and Queens universities
England and Canada

Dr. Joy Mighty
Queens University
Canada

Dr Mike Prosser
Higher Education Academy
United Kingdom

Professor Keith Trigwell
Oxford University
England

Professor Melanie Walker
University of Sheffield
England
Appendix Three. Presentations by members of the Institute.


Brew, A. (2005). Integrating Teaching and Research: What do we know? Keynote address to the Canadian Summit on the integration of teaching and research,. University of Alberta, Canada, 3-5 August.

Brew, A. (2005). Institutional strategies to develop research-enhanced teaching and the scholarship of teaching Seminar presented at Murdoch University, November


Jackson, M. (2005) The University of Sydney environment of teaching and learning, Faculty of Pharmacy Retreat, April.


Jackson, M. (2005) Teaching in the promotion application, University of Sydney Open Forum on Promotion, April.


Jackson, M., Barrie, S. C., and Ginns, P. (2005) The Student Course Experience Questionnaire, Presentation to representatives form Nagoya University, Japan, December.


Appendix Four: Publications and research grants by members of the Institute whose names are bolded in the bibliography.

Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of publication</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edited book</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refereed article</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal issue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refereed conference paper</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference papers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Books


Book chapter


Articles in refereed journals


Research and development grants

1) DP0559282 Prof P Goodyear; Associate Professor MT Prosser and Dr RA Ellis
Title: Learning through online and co-present discussion in higher education: expectations, experiences and outcomes
2005 : $76,000
2006 : $76,000
2007 : $76,000

Summary
This project will make a substantial contribution to international research in the fields of learning and teaching in higher education and learning and teaching with ICT. In practical terms, the project will provide evidence-based guidelines for the integration of ‘blended’ learning approaches, especially with respect to the ways ICT can support small group discussion activity. Scientifically, the project will add to our understanding of how students and teachers approach learning and teaching through discussion (co-present and online). Such knowledge is a vital, strategic asset given the growing economic importance of Australian higher education and of its international reputation for quality.

2) LP0562146  Prof P Goodyear; Associate Professor MT Prosser; Dr RA Ellis; Ms S Blackwell; Ms M McNeill
Title: Blended learning in schools, TAFE and universities: experience, principles, patterns and practice

Partner Organisations
Department of Education and Training

Summary
Effective use of technology in education depends upon the teacher’s understanding of good ways to support learning. New uses of technology to improve learning are emerging constantly: the challenge is to share good practice. This project focuses on investigating the quality of blended learning experiences and using the outcomes to identify and share good practice using a format called a ‘design pattern’. Design patterns combine research-based evidence and the knowledge of experienced practitioners in a format which is easily relayed to communicate, learn and apply. They are not yet used in teaching with technology. We will generate and test design patterns for learning through discussion in technology-based and other classroom settings.

Other publications in refereed journals


Conference papers


Brew, A. (2005). Integrating Teaching and Research: What do we know? Keynote address to the Canadian Summit on the integration of teaching and research., University of Alberta, Canada, 3-5 August.


Recommendation 1
The Review Team recommends that the Institute should follow-up faculties not participating in Working Groups. (Section 3.2.7)

Action taken by ITL
1. Wrote to all deans to identify and thank the members of their faculties who serve on the Working Groups, and draw attention to the record of attendance in each case. We will do this annually.
2. The Institute now keeps a spreadsheet of attendance and reviews it. At the end of the year we write to participants to thank them for their work.
3. If a faculty representative misses two meetings we will follow up by email and telephone. If that fails then we contact the dean.

Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)
If attendance is still an issue the Director seeks the guidance of the PVC (LandT)

ITL's evaluation of the success of action taken
Our letters of thanks elicit positive responses via email from some deans and also from some representatives who have appreciated getting some recognition from the dean.

Recommendation 2
The Review Team recommends that the Institute should continue to work on increasing its internal profile across the University. (Section 3.3.4)

Action taken by ITL
1. Organised a highly successful international conference for the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia Inc (HERDSA) in July 2005. This resulted in 460 conference attendees participating in lively debate on topics of importance to higher education research. Of the papers presented sixty were from University of Sydney staff involving more than 120 authors.
2. Began to invite one dean a semester to visit the Institute, started with Professor Derrick Armstrong of Education and Social Work because of our administrative relations with that faculty. We discussed some of the issues elsewhere in this report.
3. During 2005 the Institute designed, printed and distributed three brochures: ‘Programs for University Teachers’, ‘Teaching Quality at the University of Sydney’ and ‘Institute for Teaching and Learning’, that provide detailed information on its programs, projects and services. The brochures are included in the New Staff Information Packs for all new academic appointments.
4. Creation of an Institute Alumni Chapter (including Steering committee, handbook and Alumni website). During 2005 a significant initiative was the creation of the ITL Alumni Chapter, its subsequent launch, and website (http://www.itl.usyd.edu.au/community/alumni.htm). With over 200 graduates of ITL courses during the past 10 years, this was a timely move and during 2006 a number of activities have been planned to further this initiative.

Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)
1. This recommendation arose partly in the context of further publicising the work of the Institute at paragraph 3.4.1. We continue to evaluate each of its programs, units of study, and other activities.
2. We have identified some areas where evaluation is not routine, e.g., administration.

ITL's evaluation of the success of action taken
The Acting Director sees all evaluations, and notes that they are embarrassingly good.

Recommendation 3
The Review Team recommends that Institute for Teaching and Learning should increase its level of critical self-reflection, including working to establish an overall evaluation mechanism. (Section 3.4.4)

Action taken by ITL
1. This recommendation arose partly in the context of further publicising the work of the Institute at paragraph 3.4.1. We continue to evaluate each of its programs, units of study, and other activities.
2. We have identified some areas where evaluation is not routine, e.g., administration.

Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)
In tandem with the revision of the Institute for Teaching and Learning’s Strategic Plan 2003-2006 when the new director arrives, the plan is to develop a more comprehensive and integrated approach to evaluation. One possibility is an annual meeting with Associate Deans to seek their feedback on the ITL and to assess the needs of faculties.

ITL's evaluation of the success of action taken
The acting director sees all evaluations, and notes that they are embarrassingly good.

Two members of the staff have been received faculty teaching awards.
Recommendation 4

The Review Team recommends that the Institute for Teaching and Learning should continue to actively pursue the enrolment of full-fee paying students in its integrated program of studies in higher education. (Section 3.6.4)

Action taken by ITL

1. Places in the Graduate Certificate in Educational Studies (Higher Education) Applicants as full-fee payers for the Graduate Certificate in Educational Studies (Higher Education) were generated; 1 in 2005: 2 in 2006, a 100% increase!
2. Generation of Fees from tailoring the Principles and Practice of University Teaching and Learning program for Moore Theological College (Newtown) and the King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals. One member of the Moore College staff has subsequently enrolled as a fee-paying student in the Graduate Certificate.
   Moore College and the Australian College of Nursing have purchased the use of our survey questionnaire services.
4. Fee Paying places in Higher Education courses. The ITL continues to attract income from PhD completions (see the list of PhD students on the ITL website http://www.itl.usyd.edu.au/research/phd.htm). Enrolments in Master of Higher Education units continue to grow (five in 2005).

Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)

The Evaluation and Quality Assurance website will provide details for conducting this service to outside organisations.

We have negotiated with the College of Nursing regarding purchasing use of our survey questionnaire capacity.

Further action planned but not yet implemented

The acting director plans to visit the peak body of theological colleges to make our services known.

We have negotiated with the College of Nursing about purchasing use of our survey questionnaire capacity.

Recommendation 5

The Review Team recommends that the ITL should undertake a Review of their Programs to develop clarity around goals and pathways. Specifically, the Review Team felt that ITL should address the demand for programs for neophytes and leaders. (Section 4.1.7)

Action taken by ITL

1. The Institute continues to support faculties in developing and implementing their own programs to prepare tutors. We have worked particularly closely with Arts, Economics and Business, Engineering, and Pharmacy in this endeavour.
2. A staff member devised a presentation to neophyte academic staff on the ITL’s services and this has been presented (twice in 2005, scheduled for seven sessions in 2006) as part of the SSDU Academic orientation program. In the two sessions in 2005, the first had 17 attendees; the second had 16 attendees.
3. In 2005 the Principles and Practice of University Teaching and Learning program had an average 61% neophyte academic. It is the first stage of the Graduate Certificate offered by the ITL and the purpose of the program is to give a basic introduction to higher education teaching and learning principles. The program address how best to facilitate the learning of students, as well as how to enhance their understanding. The completion of this program has been made mandatory for new academic staff.

Further action planned but not yet implemented

Developing and implementing a program on leadership is contingent of staffing.

ITL’s evaluation of the success of action taken

A great many tutors complete the faculty programs. The Acting Director signed certificates of completion for more than seventy from the Faculty of Engineering in January 2006.

The success of the Sydney Staff Development Unit collaboration has been extremely positive with feedback on the sessions rating highly in the program evaluations. 128 participants completed Principles and Practice of University Teaching and Learning program in 2005. Many of these had to complete the program for confirmation of appointment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2005 Courses and # of Participants</th>
<th># required to complete</th>
<th>% required to complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February – 29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June – 36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September – 27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November – 36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For 2006 demand for subsidised places in the Graduate Certificate continues to outstrip supply, there were 57 qualified applicants for 36 places.

Recommendation 6

The Review Team recommends that the ITL should undertake an analysis of the Postgraduate Supervision Development Program and that this analysis informs actions to enhance the effectiveness of the program and increase completion rates. (Recommendation 6) (Section 4.2.2)

Action taken by ITL

1. 2004 saw the beginning of a major review and redesign of the Research Higher Degree Supervision program and this continued throughout 2005.
2. It became clear during 2005 that the new policy on research supervision training had an impact both on enrolments and on completions. Steps have been taken to clarify requirements for completion of the program, for example, by introducing the program in the Introductory workshops held twice in the year, in the monthly online sessions and in discussions with postgraduate coordinators in some faculties.
Our data show that 54% of the 46 program graduates took less than 12 months to complete all seven modules as shown in the next table.

### Higher Research Degree Supervision Program Completion Periods (for 46 program graduates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of completions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 months or less</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12 months</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-18 months</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 months-2 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years or less</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown registration date</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Recommendation 7
The Review Team recommends that the ITL should continue to pursue the return of DEST research quantum to the ITL. (Section 6.2.2)

#### Action taken by ITL
1. The Pro Vice Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) acted on this matter and the Institute received a payment.
2. The Institute has also identified a technical issue about course codes for enrolments for Graduate Certificate that may explain the difficulty in securing funds from fee paying students.

#### Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)
We remain unsure that we are receiving funds for diploma and masters courses taught by the ITL. We are following up on this with the Faculty. We are also seeking funding for PhD completions.

#### ITL’s evaluation of the success of action taken
Some of the money is in the bank from the research quantum. We will regularly monitor accounts to see that it is received annually.

#### Recommendation 8
The Review Team recommends that ITL investigates opportunities for developing a benchmarking relationship with a peer institution in North America and/or the Asia-Pacific region. (Section 6.3.3)

#### Action taken by ITL
1. The Pro Vice Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) and the Acting Director have had preliminary conversation with Professor Gary Poole about a relationship with the University of British Columbia in November 2005. This is good choice for many reasons, similarity of the universities, common interest in the Asia/Pacific, similar approaches to strategy in teaching.
2. The ITL was approached by Nagoya University (a member of Academic Consortium 21) in January 2006 to use our course experience questionnaires and to begin a benchmarking relationship around that instrument. Nagoya University is a research intensive, comprehensive university and it plays a leading role in Academic Consortium 21, of which the University is also a member; and it has a centre akin to the ITL, making it a good choice.

#### Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)
The new director will follow up with each university in consultation with the Pro Vice Chancellor (Learning and Teaching).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 9</th>
<th>The Review Team recommends that once the new Director ITL is appointed, the ITL should commence the process to update their Strategic Plan. (Section 9.2.3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action taken by ITL</td>
<td>A new director has not yet been appointed. The Institute's current plan runs to the end of 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</td>
<td>We have begun to compile information for the next round of Academic Board reviews which will feed into the planning process later in 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITL's evaluation of the success of action taken</td>
<td>Too early to comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 10</td>
<td>The Review Team recommends that the Institute for Teaching and Learning should liaise with the Web Support Unit to request a link to the Institute's Website from the Staff intranet home page (<a href="http://intranet.usyd.edu.au/staff/index.html">http://intranet.usyd.edu.au/staff/index.html</a>). (Section 9.3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action taken by ITL</td>
<td>We have link on the teaching and research page now: <a href="http://intranet.usyd.edu.au/staff/teaching.html">http://intranet.usyd.edu.au/staff/teaching.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</td>
<td>We have not yet identified any change because of this link.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>