

DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO

SELF REVIEW

July 2004

Structure of the document	1
Introduction.....	1
Background	2
1 Integration	2
2 Alignment and positioning.....	2
3 Diversification of core business.....	3
4 Growth.....	3
Terms of Reference relevant to the Development Portfolio	4
Issues and problems	6
1 Incapacity	6
2 Clayton-Centric infrastructure	7
3 Structure and process	7
4 Portfolio interfaces	8
5 Activity interfaces	8
6 Key account management	8
7 Centres.....	9
8 Alumni	9
9 Fundraising.....	9
10 Workloads	10
11 International students.....	10
12 Upskilling of academic staff.....	10
Recommendations.....	11
Appendix 1 Adult Learning and Development Strategy	13
Appendix 2 Professional and community services.....	16
Appendix 3 Report/submission from Faculty Development Manager	18
Key recommendations.....	18
Sample approach: Integrated learning, teaching and research framework	19
Appendix 4 Response to terms of reference by Marketing Manager.....	23

DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO

SELF REVIEW

July 2004

Structure of the document

This response is arranged in a number of sub-sections. First, there is an introductory overview, which summarises the essence of the narrative outlined in the main part of the document. Second, there is a background section that highlights and elaborates four core themes that are central to understanding the recent path taken by development. Then follows the main body of the discussion, which addresses the terms of reference. Next, there is a section that considers a number of issues and problems arising out of the development experience. While these are hinted at throughout the discussion, they are summarised more systematically in this section. Finally, there is a set of recommendations arising out of the issues identified.

Introduction

The purpose of this response to the Academic Review terms of reference is to summarise the journey taken by this portfolio in the period since the previous review of the Faculty. In many ways, as this document indicates, the small-scale story of Development in the Education Faculty represents a microcosm of the larger narrative of Monash University and, indeed, the entire Australian higher education sector, as each has sought to respond to the challenges posed by the marketisation policies of successive Australian governments.

As the discussion shows, the Faculty's development journey has been far from straightforward and uncomplicated. Indeed, for some academic staff the entire notion of 'development', the commodification of learning that this entails and the very idea that Faculty resources should be committed to activities of a commercial nature is at best anathema and at worst a corruption of traditional educational ideals. Having said that, it is important to make clear at the outset the over-riding point of significance concerning this portfolio. Despite all the lumpiness, hesitancy, stumbling and false starts experienced by those working in this domain, in the last decade or so, but especially during 2001-4, development activity, which was once utterly peripheral and marginal to the work of the Faculty, has at last come in from the cold. It now sits at the heart of the Faculty's core business. This elevated status of the portfolio is an indication of a massive recent cultural transformation that has occurred and is still occurring across the Faculty.

To those colleagues who have worked in the Faculty continuously over the past decade, the sense of this transformation is palpable. Moreover, the reality of the transformation can be readily substantiated by the data assembled below as evidence of the accomplishments of this portfolio. These data show that, in the 1990s, the Faculty responded initially in a tentative and reactive manner to the commercial imperatives created by pressures to marketise, but that, as part of the attempt at a more co-ordinated and planned response to the challenges posed by market forces, the Faculty has now adopted a much more proactive strategy of 'sustainability'. This strategy has been deliberately anchored in a broadening of the overall curriculum at all levels of provision and is evident in the diversification of the faculty's student enrolment profile.

While this transformation has resulted in some stunning successes, the sense of triumphalism that it has engendered should be tempered. The experience has been far from one of unalloyed joy. Indeed, there have been heavy costs, both personal and professional. Moreover, there is a number of ongoing issues and problems, some of which are intractable, for to be governed in significant measure by the marketisation imperative has placed much of the responsibility for its own destiny into the hands of the Faculty itself. The result is that these issues and problems are of the Faculty's own making, and arise principally through having to create and manage its growth. This is a new experience for senior academics in the Faculty, particularly those working within this portfolio, for many of them began their careers and were socialised as teachers and researchers in an era of overwhelming reliance on government largesse. In sum, the totality of these ongoing issues is concerned with the Faculty's capacity or incapacity to service its existing growth trajectory. As will be evident below, the response within the portfolio to the challenge posed by the need to be sustainable,

particularly during the period 2001-4, has been to try to 'cover all bases' and to 'pursue all options'. Those working within the portfolio now realise that this is no longer a tenable strategy, and they have begun to adopt a more selective and measured approach to managing growth.

Background

What have been the essential elements of the Faculty's recent cultural shift, and what role has development activity played in this process? The journey is far from over, but these elements will help provide a meaningful sense of how the Faculty has arrived at where it is now positioned in 2004, and where it sees itself headed during the life of its current operational plan and beyond. Four themes say it all. These are: integration, alignment and positioning, diversification and growth. A brief explanation of each theme follows.

1 Integration

In 2004, development activity is integrated into the mainstream academic work of the Faculty to an extent, which can only be described as unprecedented. 'Development' encompasses the work of the Development Office (DO), the International Unit (IU), marketing and promotions and the subsets of activities that fall within each of these domains. The following list of examples captures something of the scope of development activity:

- marketing and promotion of certificate-level short courses
- securing local and international fee-paying student cohorts for both award and non-award courses
- preparation and submission of commercial tenders and contracts
- management and conduct of school reviews and schools consultancy services
- identification and engagement of potential commercial partners
- devising of strategies to consolidate ongoing commercial partnerships
- management of key account portfolios
- hosting of local and international delegations and visitors
- commercial systems implementation, maintenance and administration
- business planning

While few of these activities may have been 'on the radar' of academics at the time of the previous review, they have been undertaken deliberately and with strong conviction as to their legitimacy and appropriateness. They are all intended to secure and maintain the Faculty's current and future scholarly standing and reputation. The present level of integration is consistent with the overall direction and thrust of the University's strategic planning framework and assumptions, in particular No. 10 ('Self-Reliance') of the Monash University Values. In contrast to its immediate predecessor, the Professional Development Institute (PDI), Faculty academic staff in 2004 both expect and volunteer to engage, as part of workload, in the range of contractual, tender and project work generated by the DO. The seeds of this depth of engagement were planted as a result of the decision to more closely monitor the activities of the PDI as part of its re-location to the Clayton campus in 1999, and germinated with the re-structuring of the PDI into the DO in 2001. Not only do academic staff more willingly commit themselves to be part of development, but there is now almost universal recognition amongst colleagues (as evidenced by the February 2004 Faculty Day listening post activity) that the likelihood of their success in securing development project work and commercial contracts is significantly enhanced if they work closely with DO staff.

2 Alignment and positioning

Since approximately 2000-1, the Faculty has attempted to position itself competitively in a variety of new education markets. While not representing a priority listing, these markets reflect existing and emerging Faculty teaching and research strengths. They include:

- early childhood
- TESOL
- schooling
- TAFE and higher education
- adult, further and community education

- work and learning, workplace training
- policing
- human development and counselling
- sport and outdoor recreation
- leadership
- curriculum, teaching and learning
- multi-culturalism, global and indigenous knowledge and cultures

The Faculty's new market relations are evident in a series of alliances and partnerships with a range of public, private and not for profit agencies and networks. These arrangements are hugely labour and time intensive, and they represent hours and hours of relationship-building, and the development of reservoirs of goodwill and trust. All have been maintained through a series of commercial contracts, memoranda of understanding and informal working agreements. The effect of these partnerships has been to secure and strengthen the academic work of the Faculty in two main ways. First, they have resulted in the identification and enrolment of a series of new local, national and international (inbound and off-shore) fee-paying student cohorts. Second, these partnerships have generated a small, but nonetheless growing, number of collaborative research projects which have contributed significantly to Faculty research quantum.

3 Diversification of core business

The core business of the University and the Faculty has always been, and will continue to be, teaching and research. As the Operational Plan makes clear to the outside world, as part of the Faculty's vision statement, the particular focus of Education Faculty academic work in these two areas of core business is human learning and development. Historically, the Faculty's traditional client base has mostly been the school sector. On the other hand, while it has never regarded 'education' as being solely synonymous with 'schooling', for most of the 1990s, a period marked by significant contraction in teacher education and a political climate hostile to education, Faculty growth was retarded by its over-dependence on the supply and demand for teachers. As a result of its recent policy of strategic alignment and positioning as part of sustainability, however, the Faculty currently provides probably the most diversified set of program offerings in its 40-year history and, as a consequence, is much less vulnerable to sectoral contraction and instability. The outcome of this diversification is that the Faculty now has a very reputable, and visible national and international profile in a number of key areas of high and persistent educational demand.

4 Growth

In 2001-4, the Faculty made a large number of new and ongoing academic and general appointments. Particularly significant was the decision to appoint a Manager, Faculty Development. Unquestionably, a significant contributing factor here was the extremely satisfactory level of commercial return to the Faculty resulting from the expansion of its development work. These staff appointments have occurred in a number of areas of high market demand. Apart from the positive contribution of these appointments to lightening staff teaching and supervision loads, they have also significantly enhanced overall staff capability levels in these key areas, to the extent that some clusters of academics may now be approaching 'critical mass'. In bald reductionist terms, the pattern that emerged was: 1. find or create a demand; 2. next, meet it and sustain it; 3. then, obtain resources forthcoming as a result of the income generated. Veneered with the language of marketing, the links in the strategic chain were: market research>plan business activity>implement plan>evaluate plan>action>improvement.

But this emergent pattern has come at significant cost for many academic staff: teaching loads way in excess of desired levels defined by the Teaching Load Distribution Formula (TLDF), a massive and widespread sense of work intensification, and gross work-non work life imbalance. While not necessarily representing a pattern of self-sustaining growth, this outcome of expanded capacity approaching critical mass (in some scholarly areas) has generated a virtuous (as opposed to a vicious) circle for the Faculty. In broad terms, the logic of this virtuosity operates as follows: increased financial and reputational returns facilitate improved capability, which in turn helps build overall profile and status, and makes the Faculty an attractive employment location for potential new academic staff, which increases its capacity to attract new markets, which fuels further growth, and so on. Equally, this growth trajectory has also facilitated the appointment of an increased number of general staff who have significantly broadened the Faculty's administrative and managerial skills bases (refer to the 'General Staff Profile' in Staff Portfolio [S34]), provided essential support services to academic staff, and strengthened overall Faculty capability.

Terms of Reference relevant to the Development Portfolio

- TR1** The development portfolio has contributed significantly to the reputation and standing of the Faculty's core academic business. This claim can be substantiated in a number of ways. First, the Faculty is now being invited regularly to either: a. submit tenders, and/or b. to be a preferred tenderer, by significant public sector agencies, particularly but not only, in the field of education. These invitations have come 'on the back of' the previous provision of high quality project deliverables. Second, the Faculty's success rate with project tendering and contractual work has increased. For example, of five projects put out for tender by DE&T this year, Monash submitted for four and won all four. These were for a Masters program in School Leadership, an environmental scan on teaching and learning for the Research Unit¹, a research project on giftedness, and a mentoring program for aspiring leaders showing the breadth of activity and expertise recognised. Third, the quality of the feedback obtained from cohort-based course enrolments, procured as a result of DO efforts, attests to the quality of Faculty courses and teaching². Fourth, on the platform of the quality of teaching programs provided for its strategic partners, the Faculty has been successful in obtaining research grants on an institutional or inter-institutional basis (eg an evaluation of the Police Schools Involvement Program).
- TR2** The work of the development portfolio is closely aligned and consistent with the planning priorities of the University, as expressed in three of its major policy documents: *Leading the Way, Monash 2020*; *Monash University: Excellence and Diversity: Strategic Framework 2004-8*; *Global Development 2002-6*.
- TR4** The Faculty is one of two non-departmentalised Monash faculties. On balance, this non-departmental structure has enabled, rather than constrained, the Faculty's capacity to bolster and sustain its market attractiveness and competitiveness. The division of the Faculty into functional portfolios, each headed by an AD, with each AD advised by a policy committee, has facilitated ease of communication, identification of staff and representation of a range of Faculty viewpoints. In development, for example, this is evident in data on the number and diversity of staff from each campus involved in local and international teaching contracts and short-course projects, whose engagement in an otherwise departmentalised structural environment might have been inhibited.

As required by the University, the Faculty engages in an annual risk management profile exercise, as part of which it identifies the potential risks to its well-being and reputation due to the possible failure or impairment of aspects of its core business. A number of development-sponsored or development-initiated activities fall into the medium to high risk zones.

One unacknowledged or implicit aspect of risk management, however, may be the Faculty's potential loss of intellectual property, either in the development area directly, or perhaps in the event of unanticipated departures of staff who have participated in development-initiated activities. Much of the growth and transformation identified earlier in this response have relied on a paucity of staff with the requisite skills (e.g., negotiation, networking, industry and market profile). Expertise in the costing of projects, for example, is limited to very few persons. These possibilities highlight the need to institute systems to facilitate project archiving. A start has been made with the introduction by the DO of the Submissions Contract Register (SCR).

- TR5** As evidenced by DO data on the composition of contract project personnel, the Faculty in 2004 has achieved a much better balance of academic and external consultants engaged in development work. In the PDI period to 2000-1, for example, the Faculty was significantly more dependent on the expertise of external consultants to give it 'market presence', along with the capability necessary to fulfil its commercial obligations. A good illustration is the contract to manage school reviews for DE&T (Victoria) where an unhealthy number of consultants were able, in effect, to 'trade on the Faculty name' and an unacceptable proportion of project-generated income flowed to sources outside the Faculty. Thus, while significantly diminishing the Faculty's rate of financial return, this situation also reduced its capacity to implement requisite quality control processes. This situation has since been rectified. A second important change in the School Review area, which has assisted the Faculty in

¹ Additional documents: F4.1: Letter from Research Unit of DE&T re Environmental Scan

² Additional documents: F4.2: Evaluation of Kangan Batman courses and F3.8 Unsolicited letters from students in cohort based courses from 'non-traditional' sectors, eg VISY, Victoria Police

maintaining positive outcomes consistent with the commitments in its vision, has been the introduction of new quality control measures³. DE&T has been heard to use Monash's School Review procedures and quality assurance processes as a model and we have recently increased the number of reviews for which we are contracted

TR6 Two aspects of the expansion of development activity have increased pressure on existing Faculty resources. As indicated by the Faculty enrolment data, there has been a fourfold growth in the numbers of in-bound international students in five years, particularly at Clayton.

EFTSU March 31	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
On-shore international	55	63	74	149	207	221
Off-shore	0	0	4	12	50	71
Domestic	2003	1919	2053	2070	2114	2282
Total	2058	1983	2131	2232	2371	2554

The trends evident in the above data, along with the numbers of enrolments in short courses (approximately 700 in 2003), have created problems for the allocation of teaching spaces. To some extent these time-tabling difficulties, particularly in the case of short courses, have been eased by 'quarantining' dedicated rooms for development programs, although any expansion of the scope and variety of these activities is likely to exacerbate this problem. On the other hand, the upgrading of IT infrastructure in these dedicated spaces (e.g., powerpoint and video installations) as part of the renovation of Building 6 at Clayton, has significantly enhanced the aesthetic quality of the learning environment provided to short-course participants, and provided international students with their own dedicated work space.

TR7 A significant feature of the Faculty's success in attracting new student cohorts, as a result of development initiatives, has been its capacity to provide flexible learning environments for off-campus, institution-based students and for students enrolled by distance mode. A key feature of this flexible learning has been the provision of electronic access to digitised resource materials on unit webpages. This facility for students has been augmented by the provision of high quality hard copy unit materials produced by CeLTS.⁴

TR8 As also indicated by the enrolment data (see Curriculum Portfolio [C14-16, C17-18]), the Faculty's overall student profile has changed significantly during 2001-4. These changes have occurred directly as a result of development portfolio initiatives. Two case study examples illustrate the point. First, the Faculty's TAFE partnership strategy has created a series of Masters-level institutional cohort-based teaching markets with a number of major Melbourne metropolitan TAFE colleges (Appendix 1). These programs have provided firm foundations for subsequent consultancies and joint research projects. Second, as part of the Faculty's partnership with Victoria Police, over 100 officers are now enrolled in Masters-level coursework and research degrees. Both strategies have been implemented following the drafting of a series of strategy papers. Coupled with two joint Faculty-Victoria Police research contracts, the number of Police student research projects promises to augment significantly the intellectual capability of the Force.

TR9 The flow of decision-making processes in relation to courses, especially arising out of development portfolio initiated partnerships, has been effective. Initiatives have been generated by DO staff, and then discussed at Development Committee prior to the preparation of a formal submission to Faculty Executive Committee, or have been documented in Executive Committee papers as part of load planning.

Regular reports (as per the schedule of portfolio reporting) have been provided to both Executive Committee and Faculty Board on the progress of local, national and international cohort initiatives⁵.

³ Additional documents: F2.14: Processes for School Reviews

⁴ Additional documents: F6.3: Sample DE materials: BSOR, Early Childhood, Counselling, Organisational Leadership

⁵ Additional documents: F2.15: Reports to Faculty on Development outcomes

Development portfolio initiated proposals for new courses have been articulated through the internal Faculty Curriculum Committee processes. This has entailed the required liaison between the ADs in Curriculum and Development, and a range of academic staff and general staff (e.g., Manager, Marketing and Promotions, and Faculty Manager), for costings, load projections etc.

TR18 The range, scope and impact of the Faculty's engagements are considerable [D16: Appendix 2]. A significant proportion of these engagements arise from ongoing professional connections between academic colleagues, but an equally significant proportion is generated as a result of development portfolio strategic activities and the networks established by DO staff⁶. Moreover, there is a significant amount of repeat business attracted on the basis of initial project success, and 'word of mouth' knowledge of successful project delivery and client satisfaction.

TR19 The performance and reputation of the Faculty in relation to its commercially generated core business is high. This is evident in a number of ways, including: the positive feedback obtained from participants in short course programs; repeat request to tender for projects following previous quality delivery; success rate with tenders; preferred tender status for key projects. For example, our success rates with tenders has increased from 49% in 2002 to 84% in 2003 and 80% so far in 2004 with 15% outstanding,

TR20 In relation to the community engagement dimensions of the Faculty's development work, the DO maintains extensive, up-date and accurate records and files on all projects and activities. It also maintains detailed agendas and minutes of meetings, along with tabled papers, of the Development Committee. The agenda is structured to ensure that each of the sub-areas of the portfolio (e.g., schools consultancy, international students) provides regular reports on trends, issues and potential policy changes. All short course programs established, sponsored and maintained by the DO are regularly evaluated by participants. This feedback is utilised in modifying the design and delivery of subsequent programs, and influences the nomination of program presenters.

As part of the management and oversight of the Faculty's off-shore teaching, as part of the contractual arrangement with APMI (Singapore), regular independent evaluations by students of all aspects of the unit delivery (including teaching, Faculty administration and advice) are completed on behalf of the partner (APMI). These are completed immediately following the last day of the fifth day of the unit teaching, and faxed back to the Faculty. This feedback is communicated to the relevant academic and general staff for action.

Issues and problems

There now follow 13 matters of concern arising out of the previous discussion. Taken at face value, their totality might be interpreted as indicating that the development 'tail', so to speak, is somehow wagging the Faculty 'dog'. This is not strictly correct and represents an over-simplification of the position. The development portfolio cannot be said to have 'got ahead of itself', for the Faculty would not be in the sound situation it is without the powerful growth trajectory it has forged; and everything that has been done has been done in as considered a way as possible. On the other hand, these matters have emerged as part of the price paid for three-four years of purposeful and strategic growth.

1 Capacity

In large measure, the overall success of development activity in the Faculty relies on 'far too few doing far too much'. There are at least two dimensions to this problem of skewed enterprise. One, there is a limited number of Faculty colleagues with specialist expertise in development work. Two, there is insufficient infrastructure and back-up support for this small number of people. By university standards, development is a 'lean' (although not a 'mean') outfit: the strong sense of those working in this portfolio is that, as a Faculty, we endeavour to generate at least as comparable an amount and volume of entrepreneurial work, both on- and off-shore, as larger departmentalised Monash faculties, the majority of which have much bigger staff numbers and student enrolments than Education. In this sense, there can be no doubt that we 'punch well

⁶ Additional documents: F2.15: Reports to Faculty on Development outcomes

above our weight'. For this, however, the Faculty pays a price: A number of detrimental and potentially debilitating consequences follow from this mal-distribution of work in the hands of a few. First, there are time periods of excruciatingly high pressure and stress, especially for general staff in the DO, when a series of high stakes tender and contractual deadlines coalesce, and colleagues become stretched to breaking point, both intellectually and emotionally. Second, the portfolio has been and continues to be vulnerable to the loss of expertise due to the temporary absences and illness of key academic and general staff. Third, the portfolio is also equally vulnerable to the sudden departure (e.g., due to resignations) of key personnel. These possibilities need to be addressed as part of the Faculty's policy of risk management.

2 Clayton-Centric infrastructure

While the infrastructure for Faculty development work has been consolidated at Clayton since 2000, after the transfer of the original PDI from Peninsula, and incorporated into core Faculty business, much of development work continues to be Clayton-centric (e.g., school reviews). There is no identifiable reason in principle why a consequence of location on one of the three campuses should induce such a place-bound bias. These observations are not intended to single out individuals or particular activities for criticism. Indeed, a number of development staff are blameless in this regard and should be regarded as exemplary in their efforts to engage with all three campuses (e.g., Manager, Faculty Development), yet there is still insufficient consultation between some Clayton-based personnel with Gippsland and Peninsula campuses. More could have been done by the AD(D) during 2002-4, for example, to visit all three campuses and to hold development fora, and to align these with meetings of the Development Committee as these circulate around the campuses. The handover of oversight of the portfolio to a Gippsland-based AD(D) during 2004-5, who will be travelling between and working across two campuses, may go some way to rectifying this Clayton-centricity. On the other hand, there can be no doubt that the DO and probably the AD(D) need to be based at Clayton for a significant proportion of the working week, particularly with constant possibility of impromptu international delegation visits to Clayton, because the international component of the AD(D) portfolio entails representation on an increasingly large number of university committees in the international area (which convene at either Clayton or Caulfield) and in order to be in close contact with University officers (e.g., the solicitors' office) for contract finalisation purposes. There is, therefore, a huge convenience factor which is biased towards a Clayton location for development infrastructure. A detrimental consequence, however, is that Clayton 'calls the tune', so that unless of their own volition they happen to initiate a project, many non-Clayton academic staff only tend to 'engage' with development work if and when they are called upon to do so.

3 Structure and process

Much of the activity that forms part of this portfolio is highly dependent on the personal networks and contacts of key colleagues, both academic and general. That is, in the sourcing of its business the Faculty relies significantly on the range of personal contacts and industry networks established by these personnel. In one sense, there is nothing unusual about this form of sourcing of work: after all, this tendency, which is an outgrowth of relationship-building, lies at the very heart of what it means to be entrepreneurial. To the extent that these contacts have paid off (by generating teaching-based income streams and research quantum), the Faculty can justifiably take comfort from having made some good (indeed, in some cases, outstanding) staff appointments. While this reliance represents an undoubted strength, it can also be a weakness. The reason is that networked contacts and relations proceed in a way that at times ill-conduces to regularised structure and process. Such processes as peer review and consultation, for example, can be experienced as constraining when there may be a need for speed in order to capitalise on an opportunity and secure market advantage. With a few exceptions, our response to opportunities and possibilities tends to be of the 'don't let them slip through our fingers' variety, as opposed to a calculated decision to confine the Faculty's commitments to avoid over-reaching itself.

The result is that the Faculty relies heavily, at times, on a structural mix of formalism and ad-hockery. That is, structures such as committees often find themselves 'playing catch-up' by endorsing in-train initiatives and by responding to what are, in effect, *faits accomplis*. Another important consequence is that in the way this patchy pattern plays itself out there is enormous scope for potential (and actual) disconnects. Possible projects arise and persons who need to know—because they are accountable for the activity-mix and balance of initiatives in light of operational plan targets—discover their existence through happenstance or find themselves positioned way down the information chain. This means there is no one co-ordination point or that co-ordination only happens if in fact it happens. In short, the nature of work procurement, the sheer volume of it, and the lead-times and deadlines for its completion are often ill-conducive to structural oversight and regularised consultation processes. Whilst this is an ongoing issue and one that plagues this type of fast

response necessity for some projects, the Development Office nevertheless has been operating with an extensive and well laid out strategic planning process which is reviewed and updated when necessary. The overall aims, connections and project successes have not been due to mere adhocery but due mostly to careful and concise strategic thinking and planning (see, for example, D13 Appendix 1).

4 Portfolio interfaces

Associate dean portfolios exist currently as silos. Their siloing behaviour is different from departmentalised siloing. In the latter case, the silos tend to be what Lesley Santee Siskin (Harvard Education) calls territorial 'realms of knowledge'. The Faculty's portfolio silos operate, for the most part, in parallel and blissful isolation, although every now and then their activities rub up against one another. An example might be the fault line between research and development, so that tender work generated in development assumes priority by encroaching on what might otherwise be colleagues' research active dedicated time. Portfolio siloing arises when, as a way of negotiating and defining for themselves a sense of manageable space in an increasingly boundaryless, open-ended and intensified work environment, colleagues 'self-bound' their working in order to cope. This means that they do not necessarily engage with others about possible consequences, nor do they pre-plan, because to do so is to exacerbate potential role boundarylessness, loss of control and diminution of comfort zones.

5 Activity interfaces

There are also silos within silos. Within development, for example, there is school reviewing, schools consultation, the whole area of international students, and to some extent marketing and promotions, and so on. While academic managers and/or colleagues responsible for these activities come together five times per annum around the Development Committee meeting table, activities within these domains often proceed according to their own rhythm and pace. One way of aligning and interfacing these activities might be through a series of plans or framework statements. Currently, however, while there are some strategic priorities listed in the Operational Plan, there is no overall marketing plan, although there is a series of development plans, so that there are no clearly articulated points of connection between these two domains.

The consequences of this disconnection play themselves in different ways. In domestic or on-shore activities, there are plans which are designed to create and strategically develop different markets (e.g., the Work & Learning in the TAFE sector). These plans follow closely the Monash PAMEI quality of cycle (i.e., plan, act, monitor, evaluate, improve) and, significantly focus on the alignment of teaching and research within strategic partnerships. Notable examples are the expanding partnership arrangements with VISY Industries, the TAFE sector, the Victoria Police, DEST and DE&T. In the international arena, on the other hand, domains of activity often emerge in the following way. The pattern of expansion tends to be that activities grow and accumulate as individuals feel their way forward and develop trust with partners, and sense the appropriate next step to be taken. Thus, a project or an activity begins to gestate. This then metamorphoses, so that eventually the momentum established might be reconstructed (i.e., rationalised *post hoc*) as comprising a strategy.

6 Key account management

With the expansion of activity and commitments since 2001, the portfolio has reached a point at which serious consideration needs to be given to the management of 'key accounts'. This refers to the arrangement of portfolio responsibilities in a series of activity areas with domestic and international partners which are significant stand-alone sources of short-course, teaching and research income. Taking the international component of the portfolio as an example, there is an argument for hiving off international activities and creating an AD portfolio separate from the domestic domain. 'International' is both an expanding area, as the university positions itself for extensive engagement in North America, Europe and, in particular, Asia. Externally, there are now seven university committees in the international area which require Faculty representation. At the moment, this representation is provided (mostly) by the AD(D), and to some extent by the Deputy Dean and the AD(R). Internally, responsibility for academic visitors resides with Research portfolio.

Internationally, then, an AD(I) might assume responsibility for this university-level representation, along with the APMI/TMC Singapore teaching programs, the Auckland International College contract, short-course programs and international projects. Another crucial area of responsibility here is the Faculty's emerging engagement with Chinese universities. In short, if the Faculty is genuinely serious about international

engagement, internationalising its curriculum and operating strategically, then it needs an 'international strategy'. Assuming that an AD(I) were to be established then, domestically, the AD(D) might take responsibility for the expanding numbers of agency partnerships: e.g., Victoria Police, TAFE sector, DE&T and the corporate sector. The alternative to a domestic-international portfolio split might be to appoint an academic-in-charge of Singapore, police, TAFE etc. Either way, an unresolved issue is whether the appointee would manage or oversee the totality of the activities in each partnership (i.e., including teaching and research) or whether the oversight would be confined to development *per se* and the procurement of work. An important advantage of either of these arrangements, but especially the former, would be to enable a much more co-ordinated approach to the quality monitoring of work. At the moment, the Faculty relies on a range of acceptable and reliable conventional quality measures (e.g., student enrolment and admissions criteria, consultation with stakeholders, conclusion of program evaluations), but management of both the portfolio and sub-portfolio areas in the manner proposed would facilitate concerted oversight and review. (see Appendix 3, D18)

7 Centres

Embedded in the targets of successive iterations of the Faculty Operational Plan since 2001, there has been a commitment to a Development Committee-sponsored review of centres within the Faculty. Despite various attempts to put in train a review mechanism, this review is yet to 'get off the ground'. This is an unfortunate outcome because the Faculty does not have a policy on centres. The outcome of this review might be expected to provide invaluable data which, along with substantive recommendations, should provide a solid foundation for such a policy. Another reason why this is an unfortunate outcome is that, as the Faculty undertakes a process for fostering and supporting research clusters, there needs to be clarity about centres, their diverse natures, the rationale for their existence and their connection with the clustering of critical masses of academics. This need is particularly urgent in the case of the Krongold centre, the strategic future of which has been the subject of considerable Faculty discussion and effort during 2003-4. In light of the recent initiative to establish Faculty research clusters, it would be appropriate, therefore, to try to align the review of centres with the clustering initiative in order to ensure that the conferral of 'centre' status, if it occurs at all, occurs as a deliberate decision in line with Faculty policy.

8 Alumni

Responsibility for Faculty alumni falls within the development portfolio. For the most part, the Faculty has paid lip-service to the idea of identifying and engaging with its alumni. Despite some sporadic attempts on the part of some Faculty colleagues and graduates during the previous two decades to activate an ongoing alumni connection, there is little by way of an enduring relationship. The current lack of both a policy and a strategy is a result of the absence of development portfolio activity in this area. This absence is partly due to a lack of resources and capacity to foster and build the necessary relationships. Prior to any investment in resources in this area, there are important questions to answer, including: What purposes and motivation would be served by the Faculty in fostering relations with its alumni? What is the connection between these relations and the Faculty's strategic priorities in the Operational Plan? How might the Faculty identify its alumni (and what role would the university play in this regard)? In the light of the objectives to be achieved by relations with its alumni, how might ongoing alumni relations be sustained? There are two possible solutions. First, in light of the earlier point about resources and capacity, the Faculty may need to consider the appointment at some future date of an alumni officer. A second, and possibly more useful, suggestion, in order to address properly the previous policy questions, would be to position alumni activities within the area of marketing, and then to develop a alumni strategy within an overall Faculty marketing plan.

9 Fundraising

A major item for the Faculty's consideration is the question of whether or not it should engage actively in fund-raising. Apart from the possible involvement of Faculty alumni in this area, as part of a multi-pronged mode of alumni engagement (as per the suggestions in point 8), there appear to be at least two possible options for fund-raising: sponsorship and endowments. In the event that the Faculty decides to actively pursue external sources of funds, for either option there would need to be overall fund-raising strategy in place. Once again, as with alumni, and without any intention to over-burden the marketing area, fund-raising may need to form part of an overall approach to marketing and promoting the Faculty. For the purposes of fund-raising, the Faculty lacks currently the requisite capacity, and it would need to draw significantly on the expertise of the University. Rather than canvass extensively here the possibilities and pitfalls associated with either of the two suggested options, the Faculty may need to draw on the experience of other parts of Monash (e.g., the former David Syme Business School, now part of the Faculty of BusEco) or other

institutions (e.g., the Bowater School of Business at Deakin University). Likewise with endowments (which are usually provided by alumni), while the Faculty has its own experience of the deep generosity of the Krongold family on which to draw, university advice would be required on the possibility and feasibility of philanthropic activities and commitments.

10 Workloads

It is not clear how, if at all, 'development work', either broadly or narrowly defined, gets factored into the Faculty's expectations concerning workloads. Part of the reason for this is that while the Faculty has the Teaching Load Distribution Formula (TLDF), it does not have an 'Academic Work Load Distribution Formula'. Section 6 of the TLDF mentions 'Other teaching and consultancies', where school reviews and PD/short course teaching are highlighted, but that is all. Nonetheless, section 6 cites the examples of 'income generating consultancies and other activities' (p. 4). Clearly, a number of development initiatives generate significant teaching and research work (e.g., TAFE strategy), and add significantly to the teaching workloads of some academic staff, thereby reducing their capacity to undertake research, particularly if they are above the preferred level of teaching load points.

In short, the Faculty's current growth trajectory fuels competing demands on and priorities for academic staff and their time, and in this regard is a significant source of tension. Effectively, the pursuit of growth requires, and is dependent on, a number of staff acting against their own best interests by loading themselves up with development work. A number of these people can do research, and are either already active researchers or, if they are not, they are people who want to be researchers and do not have the time to undertake it. Such people are carrying forward the development strategy for the Faculty, and they are torn between being good organisational citizens and denying their career interests and advancement. This tension is closely connected to the earlier issue of incapacity and it is by no means peculiar to Monash Education, for it is an Australia-wide systemic issue. Until such time as it is addressed, the Faculty will be trading on, and continuing to make itself hostage to, the goodwill of its staff.

11 International students

During 2001-4, the Faculty has increased significantly its on-shore international student enrolments, as indicated by the earlier data. In this period, there have been two important developments in relation to the quality of service provision. First, the staff working in this area have been organised into a highly efficient and responsive international unit. Two strong indicators here are: the rapidity of the 'turnaround' time for processing student enrolment applications and the high quality of the extensive data base maintained by the unit. Second, there has been an expansion of the services provided to students. The Faculty was one of the earliest of the Monash faculties to provide both pastoral and learning support to students through the employment of a staff member with these dedicated responsibilities. Fifteen years later, it continues to be one of the few faculties to provide such services, as opposed to having students rely (as some faculties do) on the university-wide language and learning support unit.

The issue for the immediate and longer-term future is this: given the Faculty's expectation of a doubling of current enrolments within the next three years, and given that Monash Education (on the basis of anticipated Semester 2, 2004 enrolment data) appears to be the *only* Faculty with a projected enrolment increase of international students, how can the current level of Faculty support be expected to cope, when that level of support is already stretched to breaking point? Without an increase in person-power the quality of support can only be expected to decline. To illustrate: much of the quality of student support for which the Faculty has a justifiably well-earned reputation stems from the provision of intensive one-on-one and small group work with students. In the event that projected growth translates into actual growth, the per-student entitlement to engagement in such sessions would either have to be reduced, or the format of advice might have to be changed to some kind of impersonal and disembodied Web-style format. Either way, the consequences for quality *and* for projected enrolments are highly likely to be negative.

12 Upskilling of academic staff

The successful engagement of the Faculty in commercial activity depends on a number of factors concerned with overall capability, some of which have already been highlighted. There is a number of important dimensions of capability. Two in particular are worthy of mention. First, the broadening of the collective skills base in respect of the scope and depth of academic staff experience in tendering, and contract procurement, management, implementation and delivery. Second, the ongoing refinement of development infrastructure, in

particular DO support services to academic staff. In both instances, the Faculty has significantly improved its performance during 2001-4.

In relation to the first, some sense of the Faculty's success in securing expanded academic staff engagement is apparent from both the sheer number of current projects, their diverse nature, and the many tendering agencies with which the Faculty has entered into contractual arrangements. In relation to the second, while the available support infrastructure (both human and technical) now operates at a high level of sophistication, it requires both expansion and fine-graining. 'Expansion' means the appointment of additional personnel in order to cope with the burgeoning work load. While 'fine-graining' should not by any means be interpreted solely as the 'technologisation' of processes, there is little doubt that the burden of work could be diminished through additional 'smart work' strategies. On the other hand, efforts to be smarter can be thwarted, not through the fault of any particular person, but because for so much of the time, staff find themselves swimming with 'the flow' of work, their heads just above the rising tide: hence the corridor conversation references amongst ADs to be 'swamped' or to 'drowning'. A good illustration here is the Submissions Contract Register (SCR). Despite the endorsement by the Faculty Executive in late-2003 of an implementation protocol for the SCR, there has as yet been no 'roll-out'. Why? For the simple reason that an up-skilling program has to be organised across three campuses, but to do so requires finding or creating a 'break' in the flow in order to devise and implement the program, so as to secure maximum academic staff uptake. It has been difficult to find a possible down-time period to provide such a break. (In intensified boundary-less work environments down-times, so-called, have long gone by the board.) Result? Lip-service substitutes for up-skilling.

13 'Routinising' development work

This issue relates closely to the matters raised above as part of key account management (item 6). The concern here is about when 'development' work ceases to be part of the phase of scanning for, and identification and procurement of, possible work and markets, and changes its status to become ongoing or part of the 'normal' work of the Faculty. This is not simply a matter of line drawing, but there have been occasions in which, for some inexplicable reason, the engagement of DO staff continues beyond even the point of student enrolment, which is the period when the management of students has clearly entered the 'academic' realm, and should be managed by academic service and student service staff. A case in point are Master degree-level, institution-based enrolment cohorts. In a couple of cases, way past the point at which the market has been identified and the business secured, so to speak, enquiries have filtered through to DO staff concerning pedagogy and course delivery matters, when these should have been directed to the course co-ordinator or lecturer-in-charge. While the reasons for such mis-directed communications are unclear, the consequence of mis-direction has been to add unnecessarily to already heavy and pressured workloads of DO staff. This process error may be rectified by a 'process-mapping' exercise or by making clear as part of a protocol that accompanies the contractual arrangements with a strategic partner that, for particular types of enquiries, there are clear lines and contact points sourced to the relevant 'key account manager' or academic in charge.

Recommendations

This set of recommendations on the Development Portfolio has been developed by Professor Peter Gronn at the end of his period as Associate dean (Development). In addition, further aspects have been added by Associate Professor Len Cairns, current Associate dean (Development).

The major recommendations arising out of the Development Portfolio Response paper to the terms of reference for the Review of the Faculty are listed below. In each case, there is full supporting discussion and argument in the paper. A brief summary is included with each recommendation.

- 1 That the Faculty appoint an Assistant Manager, Faculty Development.

This recommendation arises out of discussion in the main report concerning the need for additional staff within the Development portfolio as the section develops into a broader range of activities and consolidates tenders, strategic partnership developments and international and alumni aspects of the area.

- 2 That the Faculty consider and discuss a new portfolio role, Associate Dean (International), and that the incumbent be responsible for the entire range of international Faculty engagement

This recommendation arises in the body of the report out of the perceived expansion of International activity by the Faculty, including off-shore initiatives and partnerships. Such a step would add an additional Associate dean to the existing group. Further consideration as to the existing strategies and possibilities within the Development portfolio are also being considered.

- 3 That, consequent of any determination on the above recommendation, the position of Associate Dean (Development) be re-constituted to include responsibility for all existing, and new local and national initiatives and partnerships.

This recommendation is simply a consequence of any deliberation and or action on the previous recommendation.

- 4 That meetings of the Development Committee circulate regularly between Clayton, Gippsland and Peninsula campuses, and that, where possible, the convening of development fora be dovetailed to committee meeting times and venues.

The Committee, which is one of 5 major Faculty policy committees, currently meets at Clayton. Adoption of the recommendation would align committee practice with that of Faculty Board and the Faculty Executive Committee.

- 5 That priority be given to the framing and implementation of a Faculty marketing plan during 2004-5, with particular attention given to the devising of alumni and fund-raising strategies, and possible future staffing appointments in these areas.

The Faculty has delayed work in this area until completion of the University's recent re-badging of its logos etc. and until the completion of the University marketing plan. It now time to complete our own plan.

- 6 That, in light of projected international student enrolment trends, a review be conducted of existing and anticipated student needs to ensure that there is an ongoing level of quality service provision commensurate with such identified needs.

For many years, the Faculty has provided a level of excellent support service to its international students. Its reputation in this regard is one of the reasons why international students enrol in Faculty programs. In order to sustain its reputation, as enrolments expand, the level of support will need to increase.

- 7 That, in the case of cohort-based enrolments, immediate attention be given to clarifying for partnering agencies the role and timing of involvement of, and responsibilities exercised by, various Faculty service teams and academic staff.

This recommendation is about 'process-mapping': in this case, clarifying the various responsibilities of development, general and academic staff. This need has arisen mainly as a result of uncertainty amongst some of our partners about to whom they direct ongoing inquiries, suggestions etc.

- 8 That consideration be given to expansion of the existing the Teaching Load Distribution Formula to an Academic Work Load Distribution Formula, in order to acknowledge engagement in development activities as a legitimate part of academic work loads.

There are many dimensions to the issues addressed here. In brief, while there is an increasing willingness on the part of academic staff to engage in development work, there is uncertainty about lack of recognition and/or compensation by the Faculty, particularly if and when this engagement adds to existing workloads. This aspect throws into open debate a tension among the various roles academic staff are expected to fulfil. Teaching load is but one fraction of staff activity together with Research and administration, and the inclusion of responses to and involvement with commissioned research tenders, cohort teaching and development activities such as school reviews and new programmes all need due consideration and recognition within the total academic activity of staff.

APPENDIX 1: ADULT LEARNING & DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

ACTIVITY	RESEARCH	QUALIFICATIONS	ARTICULATION	STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP
	<p>Education has longstanding research links with TAFE Institutes, which are being extended with specific initiatives including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> proposed research training programs via research Masters with specific TAFE Institutes CROSS-VOCE – a proposed cross-national research and research training initiative aimed at supporting professional development oriented to TAFE capacity building to support internationalisation 	<p><i>Education has established cohort-based Masters programs in Organisational Leadership and in Work and Learning Studies (WALS) sponsored/ supported by TAFE Institutes as part of their staff development and capacity-building activities.</i></p> <p>Education also offers an undergraduate program in Adult Learning and Development that has drawn largely from RTOs in the wider VET sector, rather than TAFE Institutes.</p>	<p><i>TAFE Institutes are keen to negotiate articulations into university programs for students completing TAFE awards, partly driven by the development of TAFE degrees but mostly in recognition of their need to build capacity, developing staff to operate in the international education market. Education is establishing articulations into Masters programs.</i></p> <p>TAFE Institutes are also seeking articulations into programs offered by other faculties. Education has established relationships with TAFE Institutes and their CEOs.</p>	<p>TAFE Institutes are currently positioning to establish formal partnerships with higher education institutions. Monash is an attractive partner.</p> <p>Education now has strong relationships with the 5 main stand-alone TAFE Institutes in Victoria and broader national networks. TAFE Institutes are relinquishing existing links with other universities to consolidate these partnerships with Monash</p>
Box Hill	NCVER Research Project – Monash, Box Hill MEd (Research)	MEd (WALS) - (20 students) MOL - (20 students) Med (WALS) 2005 negotiation MOL – partnership with TAEF		Joint Projects Monash-Box Hill Centre for Teaching Excellence
Kangan Batman	MEd (Research) – potential Articulation	MEd (WALS) (20 students)	(Gippsland) Sport & Outdoor Recreation TAFE Indonesia	
Gippsland TAFE	MEd (Research) (20 students) at Gippsland Education Precinct	BALD - potential	Dip Workplace training & Assessment (DWPT&A) → BALD	Education Precinct (DWPT&A)→ + BALD (20 potential students) Short Courses
Gordon	Research Negotiation underway			
Holmesglen		MEd (WALS) – potential MOL - potential	B.VET → Med (WALS)	
Chisholm (Peninsula & Berwick)	Possible MEd (Research)	MOL – Partnership delivery to industry client (1 st negotiation – Peninsula Council) Potential MEd (WALS) and (MOL)		Delivery of Cert IV WPT & ASS to Monash Students (2 courses in 2003) (2 courses in 2004)

Other potential TAFEs – Swinburne

A PROPOSAL

Monash University-Box Hill Institute Research Centre for Vocational Education Teaching

Background:

There is no Research Centre for Vocational Education teaching in Australia. Where the school and higher education sectors have a series of (government supported) organisations dedicated to teaching quality and leadership development, the VET sector has none. This is partly a consequence of 15 years training reform which has authorised industry as the main driver of vocational education and training provision. But today, governments, VET sector professionals and even industry are calling for quality teaching in VET.

The challenge for the VET sector is to build a workforce that is:

- excellent at teaching but also has industry experience and can contribute to industry renewal and innovation,
- knowledgeable and skilled pedagogically and is also committed to evidence-based practice, research in teaching, and strategic problem solving oriented to building individual and social capacities in learning and governance in regions, workplaces and communities.

The proposal is to establish the **Monash- Box Hill Research Centre for Vocational Education Teaching**. This structure will meet the pedagogic development needs of the VET sector, its industry partners, governments committed to workforce development for an innovation economy and learning society, and VET professionals.

Key design features

Structure:

- This Centre will be based on a partnership between Monash Faculty of Education and Box Hill Institute of TAFE.
- The partnership will be orchestrated around an MOU which clearly delineates the activities of the Centre and the activities that will remain with Monash University and with Box Hill Institute.
- Activities auspiced by the Centre will be subject to relevant forms of contractual agreement within the framework of the MOU that formalise research or other partnerships, mentoring and capacity-building relationships, sub-contracts in teaching provision.
- Financial and intellectual property arrangements will be clearly delineated within each of these activity-based contracts.

Form:

- The Centre will be a distinct administrative entity, located at Box Hill Institute.
- The Centre will be governed by its own Board composed of representatives of Monash University, Box Hill Institute, the Victorian government, the relevant union, and other representatives as appropriate.

Staffing:

- The Centre will employ an executive director with responsibility for the day-to-day operations of the Centre under the guidance of the Board, an R&D manager and other administrative staff as required.
- Projects auspiced by the Centre will involve staff from Monash and Box Hill Institute on a contracted basis.

Activities:

The Centre will provide a framework for

- partnerships between Monash University and Box Hill Institute and Industry for specific research projects,
- partnerships between Monash University and Box Hill Institute oriented to building research capacity, and that focus on application and demonstration of research
- partnerships between Monash University and Box Hill Institute for specific international development activities.
- provision of Monash University Masters coursework, Masters by Research and Doctoral programs,
- partnerships in teaching of undergraduate programs, mentored and supported by Monash University,
- development of relevant short courses, jointly or singly offered by Monash and Box Hill,

Resourcing:

A funding base to cover the initial development of the Centre will be negotiated with the Victorian government, Box Hill Institute and Monash University. These costs should cover the appointment of an executive director, administrative support and initial development costs. The business plan will outline a strategy for progressively moving this Centre to a self-funding basis.

MONASH UNIVERSITY – FACULTY OF EDUCATION

Developing an innovation economy education workforce A research and development strategy

Occupational imperative: The Victorian government is committed to building an innovation state and caring communities. Education and training workforces are critical to this agenda, assisting industries to compete in the global innovation economy; communities to develop; and individuals to gain the skills and knowledge they need for the future.

The implication is that teachers, trainers and managers, in the public and private sectors, should be able to support learners' as they develop:

- Industry-specific and generic knowledge and skills;
- Individual's capacities for critical analysis, researching and managing information, problem-solving and innovation, communication and dealing with diversity, working in teams and networking;
- Capabilities in community-building and working in partnerships; and
- Opportunities and supports that facilitate individual's engagement in lifelong learning, including learning pathways through, and re-entry to, education and training. (Kosky, 2002)

Current workforce development: Education workforce development is seen to be a critical issue in Victoria for schools and for public and private vocational education providers. School teachers have the benefit of being 4 year trained. Teachers in TAFE Institutes and industry can practice with just a Certificate IV. A study of education qualifications held by Victorian TAFE teachers estimated that 15% of TAFE teachers hold no education qualification. Only 36% hold a Bachelors degree or postgraduate qualification. This is a substantial market for programs that develop knowledge, skills and capabilities related to learning.

Highest Education Qualification Held		Percentage Distributions	
Certificate level	Certified Competencies	19.8	5.2
	Certificate IV		14.6
Diploma level	Trained Teacher Certificates	26.6	4.4
	Diplomas		22.2
Bachelor level	Bachelors	10.3	10.3
Postgraduate level	Graduate Certificates	25.8	1.8
	Graduate Diplomas		20.0
	Masters/PhD		4.0

Source: Seddon, Penna and Dart, 2003

Our contribution: The Faculty of Education is well positioned to contribute to the development of these global-local education workforces by supporting capability development in:

- Excellent teaching
- Research training and
- Research capacity-building

Our partnerships and initiatives: The Faculty of Education already has a strong workforce development relationship with the Victorian Police. We also have developing partnerships and significant initiatives with:

1. BoxHill Institute	2. Kangan-Batman TAFE	3. GippsTAFE
4. Gordon Institute	5. Holmesglen TAFE	6. Chisholm TAFE

We seek: Faculty endorsement for:

- (a) this research and development agenda, and
- (b) the Monash-Box Hill Institute Research Centre for Vocational Education Teaching

Terri Seddon (ADR) & Sarah Newton (Development Manager)

Appendix 2 Professional and community services

Projects and consultancies

The Faculty undertakes projects and consultancies on behalf of government agencies, public and private entities and corporations. These range from research, evaluations and reviews, curriculum development and advice, to professional development programs.

Recent and current projects

Mentoring for First Time Principals
[Department of Education and Training (DE&T)]

Environmental scan on teaching and learning
[Department of Education and Training (DE&T)]

Evaluation of Select Entry Accelerated Learning Programs
[Department of Education and Training (DE&T)]

Using ICT in Adult Literacy Education
[NCVER]

Provision of Governance Training
[AusAID]

Executive Coaching Program
[Defence Force Academy]

Keymakers-Advancing student engagement through changed teaching practice
[Frankston, Mornington, Peninsular Local Learning and Employment Network (FMP LLEN)]

Provision of Early Childhood Learning Resources
[Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST)]

Teacher Mentor Training Program
[Department of Education and Training (DE&T)]

Evaluation of the Local Learning and Employment Networks (LLEN)
[Department of Education and Training (DE&T)]

Research into Engagement and Disengagement of Secondary Students in the FMP Region LLEN
[Frankston Morning Peninsula Local Learning & Employment Network]

TAFE Travelling Scholarship Scheme
[Department of Education and Training (DE&T)]

TAFE Teacher Qualifications in Development and Recognition of Teachers in the Victorian Workforce
[Department of Education and Training (DE&T)]

ACE Outcomes Project
[National Centre for Vocational Education Research (NCVER)]

Building Community through Social Partnerships around Vocational Education and Training
[National Centre for Vocational Education Research (NCVER)]

Innovative Projects Initiative - Literacy and Numeracy
[Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST)]

Schooling Issues Digest 4: Performance of Australian School Students in International Studies in Science Numeracy
[Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST)]

Evaluation of Police Schools Involvement Program (PSIP)

Pathways to Learning and Networking with Notebooks (PLANN)
[Adult Multicultural Education Services (AMES)]

Monash University schools consultancy (MUSC)

The Monash University Schools Consultancy (MUSC) service supports the work of principals through the provision of consultancy and process support and tailored professional development. The service has provided over 600 consultancies since its establishment five years ago.

Programs and end products are designed to meet individual school needs with support from highly experienced and expert principals, teachers and academics. Consultancy services include:

School review

Public, private and registered school support. School self assessment, preparing for the triennial review, data collection, consultancy support, workshop, desktop publishing. Final product produced.

Producing the charter

Consultancy support, workshops and desktop publishing the charter in approved format style. Final product produced.

Developing a school annual report

Consultancy, data collection, desktop publishing. Final product produced.

Developing a school marketing plan

Consultancy support, research, workshops and desktop publishing of plan.

Developing a workforce management plan

Research projections, consultancy and desktop publishing of plan.

Developing a school literacy plan

Consultancy support, research, workshops and desktop publishing of plan.

Developing a school numeracy plan

Consultancy support, research, workshops and desktop publishing of plan.

Developing a school technology implementation plan

Consultancy support, research, workshops and desktop publishing of plan.

School Reviews

The Faculty of Education, under contract to the Department of Education Victoria (DE&T), undertakes external reviews of Victorian Primary and Secondary Government schools.

DE&T is committed to continuous improvement in the quality of education provided in schools and to ensuring high levels of student achievement. As part of DE&T's school accountability processes, the Monash Faculty of Education School Review team undertake independent reviews that aim to identify the achievements of the school, issues emerging from the information, recommendations for improvement and priorities for inclusion in the next school Charter. This external review facilitates agreement between the school and DE&T regarding the directions to be incorporated in the next school Charter

In 2004, the Faculty will undertake 58 Continuous Improvement reviews and 6 Diagnostic Reviews.

Appendix 3 Report/submission from Faculty Development Manager

Key Recommendations

- 1 *That the Faculty continue to develop an integrated approach to teaching, learning and research development across the Faculty (see Framework following).*

This Integrated Framework outlines a development approach that combines all aspects of the core teaching and research functions of the Faculty. The strategy is built around the engagement of student cohorts in teaching and learning, is premised on partnership with the client organisation and underpinned by research and organisational research capacity building.

The Framework begins its life cycle by developing local and national markets, which can then be utilised by the Faculty to springboard into global expansion.

- 2 *That the Faculty consolidate its growth strategy by shifting the emphasis of its development activities to the mature and repeat development stage of the Integrated Framework.*

For the last 3 years the Faculty has concentrated much of its development activities towards building new markets and pursuing strategic business growth. This strategy has already paid dividends, but has demanded considerable expenditure of energy and placed great demands on both the physical and human resources of the Faculty. For the Faculty to remain in this phase of development for any length of time, would be detrimental to the Faculty's long term sustainability.

Fortunately the Faculty is moving into a new phase of development that represents mature markets, repeat business and expanding opportunities. We should consolidate our efforts, focusing on sustaining these mature markets whilst utilising them to spearhead into linked industries and global opportunities. This would facilitate the expansion of these well developed areas of focus. Whilst we should continue to grow those entirely new markets that are important to our teaching, learning and research, this should now take less of our time and energy as we reposition our focus.

- 3 *That the Faculty give priority to refining a seamless approach from development of new business through to its implementation by applying a key account management structure.'*

The need for a more seamless interface between the development and implementation of programs and projects has been highlighted due to the recent rapid growth of new developments in the Faculty. If we are to shift our priorities to mature and expanding markets and hence a long-term sustainable business, it is imperative that we put in a structure that can be rapidly responsive to the often quick turn around times required by new business developments. A key account management structure could facilitate a more streamlined approach to this transition. Key Account Management could follow these guidelines:

- Key Account Managers should establish a Project Team where appropriate for key accounts (eg Visy) which will be made up of the relevant Faculty staff
- All Project Teams will have the same charter, guidelines and regulation (to be developed)
- The Project Team will be made up of the appropriate general staff from the necessary teams and the appropriate academic staff
- Using current Faculty systems and overseen by the Key Account Manager the team will move to implement the required business.
- The Project Team may change representatives from time to time depending on the development requirements of the client

- 4 *That workloads, career progression and professional development of staff be reviewed and suitable frameworks be developed.*


In order to keep abreast of the dynamically changing environment of the Faculty it would be helpful for the general staff to have a clearly defined professional development framework to assist them to meet the rigorous demands of their daily workload. This professional development framework should also provide staff with qualifications and career pathways. A suggested framework appears as an Appendix A [S19] to the report of the Staff Portfolio self review.

SAMPLE APPROACH – INTEGRATED LEARNING, TEACHING AND RESEARCH FRAMEWORK EDUCATION LEADING TO THE FUTURE

MARKET	MARKET SEGMENT	CLIENT	PRODUCT MIX			Arcs of Industry
			New Developments	Growth	Mature and Repeat Developments	
PUBLIC SECTOR	Organisational Capacity Building	Victoria Police	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 30 Master (by course work) 9 Master (by research) 2001 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100 Master by Course Work and Research 2 Research Projects 2004 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued intake of 20 Master by Course Work and Research annually ARC linkage Potential intake of first undergraduates 2005 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defence Fire Brigade Correctional Services <p>Global Expansion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand Model to our Police forces, e.g <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Singapore - South Africa
		DE&T	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mentoring Program 100 participants 40 Master in School Leadership 2004 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mentoring Program 100 participants 80 Master in School Leadership Research Programs 2005 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership Professional Development Programs (2000-2004) Mentoring Program on going without contribution from DE&T (2007) Master Program ongoing without contribution from DE&T (2007) International Leaders in Research – School Leadership 	<p>Arcs of Industry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jewish School System Independent System Catholic Education <p>Global Expansion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching model Masters Research Partnership with other Universities

MARKET	MARKET SEGMENT	CLIENT	PRODUCT MIX			Arcs of Industry
			New Developments	Growth	Mature and Repeat Developments	
PRIVATE SECTOR	Organisational Capacity Building	Visy Industries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20 Master of Organisational Leadership Cohort 2003 50 Graduate Certificate 2004 Mentoring Program 2005 <p>Visy Centre</p> <p>Visy Chair</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 30 Master of Organisational Leadership Cohort 2005 200 Graduate Certificate 2006 PhD Students 2006 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 200 Master of Organisational Leadership cohorts from Visy & Suppliers 2007 20 per annum following from Suppliers On going HDR Students 2007 Research ARC 2007 	<p>Arcs of Industry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supply Chain Other manufacturing industries <p>Global Expansion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> south East Asia (Visy) North America (Visy)

MARKET	MARKET SEGMENT	CLIENT	PRODUCT MIX			Arcs of Industry
			New Developments	Growth	Mature and Repeat Developments	
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SECTOR	Teaching, Learning, Research and Research Capacity Building	Box Hill Institute	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25 Master of Education (Working & Learning Studies) 2003 20 Master of Organisational Leadership 2003 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Master of Education (Working & Learning Studies) – another cohort 2005 NCVER – research project 2004 Master of Organisation Leadership – another cohort 2005 Master of Education (Research) 2005 Development of Joint Research Centre ‘Working Knowledge’ 2005 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future cohorts with other TAFEs Future cohorts with other TAFEs New business through Working Knowledge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research Degrees Consultancy Professional Development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private Providers Industry with large training areas, e.g. Victoria Police <p>Global Expansion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> International market through Centre ‘Working Knowledge’
		OTHER CLIENTS Kangan Batman Gipps TAFE Gordon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 30 Master of Education (Working & Learning Studies) 2003 Master of Education (Research) 2004 Development Organisational Research Capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation Project 2003 HRD students 2003 		

MARKET	MARKET SEGMENT	CLIENT	PRODUCT MIX			Global Expansion
			New Developments	Growth	Mature and Repeat Developments	
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION SECTOR	Integrated Studies	Australian Japan Foundation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrated studies Program for Japanese Teachers 20 students X 2 2004 		For five years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for further Professional Development to Japan Delivery of Diploma of Education to Nova in Japan (6000 Graduates) Early Childhood
	TESOL	Hong Kong University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Immersion Program Cohort x 1 2002 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Immersion Program Cohort x 2 2003 - 2004 	On going project 5 years	
	TESOL	Hong Kong Institute of Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Immersion Program Cohort x 1 2004 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Immersion Program Cohort x 2 2004 	On going project 5 years + 3 new cohorts	Global Expansion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnership in Master Delivery Student exchange Academic Scholar Visits Research

Appendix 4 Response to terms of reference by Marketing Manager

Introduction

The faculty first employed a marketing manager in 1998 following a recommendation in the 1994 Faculty Review and the subsequent restructuring of the faculty in 1997.

The marketing manager had responsibility for the management of course enquiries, the production of brochures and coordinating faculty events and recruitment activities, including advertising. This initial appointment established a marketing function within the faculty with a major focus of this role being the graphic design and production of course brochures.

A new marketing manager was appointed in April 2002. This appointment saw a shift in the role of the marketing manager to a more strategic marketing approach to support the development of the faculty as well as enhance the faculty's internal and external communication. This was supported by the introduction of an Enquiries and Admissions Database in 2002 which now provides an in-house Marketing Information System to inform recruitment and marketing.

In the past three years there has been a major shift in the marketing of the faculty from an organization that provides solely undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate programs for teachers to an organisation that is about capacity building for individuals, organisations and communities. During this time, there has been increasing demands on faculty marketing as central support services within Monash has introduced new procures and polices. In particular the Marketing Manager works closely in supporting the activities of Marketing and Public Affairs, the Prospective Students Office and Monash International.

The key issues and activities impacting on faculty marketing since April 2002 have been:

2002

- Inaugural Monash Postgraduate Expo
- Redevelopment of the Monash International undergraduate and postgraduate course guides
- Inaugural International Applicants day
- Development of the Master in Organisational Leadership
- Launch of Enquiries and Admissions Database
- Signing of a Memorandum of Understanding with MECU (formerly Education Credit Union)
- Invergowrie Faculty Scholarships
- Consolidation of faculty brochures

2003

- Launch of new Monash visual identity
- Implementation of new visual identity across all facets of the faculty
- Introduction of Monash Marketing Blueprint
- Proactive recruitment of Canadian Dip Ed prospective students
- Re-design of Undergraduate Teaching, BSOR and master of Education brochures
- Development of Speakers in Schools Kit.

2004

- Development of new faculty web site
- Development and launch of CUPID
- Refinement of Monash and faculty visual identity
- Re-write and re-launch of all faculty marketing publications to have a consistent "voice" and style.
- Incorporated role of faculty Copyright Officer into marketing role and coordinated 2004 Screenrights survey
- Development and implementation of recruitment advertising campaign.