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Executive summary

The objectives of the Demonstration Project on Course Redesign and Academic Productivity (the ‘Demonstration Redesign Project’) are to improve academic productivity and student learning. The project originated out of a series of executive seminars organised by the LH Martin Institute (LHMI) and led by Professor Bill Massy. These seminars highlighted successful academic productivity and student learning improvements achieved through course redesigns led by the National Center for Academic Transformation (NCAT) in the USA. Building on early 2010 foundation meetings with NCAT in Washington DC, the Demonstration Redesign Project is a partnership between the two participating universities, James Cook University (JCU) and the Australian Catholic University (ACU), and LHMI, NCAT and the Office for Learning and Teaching. Two units (or subjects, not single classes or sections) at each participating university will be redesigned according to NCAT’s methodology for activity based costing and course redesign. All four units receive financial support for their redesign. The success of the project is determined by improvements to student learning outcomes and cost reductions for the participating departments/schools.

Phase One commenced with the dissemination of a call to participate, outlining the project goals and methodology. The National Tertiary Education Union was consulted regarding the project objectives and interested parties were invited to attend an orientation webinar led by NCAT. The orientation webinar received 125 registrations and was attended by 71 participants, mostly from JCU. Eight project teams (five from JCU; three from ACU) participated further in the project, preparing a Response to the Readiness Criteria based on NCAT’s guidelines. Project teams received feedback on their responses in the second webinar, titled Developing the Proposal. Five project teams submitted a final Project Plan and three were supported by NCAT for redesign (two from JCU, one from ACU). In NCAT’s opinion, these project teams had a clear rationale for redesigning their units and a fully described strategy to reduce costs and measure student learning. All three had a good chance for success. A second project team at ACU was supported by ACU and LHMI for redesign independently of NCAT, but as part of the Demonstration Redesign Project.

The self-evaluation of Phase One included an online questionnaire of all non-Steering Committee participants in the project and interviews with Steering Committee members from ACU, JCU, NCAT and LHMI. The results from the online questionnaire were generally very positive. Respondents were satisfied with the clarity of information, the usefulness of NCAT’s resources, support and communication. All project teams saw value in NCAT’s Redesign Readiness Criteria and associated processes. NCAT’s cost reduction strategies and resources received some criticism, and certain participants had difficulties with terminology. The Steering Committee were pleased with the commitment of the project teams and believe NCAT’s methodology is generally applicable to the Australian context.

Project teams were required to follow NCAT’s principles as closely as possible, but some made local adaptations through practices deviating from NCAT’s guidelines. Firstly, ACU chose to “pre-select” or restrict participation to units nominated by their faculties based on internal priorities and workload constraints. ACU’s approach restricted the potential pool of units to choose from and thus may have excluded some units with greater scope for
improvement or applicability to NCAT’s redesign principles. The Steering Committee will reserve judgement on the different university approaches for selection until the final results of the project are available.

Secondly, many of the project teams sought to use a wider definition of cost reduction than typical of NCAT redesigns. Commonly, teams wanted to include hours freed-up from teaching as direct cost savings if individual teaching loads were to be reduced post-redesign (e.g. from 50% teaching workload to a 40% teaching workload). NCAT generally do not include such workload reallocations as cost savings in their calculations because departmental staffing costs may remain identical post-redesign. However, the universities supported their inclusion because workload reallocations helped departments to achieve their desired goals (e.g. improved research capacity and professionalised teaching) within the same departmental budget. If time saved under the redesign can be measured within the institutional workload models and reallocated to other departmental priorities, project teams will report these as savings in addition to savings in departmental staffing costs.

The Demonstration Redesign Project has three phases. This report presents the results for Phase One, the preparatory work, planning and selecting of units for redesign. Phase Two will see project teams pilot, implement and review their redesigns (Semester 2, 2012). Phase Three will see full implementation and dissemination of findings. A final report on the results of the Demonstration Redesign Project, including Phase Two and Phase Three, is due in December 2013. Further details on the Demonstration Redesign Project are available from the project website:
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1. Introduction

The objectives of the Demonstration Project on Course Redesign and Academic Productivity (the ‘Demonstration Redesign Project’) are to improve academic productivity and student learning outcomes by employing activity based costing and course redesign. The project has its origins in 2009 when the LH Martin Institute (LHMI) organised a series of executive seminars with Professor Bill Massy on academic productivity. The seminars generated quite some traction in the Australian university sector, in part because of Professor Massy highlighting the success of course redesign projects led by the National Center for Academic Transformation (NCAT, [http://www.thencat.org/](http://www.thencat.org/)). NCAT is an independent, not-for-profit organisation with expertise in improving learning outcomes for students at a reduced cost to the institution. NCAT’s previous course redesigns in the USA have, on average, reduced costs by 37% whilst improving (or at least maintaining) student learning and retention. Given the take up of the seminar outcomes by participants, an initial discussion with Professor Massy was started, canvassing the viability of the approach in an Australian context. This subsequently led to LHMI approaching the (then) Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) to jointly sponsor a pilot project on academic productivity and course redesign, which ALTC accepted.

Following the agreement between ALTC and LHMI, pilot institutions were sought from the participants of the Massy seminars. The outcome of this process was the Australian Catholic University (ACU) and James Cook University (JCU) joining the pilot. In early 2010 scoping meetings were held with Carol Twigg (President and CEO, NCAT) in Washington DC as part of a meeting on academic productivity at the United States National Academy of Science. With NCAT and Massy agreeing to join the pilot as external consultants, a kick-off meeting was organised in early December 2010 in Melbourne with participation of all project partners. This one day meeting resulted in the adoption of the project structure and approach that is outlined in more detail in the remainder of this report. The agreed upon timeframe suffered from the unexpected demise of the ALTC in early 2011 and the subsequent creation of the Office for Learning and Teaching (OLT) as the new partner. Additionally, the project needed to be coordinated with the teaching semesters at the two universities, which compounded the delay. Nevertheless, the project got under steam again in July 2011 with calls for participation being rolled out across the two institutions. At this stage, LHMI also consulted with the National Tertiary Education Union (NTEU), gaining their support for the project.

The structure of the Demonstration Redesign Project involves selecting two course units (or subjects, not a single classes or sections) at each of the participating universities for redesign according to NCAT’s demonstrated methods for course redesign in the USA. All four units receive financial support for their redesign: a $20,000 grant from the Demonstration Redesign Project and $20,000 in-kind contribution from the participating university. The success of the project is determined by improvements to student learning outcomes and cost reductions for the participating departments/schools.

In summary, each redesign uses activity based costing techniques to get a sound understanding of cost drivers at the academic program level. The next step involves planning the unit redesign, which in principle relates to disaggregation of academics’ roles in
terms of curriculum development, pedagogy, course delivery and assessment activities and limiting staff activities to those that can only be done by academics, replacing all other activities with technology and lower cost staff. The redesigns are then piloted over the course of one semester, where they are monitored and reviewed for their improvements to academic productivity and student learning outcomes. The final step is the full implementation of the redesign.

**Project structure**

The Demonstration Redesign Project has three phases:

- **Phase One:** Preparatory work, planning and selecting the units for redesign (August 2011 to February 2012)

- **Phase Two:** Pilot development, implementation and review (March 2012 to January 2013)

- **Phase Three:** Full implementation and dissemination of findings (February 2013 to July 2013).

The Demonstration Redesign Project has now completed Phase One. The original timeline for the project saw the project running from February 2011 to December 2012, with a webinar in March 2011 to formally start the project. Unfortunately, the commencement of the project was delayed until August 2011. This delay was due to the policy changes surrounding the ALTC and OLT, and the need to coordinate the redesigns with the teaching semesters at both universities. The selection of units taught once per academic year, further deferred the schedule.
2. Project Methodology and Selection Process

The selection process involved four steps. Firstly, the participating universities disseminated a call to participate and an invitation to the orientation webinar. The second step involved participants establishing project teams and preparing a statement addressing NCAT’s Redesign Readiness Criteria. This occurred prior to the second webinar, titled Developing the Proposal. Thirdly, teams built upon their Response to the Readiness Criteria and submitted a Project Plan, including NCAT’s forms and resources for measuring student learning and activity based costing. Throughout the process, NCAT and LHMI offered advice and support. The final step involved NCAT evaluating the Project Plans and preparing a recommendation to the universities. The final decision for which projects to support was left to each university.

2.1 Call to Participate and Orientation Webinar

NCAT and LHMI developed a Call to Participate document and instructions for how to engage academics with the project. The Call to Participate outlined the objectives of the Demonstration Redesign Project, identified the types of staff and units most suitable for redesign within the project framework, and additional background resources from NCAT’s website on successful redesign of curriculum. The Call to Participate made it clear that the two objectives of the Demonstration Redesign Project were: (1) improved student learning outcomes; and (2) cost reduction. Under NCAT’s methodology, cost savings does not mean job losses. Cost savings achieved remain within the department that generated them and allow academic staff and their institutions to achieve their “wish lists” — what they would like to do if they had additional resources. These may include:

- Offering additional or new courses that previously could not be offered;
- Satisfying unmet student demand by serving more students on the same resource base;
- Breaking up “academic bottlenecks” — courses that delay forward progress of students within a subject area or program because they are oversubscribed;
- Increasing academic staff release time for research, renewal or additional course development; and
- Combinations of these.

JCU and ACU disseminated the Call to Participate five weeks prior to NCAT’s 2-hour Orientation Webinar on 26 August 2011. The Orientation Webinar received 125 registrations (including 11 Steering Committee members) and was attended by 71 participants. In the case of ACU, the Call to Participate was distributed through the Vice-Chancellor’s Office and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students, Learning & Teaching) invited participation from all of the deans. At ACU the invitation was not extended to individual academics, with individual participation in the project decided by the faculties based on their own priorities and the time constraints of their staff. By contrast, at JCU the invitation from the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor was extended to all individuals interested in participating in the project. Consequently, the vast majority of non-Steering Committee
registrations for the Orientation Webinar came from JCU (100 registrations) compared to ACU (16 registrations). However, the decision from ACU for participants to be nominated by their faculties (or “pre-selected”) meant that those participants were more likely to participate further in the project.

2.2 Response to the Readiness Criteria and Developing the Proposal Webinar

Those interested in participation beyond the Orientation Webinar were required to establish institutional teams and submit a Response to the Readiness Criteria by 13 October 2011, one week prior to the second webinar. The Response to the Readiness Criteria requires teams to assess collectively their strengths and weaknesses across seven areas: unit choice; redesign model; assessment plan; cost savings plan; learning materials; active learning; and collective commitment. The responses are designed to help institutions select the unit with the highest chance of success and scope for improvement.

The Demonstration Redesign Project received eight completed responses. However, one unit (from JCU) was deemed to have too little chance of success to warrant further participation in the project. In the view of their project team, there was little scope for reducing costs due to a long term and permanent staffing profile. There was also no evidence of potential enrolment growth, leaving very little potential for cost reduction. The seven remaining responses came from the following project teams:

1. **ACU Education**: Creating Inclusive, Safe and Supportive Schools (EDFD 271/221/261), Faculty of Education
2. **ACU Nursing**: Transition to Professional Nursing (NRSG367), Faculty of Health Sciences
3. **ACU Psychology and Statistics**: Research Design and Statistics 1 (PSYC104), School of Psychology
4. **JCU Education**: Education for Cultural Diversity (ED2990), School of Education
5. **JCU Effective Writing**: Effective Writing (CU1010), Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
6. **JCU Financial Management**: Financial Management (BU2004), School of Business
7. **JCU Healthcare**: Health and Health Care in Australia (HS1401), School of Public Health Tropical Medicine and Rehabilitation Sciences

The above project teams were invited to attend the second webinar. This two-hour Developing the Proposal webinar, held on 20 October 2011, received 72 registrations and was attended by 32 participants. The webinar provided feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of the responses based on NCAT’s seven Redesign Readiness Criteria. The enthusiasm shown by the staff and standard of the seven responses was high. In the opinion of NCAT, all seven units were suitable for redesign. A summary of NCAT’s evaluation of the Response to the Readiness Criteria is shown in Figure 1.
Figure 1. NCAT’s Evaluation of Responses to the Readiness Criteria

### Reasons for Choosing the Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JCU Effective Writing</td>
<td>JCU Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCU Financial Management</td>
<td>JCU Health Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACU Education</td>
<td>ACU Psychology and Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACU Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Choice of Redesign Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JCU Effective Writing</td>
<td>JCU Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCU Finance Management</td>
<td>JCU Health Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACU Nursing</td>
<td>ACU Psychology and Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACU Education</td>
<td>ACU Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Choice of Assessment plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JCU Effective Writing</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCU Finance Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACU Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACU Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCU Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCU Health Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACU Psychology and Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Choice of Cost Reduction Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Lacking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JCU Effective Writing</td>
<td>JCU Financial Management</td>
<td>JCU Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCU Health Care</td>
<td>ACU Nursing</td>
<td>ACU Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACU Psychology and Statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Collective Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JCU Effective Writing</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCU Financial Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACU Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACU Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCU Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCU Health Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACU Psychology and Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: NCAT provided general comments on the Learning Materials and Active Learning criteria.
Unit Choice

Some units are more ready for redesign, more suitable for large-scale change, or have a stronger potential for improvement and impact on the broader curriculum. The best targets are units facing academic or resource problems (or both). Some units may be weaker candidates for redesign simply because they have relatively few academic problems, and hence minimal justification for large-scale redesign. At this stage, project teams are expected to be specific and provide data to justify their claims (e.g. pass rates, enrolment numbers), but not in the structured format later required in the final Project Plan.

According to NCAT, most project teams presented a clear justification for why their unit was suitable for redesign. Teams cited factors such as high drop-out rates, accommodating enrolment growth, consistency across multiple campuses, the range of student abilities and the inadequacies of the traditional lecture method. Three project teams (JCU Education, JCU Health Care, ACU Psychology and Statistics) were unclear about what the problems were or lacked supporting data for the problem they were trying to resolve (e.g. failure rates). This was not to imply the units were unsuitable, only that the level of evidence provided in their responses was insufficient.

Redesign Model

The choice of Redesign Model is often based on which model best fits the discipline and students. The six Redesign Models are summarised below in Figure 2.

---

**Figure 2. NCAT’s Six Redesign Models**

- **Supplemental Model**: retains the basic structure of the traditional unit, but supplements these with technology-based, out-of-class activities to encourage greater student engagement by creating an active learning environment within a large lecture hall setting.

- **Replacement Model**: replaces (rather than supplements) some in-class time with online, interactive learning activities, while retaining in-class activities for those activities deemed better accomplished in a face-to-face class.

- **Emporium Model**: eliminates all lectures and replaces them with a learning resource center model, allowing self-paced learning based on a suite of learning materials.

- **Fully Online Model**: eliminates all in-class meetings and moves all learning experiences online.

- **Buffet Model**: allows students to choose their method of learning the material including an array of face-to-face, online, audiovisual, individual and group-based learning opportunities. An initial in-class orientation provides information about the buffet structure.

- **Linked Workshop Model** retains the structure of the original unit, but replaces remedial/developmental instruction with just-in-time workshops for students, based on results of diagnostic assessments.
According to NCAT, three units had a clear choice of Redesign Model and why the particular model was appropriate for the discipline and aims of the redesign (JCU Effective Writing, JCU Finance Management, ACU Nursing). The remaining projects were less clear with their choice or misunderstood some aspects of the chosen model. For example, the Supplemental Model retains lectures and supplements these with non-traditional learning. This was misunderstood by one project team, where supplemental learning materials were considered “add-ons” to the lectures, rather than entailing significant internal changes to the existing structure of learning in the lecture hall.

Assessment Plan

The Assessment Plan requires teams to choose how they will measure student learning. A successful redesign should demonstrate improvements in student learning, which requires obtaining data and choosing a measurement method. Teams may choose between collecting data through parallel sections (comparing student learning in the redesign taught alongside the traditional format, a classic “quasi experiment”), or a baseline before (traditional) and after (redesign) comparison. Teams must also choose the method of student assessment, such as comparing common final exams, common exam items, or student work using common rubrics.

NCAT believed that all project teams had made clear choices and justifications for their Assessment Plan. The only caution NCAT had for the seven project teams was that their assessment strategies involved many measures. More assessment measures do not always mean better results. Project teams may benefit from selecting a single measure for success and redistributing their efforts elsewhere.

Cost Savings Plan

Although at this stage the project, teams do not need complete a detailed assessment of their teaching costs (a requirement of the Final Proposal), they are required to select an intended strategy and justify its choice. NCAT offer three Cost Reduction Strategies: (1) Each instructor carries more students; (2) Change the mix of personnel from more expensive to less expensive staff categories; and (3) Do both simultaneously.

Under enrolment expansion, each instructor can carry more students either by increasing the section size or increasing the number of sections that each instructor carries for the same workload credit. Under stable enrolment, cost reduction requires fewer resources to be assigned to teaching the same number of students. In this case, the total number of teaching staff must be fewer under the redesign. Changing the mix of personnel requires transferring teaching work from more expensive staff categories to less expensive staff. This will reduce the overall costs, regardless of stable or expanding enrolment. Both approaches may be pursued simultaneously. Examples of the Cost Reduction Strategies are shown below in Figure 3.
**Figure 3. NCAT Cost Reduction Strategies**

1. Each instructor carries more students.
   a. Increase section size

   **Stable enrollment:** If your enrollment is stable, this will allow you to reduce the number of sections offered and the number of people teaching the course.

   **Examples**
   - *Traditional*: 800 students: 40 sections of 20 students each taught by 40 instructors. S/F ratio = 20:1
   - *Redesign*: 800 students: 20 sections of 40 students each taught by 20 instructors. S/F ratio = 40:1

   **Growing enrollment:** If your enrollment is growing, this will allow you to serve more students with the same number of people teaching the course.

   **Examples**
   - *Traditional*: 800 students: 40 sections of 20 students each taught by 40 instructors. S/F ratio = 20:1
   - *Redesign*: 1600 students: 40 sections of 40 students each taught by 40 instructors. S/F ratio = 40:1

   b. Increase the number of sections that each instructor carries for the same workload credit.

   **Stable enrollment:** If your enrollment is stable, this will allow you to offer the same number of sections and reduce the number of people teaching the course.

   **Examples**
   - *Traditional*: 800 students: 40 sections of 20 students each; each instructor teaches one section for the same workload credit. S/F ratio = 20:1
   - *Redesign*: 800 students: 40 sections of 20 students; each instructor teaches two sections for the same workload credit. S/F ratio = 40:1

   **Growing enrollment:** If your enrollment is growing, this will allow you to serve more students with the same number of people teaching the course.

   **Examples**
   - *Traditional*: 800 students: 40 sections of 20 students each; each instructor teaches one section for the same workload credit. S/F ratio = 20:1
   - *Redesign*: 1600 students: 80 sections of 20 students; each instructor teaches two sections for the same workload credit. S/F ratio = 40:1

2. Change the mix of personnel from more expensive to less expensive.

   **Stable enrollment:** If your enrollment is stable, this will allow you to offer the same number of sections and reduce the total cost of the people teaching the course since adjuncts, tutors and undergraduate tutors are paid less than full-time faculty, and tutors and undergraduate tutors are paid less than adjuncts.

   **Examples**
   - *Traditional*: 800 students: 40 sections of 20 students each; 30 sections taught by full-time faculty; 10 sections taught by adjuncts.
   - *Redesign*: 800 students: 40 sections of 20 students; 10 sections taught by full-time faculty; 30 sections taught by adjuncts.

   **Growing enrollment:** If your enrollment is growing, this will allow you to serve more students, offer more sections and reduce the cost-per-student since adjuncts, tutors and undergraduate tutors are paid less than full-time faculty, and tutors and undergraduate tutors are paid less than adjuncts.

   **Examples**
   - *Traditional*: 800 students: 40 sections of 20 students each; 30 sections taught by full-time faculty; 10 sections taught by adjuncts.
   - *Redesign*: 1600 students: 80 sections of 20 students; 20 sections taught by full-time faculty; 60 sections taught by adjuncts.

Source: http://www.thenca.org/PlanRes/R2R_CostRed.htm
At the Developing the Proposal webinar, the project teams’ Cost Savings Plans received the most critical attention from NCAT. This was typical of previous NCAT redesigns undertaken in the US. Only two of the Responses to the Readiness Criteria articulated a clear Cost Reduction Strategy (JCU Effective Writing, JCU Health Care), both involving increasing the number of students each instructor carried and changing the mix of personnel towards lower cost staff (note: neither of these units was selected as one of the final four projects supported in the Demonstration Redesign Project). Two of the units (JCU Financial Management, ACU Nursing) articulated a clear strategy for cost reduction via accommodating enrolment growth, but did not provide evidence supporting projected growth (e.g. history of enrolment growth, waiting lists, etc.). The remaining three projects outlined multiple labour-saving tactics to reduce teaching hours, but did not outline how these saved hours would be translated into reduced costs to the department or institution. Reducing time spent by individual staff on teaching a section of the unit is the first step, enabling cost reduction through implementing one of NCAT’s Cost Reduction Strategies. Reducing workload but maintaining the same number of staff teaching the unit, equates to “paper savings”. It saves individuals time, which may or may not be used to further the department’s mission, but does not produce direct savings to the department.

NCAT emphasised that by the end of the selection process, the project teams must have chosen a Cost Reduction Strategy. Further, NCAT made it clear that, should any of the teams have reservations or not wish to choose a Cost Reduction Strategy, they needed to contact NCAT to explain their situation. The project teams risked wasting time following the application process if they planned to neglect one of the core objectives of the project, cost reduction.

Learning Materials and Active Learning

The learning materials and active learning criteria address pedagogical changes. The project teams are in the best position to understand their own disciplinary pedagogies, but NCAT offers some general principles for success. Learning materials that utilise the existing disciplinary body of technology-based curricular materials, and appropriately blend these with created “home grown” materials, will have a greater chance for success than those projects which require wholesale development of something new. Secondly, technology is an enabler of best practice and can support active learning, but more technology for technology’s sake does not lead to greater student engagement. Project teams with prior experiences with technology-mediated teaching and active learning will have a “head start” over those redesigns which start from scratch.

In many of the Australian cases, there was adequate justification for creating new learning materials due to the unique curriculum content. However, many projects only included a list of technologies focusing on delivery methods (e.g. Blackboard, Facebook, Twitter, WebEx). This is not what NCAT means by learning materials. Learning materials are actual curriculum content, rather than technology on its own. Again, when responding to staff experience with technology-mediated teaching and how the redesign will promote active learning, many of the projects provided details of proposed technologies, but failed to explain how the technologies would promote active learning.
Collective Commitment

Collective commitment is key for the success and sustainability of the redesign effort. Staff commitment must extend beyond the departmental level to areas of policy (class meeting times, contact-hour requirements, governance approvals); budgeting (planning and processes that support innovation); systems (registration systems, classroom assignments); and infrastructure (equipment purchase and deployment).

All project teams demonstrated a very strong collective commitment to the project. NCAT was impressed by the level of extended commitment. While undeniably positive, NCAT cautioned against letting the teams grow too large. The main issue that has hampered previous project implementations has been a breakdown in consensus of what the teams want to achieve and obviously size of the group can be a factor in this.

2.3 Preparing the Project Plans

Shortly after the second webinar, the ACU Psychology and Statistics project team withdrew their application, citing that they would pursue their redesign outside the project. The remaining six project teams prepared Project Plans addressing:

1. Unit objectives, including numbers of students enrolled;
2. Academic problems and rationale for redesign;
3. Unit redesign planning;
4. How the redesign will enhance quality of learning;
5. How the impact of redesign on learning will be assessed; and
6. How the redesign will produce cost savings and what will be done with the savings.

The Project Plan contained three parts: an Application Narrative, a Course Planning Tool (CPT) and six Assessment Forms. The Application Narrative specified the project team’s choice of redesign model (one of the six supported by NCAT), how their implementation embodied NCAT’s five principles of successful redesigns, specific changes to the curriculum, teaching duties and learning materials, the cost reduction strategy, a timeline, and a budget for the redesign. The data supporting the claims made in the Application Narrative were contained in the CPT and Assessment Forms. The CPT contained detailed breakdowns of the labour costs in the traditional unit, primarily through assigned teaching hours, and projected cost reductions through the redesign. The Assessment Forms contained student enrolment and learning outcomes for the traditional and redesign unit (projected for the pilot and full implementation), based on the project teams’ choices of student assessment.

NCAT and LHMI remained in contact with the project teams during the period following the second webinar. Draft submissions were due on 25 January 2012 for preliminary review, comments and clarifications by NCAT and LHMI. Final Project Plans were due on 8 February 2012. NCAT made their final recommendations to the universities one fortnight later on 22 February, one week earlier than the timeline deadline.

The JCU Health Care project team’s draft Project Plan was underdeveloped and of a lower standard than the other three JCU project teams. They were offered an extension in order to amend their draft based on NCAT’s recommendations, but decided to withdraw from the
Demonstration Redesign Project and pursue their curriculum redesign independently. Five project teams submitted Project Plans, two from ACU (ACU Education and ACU Nursing) and three from JCU (JCU Effective Writing, JCU Financial Management and JCU Education). NCAT and LHMI continued to liaise with the project teams up until NCAT delivered its recommendations on 24 February 2012.

2.4 Final selection of Projects

NCAT carefully reviewed the five proposals and recommended three proposals: JCU Education, JCU Finance, and ACU Nursing. NCAT could not support the redesign proposals received from the JCU Effective Writing and ACU Education teams because the project proposals were unspecific in their redesign plan and cost reduction strategies, making it impossible to predict whether their redesign would be successful or not.

The final decision regarding which projects would be supported was left to the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor (JCU) and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students, Learning & Teaching) (ACU). Both universities followed NCAT’s advice and three units were selected for redesign with the support of NCAT. ACU and LHMI offered to support (financially and otherwise) the redesign of a second unit at ACU (ACU Education), independently of NCAT, but as part of the Demonstration Redesign Project.

The three NCAT-supported Project Plans contained the following elements:

- A clear rationale for doing the redesign.
- A redesign plan that could be implemented within the project time frame.
- A fully described, valid assessment strategy for assessment of student learning outcomes, documented in the Assessment Forms.
- A cost reduction strategy correctly documented in the CPT.
- An application narrative where the strategy and data corresponds with the Assessment Forms and CPT.
- A good chance of improving student learning.

NCAT had two areas of caution for the supported redesign plans of JCU Education and ACU Nursing. Firstly, these units plan to implement a pilot redesign for all students, rather than a sub-set of enrolled students. The pilot period should provide an opportunity to uncover technology issues, ensure important audiences (on and off campus) are informed of changes, and is essentially a “dress rehearsal” for the full implementation. From NCAT’s experience, implementing the pilot redesign for a sub-set of students is a safer and more manageable approach. Solving unforeseeable problems for a subset of students is clearly easier than doing so for all students enrolled.

NCAT’s second caution was that the planned JCU Education and ACU Nursing redesigns included cost savings from “hypothetical” savings of staff time. The project teams convincingly articulated that the redesigns will free up time for the teaching staff through a variety of labour-saving strategies (e.g. reducing face-to-face teaching hours, eliminating duplication, using automated feedback). However, the project teams were less convincing in how these saved hours would be used for departmental purposes and/or lead to cost
reduction. Both were vague in claiming that saved hours can be “allocated to other subjects, thereby reducing the need for additional casual staff employment”, “used towards research projects...”, and “[spent] on activities associated with the scholarship of learning and teaching...”. There was also a suggestion from one team that the saved hours would allow more time for student consultation for those in greatest need, but in this case they would simply be reallocating time within the unit, not saving time. In NCAT’s opinion, the broader interpretation of saved hours will likely overestimate the potential cost savings because the reallocation of workloads is unclear or yet to be confirmed. This increases the risk that saved hours will simply be “paper savings” or individual workload reductions, not cost reductions to the department.

Including these savings also necessitates a modification to the CPT. The CPT takes gross estimates of time use and helps teams to understand that labour saving tactics enable cost reduction. It is not designed to accommodate changes in individual teaching load following a reassignment of work pre- and post-redesign. For example, it cannot accommodate for when an individual’s teaching load is reduced from 50% to 40% as a result of the labour saving generated by the redesign. This would require a different tool.

The fourth redesign, ACU Education, was ultimately supported by LHMI and ACU because they were sufficiently satisfied and confident with the potential impact of the curriculum redesign on student learning, the scope for cost reduction and collective commitment of the ACU Education staff. NCAT’s concerns were that the ACU Education Project Plan was too brief, lacked detail and was essentially still a “plan to plan”. Therefore, it ran a stronger risk than the three supported projects of not meeting its goals within the timeframe of the project. The ACU Education team’s cost reduction also relied heavily on a 20% reduction in teaching hours, and cost reduction appeared somewhat secondary to their primary objectives of improved student learning and workload reallocation.

From an LHMI perspective, in addition to the above, the fact that the Demonstration Redesign Project is essentially trialling to what extent NCAT’s methodology is applicable in an Australian context, also allows for the inclusion of somewhat different approaches, evidenced by the fourth project. Should the project not achieve its intended outcomes for reasons identified by NCAT, this lends further credit to their approach. Should it indeed achieve its intended outcomes, this may suggest that modifications to the methodology are possible. Summaries of the four supported projects are presented in Appendix 1.
3. Evaluation

LHMI coordinated the formal evaluation of Phase One of the project. The evaluation involved an online questionnaire for general participants and separate telephone interviews with the Steering Committee members from JCU, ACU and NCAT. A summary of the main results are presented below (further details and a copy of the questionnaire are available in Appendix 2 and Appendix 3).

3.1 Summary of evaluation questionnaire

The evaluation questionnaire was emailed to all 140 people who were either listed as members of a project team or registered for the orientation webinar. Thirty-nine respondents completed at least one section of the survey, providing a nominal response rate of 28% (39 out of 140). The responses to the questionnaire were generally very positive. Respondents were satisfied with the clarity of information provided in the Call for Participation, the usefulness of NCAT’s background resources, the information and structure of the two webinars, and the support and communication from NCAT, LHMI, and their own universities. Although the workload requirements were demanding for some, all project teams saw value in NCAT’s Redesign Readiness Criteria and associated processes.

The open-ended questionnaire responses tended to be more negative, but this was ‘by design’ because respondents were specifically asked to describe their challenges and suggestions for improvement.

Three issues received some criticism: (1) the Cost Reduction Strategy, (2) the Course Planning Tool; and (3) NCAT’s terminology.

The Cost Reduction Strategy

Fifteen of the 39 respondents to the evaluation questionnaire were part of a team which developed a Response to the Readiness Criteria. One third of these respondents were dissatisfied with the information and resources provided for selecting a Cost Reduction Strategy, while one third were satisfied (the remaining third were neutral). Dissatisfaction likely stemmed from disagreement about the definition of cost reduction between NCAT and the project teams. It is understandable that cost reduction received the most criticism because it is frequently the most contested and difficult step in NCAT’s redesigns in the USA. At the time of the second webinar, only two of the project teams had a clearly formulated Cost Reduction Strategy, three had an unclear strategy, while the remaining three did not have a strategy at all. While academics typically have strong engagement with improved student learning and reducing teaching time, commitment to cost reduction is often stronger amongst administration and leadership. Based on NCAT’s US experience, academic engagement with cost reduction frequently occurs after the benefits of the redesign have been demonstrated.

The Course Planning Tool

The Project Plan required teams to provide data on their Cost Reduction Strategy in NCAT’s Course Planning Tool (CPT). The CPT was taken directly from NCAT’s USA resources, with only minor changes for Australian terminology. It was a conscious decision by the Steering
Committee not to develop a completely new spreadsheet for measuring costs in an Australian context, but to advise the project teams when and where confusion arose.

Only nine of the 39 questionnaire respondents were involved in preparing the Project Plan and the CPT. None of the tasks associated with the Project Plan were considered “easy” or “very easy”, but the CPT was the greatest source of difficulty. Two thirds (six out of the nine respondents) found this task “difficult” or “very difficult”, with the remaining respondents neutral. When asked to articulate their main challenges, the CPT was considered difficult due to: its level of detail, the time required to complete the task, the constraints of the application timeline, unclear terminology, and difficulty presenting workload allocations across multiple campuses. Generally, the respondents would have liked more flexibility to cater to local context.

**Terminology**

Terminology was frequently a challenge, though it should be noted that only a minority of respondents declared this to be a problem. The Cost Reduction Strategy and CPT received particular criticism based on confusion arising from the use of American terminology. This probably reflected the disagreement over acceptable strategies, rather than confusion of terms. However, there was one term which was particularly difficult to translate directly to the Australian context. In the early stages of the project, many project teams were confused about how to calculate their unit’s cost based on teaching “sections”. Australian units are typically taught with single lecture groups on each campus, with each lecture group divided into tutorials. It was not clear whether the number of sections was based on lecture group or tutorial group. One respondent suggested a common glossary of terms would have improved the process.

### 3.2 Steering Committee perspectives

LHMI coordinated feedback from the Steering Committee via telephone conversations with representatives from each institution: Carol Twigg (President and CEO) and Carolyn Jarmon (Vice President), NCAT; Anne Cummins, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students, Learning & Teaching), ACU; and Paul Gadek, A/Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic), JCU. In the case of JCU, only limited feedback could be provided because Paul Gadek became responsible for the Demonstration Redesign Project in December 2011, mid-way through Phase One. The Steering Committee were pleased with the commitment and progress of the Demonstration Redesign Project. All agreed that NCAT’s methodology was generally applicable to the Australian context, and are looking forward to the results of the project.

**NCAT**

NCAT’s experiences with Australian universities were broadly similar to those in the USA. The projects supported by NCAT were of a comparable standard to those of previous redesigns in the USA. Australian project teams generally consulted more, but this was likely due to greater need for initial clarification based on differences between Australian/USA terminology. Generally speaking, those who consulted and wished to learn more about NCAT’s methodology developed higher quality proposals than those who communicated less with NCAT. NCAT’s greatest concerns related to the limited number of proposals,
particularly from the types of units typically redesigned in the USA: high enrolment, first-year undergraduate units with extensive student learning difficulties. The Australian units met the criteria for redesign, but had comparably modest student learning problems. NCAT were concerned the choice of units was limited by university preferences to pre-select units of institutional priority.

**Differences between USA and Australian universities**

The Australian project teams were motivated to improve quality through more flexible offerings, such as catering for working students through offering online learning. However, in the USA, these types of objectives have been established for two decades. Like most programs in USA, NCAT perceived lack of “grass roots” support for productivity improvement from academic staff. Project teams developed the cost reduction plans because it was a core requirement of NCAT’s methodology. This is not a unique experience for NCAT. Administration is usually more inclined towards addressing cost issues, academic staff typically only show dedication to cost reduction after productivity improvements are achieved. Ideally, academic staff commitment should not require experiential learning of the demonstrated benefits of cost reduction. However, this is not unique to Australia. NCAT’s experience in the USA shows that demonstrated productivity improvements do lead to greater motivation of academic staff.

In NCAT’s opinion, differences in vocabulary were mostly resolved early on. For NCAT, the greatest area of ambiguity was in the role of university leadership in the Demonstration Redesign Project. It was not clear how academic staff were informed or encouraged by campus leaders (i.e. the Deputy-Vice Chancellor Academic) to be part of the Demonstration Redesign Project. It was unclear to NCAT whether the leadership was actively engaged in this project, or whether it was seen as a staff-led initiative. NCAT were surprised that of the many people who participated in the orientation, relatively few projects came out of this.

From their USA experience, NCAT believe that institutional/campus leadership need to be actively and constantly engaged throughout the process, otherwise there is a heavy reliance on staff-led motivation. This limits the development of sustained interest in cost-reduction, improved learning and accountability, particularly when university leaders change. Policy interventions, such as institutionalising ongoing efficiency improvement in the staff incentive structures, help sustain and extend productivity improvements.

**Opinions on the quality of the proposals**

The three NCAT-supported projects had good quality proposals. NCAT set a high standard for specificity (as they do in the USA) and the Australian proposals generally covered all requirements satisfactorily.

One shortcoming was that proposals were not entirely clear or specific in what they will do, tending to be more general in their plans. However, this lack of specificity or detail was not simply due to brevity of the proposals. Some of the lengthiest proposals (not supported by NCAT) contained the least detail on implementation. Other proposals contained a lot of jargon and misunderstood the relationship between information technology and pedagogy:
more technology does not inherently mean better learning or cost-related outcomes.

The Response to the Readiness Criteria should filter out those proposals for unsuitable units and those not interested in actually reducing costs. However, this was not the case. Some suitable units (based on the Readiness Criteria) did not have a suitable Cost Reduction Strategy. There was a general sense that Australian proposals were more interested in addressing faculty problems (e.g. a lack of adequate time for research), rather than student problems. This is partly because some of the units did not appear to have a drastic problem with student learning (e.g. the student pass rates were not as low as many units redesigned in the USA).

The main concern of NCAT was that by encouraging or pre-selecting units, the Demonstration Redesign Project may not have reached the most suitable units. The selected units met the minimum requirements, but were not ideally suited to the NCAT’s methodology. There is less scope for reducing costs when the selected units have relatively small enrolment, are final year units with unique curriculum content and/or have few academic staff involved. Potential improvement in student learning is also limited when the problems typical of first-year units are not present (e.g. very low pass rates). NCAT do not believe that the quality of the Project Plans would have improved by modifying the Call for Participation or placing a greater emphasis on cost reduction. Putting too much emphasis on cost reduction may weaken interest in the project, with fewer people registering at the orientation, leading to fewer Project Plans and suitable units to choose from.

Opinions on internal pre-selection of units for redesign

NCAT are in principle opposed to pre-selection of units for redesign based on reducing the workload to prepare applications, or to achieve administrative or leadership priorities. Administration should not control the process and must encourage as many departments to be involved as possible, allowing for the greatest choice of potential projects. Pre-selection narrows these possibilities and negates the possibility for unselected projects with good proposals to go ahead with their own redesigns independently. From NCAT’s experiences, institutions often find funding to support additional projects if there are high quality proposals which miss out on selection.

The selection process requires significant work from the project teams, but ultimately it is a learning process because teams self-evaluate the cost-effectiveness of their current approaches towards delivery and identify areas for improved efficiency. Preparing a Project Plan should have practical benefits for cost reduction and improvement, irrespective of the final selection. Time spent preparing the proposal is not wasted if the project is not selected, hence there is no rationale for minimising time spent on proposal preparation by pre-selecting units. Redesign should not be treated simply as a grant application process. If staff believe that improved efficiency and student learning are rewarded and valued by their institution, staff will want to participate in programs where they learn how to achieve these goals. If they do not believe cost reduction and improved learning are valued, a primary motivation to participate will be for the grant and time spent on unsuccessful applications will be considered wasted.
Australian Catholic University

The Demonstration Redesign Project received a high degree of commitment and has provoked significant discussion about the way ACU organises its teaching and curriculum redesign. All faculties have been looking at processes to improve efficiency, structure and delivery of programs. ACU has undergone massive change in its teaching pedagogy. There is very strong engagement with the Demonstration Redesign Project, even outside the project teams and their faculties. It has encouraged many people to think about the various dimensions of teaching (costs, pedagogy, technology, student learning) and provided both individual learning for the direct participants, and institutional learning on how to improve teaching efficiency and effectiveness.

Most of the challenges of the Demonstration Redesign Project have related to internal constraints, such as the project management capabilities within the teams, external time constraints, industrial relations and ACU’s existing workload model. The demands of NCAT’s methodology, while constraining and difficult to implement at first, were mostly viewed as a necessary and positive learning exercise.

**Internal feedback**

The Demonstration Redesign Project has been effective in raising the awareness of the cost of teaching amongst the teaching staff. Academics do not usually think of student-teacher relationships as business relationships. If one was to ask “how much does it cost to teach your unit?” very few would know. This is because the real costs of teaching are not key performance indicators for individual staff. These costs are typically understood only by deans or heads of department. While most staff understand that sessional staff cost less than continuing staff, few understand the complexity beyond these broad generalisations.

Feedback from the associate deans indicated the project receives a high degree of commitment from the staff involved, who are motivated early adopters of contemporary teaching pedagogy. In previous years, many staff did not accept the relevance and importance of information technology in teaching. While there are still some staff who resist integrating information technology beyond having an online unit outline, these staff are a shrinking minority.

**Challenges**

The discipline and demands of NCAT’s methodology was initially considered constraining and difficult to implement. However, having completed the required steps and reflected on the process, most viewed it as positive learning exercise. People did remark that there were significant time and workload issues, but one suspects this was due to working within external time constraints. Parts of the process may appear tedious and time consuming at first, but this is mostly because the process is new to the staff. The time and workload demands were probably normal for a curriculum redesign project. If it were to happen more regularly, it would surely become less cumbersome.

Many of the challenges did not lie directly with the project requirements, but with the
project management capabilities within the teams and the constraints of ACU’s existing workload model. ACU must work within the constraints of the enterprise bargaining agreement. ACU has also recently developed a new workload model which prescribes a set number of hours for components of teaching duties. Changing the nature of how things are taught and how work is managed requires staff and union support because if the workload model is interpreted narrowly, the curriculum redesign and cost savings strategies outlined in the Demonstration Redesign Project could be contested industrially. It is expected that broader support will come following the demonstrated success and benefits of the project, but the industrial relations constraints are very real and may be different to the previous redesigns undertaken in the USA. One area where teaching staff were uncomfortable was with some of the language used. It was confronting to see the strong emphasis placed on replacing teaching time with technology or standardised multiple-choice tests.

The overall timeline for the Demonstration Redesign Project changed and this put pressures on staff. ACU agreed to participate at the end of 2010, but it took many months to commence (mid-2011). Although this was due to constraints external to the Steering Committee, the assumption was that the Demonstration Redesign Project could commence at any time during the year. However, with most units not taught in both semesters, this delayed the pilot implementations.

Selection of units

Completing the application process is viewed as a good learning process, but at ACU there are many change processes operating concurrently and staff are pressed for time. It is difficult to ask staff to commit discretionary time to a process where they may not be successful, particularly when the Demonstration Redesign Project is testing a methodology for the first time in Australia. The lack of available time to prepare a detailed project proposal meant that some highly capable project teams risked not becoming involved in the Demonstration Redesign Project.

ACU decided the best method for ensuring that the most appropriate units and staff were included in the project was through a collaborative approach for participation. ACU engaged faculty leaders early on in the process and encouraged them to identify the units most suitable for redesign. Utilising faculty leadership for early identification of suitable units minimised the workload and time required for the application process. All five faculties were invited to participate in the project and the invitation came directly through the Vice-Chancellor’s Office (which is not the normal process). The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students, Learning & Teaching) invited participation from the deans. All were engaged with the project, each providing their own proposals. This approach was only available because faculty deans were highly committed to the Demonstration Redesign Project and willing to provide leadership in the early stages. It should also be recognised that having faculties nominate their preferred units did not remove all competitive processes. The number of faculties and nominated project teams exceeded the number of funded positions.

The selection of second- and third-year units for redesign was primarily based on the relatively high enrolment in these units and their strategic importance. Also, at ACU there tends to be more academic problems (e.g. higher failure rates) in these units, compared to
The project team proposing to redesign a first-year psychology and statistics unit participated in the initial stages of the project, and their unit was suitable for redesign, but they were not in a position to participate further. There was no negative feedback from this team, except perhaps the constraints of the process and timelines.

**Future scalability of the Demonstration Redesign Project Methodology**

ACU are unsure if NCAT’s methodology is scalable or suitable as a whole-of-institution process. Scalability is highly dependent on future mentoring by staff knowledgeable of the process. However, the general discipline of the process is widely applicable. The ACU Education team, who have adapted NCAT’s methodology to their own needs, have chosen to utilise what they consider the most relevant elements of NCAT’s methodology.

ACU hopes that the Demonstration Redesign Project staff can be mentors and fellows for future redesigns. This directly complements the development of professional teaching-intensive academics who know how to make curriculum work in a multi-disciplinary team and with 21st century teaching practices. At the conclusion of the Demonstration Redesign Project, ACU will ask the project teams involved (and even some staff concurrently redesigning curriculum outside the Demonstration Redesign Project) to discuss what were the most important and valuable parts of the process.

**James Cook University**

Informal feedback on the Demonstration Redesign Project from faculty Pro-Vice Chancellors is positive, many are excited by the prospects of NCAT’s methodology and are keen to see the results of the pilot projects. The enthusiasm may have led to unreal expectations from staff for what could be achieved in the project given the constraints of time and competing commitments. JCU promoted wide participation in the Demonstration Redesign Project, with the decision to participate left to the individual teams. However, given the workload demands for preparing the application, support from the heads of schools was needed in practice. The wide participation meant some staff were interested, but the project was inappropriate for their goals. For example, some teams may have been primarily interested in project as a source of funding for improving student learning in their units, but had little scope or interest in the sort of cost reduction intended in the project guidelines. Although the rationale for the project could have been more explicit in the initial call for participation, it is doubtful that this would have had much influence.

The two principal project leaders are fully engaged and receive full support from their faculties. Although enrolment in these units may not be large by the standards of NCAT’s previous redesigns, both units have relatively high levels of enrolment in relation to their faculties and are attempting to accommodate increased enrolment through the redesign. Both also have a high degree of impact, being taught across multiple campuses, and the finance unit is a pathway for future finance majors. It was not a planned decision to choose second-year units for redesign over first-year units. JCU initially had three first-year unit project teams actively engaged in the Demonstration Redesign Project, but it later became clear to some teams that their units were not suited to the project. The feedback from NCAT to the unsuccessful projects was very informative and valuable for all involved. It was very
important to get this information because the project teams not progressing with the Demonstration Redesign Project now have the advice of NCAT on how to independently improve their curriculum. JCU are looking at the two funded projects as exemplars for how to approach curriculum redesign in the future.

**LHMI**

LHMI is pleased with the progress shown in Phase One of the project. NCAT have offered timely, effective, and consistent guidance via the scheduled webinars, telephone/Skype conversations and emails. This has been reflected in the positive formal evaluation through the questionnaire, and informally in discussions with the project teams. The universities have shown strong commitment to the project, both from their academic staff and leadership. Both universities, through their different selection approaches, have chosen appropriate units for redesign. The three unit redesigns supported by NCAT appear to offer significant scope for cost reduction and improved student learning under NCAT’s methodology, while the fourth unit redesign supported by ACU and LHMI presents a convincing case for redesign involving workload reallocation.

The rigour of NCAT’s methodology has proven very successful in large-scale redesigns in the USA and LHMI so far is satisfied that NCAT’s methodology can be effectively applied to Australian universities. However, LHMI has not sought to constrain the universities from adapting NCAT’s methodology to their local settings where necessary. The success of the Demonstration Redesign Project depends on the commitment of the participating universities, and when the academic leadership has put forward a convincing case for local adaptation, LHMI has been supportive. For example, LHMI sees no problem with project teams calculating and recording additional cost savings through the internal reallocation of workloads. The use of labour-saving tactics to reduce teaching workloads, but not the number of teaching staff, will be a valid and desirable approach for some departments to achieve their priorities. So long as the project teams accurately account for their cost savings under both NCAT’s definition and their own definition (based on their institutional workload model), there will be no conflict between NCAT’s methodology and the Demonstration Redesign Project outcomes. However, LHMI accepts that NCAT are not in a position to advise on projects that have minimal scope or commitment to their cost reduction under their methodology.

The two universities have pursued different approaches to identifying the most suitable units for redesign. The practicalities of internal staffing changes and changes to the steering committee representation at JCU, has limited the direct involvement of JCU leadership in shaping the selection process. Their approach has closely followed the bottom-up generation of project proposals promoted by NCAT. ACU made it clear that they had the desire and capacity to take direct leadership in pre-selecting units. This provides the Demonstration Redesign Project with an opportunity to evaluate the project results with these different institutional leadership approaches in mind. LHMI are happy to reserve judgement on their approaches for selection and cost reduction strategies until the completion of the project.
4. Discussion

The objectives of the Demonstration Redesign Project are to improve academic productivity and student learning outcomes in four units, two at each of the participating universities. The project utilises the services of NCAT, who have demonstrated success on both key objectives in their previous curriculum redesigns in the USA. NCAT and LHMI advised the project teams to follow NCAT’s principles as closely as possible for planning and proposing curriculum redesign. Only limited amendments have been made to NCAT’s documents and tools. At the end of Phase One of the Demonstration Redesign Project, three project teams (two at JCU, one at ACU) received support from NCAT for their redesign proposals. A fourth project team, received support from ACU and LHMI to redesign their curriculum independently of NCAT, but as part of the Demonstration Redesign Project.

Implicit in the objectives of the Demonstration Redesign Project is to investigate the extent to which NCAT’s redesign principles may apply to the Australian context. Overall, the results of Phase One indicate NCAT’s approach to course redesign appears to be viable within an Australian context. All project teams saw scope for cost reduction and improved learning through NCAT’s methodology and the feedback was that the self-evaluation and selection process was overwhelmingly valuable. However, only three viable projects emerged which could be supported by NCAT, and these were not the typical large-enrolment undergraduate units with entrenched academic problems that NCAT usually supports. On the one hand, this may be due to choices made by university leaders to identify units of strategic importance and minimise the number of unsuccessful project applications. On the other hand, it may be that there are relatively fewer units in Australian universities to which all of NCAT’s redesign principles are applicable. This would suggest that project teams would be better served by adapting NCAT’s principles to their own context.

It became increasingly clear that the project teams and their universities desired greater flexibility, particularly when it came to implementing cost reduction and accounting for cost savings. These concerns are not unique to Australian redesigns; academic staff in many previous redesigns in the USA also showed aversion to implementing cost reduction, at least until after the benefits of the redesign have been demonstrated. However, given national differences in how universities are managed, workload models, industrial relations, the types of staff employed at universities, and the relative scale of universities in Australia compared to the USA, the concerns of the Australian project teams may genuinely reflect a need to adapt NCAT’s methodology to the Australian context. The success of the Demonstration Redesign Project will be measured based on improved academic productivity and student learning outcomes, and this depends on the commitment of the project teams and their universities to the Demonstration Redesign Project’s methodology.

4.1 Adapting the Course Planning Tool to Institutional Workload Models

Each university has sophisticated and detailed workload models which directly attribute the time academics are credited for the different teaching tasks. Although the project teams found it time consuming to collect the workload data and liaise with the professional staff responsible for the workload models, all teams were confident that they could accurately
cost the amount of time staff were spending teaching the traditional unit. Likewise, teams were confident that the assigned teaching workloads would be lower under the redesign due to the employed time-saving strategies. While actual working hours will never exactly match the assigned hours to tasks in the workload model, the workload model automatically reduces the assigned teaching hours, freeing up time for departmental managers to assign academics to other work. Hence an academic with a 50% teaching workload pre-redesign may be assigned a 40% workload post-redesign, despite teaching the same number of sections of the redesigned unit, freeing up 10% for additional departmentally assigned duties. Unfortunately, NCAT’s Course Planning Tool is not designed to capture cost savings through such workload reallocations.

A second justification for broadening the definition of cost savings to include workload reallocations is the highly flexible and relatively low-cost role of casual teaching staff, compared to staff on continuous contracts. Australian universities have experienced a burgeoning expansion in the use of casual or sessional contract staff, who now account for an estimated 60% of the academic workforce (May, 2011, forthcoming). The growth in casual staff, who typically receive less compensation for their teaching and by definition have limited job security, can be viewed as the ‘tenuous periphery’ of the workforce, working alongside the ‘tenured core’ (Kimber, 2003). If workload reductions from the redesign are used to reduce the number of staff involved in teaching the redesigned unit, then there are clear, immediate and measurable cost savings to the department. However, universities have the least flexibility to reduce staffing numbers amongst the most expensive staff. While it is desirable to have fewer staff teach the redesigned unit, it is counterproductive to reduce the number of casual staff involved in teaching the unit. Therefore, there is justification for reallocating workloads from continuing staff to other tasks better suited to their skills.

Given the confidence of the universities in their workload models to capture workload savings, the limited flexibility of reducing the number of continuously employed staff, and the stated desires of the universities to reallocate workloads towards other duties, it seems appropriate that the Australian project teams be allowed to include these savings in their calculations. To assist the project teams, and for future redesigns in Australia, it is recommended that the Steering Committee develop an appropriate tool for representing these savings, alongside standard NCAT savings in the CPT.

4.2 Academic Workloads: Supporting Research and Professionalising Teaching

The Demonstration Redesign Project objectives do not specify how the project teams may use their cost savings. Such choices are left to the departments which generate the savings. Many of the project teams saw the Demonstration Redesign Project as a pathway to improving the research capacity, professional development and teaching scholarship of their departments. This came somewhat as a surprise to NCAT, who sensed that Australian project teams were mostly interested in addressing faculty problems (e.g. a lack of adequate time for research), rather than pedagogical problems.

The greater desire of the Australian universities to improve staff access to research time must be understood within the Australian context of academic work. Compared to their
American counterparts, Australian academics hold a relatively stronger interest in research compared to teaching. In the 2007 Changing Academic Profession international survey of academics in 19 countries, Australian academics reported the fourth lowest level of interest in teaching (Coates et al., 2009). Only 7% of Australian academics are primarily interested in teaching, 70% report stronger research interests. By comparison, 56% of academics in the USA report a stronger interest in teaching, the highest proportion for academics in any country surveyed. However, compared to other countries (including the USA) Australian academics spend fewer hours on research and similar hours on teaching (Bentley & Kyvik, 2012). Relatively long teaching hours are particularly problematic for aspiring researchers in lower academic ranks. A 2009 survey of the Australian academic profession found similar results, with about 80 percent of academics declaring a primary interest in research and publishing, yet only 20 percent believed they had sufficient time for research (Bexley, James, & Arkoudis, 2011). Roughly one quarter wished to focus more on teaching, the lowest level of interest across 11 factors surveyed. Even outside the research-intensive Group of Eight universities, such as ACU and JCU, only about one third of academics are primarily or mostly interested in teaching, relative to research (Coates et al., 2009).

The mismatch between research aspirations and day-to-day workloads is also an industrial relations matter. LHMI consulted with the National Tertiary Education Union (NTEU) prior to the commencement of the Demonstration Redesign Project to ensure their support for the project objectives. The NTEU’s two core academic claims in their 2012 collective bargaining negotiations will be workloads and support for teaching focused academics (NTEU, 2012). At ACU, the 2010-2013 collective agreement already contains a detailed breakdown for academic career pathways and acceptable teaching load allocations (e.g. 40% of total workload or 638 hours for teaching and research academics; 60% or 957 hours for teaching-focused academics). However, as the surveys of the academic profession suggest, actual workloads rarely reflect normative working time distributions. The importance of attracting and developing academics interested in careers in teaching was echoed by ACU in their desire to use the Demonstration Redesign Project as a tool for professionalising their teaching and expanding the opportunities for research active staff. ACU understand the importance of developing a core group of academics adept in 21st century teaching practices. The Demonstration Redesign Project ties closely with these goals and other projects at ACU pursuing this endeavour.

4.3 Open versus Pre-Selection of Units for Redesign

The Demonstration Redesign Project’s selection process was comprehensive, involving considerable commitment and time from the project teams seeking participation. This was a conscious decision. Firstly, the selection process was self-evaluative, meaning that project teams selected for participation would be in a strong position to plan their redesigns in the next semester based on their evaluations. The Demonstration Redesign Project evaluation questionnaire confirmed that this was the case for most teams. Unsuccessful project teams would also benefit from the process because they had received advice from NCAT and may even continue with their redesigns independently. Feedback from the Steering Committee confirmed this was also the case for some teams withdrawing from the project. Secondly, progressively through the selection process, project teams could self-select out of the project if it became clear that the Demonstration Redesign Project or its methodology was
not suitable. The selection process acts as a filter, determining which teams are most committed and most suitable for redesign. In practice, the high-level of interest in the orientation webinar led to eight project teams in the second webinar (three from ACU, five from JCU), and subsequently five final applications.

NCAT’s recommended method for selecting redesign projects is through open call for participation, with project teams competing based on NCAT’s established criteria for successful projects. Although JCU opted for an open and bottom-up call for participation, ACU invited faculty deans to nominate units of strategic importance. This minimised the number of staff spending time preparing unsuccessful applications, but also restricted the potential number of project teams. From a project outcomes perspective, a pre-selection process such as that adopted by ACU, may lead to quantitatively less improvement in learning outcomes and cost reduction. As the final selection involved two project applicants for two positions, the final decision could only be made based on whether the projects were likely or not to succeed, rather than the extent to which they may succeed. However, competitive processes may also lead teams to inflate their projected cost reductions. At this stage in the project, it is too soon to judge the comparable success of each project team. The two different paths taken by ACU and JCU add a comparative dimension to the project. Therefore, we must reserve judgement on the selection process until the outcomes of the final implementations have been delivered.
5. Conclusion

Phase One of the Demonstration Redesign Project has seen the completion of the preparatory work, planning and selection of four units for redesign. The Steering Committee is pleased with the progress and commitment of the project teams, and confident that NCAT’s principles for course redesign are applicable for the units selected in the Demonstration Redesign Project.

Generally, the project teams followed NCAT’s principles closely and developed proposals of a high standard, comparable to NCAT’s previous redesigns in the USA. ACU’s choice to pre-select units differed from the usual approach taken in the USA, but suited their internal priorities and adds a comparative dimension to the final results. The self-evaluation of Phase One was positive, with most participants satisfied with how the project has been coordinated, the clarity of information and requirements, and the usefulness of NCAT’s approach for curriculum redesign in Australian universities.

Overall, first evidence exists that the strategy and practices of course redesign have the potential to yield substantial benefit to Australia. In an expanding and diversifying system the need to ‘do more education’ with ‘fewer resources’ and ‘achieve higher standards’ is more evident than ever. Australian higher education has changed significantly over the last few decades and in meeting demands for increasing productivity. The redesign methodology appears to offer a cogent approach to structuring and refining leadership of future change.

The Demonstration Redesign Project will now progress to Phase Two. Our feasibility reviews will unfold during the next phase of this work as several redesigns are pilot tested and reviewed. During this time LHMI will collaborate closely with project members to determine the promise and details of the redesign method for Australia. NCAT will advise the project teams individually on the implementation of their pilot redesigns and provide recommendations based on the student learning and cost reduction results. We will develop clearer understanding of contexts in which this method works best, how the methods would need to be refined, the ‘value add’ to institutions and educators, and prospects and resources for broader implementation. A final report on the results of the Demonstration Redesign Project, including Phase Two (pilots) and Phase Three (full implementation), is due in December 2013.
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Appendix 1. Project Summaries

**Financial Management (BU2004), School of Business, James Cook University**

*Primary contact:* Mr Ben Jacobsen ([ben.jacobsen@jcu.edu.au](mailto:ben.jacobsen@jcu.edu.au))

Financial Management is the only finance (discipline) subject most Bachelor of Business students encounter in their degree at James Cook University. It has maintained enrolment numbers on Cairns and Townsville campuses (180 per annum). In contrast the Singapore campus has experienced burgeoning demand. Enrolments in BU2004 have grown from 51 to 291 in the last four years (annual growth of 79%) and this demand is expected to continue. This unit has been identified for redesign based on the desire to increase student engagement, unit completions and improved coordination/consistency of delivery in a multi-campus setting.

*Choice of redesign model:* The Buffet Model.

The current formats for teaching Financial Management support only a limited range of learning styles and differ across campuses depending on the lecturer’s preferred approach to teaching. The buffet model customises the learning environment for each student, allowing students alternate pathways to reach the learning outcomes. Employing the buffet model involves collaboratively developing resources aligned to individual learning styles, improving the quality of learning by providing students with individualised assistance. Specific resources will be designed and developed to support different learning styles (e.g. active/reflective, sensing/intuitive, visual/verbal and global/sequential) and these learning styles will be the organising theme for student-focused teaching materials.

The buffet model is consistent with many of the core principles in JCU’s Learning, Teaching and Assessment policy. The most pertinent is: Approaches to teaching are varied and adaptive to new demands in learning and will include effective use of appropriate technologies and innovation. The key advantage of the buffet model in assisting academics in the redesign, is its incorporation of flexibility which is central to dealing with diverse circumstances. Rather than replace face-to-face teaching in lectures and tutorials with online technologies, it allows for both to coexist and strategic responses to student demand to be made.

*Choice of assessment plan:* Before and after comparisons of common content items selected from exams.

Measuring the impact of redesign on learning will be achieved through comparisons of common content items selected from exams. Two problems (equivalent to 20% of the total course mark) for the final examination will be developed and implemented across campuses in the first offering in 2012 to establish a baseline. A random sample will be selected from a cohort on each campus for the planned pilot and full implementation in 2013. Metrics such as student use of online resources (a feature available in BlackBoard and Connect) will also be gathered in each of the comparison cases as a proxy for engagement. Student feedback on common questions through student feedback on subjects will provide additional evidence.

*Cost reduction strategy:* Each instructor carries more students, enrolment growth.

The cost reduction strategy employed in the redesign process is to facilitate teaching more students with the same staff costs (accommodate enrolment growth). The labour-saving tactic is to reallocate teaching staff towards more productive teaching and learning activities, such as from large class lecturing to smaller workshop-style learning assistance. This will change the mix of class contact to facilitate more student instruction without increasing staff numbers. The total hours spent on one section is expected to fall, allowing existing staff at all campuses to teach more students (avoiding an increased cost).
The subject Education for Cultural Diversity is a core subject for education students at James Cook University. The subject aims to prepare students with the knowledge of theories, policies, frameworks and teaching strategies to cater for cultural diversity as future teachers and involves confronting their understandings of their own culture and the culture of ‘others’. This subject is vital to the strategic aims of the university in catering for underserved populations in our region and is a necessity for teachers who are entering increasingly economically and culturally diverse schools. The target enrolment numbers are 320 students across all four modes of delivery: Townsville Internal (160), Cairns Internal (80), Townsville External (60) and Townsville Limited (20).

Choice of redesign model: The Replacement Model.

The replacement model has been selected as the most appropriate for redesign of all modes of delivery for the unit. For the internal delivery, the replacement model reduces in-class meeting time, replaces some in-class time with online interactive learning activities and makes significant changes to remaining in-class meetings. The redesign replaces the bulk of the traditional lecture structure with interactive content, such as weekly face-to-face student seminars that: (a) engage with pre-designed theory and empirically supported class activities, (b) engage with short activities that help explain the online component of the subject, and (c) review materials that students find challenging from the previous week.

The regional location and student demography suits the Replacement Model. JCU’s two campuses are located in a part of the world prone to flooding disruptions and students are characteristically regional/remote. Most students are first in the family to attend higher education, work part-time and between 40% and 50% are mature aged students with family commitments. The redesign will increase the learning flexibility for students and many will be able to benefit from the online component of the course when they cannot travel to the university. For external students, the redesign will bring greater alignment and efficiency as all students will be working with one online interface for the delivery of content.

Choice of assessment plan: Before and after comparisons of common final exams and student work using common rubrics.

The outcomes of the redesign will be measured using baseline ‘before’ and ‘after’ data. Subject data from the 2011 traditional delivery of the subject will be compared to 2012 data collected after the implementation. Quantitative and qualitative data will be gathered to compare the two and assess the impact of the redesign. Quantitatively, the student participation can be tracked, student achievement data can be gathered and retention data compared. More qualitatively, a survey and sample focus groups with students will gather feedback about the pedagogy, subject materials and assessments across the redesign and traditional modes. The results of the end of semester examination will also be compared before and after the redesign.

Cost reduction strategy: Each instructor carries more students, stable enrolment.

Redesign will reduce preparation and teaching costs by reducing the amount of teaching hours required to deliver the subject and consolidating the delivery of the subject across modes and campuses. By replacing the face-to-face lectures with interactive online delivery, costs will be significantly reduced. The redesign produces cost savings by serving the same number of students with reduced number of instructors, from 3 to 2. This eliminates the cost of employing casual staff. The redesign will make the subject less labour intensive, while serving the same number of students. By replacing some hand graded assessment for automated online grading and software which supports collaboration such as the poster, further costs will also be reduced. The school will use the savings to allocate teaching time to other subjects, and allocate research time to the academic staff thereby increasing the research capacity and teaching capacity of the school, particularly in this strategic area of Education for Cultural Diversity.
Realising Professional Practice (NRSG346), Faculty of Health Sciences, Australian Catholic University

Primary contact: Professor Sally Borbasi (sally.borbasi@acu.edu.au)

Realising Professional Practice is a large undergraduate unit that facilitates the transition to professional practice for students, connecting nursing theory with nursing practice. Offered across five campuses in the final semester of the Bachelor of Nursing program, it is currently delivered face-to-face by five independent teaching teams (one team per campus) to a cohort of 868 students (Semester 2, 2011). Student feedback indicates they are looking for flexible delivery options so they can undertake their study at a time and place that meets their individual requirements.

As student numbers continue to grow, resourcing this unit is proving increasingly problematic, particularly on the smaller campuses where there are fewer teaching staff. Through the redesign process, the Faculty of Health Sciences intends to integrate technology to support and enhance student learning, greater student engagement with the unit content because of the flexibility afforded by the blended mode, and a decrease in the instructional costs per student.

Choice of redesign model: The Replacement Model.

Face-to-face lectures will be reduced from 24 hours per campus to six hours per campus, with the additional lectures replaced by self-directed individual learning activities. Face-to-face tutorial sessions for groups of 25 to 30 students will be replaced by scaffolded and facilitated online group work activities that teams of students will be able to complete at their own pace. The redesigned unit will be delivered centrally, with the same resources being used across each of the campuses, and with members of the teaching team carrying up to 50 students for each online tutorial session. The focus of the teaching role will shift from one of content delivery to one of learning facilitation.

The proposed redesign seeks to facilitate student inquiry, and the learning activities will be developed to equip students with a skill set making them more effective practitioners. Students will have greater control over their learning, and will experience greater autonomy, as the redesigned unit will limit didactic teaching, and provide more opportunities for engagement in active learning. The reduction in face-to-face teaching will provide academics with additional time to develop and refine learning activities and assessment tasks that will facilitate improved learning. Additionally, they will be available to consult one-on-one with students more often, and will have more time to devote to supporting students who are experiencing difficulty.

Choice of assessment plan: Before and after comparisons of common final exams and student work using common rubrics.

An item of assessment that is comparable between the traditional offering and the redesigned unit will be identified. Student performance on this assessment item across the alternate offerings of the unit will be compared. A common final exam paper comprising a comparative mix of short answer and short essay questions will be used. Additionally, overall grades between the traditional delivery mode and the blended delivery mode will be compared to determine the impact of the redesigned unit on overall student achievement for the unit.

Cost reduction strategy: Increase the number of sections that each instructor carries for the same workload credit, accommodating enrolment growth.

The redesign reduces the number of people required to deliver the unit and increases the number of students carried by each online tutorial facilitator. By examining the mix of teaching personnel and reassigning tasks to the most suitable staff types, we expect to produce genuine cost savings. The redesigned sections will involve fewer teaching hours and the workload credit will be reduced accordingly. Freed-up time will be reallocated towards other activities associated with the scholarship of learning and teaching, leading to improvements in the education experience for students. Freed-up time may also be allocated towards research and other departmental priorities.
Creating Inclusive, Safe and Supportive Schools (EDFD 271/221/261), Faculty of Education, Australian Catholic University*

Primary contact: Professor Geoff Romeo (Geoff.romeo@acu.edu.au)

Creating Inclusive, Safe and Supportive Schools, is a core unit in three key undergraduate education programs. Independent versions are delivered in blended mode each year across five campuses to over 950 students.

There is a “Lecturer in Charge” on each campus. There is a requirement that each version of the unit has common, moderated, assessment tasks. However, there is no national coordination of content, teaching and assessment of the unit. The delivery of independent versions across five campuses is problematic. From a systemic perspective it is costly because there is duplication of delivery, teaching, administration, and coordination. From a student perspective there is inconsistency (course drift), inflexibility, and limited access to content and expertise that exists on other campuses. While the quality of the student experience is high, the redesign will improve efficiency through less duplication of effort, teaching, administration and coordination.

Choice of redesign model: The Replacement Model.

The Replacement Model has been selected with the goal of developing one nationally consistent version of the unit. The unit will be totally redesigned and redeveloped in the University’s Learning Management System (LMS). Existing content across all iterations will be filtered and consolidated and, where appropriate new content and new learning objects introduced. The syllabus, assessment, and student interaction and engagement activity will be reconstructed in the LMS. In-class meetings will supplement this; however, careful consideration will be given to reducing the number and frequency, and changing the nature, of these face-to-face meetings. It is expected that a nationally consistent version of the unit that has renewed and consolidated content, rationalized assessment, and utilizes technology to provide flexibility, engagement, and active learning will improve the student experience. It is also anticipated that it will be less costly, not only in monetary terms, but also in time.

Choice of assessment plan: Before and after comparisons using pre- and post-test grades and a range of other evaluation processes involving interviews and surveys of staff and students.

The main assessment plan measure selected is to compare student final scores/grades. A five-year average of student scores/grades will be collated to establish a baseline. This will be compared to the scores/grades awarded to students in the redesign. This measure will be implemented for the pilot using two sections and for the 8 sections of the full implementation. Feedback regarding the student experience of the redesigned unit will be sorted and compared to previous years students surveys. Staff experience of the redesign process will also be assessed.

Cost reduction strategy: Increase the number of sections that each instructor carries for the same workload credit, accommodating enrolment growth.

The redesign will decrease the number of “workload hours” it takes to prepare and deliver a section, lowering the “per student” cost. This is achieved by reducing the number of hours devoted to curriculum development, materials acquisition, materials development and course delivery. In particular, gains are made by reducing or repurposing face-to-face lectures, and sharing content. This is offset somewhat by an increase in online interaction and monitoring. The workload hours saved under the redesign will be reallocated to other teaching duties and/or research.

There will also be an increase in the number of students per section in some locations. Our enrolment plan (and enrolment patterns) clearly indicates strong growth in student numbers. The flow-on effect of the increase in student numbers means that some sections will carry more students for the same workload credit in 2013, with further increasing numbers in 2014 and 2015.

* This unit will be redesigned without the support of NCAT
Appendix 2. Participant Questionnaire Results

An email invitation for the questionnaire was sent to 140 participants who either registered for the webinars or were nominated as members of a project team. Non-respondents and partial respondents received two reminder emails. The questionnaire consisted of closed and open questions on three broad areas of the project: the general approach; the methodology; and overall satisfaction with the process. Most of the open-ended questions specifically asked for “challenges” and “concerns”. Therefore, the minority of respondents who provided open-ended feedback were critical in their appraisals. The questionnaire was structured such that participants were only asked those questions which were relevant to their level of participation. Those who participated only in the orientation webinar were only asked questions on the general approach of the project.

Eighty-one respondents viewed the survey and 39 respondents completed at least one section of the survey, providing a nominal response rate of 28% (39 out of 140). However, the effective response rate can be considered significantly higher because invitations were sent to people with limited participation in the project. Firstly, invitations were sent to people who registered for the orientation webinar but did not attend the webinar. Such persons would be unlikely to respond to a survey due to its perceived lack of relevance. Secondly, invitations were sent to all persons listed as members of project teams. This included people who would not have been participating in the project until the later phases, or whose participation was contingent on their project being selected for funding and support. For example, three respondents emailed to explain they had no knowledge of the project at all. A further 14 declared they did not wish to participate in the questionnaire. Thirdly, there is a risk that unsolicited email invitations were automatically filtered into “junk email” folders, which would include a proportion of the 59 respondents who did not view the questionnaire.

Call for participation and clarity of objectives

Most respondents to the evaluation questionnaire declared that the objectives of the Demonstration Redesign Project were clear from reading the Call to Participate (31% very clear, 41% mostly clear, 23% to some extent, 5% not at all).

Orientation webinar

Out of the 68 orientation webinar participants, 22 completed this section of the evaluation. Most agreed that, after attending the webinar, NCAT’s redesign methodology was very clear or mostly clear (32% very clear, 32% mostly clear, 32% to some extent, 5% not at all). Respondents were also asked their satisfaction with a range of aspects in the orientation webinar. As shown in Figure 4, most were satisfied with the pre-webinar information resources (86%), information provided during the webinar (81%), the webinar communication (73%), the webinar duration (77%) and the WebEx webinar software platform (82%). In the open-ended comments, one respondent claimed the webinar was: “too short... lacked time to ask questions... [and] a lot of time could have been saved in the next phase if there had been time to sort out questions in this initial webinar.”
Figure 4. To what extent were you satisfied with the following aspects of the Orientation Webinar: (n=22)

Response to the Readiness Criteria

Further participation in the Demonstration Redesign Project beyond the orientation webinar required participants to develop their project teams and a statement addressing NCAT’s seven Redesign Readiness Criteria. The Response to the Readiness Criteria justified the choices made by the project teams regarding: unit choice; redesign model; assessment plan; cost savings plan; learning materials; active learning; and collective commitment. Eight project teams, three from ACU and five from JCU, submitted a Response to the Readiness Criteria.

15 of the 39 respondents to the evaluation questionnaire were part of a team which developed a Response to the Readiness Criteria. The most common reason for not developing a Response to the Readiness Criteria was a lack of time due to competing projects. Multiple respondents also declared they were unable to create a team or lacked collegial support for the redesign methodology, or did not have a suitable unit for redesign.

Across the seven readiness criteria, most respondents were satisfied with the information and resources provided to help them develop their Response to the Readiness Criteria. There were no significant difficulties for participants when selecting a suitable unit, developing greater student engagement through active learning, developing the supporting learning materials, or establishing collective commitment from their institutional teams. However, the self-selection and filtering process clearly influences such responses, given that a lack of suitable units and establishing collective commitment were reasons why other respondents did not progress with their applications. Nevertheless, we can be confident
that the information and resources provided were suitable for the tasks required. A summary of the 15 responses is presented in Figure 5.

**Figure 5. How satisfied were you with the information and resources provided for how to: (n=15)**

![Bar chart showing satisfaction levels for different tasks]

Most respondents were satisfied with the support and resources for selecting a redesign model from NCAT’s collection of Six Models for Course Redesign and developing the assessment plan for how student learning would be measured. The high proportion of neutral responses was unexpected. NCAT’s method and resources for these two tasks provide a wide range of suitable methods and examples to help teams select the most appropriate approach. Choice of assessment method was not a major concern of NCAT after reviewing the project team responses, though only a minority of teams had a clear justification for their choice of redesign model at the time of the second webinar. The neutrality may reflect the division of labour within the institutional teams, whereby some respondents may not have been directly involved in these activities.

Information and resources for selecting a cost reduction strategy received the strongest criticism from the respondents, with an even split between satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Dissatisfaction likely stems from disagreement with NCAT’s strict definition of cost reduction, which excluded the internal workload reallocations many project teams proposed. This element of cost reduction is often contested by project teams in NCAT redesigns.

One respondent complained about the use of “American jargon”. It may be that project teams had difficulty understanding how to apply NCAT’s examples to their own context. In
NCAT’s examples of cost reduction, students are divided into “sections” of equal size (e.g. 800 students taught in 40 sections of 20 students each, with each section taught by an individual staff member). LHMI received numerous queries about how to represent student enrolment based on “sections” when students attend common lectures, but are divided into separate tutorial groups, with class lecture and tutorial sizes differing across campuses. In this case, the level of analysis could be either the lecture group or the tutorial group.

Overall, most project teams found the Response to the Readiness Criteria a beneficial learning process. When asked “How valuable was preparing the Response to the Readiness Criteria for helping you understand the steps and considerations for redesigning curriculum?” three considered it “very valuable” (20%), eight “valuable” (53%) and four “partly valuable” (26%). None reported the process as having no value. Few elaborated on their responses through open-ended comments, but respondents commented that the range of criteria were to a certain extent “too rigid and did not take into account our context”. This rigidity almost certainly related to the Cost Reduction Strategy. Another respondent had more stern criticisms of the process:

“The readiness criteria covered a wide range of aspects but it seemed like unless there was a cost saving the USA group were not interested in the project. Better pedagogy, more active learning, etc. were not considered to be important. All the materials on cost saving were in American jargon and did not fit the Australian model at all. I felt that we should have been told up front that the redesign project was mostly about saving money and pedagogy was secondary. I would have chosen a different unit and a different approach if that had been made clear up front.”

(Questionnaire Respondent)

The above comment captures the source of the majority of the negative sentiment. However, it has been made clear from the start that the Demonstration Redesign Project has two clear goals: improved student learning and cost reduction. Both needed to be met for a project to be feasible, and both needed to be measured according to NCAT’s methodology. Unfortunately, this was not clear to all project teams.

Developing the Proposal webinar

Feedback on the project teams’ Responses to the Readiness Criteria formed the basis for the second webinar. All respondents to the evaluation questionnaire whose teams submitted a Response to the Readiness Criteria agreed there was adequate time between the two webinars for its preparation (15 respondents). The Developing the Proposal webinar, held on 20 October 2011, received 72 registrations and was attended by 32 participants. 11 of these participants completed the evaluation questionnaire. Their evaluation of the webinar and its content is presented in Figure 6.
Respondents were satisfied with the duration of the webinar and the WebEx online platform. Most respondents were also satisfied with the clarity of NCAT’s feedback on their proposals, but some reported dissatisfaction with the feedback approach. Broadly, NCAT were pleased with the enthusiasm shown by the staff, and standard of the seven responses. Nevertheless, NCAT did present the teams with critical feedback on where the proposals required improvement. One dissatisfied respondent cited that the feedback process was negative and “not a pleasant experience”. This respondent added that “Trying to get feedback by email prior to the meeting was difficult and we got vague responses.” However, another respondent drew a different and opposite conclusion: “I sought and received individual feedback required for developing the application. This was an important mode of assistance.”

Following the webinar, teams were expected to prepare a proposal based on NCAT’s feedback. A majority of the questionnaire respondents “mostly” understood what was required to move forward in their redesign planning (8 respondents, 53%) and one respondent “clearly” understood the requirements. Six respondents “partly” understood the requirements, no respondent felt that “most aspects were unclear” following the webinar. In response to NCAT’s feedback, most teams held team meetings (14 out of 15 respondents) and most of these meetings included professional staff (8 out of 15 respondents).

Four respondents were part of teams which did not continue participating in the Demonstration Redesign Project. The reasons offered were: a lack of administrative support; unsuitability of NCAT’s Cost Reduction Strategies for the unit; and one instance where the Demonstration Redesign Project did not suit the unit’s delivery and subject needs. Almost all of the participants whose teams submitted a final Project Proposal agreed
that their teams were prepared to write the proposal based on the feedback from NCAT (9 out of 10 respondents).

Developing the Project Proposal

The Project Proposal required teams to prepare an Application Narrative, and complete the CPT and Assessment Forms. The Application Narrative outlined the rationale for the selected redesign model, Cost Reduction Strategy, specific changes to the teaching structure, a timeline and budget for the redesign. The data supporting the Cost Reduction Strategy (e.g. current and post-redesign workload allocations) and teaching structure (e.g. student enrolment, pass rates and assessment) needed to be entered into the CPT and Assessment Forms. None of these tasks were considered “easy” or “very easy”, but the CPT was the greatest source of difficulty for most respondents. Two thirds (6 out of the 9 respondents) found this task “difficult” or “very difficult”, with the remaining respondents neutral. The results are presented in Figure 7.

Figure 7. How difficult was the: (n=9)

Respondents were also asked to articulate their main challenges and advice for completing or modifying the processes. The application narrative mostly posed challenges of articulation. This included coming to agreement on the redesign plans internally within their teams, and communicating this externally through the application process. For example, one respondent explained the greatest challenge was “getting a consensus across the team as to what they were trying to redesign and articulating that in a narrative”. These challenges are to be expected, given that preparing the application is a learning process, requiring structured self-evaluation and justification for the chosen redesign and Cost Reduction Strategy. Terminology was frequently a challenge, and one respondent suggested
a common glossary of terms would have improved the process. Examples of past redesigns on NCAT’s website were considered helpful guidance by one respondent, but another respondent who found them too prescriptive and “distant” from the Australian disciplinary context and literature.

Some respondents commented that the CPT was challenging because it contained a high level of detail and took many hours to complete. The CPT must be detailed because it is the key measure of successful cost reduction. The CPT also provides a framework for helping teams become aware of the various teaching tasks and those tasks suitable for different staff types. The time consuming nature of completing the CPT was problematic for one team due to the constraints of the application timeline. This probably reflects competing commitments, rather than a direct criticism of the CPT. In one case, the CPT was difficult to complete due to differences in practices across campuses. Each campus had its own costing model, which made it difficult to present and interpret costs in different campuses because the number of students, teaching methods, workload hours and associated costs differed considerably. Overall, there was a desire for greater flexibility and clearer use of terminology.

Although there is scope to adapt the terminology in the CPT more closely to the Australian context, the common complaint of lack of flexibility concerns methodology, not terminology. Workload savings that are not implemented through an NCAT Cost Reduction Strategy (such as savings that increase time available for research and other duties, but do not reduce departmental costs) cannot be included in the CPT because the tool is specifically structured to measure and account for cost according NCAT’s methodology. This means it is impossible to make the CPT more flexible by widening the definition of cost savings if such flexibility violates the principles of NCAT’s methodology.

The Assessment Forms received similar comments, with challenges of terminology, narrowness and inflexibility to local context. It is more difficult to understand these criticisms. The Assessment Forms require teams to enter baseline data on student enrolment and performance (grades and pass rates), and the method of obtaining performance data post-redesign. There is considerable flexibility in how teams may measure student performance and the performance data is uncontroversial. At the Developing the Proposal webinar, NCAT commented that all project teams had chosen a viable method for data collection and measurement of student learning (“Everybody got an ‘A’”). The likeliest explanation for the comments received was that dissatisfaction with the inflexibility of the CPT led respondents to report similar challenges with the Assessment Forms, even though these forms posed few challenges.

Project timelines, workload requirements and selection processes

The results for satisfaction with project timelines, workload requirements and selection processes are shown in Figure 8. Most respondents felt the overall timeline for the project and timelines for document submission were satisfactory. Two comments directly related to project timelines, with one respondent finding the selection process unreasonably long and another criticising that the timelines assumed units would be taught in both semesters: “When we said that we only offered the unit in the second semester, the suggestion was made that for the project’s sake we should offer it in first semester as well.” This is a valid
The project timelines were ideally suited to units taught across the entire year so that the full implementation would occur during NCAT’s advisory period. However, the project did not exclude units taught once per year. Two of the selected projects are taught only in Semester 2 and the project timelines have been extended to accommodate this.

**Figure 8. Overall, how satisfied were you with: (n=25)**

![Graph showing satisfaction levels for different aspects of the project.](image)

A minority of respondents (22%) reported dissatisfaction with the workload requirements of the application process, but no comments elaborated on this. Most respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the selection process. This is probably because most project teams progressively self-selected out of the application process. Internal university support for applications also influenced the selection process. This left few selection decisions to be made based on NCAT’s recommendations. The single respondent who declared dissatisfaction with the selection process explained this was entirely due to an internal university decision, not reflective of the Demonstration Redesign Project’s selection process.

**Communication with NCAT, LHMI and own institution**

The results for satisfaction with communication with NCAT, LHMI and one’s own institution are shown in Figure 9. Respondents were generally satisfied with the communication from all three organisations. Terminology, lack of attention to local context and a perceived “one size fits all” agenda from NCAT were the main difficulties highlighted. Some dissatisfaction was evident with internal decision-making within the universities. One respondent found the agenda of their institutional decision-makers was unclear and this had a negative impact on their evaluation of the project. Another respondent was uniformly “very dissatisfied” with all communication, but did not provide further comment on this. However, there are reasons to suspect that these uniformly poor evaluations were an error of data input. The
response for “Not applicable” was in the adjacent column and was probably the intended response. An earlier comment by the respondent declared a lack of knowledge of the project: “Honestly I cannot remember much at all about this project, the lead up to it or the outcomes.”

Figure 9. Overall, how satisfied were you with the communication from: (n=26)

One respondent remarked that their team would have benefitted from having the opportunity for a one-on-one discussion with NCAT and/or LHMI and being told things upfront, “instead of making you prepare the documentation and then slamming you.” It was made clear to the project teams during the webinars that they had the opportunity to request one-on-one discussions with NCAT and LHMI, and they were encouraged to do so as early as possible. Many teams took the opportunity to engage directly with NCAT and LHMI. Generally the project teams with the best developed project plans utilised these opportunities.

Support

Most respondents were satisfied with the support they received from NCAT, LHMI, and the academic, professional and leadership staff at their institution. Respondents were generally more satisfied with the support received from outside their own institution. These results are presented in Figure 10. The respondent who reported being “very dissatisfied” with all forms of communication, reported the same uniform dissatisfaction with support received from all five areas. Again, it is likely that this respondent mistakenly entered this response instead of “not applicable”. One respondent commented that the overall support could have been improved if LHMI staff had done more to help NCAT understand the Australian situation, particularly smaller multi-campus universities.
Figure 10. Overall, how satisfied were you with the support your project team received from: (n=22)
Appendix 3: Participant Online Questionnaire

Survey: Redesign Project Evaluation of Phase One - Project

Redesign Project: Experience Questionnaire

We invite you to complete the following questionnaire to gather feedback on your experience with the Redesign Project. Your feedback is requested so that we may make improvements to the Redesign Project and its methodology. Your feedback may also be published in the Final Report on Phase One and the Final Report of the Redesign Project. These reports are required by the Office for Learning and Teaching, the co-sponsors of the Redesign Project.

* 
- I wish to participate in this survey
- I do not wish to participate in this survey

Redesign Project: General Approach

Please select your university
- James Cook University
- Australian Catholic University

Please select your academic field
- Natural and Physical Sciences
- Information Technology
- Engineering and Related Technology
- Architecture, Environment and Related Studies
- Health
- Education
- Management and Commerce
- Society and Culture
- Creative Arts
- Food, Hospitality and Personal Services
- Mixed Field Programs
- Unsure/Other
Were the objectives of the Redesign Project clear in the *Call to Participate*? *

- Very clear
- Mostly clear
- To some extent
- Not at all

**Comments or suggestions on the information in the *Call to Participate***:


Did you attend the *Orientation Webinar*? *

- Yes
- No

---

**Orientation Webinar**

The *Orientation Webinar* introduced the basic planning steps for implementing curriculum redesign based on the NCAT’s redesign methodology.

---

**Overall, after attending the Orientation Webinar, was the NCAT’s redesign methodology clear?** *

- Very clear
- Mostly clear
- To some extent
- Not at all

**To what extent were you satisfied with the following aspects of the *Orientation Webinar***:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The pre-webinar informational resources</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information provided during the webinar</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NCAT’s communication approach</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The webinar’s duration</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The webinar’s software platform (WebEx)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments or suggestions:**
Did you (or your team) prepare a Response to the Readiness Criteria? *
○ Yes
○ No

Why did you (or your team) not wish to participate further in the Redesign Project?

Response to the Readiness Criteria

Further participation in the Redesign Project required writing a Response to the Readiness Criteria based on the NCAT’s seven criteria:

1. The Unit
2. Redesign Model
3. Assessment Plan
4. Cost Savings Plan
5. Learning Materials
6. Active Learning
7. Collective Commitment

How satisfied were you with the information and resources provided for how to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select a suitable Unit *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select a Redesign Model *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an Assessment Plan *</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a Cost Savings Plan *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop adequate Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Active Learning *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Collective Commitment *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How valuable was preparing the Response to the Readiness Criteria for helping you understand the steps and considerations for redesigning curriculum? *

- Very valuable
- Valuable
- Partly valuable
- Not at all

Comments or suggestions:

Following the webinar, was your project team ready to move forward in your redesign planning? *

- Yes, we clearly understood what was required
- Mostly, we understood most of the requirements
- Only partly, there were many aspects which were unclear
- Not at all, most aspects were unclear

Did your team have a meeting to discuss the feedback, and if so, were administrators involved? *

- We had a team meeting, including administrators
- We had a team meeting, but without administrators
- We did not have a meeting to discuss the feedback

Overall, did you have adequate time between the two webinars to prepare your Response to the Readiness Criteria? *

- Yes
- No

Did you attend the Redesign project’s second webinar Developing the Proposal? *

- Yes
- No

Developing the Proposal Webinar
The purpose of the Developing the Proposal webinar was to provide project teams feedback on the Response to the Readiness Criteria as well as guidance for preparing the Final Project Proposal.

How satisfied were you with the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The clarity of NCAT’s feedback</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NCAT’s approach to providing feedback</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The webinar’s duration</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The webinar’s software platform (WebEx)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments or suggestions:


Did your team submit a Project Proposal? *
○ Yes
○ No

Why did your team choose not to prepare a Project Proposal?


Preparing the Final Project Proposal

The Final Project Proposal is a comprehensive exercise. It requires one to prepare an Application Narrative outlining: the choice of redesign model, specific changes to the traditional unit/subject structure, the learning materials/software you intend to use, your cost reduction strategy, a brief timeline and project budget.

Further, one is required to complete and input data into the Assessment Forms for student learning and document the cost reduction strategy through the Course Planning Tool.
Did your team feel prepared to write the proposal, given the webinars and NCAT Feedback? *
- Yes
- No

If no, why?

---

How difficult was it to write the Application Narrative?
- Very Easy
- Easy
- Neutral
- Difficult
- Very Difficult

What were your main challenges when completing the Application Narrative?

---

Do you have advice for completing or modifying the requirements of the Application Narrative?

---

How difficult was it to complete the Course Planning Tool?
- Very Easy
- Easy
- Neutral
- Difficult
- Very Difficult

What were your main challenges when completing the Course Planning Tool?
Do you have advice for completing or modifying the Course Planning Tool?

How difficult was it to complete the Assessment Forms?
- Very Easy
- Easy
- Neutral
- Difficult
- Very Difficult

What were your main challenges when completing the Assessment Forms?

Do you have advice for completing or modifying the Assessment Forms?

Final Reflections

Overall, how satisfied were you with the following (where applicable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The broad timeline for the Redesign Project *</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timelines for submitting documents *</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload requirements for the Project Proposal *</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process for selecting final projects *</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments or suggestions:
## Overall, how satisfied were you with the communication from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCAT *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH Martin Institute *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your own institution *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Do you have any concerns regarding how the NCAT, LH Martin Institute or your own institution communicated with your project team?*

## Overall, how satisfied were you with the support your project team received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCAT *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH Martin Institute *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic staff within your university *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional staff within your university *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University leadership *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Do you have any concerns regarding the received support?*

## If you would be happy for us to contact you for further feedback, please provide your email address below:

---

Support for this publication/activity has been provided by the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching. The views expressed in this publication/activity do not necessarily reflect the views of the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching.