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Review of School Structures: Design and Social Context

Executive Summary

Introduction

The new Council-approved RMIT structure created three academic Portfolios headed by Pro-Vice-Chancellors which were to take on current Faculty roles and responsibility for budgets and budget allocations to Schools. The Council document also signalled a move towards School structures, but required that before any new Schools were formed a review of School models be undertaken.

The project was to provide opportunities for staff to share their experiences, directly through focus groups or by making submissions to the project teams. The project aimed to inform good School structures and cultures, and assist in devising staff development programs for Heads, Program coordinators and managers, and those responsible at School level for financial and administrative support.

The data gathered on School size, structures and other aspects of internal arrangements have indicated considerable diversity within the Portfolio (see Appendix B).

The project did not set out to demonstrate any particular advantages or disadvantages associated with one set of arrangements or another. However, when staff feedback is taken into account, there do appear to be opportunities for considerable learning across the Portfolio about the benefits of one type of arrangement or another.

Findings

The Appendices to this Report provide a fuller account of the broad range of ideas and observations gathered in this Project. A number of significant themes which have emerged across the diversity warrant more careful discussion. Most of this discussion touches on questions related to the relationship between the Higher Ed and TAFE components of the Portfolio.

The basic RMIT proposition that Schools be the core academic organisational units (AOUs) is widely accepted. Staff wish to work with this direction, and to ensure that it works well.

There is a range of school structures that allows the different outcomes of the TAFE and Higher Ed sectors to thrive. These include TAFE-only and Higher Ed - only options, as well as cross-sectoral Schools.

There are different views about whether large size produces economies of scale, and how far larger size, visibility and critical mass override a sense of identity, purpose and integrity. Changes of structure may be triggered at certain points as size increases, creating new diseconomies. This should be seen as an inevitable part of organisational life, while recognising the disruption which can occur when structures do change.

Integrated dual sector Schools have been supported in general, but there are vigorously contested differences as to the optimal level of integration, for practical reasons. There appears to be an approximate ‘equilibrium of reservation’ and discomfort in terms of perceived advantages and disadvantages on both sides.

Cross-sectoral School structures, at the very least, must incorporate features that recognise the value of each sector and maximise the opportunities for staff in each sector.

The research group consultation strongly favoured all academic staff having a School identity and home base. It suggested that the University should revisit the concentration strategy, (seeking to refine approximately ten), in order to agree a mode of concentration which protected the research mission of Schools and a connection between this and core teaching.
SCHOOL STRUCTURES IN THE DESIGN AND SOCIAL CONTEXT PORTFOLIO:

THE REPORT

1 Introduction and Background

The new RMIT structure creates three academic Portfolios headed by Pro-Vice-Chancellors. These portfolios are to take on current Faculty roles and responsibility for budgets and budget allocations to Schools. The initial advice to Council signalled a move towards School structures, but required that before any new Schools were formed a review of School models be undertaken.

The approach [to schools] suggests that academic organizational units be funded to take advantage of higher levels of aggregation, where shifts in funding allocations may be absorbed or dampened. The approach also fosters the idea of staff being involved in cross-disciplinary programs and projects. Before this process begins, the integrated TAFE/Higher Ed school model adopted in two faculties currently will be evaluated for effectiveness and impact (including on TAFE: career paths for staff, pathways for students, cost structure, external projection of capability. [Proposal to revise RMIT top structure, September 2002]

School Structures at RMIT

In recent years a number of departments in different faculties have amalgamated to form Schools. Some have been formed through merging VET and Higher Education departments, while others have been formed from Higher Ed departments only. Other departments are planning to form schools out of various components. The new senior management structure states that ‘a basic building block for the structure over the medium term will be Schools’. Existing Schools were created for a number of different reasons:

- to increase the critical mass of researchers and scholars in discipline areas and to cluster cognate discipline areas together to enhance teaching quality and research;
- to encourage the development of what are now known as ‘stem degrees’ and common course architecture, and to provide students with clearer pathways and more flexibility of program;
- as a response to identified industry sectors;
- to provide opportunities not available in smaller structures for personal development opportunities and enhanced career paths (for both academic and administrative staff;
- to allow for some economies of scale in the management of Schools and to reduce some duplication of shared support or functions; and

However, the university has little systematic knowledge of the way new Schools have functioned and of the benefits (and possible disadvantages) they bring.
Review of School Structures

In March 2003, VCEM agreed that a review of School structures to cover all portfolios and faculties should be conducted. Each portfolio would manage its own review, utilising shared objectives and methodology. The project on the Schools and Departments in Design and Social Context was the first to be initiated. This was not a project to review any particular Department or School, and will not be used to require particular changes to existing Schools. Rather it was intended to help in the longer term to find the best way of working within the new portfolio structures (see Annex 1 for a list of the questions which provided the basis for Focus Group facilitation and other data gathering). The project was to provide opportunities for staff to share their experiences, directly through focus groups or by making submissions to the project teams. The project aimed to inform good School structures and cultures, and to assist in devising staff development programs for Heads, program coordinators and managers, and those responsible at School level for financial and administrative support.

The intended outcomes from the project were to be:

- a report to VCEM for discussion and wider circulation, to be consolidated with the outcomes of similar reviews in SET and Business;
- evidence to inform discussions on formation of new Schools in the portfolio; and
- shared knowledge to improve structure and functioning of existing Schools and to inform any future proposals for revising School structures.

Twenty-two group discussions were held with staff in all Schools and Departments in the Design and Social Context Portfolio. Note takers recorded discussions, and their reports were subjected to a thematic analysis. The insights emerging from this analysis are presented below. Exemplars of the kinds of comments made in relation to various key themes are presented in Annex 3.

Data gathering included:

- Information on staffing numbers and profile;
- Information on structures and committees, including administrative structures and support for Heads;
- Focus groups with all Departments and Schools, including sub-groups with TAFE and Higher Ed components and with groups in different locales;
- Focus groups of Heads of Departments and Schools;
- Written submissions from anyone wishing to make one; and
- An additional focus group on Research grew out of the discussion and attracted strong interest and support.

It is apparent, therefore, that this report has drawn on diverse sources of data. In the time available, it has not been possible to verify all aspects of the insights gained. In some cases, there has been feedback that aspects of project could have been handled more effectively and transparently. However, the Project Team is confident that its efforts to remain open to staff contributions, and the overwhelming goodwill towards its purposes, means that the learning represented in this report has considerable substance, and provides a very solid foundation for ongoing conversations in the Design and Social Context portfolio. In particular, the consistency with which certain themes recurred across quite
different schools, departments and faculties give some confidence that the conclusions drawn are warranted.

**Project Team**

The whole project was sponsored by the three Academic PVCs and the PVC Organisational Capability and Development. Work began in the Design and Social Context Portfolio in March 2003. The project team for the Design and Social Context Portfolio comprised:

- Chris Duke (Chair);
- Peter Smith, Head, School of Creative Media;
- Sally Leavold, Head Department of Access and Preparatory Studies,
- Bruce Wilson, Head, School of Social Science and Planning;
- Josie Palermo, Planning Group;

Administration support has been provided by from Katherine Mott, Faculty of Constructed Environment.

**2 The Present Position - Commonality and Diversity**

The data gathered on School size, structures and other aspects of internal arrangements has indicated considerable diversity within the Portfolio (see Appendix B). There are Higher Ed-only Schools and Departments, VET-only Departments, and HigherEd-VET Schools. Size ranges from up to a dozen full-time and part-time staff, to more than 100, plus many more sessional or casual staff. Some units have a relatively specific programmatic focus, while others have quite a wide range of programs at different levels. Different units have various balances of academic and administrative staff, and sometimes, there is a varied allocation of responsibilities. Some Departments and Schools have formally established and managed research centres attached to them, while others have research activities more closely aligned with their program offerings.

The project did not set out to demonstrate any particular advantages or disadvantages associated with one set of arrangements or another. However, when staff feedback is taken into account, there do appear to be opportunities for considerable learning across the Portfolio about the benefits of one type of arrangement or another. For example:

- Internal structures vary according to program, discipline and research interests. Some involve cascade arrangements, others are relatively flat. For example, Social and Community Services (a VET department) has a flat non-hierarchical structure (see their diagram of touching pentagons, included at the end of the Appendices) built around specific business training projects that generate non-government funding very successfully. Such ideas are vital and deserve wide circulation at a time when many VET disciplines cannot manage on the low levels of student funding from the state government. Such projects rely on a highly flexible staff profile, involving a substantial number of casual employees;

- Staff involvement in decision-making is supported through various committee structures. Applied Communications, the largest school in the portfolio, has a Research Committee which manages funding for agreed spending and investment. Social Science and Planning has a Staff
Development and Teaching Committee to engage with strategic questions around teaching and learning, and to promote various approaches to staff development. Staff have voice through being members of such a committee

- Balancing of resource and support arrangements between Faculty and Department/School level. Not surprisingly, Faculty offices appear to have provided significant support in financial management and information technology services. However, other aspects of support, including marketing and web support, have been managed at a School level.

Some of the more general themes and opportunities for learning are indicated in the subsequent section.

3 Key Themes And Issues Emerging

The Appendices to this Report provide a fuller account of the broad range of ideas and observations gathered in this Project. However, a number of significant themes have emerged across the diversity which warrant more careful discussion. Most of this discussion touches on questions related to the relationship between the Higher Ed and TAFE components of the Portfolio.

Schools as Core Academic Organisational Units

The basic RMIT proposition that Schools be the core academic organisational units (AOUs) is widely accepted. Staff wish to work with this direction, and to ensure that it works well.

There is a range of school structures that allows the different outcomes of the TAFE and Higher Ed sectors to thrive. These include TAFE-only and Higher Ed-only options, as well as cross-sectoral Schools.

While there is scope for a more focused examination of the different organisational forms of Schools than has been possible in this Project, it seems that it should be possible to develop a template of the essential structure and resource arrangements for Schools, which could then support appropriate diversity. This must linked also with the developing central administration and Portfolio arrangements.

At the lower or internal level further work is required as well as continuous formative evaluation to learn and guide how best to manage groups within Schools in ways that do not reproduce full departments with the consequent cost and trend towards administrative replication and duplication. On-going intra-and cross-Portfolio cross-School workshops as a form of organisation development are implied. These in turn should inform middle management and leadership development.

The role of the Portfolio Pro-Vice-Chancellor remains one of line accountability for the Schools. This is predominantly ‘strategic’, as well as providing an appropriate framework for managing resourcing and reporting. Schools vary in their maturity, confidence, and leadership capability. The exercise of the PVC’s line management role will desirably evolve over time as Schools gain in confidence and demonstrate capacity to operate more autonomously. Part of this will involve managing the tensions between TAFE and Higher Ed and between Schools in an evolving way.

Balancing economies of scale

There are different views about whether large size produces economies of scale, and how far larger size, visibility and critical mass override a sense of identity, purpose and integrity. Changes of structure may be triggered at certain points as size increases, creating new diseconomies. This
should be seen as an inevitable part of organisational life, while recognising the disruption which can occur when structures do change.

The emphasis placed on disciplines in Schools impacted on the level of resourcing and direction setting. This emphasis permeated through the discussions about governance, profile, resourcing, strategies and priorities, communication, and promotion. At the same time, it is apparent that diverse fields of study and practice have different technical and cultural features. This may mean that optimal size varies across discipline fields. Careful modelling and ongoing evaluation of experience are called for to achieve economies of scale.

Large size is not automatically a problem. Much depends on trust, confidence, and support for effective delegation. A relatively flat, open, ‘cellular’ structure can cope in the most successful Schools with multiple reports, making best use of peer support, criticism and mutuality.

Not surprisingly smaller groups tended to exhibit reluctance to change. The same groups, however, were realistic about their expectations that Schools would very likely be constructed around them. There was often a sense of hope expressed that such planned constructions would not impede their practice as a group by interrupting particularly successful programs, business models and practices, or other aspects of their current work.

**Cross Sectoral Issues**

RMIT’s dual sector character is widely valued. Its benefits in terms of access, pathways, professional progression, and scholarship grounded in practice are all but universally valued to the point of being unspoken. The dual sector nature needs to be a highlight of our operations, and should allow us to present programs of greater diversity and often greater strength than our single sector competitors, which are either VET providers of Higher Ed providers.

Integrated dual sector Schools have been supported in general, but there are vigorously contested differences as to the optimal level of integration, for practical reasons. There appears to be an approximate ‘equilibrium of reservation’ and discomfort in terms of perceived advantages and disadvantages on both sides.

It is recognised that RMIT had not done well enough by its VET work and TAFE units. The Higher Ed and TAFE sectors are not equal or exchangeable, rather, the scholarship attributes of the two sectors have entirely different outcomes. Some TAFE in RMIT appears disadvantaged compared with freestanding TAFE Institutes. There is however no general perception that full separation is required to protect TAFE within RMIT. Instead the potential benefits of juxtaposition and integration with Higher Ed must be better exploited, to enhance excellence and assist a selective TAFE research identity. In general, TAFE needs to be more fully and equitably represented in school governance at all levels.

Cross-sectoral School structures, at the very least, must incorporate features that recognise the value of each sector and maximise the opportunities for staff in each sector. Schools will not wish to replicate the full paraphernalia of central and Portfolio administration, but must be able to engage with these: to be proactive as well as respond. The success of integrated Schools depends to a significant extent on effective personalities and their style. It requires confident open leadership. Other factors include heightening awareness of the values, pedagogy, and ways of working of staff in the other sector, dealing with funding and governance issues effectively from the outset, developing processes that advocate for those staff and students championing articulation across the sectors, and more clarity in the diffused line management in TAFE at RMIT.
Several groups raised questions of the matter of size, given that Schools are being so carefully considered as core structural units. How large should they be? If we accept that the achievement of separate outcomes for the two sectors is of primary concern, and needs to be addressed through structure rather than hampered by it, then it is possible to have single sector schools, even alongside dual sector schools within the same portfolio. This led some people to become very anxious about the future of these TAFE-only Departments or Schools. For example, the standing of a single sector VET School, for example, would not have its outcomes particular to VET enhanced by a close interaction with a Higher Ed group under the same school banner. How will they compete for staffing and infrastructure funding against some of the very large cross-sectoral schools of the portfolio at a future time when the local protection of faculties has faded? One response to this was that the Schools in the portfolio need to be of similar size, at least in terms of total budget.

There are some deep-rooted stereotypes, prejudices and other attitudes in both Higher Ed and VET sectors. These will take time to work through. In some cases stereotypes are based in current experience. They imply changing attitudes and behaviour, before closer integration will benefit the students and the institution.

Issues of articulation, credit recognition, transfer and progression need to be addressed as an ongoing organisational project. Some progression routes are much more open within RMIT than others. In places it is held that external transfer into RMIT is easier than the parallel internal progression.

Mechanisms, outside of school structures, can be developed to assist in articulation and greater collaboration between the sectors. For example, the creation of Scholarship Groups that can be cross-sectoral even in mono-sector schools. Good practice in curriculum development also suggests that Higher Ed staff be involved at the very outset when training packages are being developed (as is the case with Design), or that TAFE staff are involved in the program renewal in Higher Ed.

Traditionally TAFE culture and management is more hierarchical and authoritarian than Higher Ed. Some feel that its ‘command economy’ is inimical to a university environment, but a balance of opinion favours the evolution of more or less closely coupled and then integrated Schools. The relevant cultural and organisation change requires time and patience as well as firm leadership.

**Staffing Issues**

Ideally the strongest supporters of a deeply integrated dual sector would seek a completely integrated employment and reward situation. Fully integrated awards and conditions should remove resentments and benefit learners. This appears too hard to attempt in the short or medium term. More modestly an integrated staff workload system, and an integrated student credit system, would be see as real achievements.

Desirable degrees of local separation are contested. Some Schools appear able to work through and around inequities of hours and contract requirements, with increasing openness, staff exchange and varied forms of mobility for staff, and more student choice, curriculum and research development. Elsewhere a degree of separation, including geographical and administrative, is felt to ease the stresses of inequity.

There are good examples of VET staff advancement and openness of the TAFE-Higher Ed boundary. More such movement should occur. However, when staff are mobile across the sector interface either from VET into Higher Ed or the other way around, it is important that the teaching
delivery is appropriate to the required outcomes for that sector; for example, a training delivery is inappropriate for fostering learning in the Higher Ed sector.

Much can be achieved by high quality and well focused staff development and leadership training, including workshopping across different Schools models and methods of good practice. Some basic issues remain:

- **RMIT TAFE career paths are inadequate.** It is imperative that VET staff running effective business models are rewarded with a career step that is comparable with the C6+ scale for Higher Ed Academics. The financial benefits to a school of the industry focus approach of such staff would offset the salary increase.

- **A clear line management structure that includes TAFE staff is critical to building adequate career paths for people with aspirations in the University.** This may require an evaluation of senior positions in school structures (including Heads), and a resolution to the problem of apparent biases towards the promotion of Higher Ed staff to these positions, particularly in cross-sectoral schools.

The tyranny of geography is widely recognised. Physical separation has some, albeit limited, advantages, where too close proximity rubs in award differences as expressed in teaching hours and vacation conditions. On the other hand, students as well as staff pay a price for the dispersal of Schools across City and other buildings and locations.

In this and other respects, the quality of student study life and experience is seen to rest almost entirely with the local social and physical setting, and especially with the committed attitude of immediate teaching and support staff who for most students are RMIT. Any consolidation and relocation of Schools needs to take into account this very positive aspect of intimacy.

**Intra and Inter-Organisational Relationships**

Arrangements for Schools appear to have implications for external relationships only in specific and limited ways, although this perception might result from the high level of preoccupation with internal affairs at this time. Some see larger size, scale, breadth of expertise and diversity as strengthening the RMIT market position in a competitive environment. Having TAFE or VET and Higher Ed joined together is seen as a strength by some, but by others as diluting the academic standards in some parts of Higher Ed.

The Portfolio could clarify/encourage synergies. While it cannot and should not aim to dissolve the boundaries, it can play a critical role in managing tensions between component parts. In this context a role for juncture spanners to create links becomes apparent. Boundaries remain because they are important for encouraging identity and security, but they become semi-permeable, in and out.

Similarly, there has never been an adequate link between the bottom and top levels of hierarchy of the University. The PVC, with an emphasis on a strategic executive leadership role, working with Heads, could provide that link. The role of the centre would then be to collect and disseminate data on strategic issues.

An issue of language and nomenclature was raised occasionally. Some see Portfolio as inappropriate to an educational institution and would prefer a term like Institute or College. The particular Portfolio designation (DSC) was also felt not to be meaningfully transparent in the market place. Other titles were suggested, but not widely enough canvassed to report here.
Research Futures

The University’s research strategy attracts especially acute concern. It led to the calling of an additional strongly attended cross-Schools focus group. The strategy for concentration via a very few VRIIs is seen as threatening the vitality and strength of the existing research identity of Schools. The research group consultation strongly favoured all academic staff having a School identity and home base. It suggested that the University should revisit the concentration strategy, (seeking to refine approximately ten), in order to agree a mode of concentration which protected the research mission of Schools and a connection between this and core teaching.

In this and other respects a common theme is disempowerment. Schools need adequate discretion, trust and delegation adequate to operate confidently, and to gain and retain some of the benefits of their own enterprise. Similarly, the benefits to TAFE staff and indirectly to students of a stronger TAFE research identity can be seen as an advantage for RMIT, building on close integration and collegiality.

Staff held the view that it is possible to sustain School-based research centres – UniSA, JCU, QUT models are exemplars, in addition to those that currently working well in RMIT. However it was felt that all research centres, including VRII’s, need to be evaluated by performance, and that there was currently a lack of transparency in university-wide initiatives.

Similarly, the Professoriate needed to be placed within Schools for their substantive positions to attract quality people. However, there need to be more flexible means for dealing with researchers attached to schools due to the constraints of our IR environment. Researchers of centres were usually employed under more flexible arrangements. It was suggested that an ideal situation would be where research centre staff were associates of Schools but employees of centres. However this may cut across the capacity to employ cross-school staff.

It is essential that aspects of Project-based research, Practise-based Research and similar kinds of initiatives become commonplace as part of scholarship to be fostered in TAFE. Although these differ from traditional research modes, it would allow TAFE staff to be invited into the promotions round process, so as to be able to achieve the suggested TAFE equivalent of C6+ through the personal promotions process.

Scholarship groups could be formed within Schools that could be both cross sectoral and embracing the different types of research listed above. For example, in a scholarship group labelled ‘Photography’, the evident scholarship could be quite varied: traditional refereed research papers on the theoretical nature of photography can be written; papers on digital advances and the cultural impact; consulting projects may be run as business research models that generate both income and research experience and have an industrial focus; practice-based research into managing a photography business is of huge interest to students who may head into such a career. These activities are very much cross sectoral.
Managing Change

There was a widespread view that structural changes were made too frequently and superficially. Changes made three years ago were just bedding down and yielding their benefits. They should not be hastily remade from outside without being clear how to build on the gains of merger and integration now being won. The perception is of uninformed and dissociated decision-making lacking evident rationality. It was suggested that RMIT was just too impatient.

While there is change fatigue, there was no evidence of resistance to change or conservatism per se. Schools want elbow room and support to be more fast-moving and entrepreneurial. They will welcome success from the ‘process simplification’ project. There is a positive valuing and quest for synergy, new ideas and opportunities, and for growth and extension so long as it is well judged and there is real choice in exercise of its form and direction. Further development of Schools through amalgamation and regrouping is not resisted so long as it makes sense and promises to enhance market strength. However, there is suspicion about merging and absorbing other units into growing Schools when transparency is lacking, and where there may be a reality or suspicion of importing non-viable groups and their debts.

Ongoing exchange of good practice as a deliberate process may allow Schools to move from a line command to a more productive and creative form, and to grow in size without diseconomies. This requires patience and firm support. ‘Institutional memory’ and wisdom, as well as impatience to restructure prematurely, were common sub-texts of focus group discussions.

4 Wider Findings – Other University Issues

Most of the interest of focus groups beyond internal matters was in the management of the University at senior management levels and in terms of central services and facilities. Negative factors attracted sustained and severe criticism strong enough to colour and distort the opening phase of a number of focus group consultations. On the other hand most groups quickly became animated and committed to the task. One anxiety was that the exercise did not allow for full expression and capture of their experience and expertise.

The current budget model, which allocates a substantial proportion of the 'RMIT dollar' to central services - rather than it remaining in Schools for their work - was linked to the poor quality of central services and the cost, frustration and inefficiency which this caused. Central marketing, international as well as domestic, is one of several support services to attract criticism. AMS was a natural and frequently mentioned topic, but so were other IT, Finance and Personnel services and facilities. The opaqueness of finances, and the apparent inconsistency and irrationality of some central decisions and services, came in for frequent criticism. In some cases, the inadequacies of the central services were linked to questions of the size and economy of Schools, and of their own administrative infrastructure.

There was an overwhelming view from staff (including senior managers in Departments and Schools) that they were not adequately perceived as 'clients' by the central support centres of the university. It was suggested that a more client-focused approach towards Schools be adopted. For some, good practice in service provision required the negotiation of service agreements, with performance evaluated against agreed targets. Consistency and reliability, as well as simplification, were seen as the minimum expectations that central services should meet.
5 Conclusions

It is apparent from this Project that the formation of the new portfolios involves significant opportunities and risks. There is scope for much more relevant linking of the academic centres of the University with the Vice Chancellor’s Executive and central services. There are already some Schools which are sufficiently well established to be looking forward to this possibility, with internal management resources and structures for decision-making in place. Their interest will be in how the DSC Portfolio develops resources in Teaching and Learning, Research, and financial management with which they can engage effectively and efficiently. Other groupings will need adequate support and time to develop an appropriate framework for their purposes. Clearly, the relationship between TAFE and Higher Ed groupings will be a key part of this process. This project has provided an extensive range of insights into these questions, and this document should serve as a useful base for ongoing discussion.

As an example of organisational learning and renewal, the Schools Project has provided a useful example of how this Portfolio might seek to engage with staff at all levels, to explore various issues of importance as the Portfolio develops. Its value has been that it has revealed directly the complexity, the connectedness across levels of different groupings within the Portfolio, and has reinforced the need for openness and continuous evaluative review.
Please note: where relevant, school groups have been identified in the interest of sharing good practice and furthering understanding.
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A.1 The Student Experience

Staff were of the view that rather than being embedded in structure, student-centredness was rather created through staff’s commitment. Program Coordinators and teachers were described as often working hard to shield students from difficulties (eg AMS problems), to smooth the way for students [Access and Prep]

The student experience in the school was perceived as a strength. In smaller schools personal relationships were possible with a smaller group of staff, including greater pastoral care, with lecturers more available for consultations. The intimacy also aligned students with an affiliation for the department. For example, in one school where all year levels are designated with an administrative person, students benefit from knowing who to go to for assistance with administration issues. [Building and Const Eco]

Students also benefit from diversity in the staff with differing backgrounds. In addition, students appeared to benefit from teachers being practitioners. [Arch and Design]

Staff felt that in the main students identified with their program or school. [Applied Communication] [Social Sciences] “They don’t engage with faculty or RMIT, RMIT is a fog”.

However in a large school, due to the range of cross-disciplinary areas in the school, students did have greater expectations about the type of study they could do – eg courses from across different disciplines. Therefore staff felt pressure from trying to meet these expectations, in an environment that let them down, i.e. internal transfer as a process is not systematic [Social}
Please note: where relevant, school groups have been identified in the interest of sharing good practice and furthering understanding.

Science.

Student satisfaction in one department resulted from their ability to conduct flexible learning programs. [SACS]

In one school, considering the fact that students appeared to be benefiting from the opportunities to take courses from other programs, Industrial Design were looking to modify their program to increase the integration of their students. [Arch and Design]

Staff morale, and therefore staffing levels and funding (i.e. resources) impact on the student experience. One school acknowledged that the student experience was greatly reduced this year due to the budget cuts, with this being voiced in SSCC meetings and in general classroom comments [Creative Media]

Co-location is important for students and staff. The geographical structure of the school allows the majority of the students to have all their classes close together and close to the administration points. [Creative Media].

However the largest disadvantage for students is that there isn’t a physical home for them to identify with - no communal space for them to build a community or sense of purpose, in which to socialise or study – eg library is not adequately equipped in terms of space. [Social Science]

In an attempt to help forge student communities across sectors, one school was experimenting with sharing of resources across sectoral groups, eg class time. This appeared initially to be of benefit for TAFE students who were increasingly asking questions of Higher Ed students in their classes [Fashion and Textiles]

There is a real need for equity of provision of services for students at all campuses. Staff reported that students at Brunswick have to travel to the city for academic support. Hence this acts as a strong deterrent for students to access this service. [Fashion and Textiles]

A.2 Staff Experiences

Most staff acknowledged that communication and collegiality / participatory decision making impacted on morale – they dismayed that management did not always keep people ‘in the loop’.

Staff also overwhelmingly acknowledged the need for transparency in all management processes, i.e. recruitment, promotion, budgets, etc. [ }

TAFE Teachers are particularly burdened by dual administrative requirements of RMIT and government bodies. Therefore compliance issues were an additional burden for TAFE staff. Provision for appropriate
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support to TAFE staff was required eg AQTF; Workplace Assessment Certificate has required vast amounts of time to investigate. In addition TAFE staff may be working with a cohort of students who require higher levels of support, not recognised in funding arrangements etc.

Staff felt that administrative staff have poor career paths. It was suggested that staff get more satisfaction, and the school benefits, when administrative staff are integrated into the academic workings of the school (such as in Architecture and Design.

Staff felt that they tend to identify with the program rather than the school, but that this works to enhance their reputation in industry. This also works to create a sense of ownership and autonomy for staff. For example, currently in TAFE Art & Culture there is a flat management structure, which is a positive thing. “All staff have input into content and direction of the programs. Change comes mainly from within in the group, from the ground up”. While they acknowledged that this model was limited in relation to career options, this was compromised because job satisfaction was high due to the quality of the program, staff and students.

For some staff job satisfaction was increased through the size and disciplinary basis of their department. The discipline was the definable node around which staff came together. “We worked hard to build up our identity through the 1998 restructuring. Our identity is founded in our collective historical experience as a department”. Meaningful strategies employed through good leadership and teamwork helped develop a strong discipline base in the department.

While there were some discussions around the benefits for TAFE staff in moving across sectors, some TAFE staff rejected the notion of a successful career path comprising a move to Higher Ed as demeaning. They were committed to and sought a career path in TAFE. Therefore there is a need to recognise TAFE teachers as professionals and meet their career path needs. Careful considerations needs to be given to TAFE career pathways when constructing representation of TAFE in the portfolio executive structure.

Putting TAFE and Higher Ed together can make salient disparities, rather than highlight synergies. Equity of workload issues are problematic even within groups. For example performance management issues around Higher Ed staff working 12-12-12 presented its own problems. Some Heads discussed the development of a points systems to alleviate some of these tensions. They also discussed the need to agree on RMIT research measures that could be enforced through work plan management, which currently is difficult to enforce because it lacks ‘teeth’ and presents no added value.

Some staff suggested that a solution for dealing with disparities could be to create separate business units. In other TAFE’s there are usually directors of business units roles for eg. Ass Director, Curriculum, International etc. They suggested that the current role structures for TAFE staff at RMIT
makes comparisons with the external VET sector difficult.

It was also suggested that it is not necessary to have TAFE and Higher Ed physically or structurally integrated to make connections possible. There are funding issues that need to be resolved to promote articulation – the issue of limited HECS places always presented a problem.

TAFE staff appeared to benefit professionally from being in a cross-sectoral environment. However discussions ensued around issues of dual enterprise agreements and IR issues eg. The lack of equity in translating skills and qualifications for the ‘same work’.

TAFE staff acknowledged that if the building block for RMIT structures were only schools, then Heads would be more likely to be Higher Ed people in the current IR climate. They acknowledged that the TAFE award is lacking, but even within the award, the provision for Advanced Skills Teacher positions has not been utilised within RMIT because of the expense They suggested that it would impact on the operating a vibrant TAFE at RMIT.

Therefore career satisfaction was impacted upon by lack of VET pathways at University level rather than Department level. However lack of tenure of staff was also a concern with much of a departmental team employed on fixed term contacts

There were positions for which VET people could apply but the view was that they would struggle to be appointed without PhD’s. In cross sectoral schools the heads would usually be Higher Ed because of the EBA requirements that academic staff report to academics. In addition for TAFE teachers, the expectations that research will be part of their work plans did not translate to teaching workload allocations. Therefore it is difficult for TAFE teachers to complete higher degrees, with the exceptions of masters by coursework perhaps.

While workloads of TAFE staff don’t acknowledge it, there also needs to be time allocated to allow staff to be involved in debates, such as the development of training packages. The impact of training packages is critical yet staff are impeded in their ability to influence these debates.

Staff were of the view that academic promotion was not a simple process and in addition did not recognise professional practice. This was critical due to the urgency in raising staff capabilities. For example, in a very large school there are no professors within the School, only 1 Assoc/Prof and 2 Adjunct Professors.

Professional development was a critical feature of raising staff capabilities for staff. They suggested that more recognition for professional development opportunities for TAFE staff as well as Higher Ed staff in T&L practice and research was required.
Staff viewed the program coordinator role as an unpopular position due to the heavy administration load inherent in the role. There was currently no career path for program coordinators. It was suggested that perhaps this role could be rotated.

Co-location was important for positive staff experiences. Cultural isolation was experienced across Geographic locations, therefore leading to a lack of cross-fertilisation for staff and students.

Healthy work environments were also important for staff morale. Staff dismayed that the quality of their work environment was poor, i.e. locations, lack of computers, desk space, crowded office environments. This increased stressors in the workplace and contributed to the difficulty meeting research obligations. For example in one school only four staff members had their own offices, and staff had to share desks with other staff. Most meetings with graduate students had to take place in the coffee shop. Staff noted that great potential was undermined constantly by poor morale and the current university environment. Staff also pointed to potentially dire issues such as OH&S problems in Building 6.

A.3 Cross-Sectoral Issues and Articulation Arrangements

In terms of achieving articulation pathways, there was a view that cross-sectoral schools were enabling these synergies, because staff were more likely to work together. This was also encouraged by external drivers such as requests from clients and industry. The view was that structure would be irrelevant when a catalyst is made available. (e.g. articulation with Applied Science for Dept of Human Services).

However there were certain conditions identified for the successful operation of cross-sectoral schools. These included strong leadership, deliberate effort to ‘get to know’ the values, pedagogy, ways of working of staff in the other sector, getting the funding and governance issues right from the beginning, developing processes that advocate for those staff and student championing articulation across the sectors, and more clarity in the diffused line management surrounding VET at RMIT.

There were myths associated with the quality of programs in TAFE and the qualification of staff that need to be discredited. These were imbedded in assumptions about what TAFE from Higher Ed staff, and about Higher Ed from TAFE staff.

It was acknowledged that value systems differed between sectors, educational, philosophical, pedagogical, and that these created barriers to articulation and cooperation.

TAFE staff felt that culturally, the lexicon of Higher Ed was biased against VET and this had not been addressed. They also felt that Higher Ed...
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VET, and his had not been addressed. They also felt that Higher Ed misunderstood the level of VET teaching – that they perceived it as shallow and of low quality, so hence barriers formed between potential relationships. Conversely TAFE staff held assumptions about Higher Ed teachers not being ‘qualified’.

The general feeling was that communication between Higher Ed and TAFE was not adequate. Also, that TAFE’s vocational and industry focus was not appreciated.

Higher Ed staff felt that TAFE focused on industry needs and was reactive rather than proactive There was also a perception from Higher Ed staff that some TAFE programs “had lost their way as they are trying to mimic what Higher Ed does rather than focusing on technology”. Staff felt this represented a push towards the ‘top’ (AQF) end.

There was discussion that the objective of TAFE was being lost;” Who will then meet the demand at the lower (AQF) levels? ” Higher Ed staff also felt that VET lacked an understanding of what a university is and in particular what constitutes a sophisticated research culture.

Debates ensued, from both TAFE and Higher Ed staff, about whether the implementation of Training Packages had presented an insurmountable barrier to developing pathways. There were myths surrounding training packages, their flexibilities and limitations that need to be contested in order to move this debate forward. Staff did agree however that good practice would involve Higher Ed staff being involved at the very outset when training packages are being developed (as is the case with Design).

There was a perception from Higher Ed staff that VET students “can’t cope in Higher Ed” and need extra support (in the transition). Overwhelming the view from Higher Ed staff was that VET students did not fare well after articulation. “students do not always adapt to the need for independent direction, research and practice”.

Some staff felt that they needed the stimulus of others with similar ‘intellectualisms’ to maintain academic integrity and a sense of collegiality.

Staff felt that cross-pollination and bringing together of various creative industries could enrich each others disciplines. The key here was the nurturing of creativity in professional practice that all disciplines share.

“Our programs are intended to appeal to a broad section of the Creative Industries. There is articulation from 2yrs of TAFE and 1year Higher Ed through to post grad. Reverse articulation also is common Higher Ed to TAFE eg. Bachelor students moving into specialist TAFE courses (approx 50%) In Professional Writing and Editing this figure is 60-65%. There is some horizontal movement of students from one discipline area to another eg Writing to Multimedia and reverse” [Creative Media]
Staff were of the view that management needed to work hard at getting Higher Ed-VET to work, and that this required strong leadership and direction.

Higher Ed staff in particular were not convinced that VET managers handling H/E issues without appropriate backgrounds equated to effective leadership in a school. They suggested that VET managers lacking suitable academic training and qualifications were not in a position to provide academic leadership for Higher Ed staff.

For one department, seamlessness was created through collaborative teamwork between VET/Higher Ed staff. There were identified synergies between the programs. They acknowledged that the VET sector was no longer just focussed on practical work. “It incorporates serious academic work.” The department was trying to integrate VET subjects with Higher Ed courses, which was being made difficult due to the AMS. [LIS]

Mutual respect had helped develop an educational system, which encourages students from both sectors to take up subjects from the other sector. Higher Education program staff understand that VET is no longer in traditional vocational mode. However VET staff were disappointed that awards for VET staff were different from those of Higher Ed.

One school highlighted opportunities for TAFE degrees in Design and technology that presented a potential growth area for the school. In this case it was TAFE’s ability to attract government funding that made this initiative possible. [Fashion and Textiles]

Architecture has a strong relationship with RMIT TAFE, Building Design and Drafting, and use the articulation as a way to influence what they teach. Architecture also has a strong relationship with Foundation Studies. They also direct unsuccessful applicants to the TAFE course. [Arch and Design]

All Cert IV and Diploma & Advanced Diploma programs have articulation arrangements with Higher Ed Programs. These include BA International, BA Crim Justice, B Social Work, and B Social Science Youth Work. [SACS]

The VET sector has a real industry engagement through the “Project Space” Gallery, which shows work of emerging artists. It is here that 2nd year students come into contact with the arts industry. Part of the curriculum is to help hang shows etc. [Art and Culture]

A cross-sectoral school, has been able to move suitably qualified staff from the VET sector into the Higher Ed sector, driven by excellence of staff, program need and a burning desire in those particular staff to change sectors.

Other VET staff in the same school have expressed a wish to remain in VET, to realise their teaching abilities in the VET sector, and to wait in
hope of a career structure that recognises those VET teaching abilities. This collaboration has been reflected at the student level. For example, students have excellent opportunities to progress from Cert IV to MA within the school. Some have already done this. [Creative Media]

There are benefits from a marketing point of view – also could funnel people that miss out on a place into an alternative pathway. Also by having VET in the same structure you could keep a closer eye on standards – which tend to fluctuate depending on which TAFE students come from. [Building and Const Eco]

IPAE, as well as delivering undergraduate and postgraduate programs in Higher Ed, are experiencing articulates across both sectors of students (Higher Ed and TAFE) within the department. Internal & external forms of articulations are also evident (2.5 years intake to (major) program) [Ind Prof and Adult Educ]

Sizes of VET and Higher Ed sectors in schools are important issues to consider when determining how to structure internal governance and line management. Staff suggested that representation needs to be proportional, rather than tokenistic, with representation on boards and committees critical for developing shared understandings across sectors.

There is the danger that VET discussions get lost in Higher Ed dominated forums eg Ass Deans T&L are very Higher Ed focussed. For example in one school the staff were not aware of a tender until after the deadline had passed because of the time it took to reach them from the Faculty. VET information therefore didn’t get prioritised because of lack of understanding about actions required therein. The VET sector operates around clear line management roles. This works for other TAFE institutions.

The staff perceived that the University “still drives the world by Higher Ed”. For example they felt that the recent profile process didn’t really consider TAFE. The unclear governance structures also impeded TAFE/VET career paths.

“There is one lone voice from VET on the School’s board, and everyone else is from Higher Ed. This means that the majority of board members are not aware of VET’s activities and achievements, and there has been no opportunity to engage with Higher Ed about what VET has done. The continual need to ‘retell our story’ to the School and Higher Ed is frustrating. [Applied Communication] [Art and Culture]

It was suggested that the relationship between schools and the larger RMIT structures also needed consideration, that there should be increased representation of Schools in university management structures.

TAFE line management is diffused. Proposals for dual line management structures were put forward from within schools. In one school the Program Coordinator was the only representative for TAFE from with RMIT issues. Other Schools have a TAFE Program Manager who reports
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to Head of School. In addition there were numerous occasions where program coordinators were required to undertake the role of Program Manager, which can be very stressful. However the Program Coordinator felt obligated to be heavily involved in RMIT Forums being the “lone voice” for TAFE in the School.

In the past, having a head in TAFE appeared to have created a sense of direction. Staff bemoaned the lack of that level of leadership and described how it impacts on staff’s ability to act.

The management structure in the centre creates the right conditions for success. 5 management positions, 3 senior people with a supportive head form a good team – honest, transparent. In the past we haven’t had a head we’ve felt we could trust [ICGT]

Overwhelmingly staff were of the view that cross funding and subsidising creates resentment. It was acknowledged that these tensions could lead to total breakdowns of communication and collegiality between sectors within a school.

Administration around TAFE is enormous, eg ESOS act. For a Cross sectoral HOS it is an enormous job to manage both sectors and needs to be resourced adequately. It was suggested that benefits can be achieved through cross-sectoral collaborations without merging administrative functions.

There are a wide range of administration tasks required to support new way of working in VET. The establishment of a culture of quality client service is essential to winning repeat business. Administrative staff who know the Departments programs and projects and who have an excellent working knowledge of RMIT student administration and financial management systems and processes must be included in teaching/project teams.

Staff strongly felt that RMIT had no appropriate infrastructure for articulation of students and movement of staff from one sector to the other. At the moment there were few processes that made it easy for Higher Ed students to articulate to TAFE and also some issues with TAFE-Higher Ed articulation.

Fluidity between sectors did not necessarily improve in a cross-sectoral School. For example in one cross-sectoral school, there was no formal process for TAFE students to articulate into the 2nd or 3rd year of Degree, and instead this happened informally as students were readily offered places in Higher Ed Degree at RMIT and the Victoria College of the Arts. [Art and Culture]

Higher Ed staff in particular felt that merging Higher Ed and TAFE had a detrimental effect on the research focus of Higher Ed. They perceived VET impacting detrimentally on RMIT’s image. Staff were frustrated about the lack of a traditional research culture at RMIT. They acknowledged that it made it difficult to compete against research giants (i.e. sandstones). The

Funding issues can cause resentment

TAFE’s administration – burden and necessity

Develop processes for articulating students

Impact on Research focus
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reduction of RTS places had placed an increased burden of staff. They suggested that more collaboration within Higher Ed at RMIT was required before it strengthened ties with VET

In one school, the dual sector school merger was too quick for good articulation pathways to be formed. Staff felt that they needed to work on building these slowly.

Staff felt that too much time and money was being spent on restructuring their School. They were also of the view that, often restructure issues were handled by people who had no real understanding of issues concerning the School and the programs it delivers.

A.4 External Relationships

Staff were of the view that schools need more autonomy over finance, profile planning (eg international students), marketing, and administration. Staff felt that central services were not supporting the school’s needs.

Having adequate resources to support our business is an ongoing struggle. Our core business is T&L. However getting things done at RMIT is difficult. Our structure leads to service centres dictating what happens, central support services should be just that – providing support mechanisms, not involved in decision making mechanisms. [ICGT]

University systems and processes are challenged by innovative practice in VET. Currently they are time consuming and unable to meet our needs. For example, we had 30 trainees waiting to start a program but we couldn’t get the program on the DLS in an appropriate time, it took 10 months and employers were scathing! [ICGT]

The level of service provided by Property Services is inadequate and centrally driven and lacks the level of flexibility and professional required to support the new business environment in which the TAFE Sector needs to operate to remain viable. There are other examples in our dealings with legal (supporting the developments of MOU’s), marketing, international, DLS, and people services. [ICGT] [SACS]

The university needs a consistent corporate image, yet not even that is achievable. There is variation on the RMIT image at the local level, and no consolidation of individual school needs – we don’t promote RMIT as a uniform entity. The one size fits all approach is unsustainable because you can’t service everyone [ICGT]

Staff felt that they needed better marketing of their programs so that there was better product knowledge across RMIT in general, but also within their campus and school. This oversight often lead to, for example, brochures being produced without a full compendium of programs included. Staff were dissatisfied with marketing services by RMIT central and were more
inclined to suggest that these services are better allocated closer to the ‘providers’ of programs. [Fashion and Textiles] [Applied Communication]. [Creative Media]

In the development of larger structures, such as schools, and centres of excellence, there was a danger that the uniqueness of programs could be lost etc. Staff felt that this could be detrimental, as the loss of unique identity often impacted on relationships with industry and other clients.

This issue also impacted on the ability to market programs to international students. Eg in F&T VET, international intake had dropped dramatically after RMIT international took over marketing responsibility. Staff feel helpless in their dealings with RMIT international on this issue. [Fashion and Textiles] [Creative Media]

Staff were dissatisfied with services provided by property services. They stated that their work was poor quality and took very long periods of time. For example, 15 months to correct a fault in a lab in building 94; there were significant security issues in building 94 which had not been addressed with any seriousness even with directives from the HOS. [Creative Media]

Schools debated about the need to duplicate these support structures in schools. “We need support services to have a more client focussed way of operating, and some way of monitoring the quality of their service, e.g. formal service agreements. We want to be looked after – helped! The state of our support services creates high levels of risks for us – in the loss of enrolments, the loss of industry partners etc.”

Staff were also frustrated that School’s resources did not reflect the commercial income generated and suggested that the university budgetary model be reviewed. Overheads were a real problem. “They (i.e. faculty) ‘fix’ the prices, therefore there is no transparency in that process.” Staff needed more control to provide a diversified business, akin to the graduate business school model. [IPAE] Note: this organisational structure was nominated as an achievement by staff during AQUA achievement workshops.

If RMIT has strong links with industry and if industry is solarised, then we need to mirror that specificity in what we do – particularly when, as in our situation, there is a defined industry that we are aiming to service. [ICGT]

Industry Engagement

Industry doesn’t care whether we’re a department or school, they are just interested in the suite of programs we can offer, internal structures are not evident or important from an external point of view. However what is important is that we can service industry and that there is seamlessness in the services we provide. What is required is that we become more efficient and in step with industry. [ICGT]

Industry projects provided opportunities for active engagement by staff and students. [Arch and Design] Schools structures that reflected industry enabled good communication with industry [Applied Communication]. It
was noted that strengths come from appropriate linkages – industry and professional education. “We are failing to get the synergies at present” [School Early Childhood]

Staff felt that a certain level of autonomy was provided at the school level to engage with industry but that little support from central structures was available to help sustain relationships. There have been many instances of relationships and engagement that were fostered by individual initiatives only.

Staff believed that change should always be encouraged from the ground up. Change should be perceived as appropriate by staff and the Portfolio should guide and nurture this. Staff believed a two way dialogue was essential.

Currently the University sets up monitoring regimes that do not encourage trust, but instead encourage competitiveness, so much so that units vie for EFTS in a competitive fashion at the detriment to working for the organisation as a whole.

If the PVC role was strategic rather than line management focussed, then the role of the portfolio could be an integrative one rather than an additional layer of management. The Portfolio could clarify / encourage synergies. While it cant and shouldn’t aim to dissolve the boundaries, rather it can play a critical role in managing tensions between component bits. In this context a role for juncture spanners to create links becomes apparent. So boundaries remain because they are important for encouraging identity and security, but they become semi-permeable, in and out.

The PVC’s focus should also be on developing staff capability. This is particularly difficult for TAFE staff at the moment. Because there is no opportunity to relieve staff of load, they are not free to engage in professional development activities. This is a risk issue for RMIT in general.

A.5 Research Futures

According to staff, RMIT is already engaged in different ways of doing research:

- Individual academics (poorly rewarded)
- Distinct concentrations with R leaders (within a school)
- CRC – university contracts out with partners

Research happens at different levels – individual, collaborative, cross-faculty. Therefore the Research approach adopted is more important than structure. Staff envisaged two models operating at RMIT – VRI model and Intra/Inter School model. These were perceived as being in tension with
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one another due to the allocation of resources to the VRII’s. The question raised was how can we optimise this duality?

Central policies can sometimes be at odds with schools policies. Staff felt that research in schools is critical for the development of research leaders, and for providing opportunities for early researchers, however more support required. Research is crowded out because of teaching over delivery, therefore how can the university get a clear picture of the effort?

Staff believed that there is an assumption at the central level of RMIT that those on the ground don’t collaborate and/or look for key issues that have significant public policy significance. Therefore the central system has to provide mechanisms for this. This assumption needs to be questioned, and mechanisms for bottom up dialogue are required.

Overwhelmingly staff believed that VRIIs undermined schools’ attempts to build research cultures, and endangered the nexus between teaching and research activities. This reduced access by schools to research funding. However staff acknowledged that the Innovation investment fund had benefited the school’s research agenda.

They suggested that small strong centres could offer support and expertise to the school but at present did not allow for autonomy in their own areas of expertise. It was believed that one can’t force synergies from the centre. Staff felt that RMIT central needed a better understanding of what motivated staff to succeed in research endeavours.

In schools where research programs didn’t fit into VRII’s naturally, staff were concerned that research monies would be funnelled away from local levels. [Arch and Design]. The majority of staff are completing PhD’s therefore needed resources to develop staff capability, and attract professors with track records. [Building and Const Eco] [Ind Prof and Adult Educ]

It was suggested that the centre should map what research is currently undertaken and then create links – to build relationships and provide a way for developing a vibrant culture. They should also reward good performance against academic outcomes. Therefore structurally, the centre should be smaller.

Staff described mechanisms in place in schools, such as School Research Committees, that brought together staff with similar interests, and allocated funding according to transparent and clearly identified process [Arch and Design]. Cross disciplinary research seminars were conducted within the school and a committee infrastructure supported research, and provided a collegial decision making process around grants, scholarships and other resources. [Applied Communication]
Good infrastructure around research lead to positive research cultures, and vigorous research centres. Other mechanisms included school scholarships for students, Postgraduate students involved in sessional teaching, providing teacher training to sessional staff, and critical mass of student with 90+ HDR’s. Central policies were seen as ineffective and inconsequential in comparison [Social Science Planning]

Staff felt that there was a certain level of autonomy but little support for research in schools. Research Quantum was a real issue for staff at the program level. It was suggested that Research Quantum within the School needed to be defined more clearly so it could be easier identified. Staff noted a great deal of Research is currently not captured or recorded [Art and Culture]

Schools are operating in minimum resources, policy free environment when it comes to research. Staff described confusion between initiatives, at the central policy development level. For example the process of VRII’s contradicted efforts at local, school level and was difficult to understand. It was felt that initiatives at the schools level were not adequately resourced. “When schools are operating at a 45cent dollar how can you collaborate?”. Schools need 60cent dollar to survive, for postdoc scholars, visiting academics.

The business environment in which RMIT expects research to be conducted is not sustainable, “under normal circumstances we would need to go offshore and do our research there!”. Researchers are busy delivering on current projects and chasing new dollars, therefore this has impacted on ability to publish. Current incentives work more to HDR completions and new research income.

Staff held the view that it is possible to sustain school research centres – UniSA, JCU, QUT models are exemplars. However it was felt that all research centres, including VRII’s, need to be evaluated by performance, and that there was currently a lack of transparency in university-wide initiatives.

RMIT needed to develop its own sets of principles around research performance, not just those used by DEST – in order to sustain non-traditional areas of research eg creative arts etc. RMIT needs to respond based on what it is we actually do rather than just what is counted in reply to IGS.

In addition staff strongly felt that the Professoriate needed to be placed within schools for tenure fallback to attract quality people. However, what is required are more flexible means for dealing with researchers attached to schools due to the constraints of our IR environment. Researchers of centres were usually employed under more flexible arrangements. It was suggested that an ideal situations would be where research centre staff were associates of schools but employees of centres. However this may cut
across the capacity to employ cross-school staff.

TAFE staff are not allocated time of research therefore it is difficult to meet expectations that they will do research. [SACS] Time and resources are issues for Higher Ed staff as well. They need resources to raise staff capabilities. [Fashion and Textiles] [Access and Prep]

One TAFE school developed the Staff Research Development fund, with a committee to administrate it, that TAFE staff can access. However the “VET representative on the committee has to constantly argue that TAFE staff are actually capable of doing postgraduate work, yet Higher Ed staff and students’ capabilities are not questioned in this way”.

Higher Ed staff in the Faculty do not see VET as a legitimate area of scholarship and do not see TAFE as able to do research. In addition there were no resources available for Research students in Programs developed out of the VET sector. However it was acknowledged that many VET staff in Creative Media were doing research degrees in HE. The fees for this are paid as part of staff development. In future, such staff aim to be mobile across sectors.

A.6 Internal Arrangements (see also the organisation snapshots above)

History is important in considering issues around the formation of schools: It was suggested that historically:

- RMIT has always been decentralised;
- Innovation has always come from the margins;
- There hasn’t been strong coherent management structures at the central level; and
- Mergers still affect current culture because of the lack of work in creating a new culture and the formal / informal agreements struck to affect the merger at the time

Issues around balancing economies of scale with collegiality include:

- Size and structure
- Workloads and equity
- Discretionary funding because of size
- Developing a common culture

Some staff held the view that faculties that were doing well were smaller units, where heads know their staff and accountability is more easily managed. They suggested a four tier structure that worked, comprising a head, coordinator, operational management, and staff. Larger numbers detrimentally impacted on achieving a flat structure.
IPAIE is a good example of a small, fee for service commercial enterprise. Each area has a Program Coordinator. Because of fundamentally competitive structures decision-making is devolved to that level. Therefore there are three semi-autonomous groups with a high degree of flexibility. These groups couldn’t operate in a larger dept – each program has different workload arrangements because of their nature. [IPAIE]

For another large school, the scale of the school is important to accommodating their own specialised services. There are economies of scale: marketing, finance, however they added that these services must be managed well to make the best use of increasing size.

Size provided a reasonable budget to cover staff development, and research. Size also created the need for more transparent processes through committee structures for allocation of staff development resources etc. The down side was that it could be difficult to align cross disciplinary meanings; “what does Constructed Environment mean?” There was also the danger of developing programs by erring on breadth rather than depth – this was debated in the group – an obvious tension. Size also meant that the school could afford personnel in juncture spanners / catalyst roles – i.e. project officers, administrative assistants etc. [Social Science] A large school had more flexibility over its staffing budget—with 120 staff someone is always either coming or going. [Creative Media]

Having very large schools presented its own problems. (Very large school with $21m budget, 130 FFE and 200 casuals throughout the year. There are 20 program coordinators reporting to the HOS). Staff felt size was not manageable with a small executive management structure. They suggested appointing an academic to assist HOS’s with academic matters and a senior administration manager to relieve the heavy administrative work load of the HOS. [Applied Communication]

Some staff had concerns around getting too large and therefore risking the inter-connectivity between staff and the quality of their graduates [Building and Const Eco]

Communication in a large school was an added complexity. School wide meetings were rare (usually 1 or 2 meetings held each year). It was very difficult to organise approximately 200 staff to attend meetings. Program coordinators filtered information to staff in program areas and upwards to the HOS and school management groups. However, some staff didn’t belong to a program and felt they didn’t have a voice under the current structure.

In a high functioning department, the current departmental structure encouraged trust between colleagues. This strengthened collegial bonds. The current structure was conducive to grass roots communications between the different expertises (Information Technology, Finance, Academia and Administration). Faculty and department objectives were aligned, There was constant communication, effective communication between the different expertise at the local level, collaborative leadership,
and respect for difference and multiculturalism. There was a sense of seamlessness within the department which allowed for pathways between programs (VET & Higher Education) and mutual respect between academics and administration. [LIS]

Existing faculty structures acted as a buffer from central RMIT. Staff were concerned that if this layer disappeared, the added administrative burden would befall the school. Conversely, staff were also concerned that the PVC structure would provide yet another layer of management to be funded from school budgets.

However for some staff, a move towards schools structure was a welcome alternative to faculties. They saw it as a way to achieve a more flatter and direct structure.

Barriers to cooperation were financial models and limited EFTSU, silos and impermeable academic structures. Present financial structures encouraged the formation and continuation of silos. It was felt that this may not change with a schools structure – the silos will simply get bigger.

Higher Ed staff felt that incorporation of TAFE in their school presented a budget burden, particularly because of the size of the VET sector within the school. In addition budget incentives were out of sink with encouraging programs to earn more.

A large school required personnel to develop locally tailored financial and support systems. While this may appear to be duplication of effort it was necessary due to the complexity in the current central systems that does not meet the needs at a local level. For example, systems should track against actual business, instead of some arbitrary notion of SCH. Staff felt that they needed enabling mechanisms, budget proformas, etc, to budget against actual costs. The reporting systems are different in SAP and then different again in OPIS. These complexities also made it difficult to negotiate effectively with clients.

Yet systems tailored to school needs worked well. “Finance in our department understands the programs/individuals (micromanagement approach) This gives ‘ownership’ to the department allowing for balance in the mechanism for control” [LIS]

Staff felt that the development of V34 of the budget was presented in a very prescriptive way. In their opinion, the university did not consider actual workloads of TAFE staff. Workload was calculated purely on SOG responsibilities with no allowance for fee for service delivery, size of program or number of programs administered when one person administered more than one program.

The emphasis placed on disciplines in schools impacted on the level of resourcing and direction setting. This emphasis permeated through the school’s governance, profile, resourcing, strategies and priorities, communication, and promotion. For example, the small design Higher Ed proportion in one school translated to a de-emphasis on design and an
emphasise instead on manufacturing and technology [Fashion and Textiles].

Therefore appropriate representation of disciplines is required at each level of governance. Currently in the faculty the key positions are held by staff with Social Science background, in the Portfolio structure the majority of the program will be design based – it will be important to have design in the key positions. Design staff felt that it was important to ensure that appropriate teaching and learning models are adopted for design based programs [Arch and Design].

An ideal central executive organisation would resemble a structure whereby the PVC provided strategic executive leadership. There has never been a link between the bottom and top end. It was suggested that the PVC could provide that link. The role of the centre would then be to collect and disseminate data on strategic issues.

Staff believed that the Program Management model is effective because it provides more autonomy to facilitate students. Programs teams are important features of any structure. Staff felt that achieving program ownership through teams was important to capitalise on specialised local knowledge (from academic and administrative staff). [Justice and Youth] [Arch and Design] However this needed to be adequately supported. It was noted that administrative support functions had been devolved to the program leader level without appropriate support.

In addition good practice in VET areas involved individual program budget areas and close working on planning projects in line with AQTF compliance measures in a team based manner, with project managers playing a role in ensuring that project teams and individuals are able to work effectively. [SACS]

An overwhelming view from staff was that dedicated, passionate, enthusiastic people make structures work but this needs to be sustained by recognition and rewards. In TAFE, staff were often under recognised [Applied Communication]

Staff held the view that their school / department worked well because of the team that staff nurtured. Any school structure must support and nourish teams. Teaching teams were crucial to any structure and a sense of ownership around programs was critical.

The existing school structures needed to allow for research cohorts to develop along particular concentrations. The existing structures provided positive outcomes with regards to research. For example, one school had positive collaborations across all programs and research areas such as SIAL, Centre for Design and UAL. Students are engaged in inter discipline, specialisation or practice pathways. [Arch and Design]
Please note: where relevant, school groups have been identified in the interest of sharing good practice and furthering understanding.

The administrative burden that TAFE carries with its externally imposed regime of auditing and reporting needed acknowledging. For example, a very large TAFE school (2000 students) has a very small admin team available purely for program support (3) and this exacerbated the pressures on the academic staff. Particular note was made by administrative staff on the extremely large amounts of extra and frustrating work caused by the centralisation of work at the CPU. Students had been particularly stressed by the delays caused by this procedure and were taking their stress out on front line staff. [Creative Media]

In addition, it was difficult for administration staff to be adept across the two systems of administration because they are so different. Staff were adamant that separate resource provision was required. [Applied Communication]

A.7 The way forward

Staff believed that critical to the success of any organisational structure was getting the staffing and funding issues right. They suggested that the review of schools structure should include a review of how they are funded. Models should be developed where cross sector collaboration does not disadvantage the groups involved. Similarly VET departments should not be disadvantaged in cross-sectoral collaborations. They provided examples where compromises had been successfully applied eg, “VET departments couldn’t bear faculty loadings, so this was acknowledged and an alternative arrangement was agreed upon.”

Line management also impacted on the success of organisational structures. Staff felt that there was a need for a Deputy Head of School to whom staff could have access on a daily “as needed” basis (manage down). The Deputy Head of School should have the authority to “sign off” on behalf of the HOS. And program managers for each sector eg TAFE, Higher Ed, PG.

Roles and responsibilities needed to be clarified, particularly of TAFE staff. At this stage there is no clear load given to coordinator for management. Surely if a Program is large, time allocation should be different. Responsibilities of HOS should be very clear.

Large schools needed to adopt a committee model to meet operational and collegial needs. For example committees could include Teaching and Learning, Staff Development and Research, International and School Executive (UG and PG), which meet monthly. [Applied Communication]. Getting governance issues right meant appointing a School executive, and clarifying roles and responsibilities.
Critical drivers of success for any grouping involved shared values, culture and aspirations. Values and aspirations are within the capacity of management to influence. The level of this influence is the relationship between the commitment of management and the level of commonality of values and aspirations of the work group. The management challenge will be in respecting difference and celebrating diversity while at the same time establishing groups that encourage discipline depth to develop and provide genuine opportunities for collaboration between work areas.

Principles for formation of schools should be disciplinary with programs sharing similar bases. This allows for student and staff interaction between and across programs allowing for cooperation and seamlessness.

In Social Science and Planning where staff described coming together by ‘accident’, the school had to invent a rationale, from its diverse origins around what people were doing anyway. However critical to their success was the development of rigorous democratic governance structures. This still incorporated some unresolved tensions, with the need to stretch compromises too far on occasions. [Social Science]

Issues of sustainable growth were not clearly articulated in strategies to move forward. For example in a large school (140 staff, 2500 students on shore 300 offshore) there was still present a sense that “growth is a prerequisite to standing still”; that we have to do more and more to satisfy outside demands. [Creative Media]

Staff felt that schools in this portfolio were well placed to support Research centres, however it was acknowledged that some schools don’t have enough discretionary funds to support centres. Therefore financially viability of schools will determine the extent of research active staff. Schools need to be large enough to sustain, and be flexible enough to support projects.

However there are still difficulties in managing ‘research’ active staff under current EBA provisions. Therefore there was a perceived need to configure units that have administrative and financial resources to get things happening. Size may be not particularly the issue – rather, it is a question of more income stream and international income. The problem with large schools is that the administrative systems can never keep up and therefore schools operate in an “administrative deficit environment”.

An ideal structure would be one where The VET and H/E sectors operating next to each other working collaboratively but not within the constraints of ‘seamless’ structures.

It is widely recognised by both Federal and State training authorities that significant changes are required to the structure of VET organisations in order to realign the sector to effectively respond to contemporary industry training requirements. This includes changes to the ways in which new educational work of VET practitioners is designed, organised and managed. The Department of Social and Community Services has realigned its management and operational structures to support the new
Please note: where relevant, school groups have been identified in the interest of sharing good practice and furthering understanding.

educational work of VET Practitioners. Improvements are also being made to workplanning and performance management processes, with work plans being closely aligned to program budgets. [SACS – see endnote1]

For TAFE staff in particular, one of the first priorities would be to standardise Credit Points, i.e. all TAFE Course should have an artificial "local" Credit Point structure so TAFE students can slot into Higher Ed much easier. This would greatly assist fluidity and the possibilities for embedded modules. [Art and Culture]. However there was a consensus that RMIT is very slow to move on such issues that seem relatively easy to resolve.

Staff were experiencing change fatigue. They needed to ‘settle’ into structures for them to work. This required time and energy in relation to making change work.

Staff felt that change needed to be driven from the ground staff, not imposed. Evolving through the implementation of meaningful strategies and discussion and teamwork, the development should be facilitated and coordinated by the staff at the departmental level – rather than from the chancellery. There needed to be mutual respect and valuing of differences, before you begin to create a common culture. This may avoid the danger of mergers/ amalgamation leading to loss of focus.

“Feel like we are being stripped of our autonomy which is resulting in a low trust environment” Staff needed to have confidence in change strategies. “At the present time we don’t feel that we are getting a say in how our department/faculty is evolving”

Some groups required clarification about the definition of a school, and whether it was just a question of size. The group was also concerned that a preferred schools model was already articulated through the Portfolio and that this process was therefore a token at consultation

Some staff felt that there was a lack of respectful communication from the Chancellery to the Faculty and Department. They believed that members of the Chancellery should personally come down to speak with staff about what is happening
### Appendix B

#### Schools Snapshots

### The Present Position - Commonality and Diversity Across Schools in the DSC Portfolio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School or Dept</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Spread of T&amp;L¹</th>
<th>Volume of T&amp;L Enrolments²</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Budget 2003 Forecast: Total Income $000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access and Preparatory</td>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>FELCS</td>
<td></td>
<td>67 STAFF</td>
<td>1377 VET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VET</td>
<td></td>
<td>• HOD + administrative assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 VET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Program Managers + administrative asst x 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• PC’s / teachers x 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A large school - likened to the size of a faculty. Flat structure with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Coordinators (PC), and links made in committee structure across</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>school (i.e. UG, PG, exec committees, research committee, international</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>committee)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Program Advisory Committees &amp; Staff Student Consultative Committees held</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for each program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Some PC’s don’t teach, only line management responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Communications</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>ADC</td>
<td>106 HE 24.38</td>
<td>1563HE 617VET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Sectoral</td>
<td></td>
<td>VET STAFF</td>
<td>10 buildings,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 campuses</td>
<td>26 Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Programs, 7 VET</td>
<td>Programs, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A research centre has been established based around the AFI, John Curtin,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Mayer &amp; AGDA Collections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Recently closed two research centres.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• There is a systematic approach to research support and PEP, conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>attendance, teaching relief through the School Research Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Most faculty publications generated through this school, well developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>policies, houses a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Data provided by People Services for 2003

² (Headcounts excluding offshore and ffpaying, August 2002)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and Design</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>Others do.</td>
<td>17 Award programs</td>
<td>1319 HE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Art And Culture Cross - Sectoral | ADC | • Course Advisory Committees for each course in the School (VET and Media Arts)  
• Staff / Student Consultative Committees for each course in the School (VET and HE)  
• Area meetings in Fine Art, Foundation Studies, Visual Arts, Media Arts (VET and HE) involving all staff in the areas  
• Course Coordinators (combined VET and HE meeting chaired by HOS)  
• Embarked last year on a Staff Development Program for supporting research leave. No research fellows, postdocs and low level of ARC activity | 52 HE 20 VET STAFF  
16 Award programs, 7 VET  
2 campus  
12 buildings | 880 HE  
364 VET |          |
| Built Environment VET        | TCE     | • Head of Department & Faculty VET Manager  
• Management Team reports to HoD (this comprises Program co-ordinators and Resource Manager) | 33 STAFF  
13 VET Programs | 850 VET  
150 Fee for Service | 4677 |

[^1]: Total Income $000  
[^2]: Forecast: Total Income $000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>School or Dept</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Spread of T&amp;L</th>
<th>Volume of T&amp;L Enrolments</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Budget 2003 Forecast: Total Income $000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Creative Media ADC     | Creative Media | Creative Media   | • All teaching staff report to the Program Coordinator for teaching related matters and to the Head of Dept for overall management responsibility  
• The Resource Manager reports on a day to day basis to the Head of Department and to the Faculty Executive Officer for overall management responsibility.  
• Operates on 2 sites, small administrative team                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 40 HE 71 VET  | 446 HE 1571 VET          | • No research centres.  
• Some sporadic industry research connections. Head of School has a linkage but no other arc activities. No postdocs or research fellows. No research centres. No systematic research leave or PEP. There is direct support for fee payment of staff qualifications upgrades. Has Research Committee | 13338.16                 |
| Fashion & Textiles     | Fashion & Textiles | Fashion & Textiles | • Head of School, Assistant, 3 Program Managers, 12 Program Coordinators  
• School Operations Manager  
• And Senior Admin Supervisor report to HOS  
• School Executivemeets weekly chaired by HOS  
• No systematic research staff support program. Head did support some staff research activities and conference participation. Textiles area is developing industry based research activities. No linkages or ARC discoveries. No postdocs or research fellows. No research in the area.                                                                                                                                 | 33 HE 69 VET  | 449 HE 1954 VET          | • No systematic research staff support program. Head did support some staff research activities and conference participation. Textiles area is developing industry based research activities. No linkages or ARC discoveries. No postdocs or research fellows. No research in the area. | 13009.32                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Spread of T&amp;L¹</th>
<th>Volume of T&amp;L Enrolments²</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Budget 2003 Forecast: Total Income $000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry Professional and Adult Education</td>
<td>FELCS</td>
<td>• Head of Department + Admin Team Leader &lt;br&gt;• Program Management structure comprising of: &lt;br&gt;• Leadership &amp; Management Program &lt;br&gt;• PCET Program &lt;br&gt;• Arts/Music Program &lt;br&gt;• Context Curriculum Program &lt;br&gt;• Research by project (proposed) Program Admin Team</td>
<td>20 STAFF &lt;br&gt;18 Award programs, 40 UG Major international projects, High commercial and fee paying income programs with third party clients</td>
<td>21 FTE staff, 688 HE</td>
<td>• Post Compulsory Education Research Centre. &lt;br&gt;• International Literacy Research Unit &lt;br&gt;• Research by Project Research in regional Victoria &lt;br&gt;• Music of the Diaspora Project &lt;br&gt;• Arts and Music Research in Hong Kong</td>
<td>3909.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice and Youth Studies</td>
<td>FELCS</td>
<td>• This program – Commonwealth Youth Program now sits in Social and Community Services</td>
<td>15 STAFF &lt;br&gt;5 Award programs &lt;br&gt;1 VET</td>
<td>521 HE &lt;br&gt;84 VET</td>
<td>• Centre for Youth Affairs</td>
<td>2488.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Sectoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and International Studies</td>
<td>FELCS</td>
<td>• Head, 2 program managers</td>
<td>25 STAFF &lt;br&gt;6 Award programs &lt;br&gt;8 VET</td>
<td>233 HE &lt;br&gt;671 VET</td>
<td>• Centre for Excellence in Graphic Technologies</td>
<td>5560.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Sectoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Centre of Graphic Technology</td>
<td>ADC</td>
<td>• Head, 2 program managers</td>
<td>20 VET programs</td>
<td>881 VET</td>
<td>• Centre for Excellence in Graphic Technologies</td>
<td>5320.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>FELCS</td>
<td>• Head of Department &amp; Admin Team Leader</td>
<td>34 STAFF &lt;br&gt;12 Award</td>
<td>843 HE</td>
<td>• Centre for New Learning</td>
<td>6992.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Budget 2003</td>
<td>Volume of T&amp;L Enrolments</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Spread of T&amp;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Program Leader Undergrad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Program Leader Postgrad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Program Coordinators X 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Community</td>
<td>FELCS</td>
<td>• Team based Program Management Model</td>
<td>2897.38</td>
<td>839 VET</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 STAFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>• HOD/Program Manager – Operational /Strategic Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 VET programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VET</td>
<td></td>
<td>• 5 x Program Coordinators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Teachers with program planning, budgeting, coordination and delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Team supported by 1 Administration Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Project Officer with major project management responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science &amp; Planning</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>• Head of School + School Executive, which consists of HOS, 3 Discipline</td>
<td>14179</td>
<td>1441 HE</td>
<td></td>
<td>65 STAFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaders, Research Director and Admin Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34 Award programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff in Discipline areas report to Discipline Leaders and Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-ordinators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Links to SS+P committee structures (ie. Academic Programs Committee,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Board, research Committee etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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HE EFSTU and Program Enrolments by School

HE EFTSU and Enrolments by program: Final data for 2002 - Data as at 31 August 2002

[Diagram showing HE EFTSU and Program Enrolments by School]
Vet Program Enrolments by School

TAFE SCH and Enrolments by program: Final data for 2002
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Appendix C

Objectives of the Review

Possible questions identified for the project:

- What is the basis of existing schools (cognate disciplines/industry links/seamlessness etc), and how well do Schools function in terms of their own rationale?
- How effective are Schools in supporting disciplines and the interaction between them?
- Have Schools enhanced the research capacity of staff, either TAFE or Higher Ed?
- What, if any, have been the efficiencies resulting from School structures?
- What has been the TAFE experience in both dual sector and TAFE only units?
- What has been the impact on TAFE career pathways of dual sector Schools?
- What is the relationship, if any, between School structure and pathways, and transition of students from one sector to another?
- What evidence do we have of the impact of School structures on the student experience?
- Has there been any loss of focus on the specific missions of each sector?
- Does size and complexity affect fiscal responsibility and competitiveness?
- Can TAFE staff head up Higher Ed programs, and can Higher Ed staff head up TAFE programs successfully?
- What sort of management structures exist and how do staff experience these?
- What sort of budgetary control lies with the Heads, and what kind of program budgeting?
- How many staff are in different Schools, and how many different programs?
- What support functions are located in Schools and departments, and what effect does size have on administrative career paths and staff development?
- What support exists for Heads, and what staff development has been made available?
- Do departments and Schools work well because they have a good ‘model’ or because they have good people?
- Does physical co-location matter, and if so, how much? If co-location is not feasible, what means exist to overcome geographical barriers?
- Are there any barriers to the effective operation and management of Schools imposed by, or resulting from Faculty and University structures and operations?
• Are there improvements that could appropriately be recommended to the existing School structures and practices? Do Schools all have to be of the one kind?

---

1 It is a basic assumption of the staff team in the Department of Social and Community Services that the purpose of a management structure is to support and enhance the activities of front line workers. The innovative management structure that guides the current activities in the Department enables the group to build on existing capacity to deliver high quality programs to students and clients. The structure supports a viable working program centre, encourages entrepreneurial practice and is consistent with Faculty and University goals. The model below outlines a basic structure that reflects a systems approach to management based on the interaction of a cluster of interdependent groups. This adaptable structure supports innovation in a constantly changing education and training environment.

Adapted from Senge et al 1999