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Introduction

About this Document

This document serves two purposes:

- It sets out the record of the discussions that took place in August 2017, with their focus on the intended future of education in the Faculty of Medicine; and
- It locates that record within the wider frame of reference that Workshop 1 participants began shaping in May 2017.

In accordance with the approach agreed in March of this year, the document thus becomes the first iteration of the Faculty’s statement of decadal intent – a statement that is expected to assume its definitive shape in December 2017, as the year draws to a close. As such, it integrates the material set out in the Workshop 1 Record with that of the Workshop 2 into a single volume and continuous narrative.

Two further iterations will occur on the way to the document’s becoming that full statement:

- The next will take place in the aftermath of the discussions on the future of the Faculty’s research, scheduled to take place on 21 and 22 September; and
- The final one will occur after the fourth and last workshop scheduled for late November 2017, with a focus on the critical enablers of a successful implementation of the proposed Faculty strategy.

About the Broader Reflection

The workshops this document references were the first two in the planned cycle of four such events,¹ designed to canvas the essentials of the Faculty’s future business and associated priorities.

Beginning with the initial May workshop, dedicated to whole-of-Faculty matters, and its August successor, concerned with the

¹ The exact number of workshops may change, subject as it is to needs and the complexity of the questions they examine.
Faculty’s education activities, the Faculty’s ‘long-horizon’ reflection will subsequently visit the significance of its broad intent for its research activities (Workshop 3, September 2017) and for its professional and administrative activities (Workshop 4, scheduled for November 2017).

As was the case for Workshops 1 and 2, the outcomes of the participants’ deliberations will be incorporated into the present one, designed as it is to build on its predecessor, on the way to becoming the Faculty’s considered statement of decadal intent.

Additional information on the Faculty’s strategic reflection and its process can be found in the Introductory Notes (Appendix 1), prepared for the benefit of participants at the second workshops.

About Editorial Licence

The author has taken care to set out the substance of the group’s discussion in a manner faithful to the intent of the original comments.

Nonetheless, with readability as well and the development of a consistent argument that the articulation of credible strategy demands, the author has exercised a measure of editorial licence in bonding individual notions and concepts into in more structured and purposeful form than the flow of lively discussion can yield.

Readers are invited to turn their minds to the propositions that the material offers, and take the opportunity to comment upon them through any one of four channels, being:

- Invited participation in the remaining two workshops
- Participation in the open information and discussions sessions in the process of being scheduled
- By making their views known to their Heads of School or Centre, and
- By using the online form that accompanies this Paper.

Primary and Secondary Information Sources

The material set out in this document references two primary sources of information, being:

- The Record of Proceedings from Workshop 1, and
- The manuscript notes produced during Workshop 2, interpreted by the author.
Where appropriate, data and information have also been drawn from two further sources, being:

- The papers collected as background reading for participants at Workshops 1 and 2, and
- The author’s own research and sources.

Sources are duly acknowledged via footnotes to the body of the text.

Confidentiality

As indicated in the opening to the first Record of Workshop proceedings, the strategy development process the Faculty is engaged in is an open, consultative and collaborative one. Documents produced will have as wide a circulation as possible within the Faculty so that they can be commented upon and enriched by their readers. That being said, the documents produced, this one included, should be treated with care and consideration, as should be the information they contain and the views they offer.

At this stage in the process, the material is not intended for distribution or comment outside the Faculty, unless it is at the express direction of the Acting Dean, Professor Robyn Ward AM. Questions surrounding the use of the material in this and subsequent iterations of the document should be referred to the Dean’s office.
Part 1:

Being a revisitation and reaffirmation of key statements arising from Workshop 1 deliberations, insofar as they provide necessary context and reference marks for the discussion of the Faculty’s decadal intentions in respect of its education-specific aspirations and endeavours.

The statements originally appeared under four headings, which we have preserved in this fresh edition. The headings were:

A Precious Collection of Assets
Concerns, Doubts, Questions
Different Game, Different Rules
Cornerstone Statements
(Revised and Updated)
A Precious Collection of Assets

Size

The Faculty is an impressive body by most measures: staff, students, partners, research outputs, reach within the community – all, in total, give it an anchored presence, a weight and critical mass that translates to a significant advantage when it comes to capturing economies of scale, fostering diversification and informed risk-taking on a scale denied to many other similar – and often competing - institutions.

Staff

The Faculty is rich in intellects, at work in teaching, research and clinical care. The asset they constitute is deep and diverse, made up as it is of long-standing and new staff that reflect the extensive diversity of health expertise strands, from acute medicine to public health, and across regulated, non-regulated, managerial and administrative professions. The depth and diversity of the Faculty's staff resources have given it resilience in the face of accelerating change.

Students
The Faculty has ‘pulling power’. Over the years it has consistently attracted, taught and graduated a substantial body of students, drawn from domestic and international markets. This ‘pulling power’ has also meant the ability to choose the better academic performers at entry. By and large and considered in their entirety, these attributes continue to amount to a distinct advantage for Faculty and University alike, in the form of a diverse and gifted student body of high academic achievers.

**Associations**

**By ‘associations’ we understand the spectrum of relationships, from collaborations to full partnerships,** which the Faculty has developed and enjoys: with teaching and research institutions (nationally and internationally), with industry, with hospitals, with health-services providers and with the wider State health system, gathered into a network of considerable breadth, depth and diversity. As with the other strengths mentioned, these associations constitute another valuable asset worthy of protection, care and development.

**Infrastructure**

As a substantial body of resources engaged in extensive research, teaching and clinical care activity, the Faculty has developed over time a substantial operating infrastructure of buildings, facilities (many of them highly specialised in design, capability and equipment), systems and practices, with their supporting data, communication and technology networks. The asset thus created, multi-faceted, weighty, deep-reaching, has substantial value. Yet that value may not be recognised at its true worth, given the dispersal and underlying, embedded nature of its constituent parts.
Reputation

History matters. When successes accumulate over decades, they accrue and form into an institutional story that eventually translates to a reputation – a ‘brand’, to use the commercial term. Reputation, in turn, attracts further interest that morphs into commitments: to undergraduate and post-graduate study; to involvement and participation in research; to investment and funding; to on-going association (alumni) and contribution (philanthropy); and to the shaping of multi-form cross-sector associations. Prestigious, successful institutions, like the Faculty, have strong attractive and influential power. The challenge lies of course in the recognition and in the use of that power to beneficial ends.
Concerns, Doubts, Questions

Purpose and its Clarity

We, the Faculty, lack a sense of clear purpose – an articulated, unifying, shared sense of direction by which to steer our course as a body (making choices, taking decisions, choosing risks).
Without that reference, how shall we determine whether the Faculty’s size and resources are appropriate to its ends or not? And how shall we know whether this or that strategic priority or course of action should win out over others? Absent that sense of common purpose, unity falters; the well-integrated core gives way to loosely-connected units; energy dissipates between these units; and the greater opportunity, the opportunity that the whole alone has the power to command, slips away.

Identity, Purpose, Differentiation

Extending the above: in an environment of inevitably limited resources, conscious, clear choices as to the path (or paths) to be taken enable the concentration of resources and effort on those things that matter. ‘All things to all people’ amounts to a failure to exercise choice. It is also a recipe for waste and progressive weakening as organisational tiredness and fatigue set it. The future of a strong Faculty lies in the making of informed choices about two classes of things: those that it will set store by, value, seek out and pursue above others; and, just as importantly, those that it will not. Its chosen paths will become what identifies it and what distinguishes it from others who strive in the same arenas – its ‘colours’, so to speak.
Status Differences, Status Equality

The Faculty is greater than its medical dimension and substantially greater than its MD program alone, established though it may be. Yet medicine can still prove the habitual defining prism though which the Faculty’s world is ordered, and this at the expense of other disciplines closely related to it or to the wider field of health in its many dimensions, from disease to human well-being, from individual-centric to community-centric, and from clinical care and practice development to policy design. Inequalities of status between disciplines make for dysfunction, frustration and resentment. They must be resolved via educational, operational, organisational and behavioural adjustments if the Faculty is to reap the benefits of the discipline diversity present in its midst and exploit it for the strength that it constitutes.

Reactivity, Proactivity, Leadership

Where a sense of purpose and unity of direction lack, decisions tend to the reactive rather than the proactive. Ultimately, the strategic risk is one of ‘me-tooism’ for those caught in that space, as they turn now this way and now that, in order to match the moves of nimbler, more alert, purposeful and determined competitors. This is not the way of the Faculty. Through the revisitation and affirmation of its purpose and intended future, it will give itself the base from which to lead and exercise effective and productive creativity.

Partnerships: Laissez-faire or active management?

The Faculty’s teaching and research activities depend altogether on productive relationships with a suite of partners and associates at work in the field of health. The Faculty has long enjoyed the immense benefit that a uniquely rich web of professional relationships offers. Equally, there is no doubt that the organisation’s future, and its future successes, depend on the protection, enhancement and extension of these fundamental relationships, as well as on the addition of new ones. But are these relationships properly nurtured and attended to? Are they managed attentively enough? Is their value recognised and does the Faculty’s actions speak to that recognition? The concern is that, as a matter of fact and practice, the care paid to them is uneven, to the point where, in some instances, the relations are better characterised as collaborations (weaker) rather than genuine partnerships (stronger).
Where relationships are concerned, attitudes and management practices should be raised to a clearly higher standard – a standard whereby the Faculty is seen as an attractive, even indispensable, partner, rather than one among other collaborative options.

Research: Fitness for Purpose

The Faculty takes justifiable pride in the successes its research efforts have produced in decades past, in the results present endeavours are delivering and in the promise current projects hold. However, the continuing investment of resources in research is now taking place in a substantially different environment to the one in which past successes were garnered. Changing rules, growing demands on the public purse, sharper competition over available funds and evolving circumstances necessitate the adjustment – and greater cohesiveness – of responses, responses that in turn are expected to address meaningful problems associated with individual and community health. In that regard and without an iota of compromise to the integrity of the research effort per se, the Faculty must make sure that its approach to the conduct of research is well-directed, effectively structured and thoroughly adapted to the demands of the times – in short, that it is genuinely ‘fit-for-purpose’.

Teaching: Fitness for Purpose

When it comes to the fitness of the Faculty’s program and course offerings, the challenge that applied in the case of research is to be found here as well – perhaps even more so. Relevance to today’s needs, to undergraduate and postgraduate student cohorts with different expectations, different learning patterns and different career and practice ambitions is paramount. This is not about forsaking scientific, professional or technical expertise. To the contrary, the depth of that expertise matters more than ever. Rather, it is how that expertise is taught, developed, acquired and applied that is called into question. The Faculty’s future offering must be about more than pathways to medicine: it must be about pathways into health futures, medicine among them. Tailoring the Faculty’s offering to have it respond to new demands – indeed, influence that demand – entails profound change: in program offerings, in courses and curricula, and in the cross-disciplinary arrangements involved. The task is substantial; but so too will be the reward for a successful transition or, for that matter, the strategic and operational penalties for not embracing it.
Muster ‘Infrastructure’ Resources to Best Effect

We noted earlier the advantage that the Faculty’s extensive infrastructure confers upon it. But that advantage is difficult to capitalise upon under present arrangements and conditions. The data and systems (and, by extension, the resulting knowledge) necessary for that capitalisation to occur are too often deficient. Disparate (and at times opaque) systems, incomplete data and limited staff experience mean that sense-making, informed decision-making and risk management are often arduous, time-consuming and frequently problematic tasks. This state of affairs has two significant consequences: it denies much of the opportunity for optimisation of the use made of assets; and it proves the source of considerable inefficiency. Put simply: the value derived from many present-day systems and operational practices is unequal to the amount of effort invested in seeking it. In an environment of constrained resources that is likely to become even more so, this is neither a desirable nor a sustainable state of affairs. Extensive, productive and well-integrated change is at the centre of the Faculty’s strategic agenda.
Different Game
Different Rules

Challenges to the Established Order

Universities have long-enjoyed positions of authority as ‘dispensers’ of knowledge and ‘certifiers’ of the competence achieved by those who enrol in its programs. That privileged position, however, is coming under threat: different bodies have entered the knowledge supply and competence certification arenas, a reflection of technological advances and, more importantly, of a deep shift in the approach to study, to the earning of degrees and to career-management patterns. In an age of increasingly self-curated education and multiple offerings, customer-students can combine options from different sources to suit their individual circumstances and aspirations. They are no longer bound to a single ‘department-store’ university. They are free-shoppers. How will the Faculty recognise such profoundly altered market conditions and respond to them?

Different Students

The commercial language of the lines above is no error. Student expectations have altered, and behaviours along with them. Higher-education and the degrees conferred must, more than ever, translate to value. There is a transactional spirit to the relationship between the student and the University – an expectation of return for the monies paid.

When the market offers an increasing array of products and makes the exercise of choice reality; when prospective ‘purchasers’ of services exercise their ability to make comparative assessments
between provider offerings; and when social networks provide platforms for the instant expression of opinions, it is easy to see why behaviours would change; why the operation of education would take on a business (even commercial) tone; and why it would find itself irrevocably altered in the process, from substance and form to the construct of its delivery infrastructure.

One may agree or disagree as to the ultimate desirability of the change involved, but not about its existence. The only question, the only ‘thing’ that matters ultimately, is how an organisation (like the Faculty) chooses to respond.

**Different Notions of One’s Working Life**

**Another strand of the same reflection goes to the different working-life patterns that are emerging:** patterns whereby a life-long job or career may grow increasingly far from the norm; whereby one person has multiple jobs and careers in a working lifetime; whereby ‘jobs’ are extended in definition and content, or combined in unexpected and specifically individual ways to suit inclination, circumstance or an evolving sense of purpose; whereby the pattern of work is discontinuous, shifting from full- to part-time, casual to contract, employee to self-employed; whereby a deal of attention is paid to the achievement of a better balance between work and (personal) life; and whereby, generally speaking, learning – the updating or diversification of one’s knowledge and skills – is a life-long affair.

Jointly or severally, none of the above reconcile satisfactorily to the Faculty’s traditionally fixed offerings, in both substance and form. How will the Faculty adjust those offerings to make them compelling? How will it do so without impairment of either depth or quality? And how will it affirm itself as a serious contender in post-degree education in health and medicine?

**Constrained Government Resources**

**As the government’s taxation-based, revenue-generation model struggles to grow in any meaningful way, a relatively static pool of public funds must satisfy rising levels of demand for services and infrastructure, both of them to be had only at increasing cost.** When, at best, the revenue pie can barely maintain its size and then the contest for a share of it can only grow more intense while
the portions go on reducing. In such circumstances, it is inevitable that government will look to the returns (societal, economic or other) that the allocation of its limited resources generates. It will have a keen eye to the productivity (measured in outcomes) its investments produce, be those investments in teaching, research or clinical care. Put simply: less and less attention will go to the existence of a process (like education); more and more of it will be directed instead to the quality of the outcomes of that process. What implications will this have for the Faculty’s degree offerings on the one hand and its research endeavours on the other?

Accountability and the Notion of Market Permission

The trend to accountability suggested by the shifts noted above in regard to the ‘customer-student’ and government, speaks to the wider reach of the accountability concept in societal terms – i.e. the real, albeit often muted, ‘expectation’ that public monies directed to research will, in an open time frame, bring about improvements in our quality of life and, in the case of health and medicine, in improvements to our longevity, our physical well-being and our ability to combat disease. Society grants ‘market permission’ to those activities which it ultimately sees as beneficial to it. At its most fundamental, it is the unspoken contract that funded research, and the education of health and medical personnel, operate under. The Faculty cannot fail that contract. More than that, it must do it with unquestionable honour.

Evolving Needs in Society-at-Large

As changes work their influence among students, government and other constituencies, a significant evolution is also underway in the community at large and the shape that health care will take within it in years to come: the long-established one-to-one, patient-to-practitioner focus, along with its frequent hospital-centric (and patient-bed) locus, are shifting as the frame of reference widens and growing importance comes to attach to community health, disease prevention, the treatment and management of endemic diseases, and the self-management of individual health and illness within a developed, often virtual or widely-distributed, multi-party, health system.
Data, Technology and the Future of Care

Technology is rapidly altering – and will alter further still - the face of patient care. Remote diagnostics, monitoring and treatment capability as we know them now will be profoundly affected and widely extended by developments such as those that are taking place in remote sensing; in data transmission, visualisation and management; and in computing power. Further enhanced by artificial intelligence, these elements will alter the act and meaning of consulting as they will medical and para-medical procedures. Boundaries and interactions between humans and machines will be re-set in reach and depth. We will see the consequential birth of vastly different health and case management systems. Inevitably, the curriculum and training of those who will manage and function in this re-shaped environment will demand substantial and, likely as not, frequent adjustment.

Blurring, Porous Boundaries

In parallel with the transformation of the practice of care, we will see another evolution. Already well underway, it is the blurring of disciplinary domains that were previously strictly defined and interpreted – domains such as those of medicine on the one hand and nursing, physiotherapy, pharmacy, to name only these. These bodies of knowledge and practice have already begun extending their traditional remit into germane areas, as a wholistic view of care takes hold. The extension of knowledge boundaries will mean change in roles and responsibilities, and in the manner in which those responsibilities are discharged. The change will reach into structures and operations, and eventually into certification and regulation. To be clear: the fundamental knowledge and competency domains will remain, as will the differences between them. However, the defining edges of these knowledge domains will grow less sharp and more porous; it will touch – and sometimes challenge – role boundaries between professionals working in health (medical and non-medical, regulated and non-regulated). The altered notion of care and the rising importance of teamwork will re-enforce that trend and usher in new practices.

Partner Identity, Partner Relations, Partner Engagement
In the widened reference framework that health and care will occupy, the Faculty’s engagement with industry is likely to see substantial transformation. For one thing, the sectors from which its partners are drawn are likely to grow in diversity as collaborations expand and extend into complex environments. Future collaborators may well be drawn from community groups with an interest in health, the manufacturers of technology as well as data and information behemoths, alongside the Faculty’s more traditional associations with health service providers, government agencies and medical research institutions. Where research presses at the boundary of the interaction between humans and science, we are equally likely to see philosophers, ethicists, psychologists, computer scientists, behavioural scientists and social scientists take an active role alongside ‘pure’ medical, biomedical and health disciplines in communities of interest centred on the delivery of projects. Not unsurprisingly given this diversity of associations, the models and forms of collaboration are also likely to evolve in order to have them satisfy the requirements of the different parties.

In Closing...

There is no doubting either the extent of the changes in progress or the complexity of their interaction. Denying either (or worse, both) would be folly.

It would also put at risk the future of the Faculty as a relevant and authoritative entity in the teaching and research environments of health and medicine. We begin exploring what preparing for those changes, accommodating them and capitalising on them will mean for the Faculty in the coming sections. That exploration and preparation will then progress through the further discussions planned as part of the organisation’s strategy development process.
The Faculty Response: Cornerstone Statements (Revised and Updated)

On the Material in this Section

This section of the document presents a number of anchor statements about the Faculty’s fundamental intentions over the decade ahead.

By definition and as ‘first-pass’ statements, they are broad and aspirational in nature. They should not be criticised, let alone dismissed, for displaying such attributes. Aspirations are a legitimate and essential part of the construction of plans. They are the cornerstones of those plans, their animating spirit.

As steps in the Faculty’s strategy development process, the statements will have consequences and implications. They will be interpreted and distilled into specific objectives and measures in subsequent workshops dedicated to teaching, to research and to the organisational support apparatus required by those endeavours. Objectives and measures will have to serve them.

The Opening Premise

In defining the Faculty’s intended future, we begin from the premise that, in the face of the societal, cultural, economic, financial, business, clinical, scientific, technological and organisational change about and within the Faculty, a plan that would have the protection of the status quo as its fundamental tenet is altogether unacceptable.
Resolution 1

The Faculty will seize the opportunity before it and respond to the challenges it presents in an intelligent, well-integrated, productive, collaborative and sustainable manner.

The Greater Cause

Human health is an invaluable asset, whether to the individual whose lot it mitigates, protects, restores and improves, or to the wider community who profits by it through a better, surer, quality of life.

Yet health, individual and societal, is as fragile an asset as it is an invaluable one: unequally distributed, it is continuously exposed to unpredictable combinations of events that will threaten it, attack it, and compromise it, sometimes fatally.

Resolution 2

Through its activities in teaching and research and by drawing on the wealth of resources available to it, the Faculty will strive to improve, in material and lasting ways, the health and well-being of our society.

Three Specific Objectives in the Service of the Faculty’s Greater Cause

The Faculty will serve its greater cause through three chief strands of effort:

Education

Resolution 3

The Faculty’s teaching effort will produce graduates who, on completion of their studies, will be ready to begin contributing to the
improvement of health and well-being in the population of their choice – local, regional or international.

Deeply competent in their elected disciplines, these graduates will be equipped with the mix of cultural, professional and personal skills that will make them into leaders, whatever the level of their participation in their work environment.

Research

Resolution 4

Multi-disciplinary by design and multi-modal in approach, the Faculty’s research effort will make a noticeable and recognised contribution to the resolution of complex and pressing societal issues ranging from the general betterment of community health and well-being, to advances in health-directed, fundamental and translational science.

Unrestricted in outlook, characterised by innovation and outstandingly effective in its applications, the Faculty’s research effort will stand out as an exemplar and model of well-integrated and particularly productive intellectual effort.
Global Health

**Resolution 5**

The Faculty will become known for its pioneering work in the design of the health delivery and management systems of the future – systems that will recognise, embody and exploit the cultural, societal and technology-driven trends at work in our environments, and shape the role of health professionals in the vastly different circumstances these forces will generate.

In that capacity, the Faculty will prove a leader in the creation of innovative systems and models; a significant influence in the development of the associated health policy agendas; and the provider *par excellence* of milestone pilots and models in advanced health delivery and management systems.

**Enabling the Fulfilment of the Faculty’s Objectives: Shaping a ‘Fit-for-Purpose’ Cultural and Organisational Base**

The Faculty recognises the need for substantial and extensive change to the cultural and organisational forms of the past, if it is to reach its goals. Here too, change is not an option but a necessity – and, in some instances, a pressing one. One of the hallmarks of the change in question stands out with particular clarity.

**Resolution 6**

In the pursuit of its decadal aspirations, the Faculty will come to act as a collection of equally-valued disciplines. It will leave behind cultural and organisational inequalities that hinder its progress – inequalities that can foster ‘class distinctions’ between colleagues who, at heart, share the same fundamental intent and answer to the same cause.
The Faculty will structure its resources, its offerings, its day-to-day work environment and its rewards with that ‘equal value’ principle in mind. And it will make this inclusive, multi-disciplinary, team-oriented principle into the identifiable characteristic, and notable differentiator, of both its teaching and research endeavours.

Enabling the Fulfilment of the Faculty’s Objectives: A Far More Desirable Partner

In a competitive environment, there is a world of difference between an organisation seen as an option among possible collaborators, and a position where one is the most desirable and sought-after partner. The latter is the Faculty’s avowed aim, which we return to in the section on research.

Resolution 7

The Faculty recognises that, extensive as its resources may be, the pursuit and the attainment of its objectives demands active collaborations between itself and its partners, in mutually beneficial and responsive arrangements. As part of that recognition, the Faculty understands that it must ‘lift its collaborative game’.

Interpreting the Aspiration

In the remaining pages of this document, we begin the task of translating the Faculty’s ambitions into likely courses of action within its teaching and research environments.

The material plays the same role as marker pegs on a construction site: they define the boundaries of the structures to be erected and, in so doing, suggest their intended footprint and shape. These structures have begun to emerge as part of the reflection on education (presented in this Paper). They will be extended further through the discussions that are to take place as part of the workshop on research (21-22 September 2017).
Part 2: Education in the Future Tense (Second, Expanded Iteration)

Being the record of the positions reached as a result of Workshops 1 and 2 discussions, regarding the Faculty’s decadal intentions in respect of education, teaching and learning.

The material will be subject to review, emendations and enhancements as the strategic reflection continues to unfold.
Links, Alignment

Linking Two Sequential Reflections on the Subject of Teaching and Learning (Workshop 1 and Workshop 2)

The education-directed reflection set out in this Paper does not proceed *ab nihilo*. Many of its foundations were laid in discussions that took place during Workshop 1 and, in particular, the conversation that had teaching and learning as its focus.

The substance (and some of the phrasing) of the argument framed in that earlier document now appears in *this* record in the form of key statements inserted at appropriate points in the material. By marrying the thinking strands that emerged in the first workshop to those that found expression in the second on the same subject, we now have as integrated an insight as exists at this juncture into the Faculty’s emerging decadal education strategy.

The various aspects of that insight are presented individually, i.e. topic by topic. For each topic, we have provided a context and, where possible and appropriate, a statement of anticipated direction, characterised as a resolution.

Considered in their entirety, the resolutions describe the Faculty’s proposed strategy in matters of education. In many instances, they also delineate the bodies of work that will require execution in pursuit of the implementation and ultimate fulfilment of that strategy.

Alignment
The positions taken in this paper in regard to the Faculty’s intended approach to its education endeavour spring from discussions held during the first two workshops in the series of four that make up the Faculty’s full strategic reflection.

Importantly, the positions also take account of the University’s broader strategy, of the directions reflected in its Student Strategy 2016-2020 White Paper, and of the results of recent student satisfaction surveys.

As various quotations from these documents will show, the Faculty’s intentions, as expressed in this Paper, are in complete alignment with the University’s strategies, while student opinions – and the more critical of them in particular – have informed many of the proposed changes.
The Faculty’s Education Agenda: Cornerstone Statements

The Faculty of Medicine as a Body: A Commitment and a Definition

In times past (and a not-too-distant past at that), the disciplines and the groups in which they are clustered have often operated in an environment in which collaborative approaches, at least as a matter of day-to-day practice, have not proven a distinguishing feature of the organisational arrangements in place. Instead, unresolved divergences in views and approaches, alongside inequities in treatment (real and perceived), have been the source of energy-consuming tensions and occasional discord.

Whether it is as a matter of philosophical principle, recognition of the ascendance of interdisciplinarity in education and research or operational pragmatism (or all three), and in the face of a wide-ranging change agenda inspired by the current strategic reflection, the Faculty has determined that it must come to function as a unified body (and do so as swiftly as possible), in order to secure the benefits that derive from life under a common purpose, shared values and a well-integrated and ‘oiled’ modus operandi.
In taking that position, the Faculty is not bent on the adoption of a ‘one-size-fits-all’ in its education endeavours in particular (for it tends to be in education rather than research that the tensions manifest). It is intent, however, on identifying what should be unifying commonalities among its various parts, and what differences should be recognised between them.

With that in mind, references to ‘the Faculty’ are to be interpreted as inclusive of the biomedical, medical and public health disciplines (enumerated in alphabetical order) that are gathered under its organisational umbrella.

---

**Resolution 8**

The Faculty will, in future:

- Operate as a body rather than a loosely-held collection of disciplines. Wherever they exist, commonalities in philosophies, programs, courses, pedagogies and operations will be captured for the benefits to be had from them. Where legitimate differences exist, they will be recognised for their validity and contribution.

- Operate in a manner that accords their rightful place to the disciplines gathered under its roof, and value them equally as a matter of principle and practice.

- As a matter of organisational priority and in a systemic perspective, review and adjust its management models, operating practices, supporting systems and related arrangements, in order to have them reflect the terms and spirit of the objectives above.

---

‘Teaching’ or ‘Education’?

**The Faculty’s Position**

‘Teaching’ and ‘education’ are related but distinct concepts, with the second gathering the first in its ambit. The Faculty’s task is to *educate* the students enrolled in its programs, rather than simply ‘teach’ them a specified body of knowledge and skills. Education encompasses teaching, as it does the fulfilment of other related
developmental responsibilities such as guidance, mentoring and the provision of forms of pastoral care.

Resolution 9

The Faculty’s responsibility is to the education of the students enrolled in its programs or courses. That responsibility includes, but is not limited to, teaching. It is, importantly, a shared, Faculty-wide responsibility and commitment, into which all will participate.

Education and Research in the Faculty’s Value System

As stated earlier, there is often much pride in declaring oneself a ‘research-intensive’ or ‘research-led’ institution. Statements like these convey an implicit value judgement, a silent jostling and tussle in which the teaching mandate somehow comes second.

This does not reflect the Faculty’s position. Rather, the Faculty is firm in its commitment that, within is its walls, education will be valued as one of the two endeavours that lie at the heart of its mission and responsibilities, and as the equal and essential partner to its research endeavours.

Resolution 10

The Faculty puts as high a value on the provision of education as it does on the conduct of research. Education and research are its dual, and equal, responsibilities. They will be treated as such in the allocation of its energies and resources. This will result in changes to the manner in which the Faculty’s teaching capability is maintained, extended and nurtured.

(See detailed comments on this topic, in a later section of the document)

The Purpose of the Education the Faculty Provides
The Faculty educates students in order to have them develop and reach their potential: intellectual, professional and personal. In so doing, it prepares those who have leadership talent to exercise it. Yet its duty is to all who are admitted to its courses and programs.

The Faculty’s education process has three objectives, which we articulate below. The quotations cited after each objective are drawn from the University’s Student Strategy 2016-2020 White Paper and its companion publication, Changing How Higher Education Is Imagined. They demonstrate the close kinship between the Faculty and the University’s goals. The objectives are:

- **The fulfilment of individual potential**, whatever its form or make-up among the health-related disciplines gathered under the Faculty’s roof

  ‘Foremost among our priorities is graduates having an advanced and competitive ability to acquire and create work and new opportunities over a lifetime for themselves and for others.’

  University of Queensland, Student Strategy 2016-2020 White Paper

- **The development of knowledge and skills** to verified mastery levels – levels that speak to superior competence and genuine readiness for practice. The knowledge and skills involved will be of two broad types: scientific and technical on the one hand, and personal on the other.²

  ‘Universities – long tasked with developing independent and critical thinkers – must now also ensure they develop enterprising graduates with the knowledge, skills and networks to build meaningful and agile careers… Excellent disciplinary knowledge is, and will remain, imperative.’

  University of Queensland, Changing how Higher Education is Imagined

- **The provision of an experience** that awakens students’ thirst for learning and intellectual exploration, and one that, in the process, equips them for life and work in swiftly evolving circumstances and

  Among these we include the following *inter alia*: an ability to empathise and communicate clearly and readily; an ability to work in multidisciplinary teams; confidence in leading peers; wisdom and courage in making decisions; professional curiosity; and openness of outlook.

  ²
situations.

'We understand our students are looking for a dynamic learning experience — one that can offer a balance of support, structure and flexibility with opportunities to build the knowledge and know-how to compete in today's rapidly evolving workplace.'

University of Queensland,
Changing how Higher Education is imagined

This combination of knowledge, skills and attributes will be the hallmark, the unmistakable stamp, of the Faculty’s education and training process. Furthermore, in the pursuit of these goals, the Faculty will have a care for the well-being of students as individuals — individuals who opt to live in its midst for years and, for many among them, during one of the pre-eminently formative period of their lives.

In striving for these goals and in its day-to-day operations, the Faculty will keep well in mind that its task is not one of knowledge brokering, any more than it is that of an accrediting agency for ever-larger cohorts of fee-generating ‘customers’ to be put through processes like so many units in a production chain. While it will continue to be aware of the commercial imperatives that attach to the business of education, it will not let these same necessities pervert the wider purpose to be served when welcoming students to its programs and courses.
Resolution 11

The Faculty undertakes the education of the students it admits to its programs and courses with three objectives in mind: the development and attainment of the students’ potential; their verified mastery of the knowledge and skills associated with their chosen program of study – this to a level compatible with their putting knowledge and skills to work readily once they have completed their program; and, more widely, the acquisition of the intellectual habits that will equip them to adapt to rapidly-evolving job and work structures.²

Education for Whom? For the World: Balancing the Faculty’s Domestic and International Student Intakes

The Faculty’s outlook is global. Its subject matter is global, concerned as it is with human health and well-being. Its education program and its research efforts have no thought of borders.

The Faculty will maintain that outlook and continue to admit international students, who contribute much to the rich diversity of its student body. It already welcomes a significant number of international students (i.e. on-shore, as well as its Ochsner cohort), who enrol in its programs alongside the Commonwealth-supported Australian contingent.

Student fees are essential to the financial health of the University and, by extension, to that of the Faculty in respect of both its education and research activities. Differences in the fee regimes applied to domestic and international students can skew admission patterns if the quest for financial benefit is allowed too great an influence in the decision-making mix.

² [Note: This affirmation will have implications for work to be undertaken in respect of programs, curricula, teaching practice, assessments and life-long learning readiness. See later comments for details]
The Faculty is well aware that Commonwealth funding arrangements limit the government’s contribution to the higher education of domestic students – a contribution that the Birmingham reforms, should they become law, will depress further. In contrast, fees set for international students are materially higher than those paid by their Australian peers. Predictably perhaps under such a two-tiered financing regime, the recruitment of international students can easily become a priority, however justified or disguised, in order for the institution to capture the financial advantage that attaches to such enrolments.

Given, moreover, that all institutions have capacity-based limits as to the numbers of students they can accommodate, the material difference in revenue-per-head between the two categories of enrolments can easily produce significant imbalances between the size of the domestic and international cohorts, in those instances where revenue acquisition edges out philosophical, ethical and strategic considerations. While clearly cognisant of the financial realities at work in its student attraction effort, the Faculty is keen that its student mix should be the expression of considered strategy and policy; and, conversely, that it should not be the product of laissez-faire, or worse still, of parochialism and assumptions of debatable integrity.

Resolution 12

The Faculty will ensure, as a matter of philosophy, policy and strategy, that:

- Its student body reflects a healthy mix of domestic and international students, at both undergraduate and graduate levels
- The student learning experiences recognise and capitalise upon the domestic-international diversity present in the student body, in matters of both education and research.

The Faculty, moreover, will settle upon and articulate the rationale and set of guidelines by which it will determine the optimal mix of domestic and international students represented in its cohorts.
‘A mix of genders, cultures, disciplines, pedagogies learning contexts and student cohorts is critical to the development of creative undergraduates who become responsible citizens.’

University of Queensland,
Student Strategy 2016-2020 White Paper

Education for Whom?
The Deliberate Construction of Diversity

Many students apply to study with the Faculty, but not all who do gain a place in its programs and courses. For the foreseeable future – and certainly for the decade covered by this reflection, we expect that demand for the Faculty’s education offerings will remain greater than its ability to service it. The necessity of culling admission requests in accordance with a fair, equitable and transparent system will therefore remain.

Moreover, within that system, the selection of applicants will occur according to criteria that reflect the Faculty’s intent and experience when it comes to the make-up of the cohorts it admits and the likely success of the members of that cohort in pursuing their studies to a successful conclusion.

If it must be said: for the sake of all involved in the undertaking, care is to be taken within that system that those who are invited to study in the Faculty are reasonably likely, by virtue of their intellect, application and personal attributes, to reach the standards of competence required in their chosen program – with account taken of the knowledge-bridging and supplementation options available to them.

These notions and imperatives are known to the Faculty, which has undertaken work to review its admission process and better match student aspiration to student ability and capability. What the present reflection contributes to this work, however, is the formulation of the set of imperatives that, put to work in the system, will shape an heterogeneous student body, where ‘heterogeneity’ is taken to describe a body of students that displays the following six distinguishing attributes:
- **Gender balance**, i.e. a group that avoids any significant imbalances in its representation of the genders involved

- **Socio-economic diversity**, i.e. a student body whose members are drawn from all socio-economic tiers to mirror the composition of society at large

- **Demographic or experience diversity**, i.e. a student body that, in its make-up, reflects (a) the different educational needs of participants at different times in their lives and (b) the Faculty’s ability to offer them education opportunities through different points of entry to their chosen programs

- **Cultural diversity**, i.e. a student body in which different cultures and ethnicities are represented, as befits a Faculty attracting a mix of domestic and international students

- **Indigenous inclusivity**, i.e. a student body in which persons of indigenous descent readily find and hold their place

- **Capability cognisant**, where ‘capability cognisance’ manifests in two key ways:
  - In a system that has students gain their place in the Faculty’s programs and courses not only because of a demonstrated academic achievement coupled with a level of financial ease, but through the recognition of intellectual potential and relevant personal attributes; and
  - In a system that sees students supported, encouraged and advised towards the programs and courses best suited to their capacity, abilities and aptitudes – particularly in those circumstances where students’ choices are ill-matched with their capability.
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The Faculty, will:

- Build, consciously and actively, a student body whose attributes match five fundamentals supportive of our mission: gender balance; socio-economic diversity; demographic-experiential diversity; cultural and ethnic diversity; indigenous inclusivity; and capability recognition

- Ensure that these fundamentals find their place in the design of our admission system, in the technologies we use to drive and support it, and in the experience of those who interact with it

- Ensure that these same fundamentals are recognised in, and influence, the design of our programs and courses, pedagogies and the resulting learning experience.

Defining Change, Implementing Change: What Roadmap?

The desirability of change (and, in some instances, its necessity) in order to equip the Faculty for the decade ahead is clear. Some of the changes we canvased are meant to respond to evolving external circumstances (like student demographics and learning modes), while others target internal pressure points (like study pathways, admissions or assessments).

Change has a spectrum of depth: from light (such as in an adjustment, an amelioration or an enhancement) to the more consequential (as in a refocusing or retargeting) and deeper still, to a rethink and recasting of fundamentals. At this point in the reasoning, we address the question of change in all its forms, irrespective of their extent or depth.

Whatever the change drivers and however deep their reach, discussions during the first workshop called for a number of them to be made to the existing order of things. A similar message came
through just as loudly and as clearly during the second workshop, with its focus on things educational – in regard to matters that ranged from curricula to study pathways; from course flexibility to study personalisation; from learning modes to the recognition of credits for extra-curricular endeavours; and from admissions to assessments, as part of the Faculty modus operandi. The list is indicative; it is not exhaustive.

Let us accept that the calls for change are warranted. There is no reason to doubt either their desirability in some instances, or their necessity in others. The daunting question is how to address them. In that respect, the approach can be piecemeal or it can be integrated.

The second of the two options is the only sensible one: the parts operate in a dynamic system of interdependent elements; changes made to one will have upstream and downstream implications. What’s more, these same parts will, jointly and severally, affect the quality of staff and student experience, both of which we are concerned to improve.

The change agenda needs a unifying rationale that will give it logical and consequential integrity. The rationale emerged in the course of the second workshop and can now be summarised (see below) and illustrated (see schematic shown overleaf). In essence:

- **[1] Program ‘Mission’**
  The chain of logic begins with the intended end-point: the future-ready, contribution-ready and job-ready graduate that we expect the Faculty’s education programs and courses to produce. The Faculty must be able to articulate this end-point, as this effectively constitutes the Faculty’s promise to its enrolling students.

- **[2] Expected Results and Outcomes**
  In each program or course, students at that end-point will have acquired – and be expected to demonstrate – specified knowledge and know-how levels, as well as certain skills. The Faculty must define, for each program, what the abilities, capabilities and skills of the graduating student are.

- **[3] Targeted Admissions**
  Those whom the Faculty admits to its programs and courses should have the best chance of meeting with success in their studies. They should also contribute, by virtue of their capabilities and aptitudes, to the development of the Faculty’s preferred cohort profile (see earlier
comments on the concerted effort to build growing diversity into the student cohort).

  Student success (and teaching effectiveness) depend to a material degree on the students’ behaviours and attitudes towards their responsibilities when it comes to learning. In the reciprocal venture that is the transmission of learning, the Faculty has its own responsibilities. Both parties moreover, have expectations. Responsibilities and expectations should be made clear.

- [5] Tailored Curricula
  Curricula must be fit for purpose, i.e. they should be constructed and tailored with the intended program ‘mission’ and its expected outcomes in mind. This is not necessarily the case across all of the Faculty’s curricula. They should be revisited, assessed and adjusted as required. Room must be had as well for the inclusion of non-scientific or technical knowledge and skills that is deemed important to job readiness.

- [6] Reliable Assessments
  Assessments must test the actual competence achieved, in full alignment with the specified outcomes where knowledge and skills acquisition is concerned. That alignment must be tested, as must the assessment process itself, along with its product – i.e. the marks obtained. Objectivity, reliability, accuracy, consistency, repeatability, transparency and, last but not least, efficiency are all critical attributes of high-quality assessments.

Together, these six elements are part of a dynamic system. Within that system, they form an interdependent chain that should be used to guide the examination of necessary change and the development of enhancements to each of its parts.
Diagram 1 - Schematic Representation of Interconnecting Elements in the Faculty’s Education Endeavour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Raison d’être, Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Mission</td>
<td>Articulation of the overarching goals that speak to the Faculty’s ambitions as to its graduates and its own reputation as a centre of learning</td>
<td>Anchor point for the development of program-specific contributions, in line with the Faculty’s overarching ambition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program-Specific Competencies</td>
<td>Definition of the particular competencies (knowledge, skills) that students must demonstrate to the specified level in order to graduate</td>
<td>Defined program outcomes concerning expected, ‘excellence-inspired’ knowledge and skill mastery levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Admissions</td>
<td>Enhancement of the admissions system to have it work towards the shaping of a student body aligned with the Faculty’s strategic intent</td>
<td>Higher likelihood of success of enrolled students. Lower attrition rate. Easier teaching. Shorter tails. Higher morale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Contract</td>
<td>Articulation of staff and student responsibilities and expectations, when undertaking a Faculty program or course</td>
<td>Success-supportive behaviours. Platform for performance management (learning (students)); (teaching (staff))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailored Curricula</td>
<td>Review of curricula to ensure their alignment to program-specific knowledge and skill acquisition and mastery (substance) and up-to-date delivery practice (form)</td>
<td>Curriculum make-up explicitly tailored to the nominated competencies and appropriate delivery methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable Assessments</td>
<td>Review of current assessment methodologies and processes to ensure their fitness for purpose and technology-supported efficiency</td>
<td>Mastery and competence focused assessments of expected knowledge and skills acquisition on a continuous basis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Faculty recognises that adhering to the logic of the ‘six-element chain’ defined at Diagram 1 is fundamentally important, indeed critical, to the delivery of a well-integrated, smooth and purposeful education process, as well as to the quality of the experience that students and staff derive from it.
Beyond the broad topics reflected in the previous section, Workshop 2 conversations also addressed a number of matters either as subsets of the broader topics or as distinct items that are of direct importance or consequence to the provision of the Faculty’s ‘brand’ of education. Discussion of these matters occupies the remaining pages of this document.

On (Mutual) Expectation-Setting

When student enter into a program or course in the Faculty, they have certain expectations: about the substance of that education, the types and standards of teaching they will receive, the guidance and resources they will be able to call upon, and the general quality of their experience.

As a Faculty, we have expectations of students too: about their application, for instance, about attendance and about attitudes and behaviours related to their performance.
If we have responsibilities, so have they. Yet we don’t articulate either expectations or responsibilities; nor do, for that matter, we do a good job of communicating them, even though the success of students and, ultimately, our own, depends on the parties recognising and acquitting themselves of their mutual responsibilities in what amounts to an unspoken, though very real, contract.

On Assessments

Authentic Assessment

[The University intends to] ‘...develop a system of assessment that uses challenging and meaningful assessment tasks to engage and extend students across their programs.’

Initiative 6, Goal 1: Game-Changing graduates,
Student Strategy 2016-2020

Assessments are an integral, essential part of the University and the Faculty’s education package. Assessments serve the student as much as the institution. Throughout the program or course, they offer guidance to the students and the institution as to the students’ development, alongside an assurance as to the levels of competence attained. Ultimately, the assessment vouchsafes a student’s graduation readiness, as it does the quality of the education provided by the Faculty and the effectiveness of the pedagogies it uses in providing that education.

Current assessment methodologies, as well as the processes by which assessment are carried out, show weaknesses that deserve attention and adjustment:

Resolution 14

The Faculty in the first instance and individual Schools and disciplines in the second, will define, articulate and communicate their understanding of the general and specific responsibilities and expectations the parties involved in the education process have of each other when it comes to studying with the Faculty (as distinct from the University.

Guidance will be offered, and performance managed, in accordance with that understanding.
Some of the weaknesses pertain to the substance of the assessment instruments themselves (does the substance of the assessment test the outcomes and results we attach value to?)

Others to the consistency of the testing Faculty-wide (do the assessments performed accord to certain shared fundamentals of substance and methodology across disciplines and Schools?)

Others again to the consistency of marking, appeal process included.

Others, finally, concern the governance framework associated with the assessment process (i.e. the nature of the framework, its operation and its general transparency).

Assessments performed under the Faculty’s umbrella should answer to certain ‘non-negotiable’ fundamentals, notwithstanding the diversity of subject matters examined and their particular technical demands. The paragraphs below articulate these fundamentals:

Assessments are to be recognised and shaped as an integral part of the Faculty’s ‘logic chain’ in matters of education, which we described earlier. They speak to its concern for quality, consistency and reliability. Assessments have neither substance nor purpose in isolation of that chain.
Assessments will be on-going throughout a course of study. During that time, care will be taken to have them serve – and used – as instruments of guidance in the personalisation of student development as well as markers of individual achievement.

Assessment marking will produce consistent outcomes and results for the same student effort and material.

Assessment ‘rules’ as to their purpose, nature, form and process (along with the obligations that attach to them for both students and Faculty) – will be articulated, communicated, explained, applied and upheld in the same manner across Faculty, Schools and disciplines.

Particular attention will be paid to the ‘legibility’ or ‘transparency’ of the rules for those who participate in the assessment process. Challenges to grades that arise from process weaknesses are to be reduced – and kept – to a minimum. Contestability will remain as a matter of principle, but it will be one with a clearly-defined remit and application.

Wherever possible and appropriate, assessment will become an electronic function rather than the paper-based, effort intensive and largely human-dependent task that it has been in the past. The transition to an electronic, AI-supported, process should occur as swiftly as possible and as a matter of priority Faculty-wide.

Resolution 15

The Faculty will adjust and modernise its present-day assessment practices and processes across all Schools and disciplines in order to see an integrated, equitable, consistent, technology-based assessment framework of demonstrable efficiency and effectiveness, introduced and established as soon as possible.
On the Personalisation of Education and Experience

‘Students are seeking a greater degree of control over what, when and how they study with personal advice, technologies and opportunities to support their individual needs, priorities and aspirations.’

Goal 2: Student-Centred Flexibility, Student Strategy 2016-2020

‘A major goal of our Student Strategy is to provide a flexible environment that supports and services all students, meet their learning priorities and expectations, and personalises their UQ experience.’

Goal 2, Changing How Higher Education is Imagined

The re-casting effort is to produce a standardised, Faculty-wide system as to its fundamentals in terms of purpose, philosophy, ethos, methodological approach and operation, the latter being transferred to an AI-supported, electronic base as a matter of priority and urgency.

The notion of students ‘curating’ their education (‘co-creators of their education’) in line with their life plans is now a firm part of the higher learning narrative and the agenda of those who provide that education. It is also a potential increasingly realised by significant advances in real-time data capture, ubiquitous connectivity and processing power in the service of data analytics.

The lineage of the notion is complex, reflecting inter alia the convergence of factors as diverse as the societal trend to individuation (the ‘customer of one’ mantra), its enablement via Web-based technology, the meteoric rise of social media, the widespread availability of on-line course materials, the prospect of digital ‘badging’ for studies undertaken – right through to the casualisation of the job market and the fading attraction of careers in favour of discontinuous ‘life projects’.
Personalisation-Motivated Flexibility:  
Natural Limits

Attractive as the notion may be conceptually and embedded in the present-day narrative though it may be, its application and translation into programs exercises the mind. Personalisation demands flexibility. Flexibility, however, is not accommodated that easily when:

- A substantial, well-defined corpus of knowledge and skills must be acquired in a tight time-frame
- In that same time frame, it is also Faculty’s ambition to have students acquire skills of a professional and personal nature *in addition* to their scientific and technical ones, as per the concept of ‘T-shaped’ development – the analogy that unites depth of expertise with breadth of professional and personal work place skills
- Professional accreditation requirements have a bearing on the make-up of the curricula involved, and
- Physical and operational constraints (geography and distance, student numbers, teaching resources and facilities) make their weight felt.

Personalisation-Motivated Flexibility:  
Philosophical Limits

The Faculty espouses the notion of personalisation-motivated flexibility. It also ascribes boundaries to it, both in regard to the factors above and as a function of two fundamental conditions:

- Personalisation cannot be allowed to occur at the expense of scientific and technical competence, which remain the touchstone of an education under the Faculty’s roof
Personalisation cannot be allowed to encourage the commoditisation of learning, i.e. a ‘pick-pack-and-pay’ mentality and its close cousin, the ‘shopping-cart’ view of education.

Personalisation-Motivated Flexibility: A More Sophisticated and Robust Framework

Instead of working to a superficial and simplistic view of personalisation, better that the Faculty concentrate its efforts on a more sophisticated view of personalisation that includes the following:

- The rationalisation, from a Faculty (rather than School) perspective, of its present, complex, somewhat disjointed and relatively opaque undergraduate offerings into a considered suite of well-articulated pathways that reconcile:
  - The need for a measure of preference discovery on the part of undergraduates
  - The value that would attach to curriculum elements common to all (or many) Faculty disciplines
  - The boundaries between core knowledge and skill elements of adjusted curricula and preferential elements (‘electives’) within them
  - The injection of additional offerings (such as micro-degrees, diplomas and certificates, as well as professional development courses) the Faculty may launch in order to meet its commitment to life-long education and fill present-day gaps in its offerings

- The clear enunciation of the adjusted offerings to students

- Notwithstanding the diversity (and resulting complexity) of the management systems involved, the recognition of student as individuals operating within those systems, the tracking of their efforts and journey (via assessments, for instance) and the provision of personalised guidance and advice based on that tracking
The provision of course materials, knowledge and information in a manner that encompasses the full range of learning modes, so that students can personalise that aspect of their learning experience.

The development of a meaningful and exercised ability to match student aspirations, ability, circumstances and learning preferences to particular programs, both at the start of the students’ journey and progressively, at important articulation points in their development.

**Personalisation-Driven Flexibility: The Benefits of a Properly Targeted Effort**

Realising those five objectives will, we believe:

- Produce considerable improvements in student experience
- Direct personalisation where it is both possible and most profitable; and, ultimately,
- Generate a distinguishing, differentiating attribute to a course of study in the Faculty and the University.

As an integrated effort, these objectives accord with the achievement of the second goal of the University’s Student Strategy, with its focus on student-centred flexibility and its subsidiary initiatives (extended on-line and campus learning; unbundled course options; program schedule alternatives; and learning analytics and e-assessment capability).

---

**Resolution 16**

The Faculty recognises the growing trend to, and expectation of, the personalisation of learning. It will respond to them in a clear, considered, pragmatic, effective and compelling manner that optimises the mix of aspiration and the practical considerations that personalisation gives rise to.
With that in mind, the Faculty will:

- Review, rationalise, adjust and update its program offerings from a Faculty rather than School perspective and in accordance with the objectives and principles it has articulated, so that the offerings can be readily navigated, communicated, explored and acted upon, all the while meeting its quality standards and educational objectives.

- Systematise its Faculty-wide ability to recognise individual students, their aspirations, preferences and circumstances.

- Use the information that systematisation enables to obtain as close a match as possible between student aspiration and capability, and to track student performance as a means of guiding and advising them as individuals across the stages of their UQ and Faculty journey.

- Facilitate learning across the range of available modes, be they traditional or digital, as another means of personalising the student experience.

The quality of student experience matters to all concerned. For the student at its centre, it will be assessed from two entwined yet distinct perspectives: as a key element in assuring the viability of individual learning outcomes, and as a measure of the value derived from the investment of the student’s funds. For the Faculty in the first instance and the wider University in the second, the quality of the experience constitutes one of the critical elements in the shaping of reputation and thence, the attraction of future students via channels that range from word-of-mouth and to published rankings.

There is no single contributor to the quality of student experience. Rather, it results from the compounding interaction of a number of factors, some highly diffuse or broad of ambit (such as the structure of programs and their navigability) and others sharply defined or narrowly circumscribed (like an assessment process or the accuracy and reliability of timetabling).
In that respect, five fundamental position statements bear making from the onset:

- The Faculty recognises the criticality of student experience, and the quality of that experience, for the students and for itself

- The Faculty recognises that it has a critical role to play in delivering an experience of superlative quality for its students. It also recognises that producing that experience is a responsibility it shares with the wider University, as not all aspects of experience creation lie within its control

- As for those aspects that do lie within its control, the Faculty will do its utmost to raise them to the highest standard that it can – and maintain them to that standard over time,
addressing in the process the unevenness in quality that characterises its current performance across disciplines and activities

- The quality of experience is a Faculty concern rather than a discipline or School-limited affair. It will therefore be approached and dealt with as such, through the development and introduction of shared standards, policies, practices and metrics, to be ‘realised’ in disciplines and Schools.

- Quality of experience results from the quality of operation in individual links along the length of the activity chain described earlier. All links in the chain matter and contribute to the overall achievement of quality.

Put simply: generating an experience of superlative quality for students is (a) everybody’s business; (b) every day’s business; and (c) evenly shared business, Faculty-wide. In the paragraphs that follow, we discuss ‘non-chain’ elements that are likely to contribute further to the quality of student experience.

Enhancing the Quality of Experience: Seamless, Student-Oriented and Staff-Supportive Operations

One of the weaker points in the Faculty’s performance resides in the efficiency and effectiveness of its day-to-day operations. Current arrangements – and the performance they produce – speak to:

- The lack of a shared, overarching and ‘acted-upon’ service ethos that puts customers first (where the ‘customers’ in question are either students or staff (or both) and is sensitive to the rippling impact of decisions in a highly dynamic web of interdependent actors and agents.

- The lack of a shared, Faculty-wide, cross-discipline, cross-School, strategy-focused, longer-term view by which to unify outlook and set the compass for the planning and prioritisation of necessary or desirable improvements to individual professional, administrative, technological
and infrastructural support activities

- Resourcing levels and structures that are designed for resource-intensive, human-dependent rather than AI-assisted interventions, and thus do not deploy existing resources to best effect nor necessarily

- Fragmented, unreconciled and often outdated approaches to, and standards of, service delivery that spans the entire student and staff activity chain as an active continuum

- An information and communication systems environment that is too often antiquated in its parts, disjointed and fragile, extended as it has been via incremental, largely ad-hoc and necessity-devised patches of uncertain reliability and questionable sustainability.

Jointly and severally, these weaknesses have affected the quality of student experience, frequently translated into an added burden of work for staff and, regrettably, also raised the Faculty’s risk levels to unacceptable heights. This state of affairs is dangerous, unsustainable and far removed from the operational standards that the Faculty wishes to demonstrate and be known for.
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The Faculty recognises the critical part that smooth, well-integrated, outcome-oriented, AI-supported, efficient and effective day-to-day operations play in the quality of experience students and staff encounter.

It also recognises that present-day arrangements are unfit for the future that the Faculty is designing for its students, its staff and itself as an academic institution within the wider University.

The Faculty will continue to pursue with all necessary vigour its current strategy-directed, comprehensive and integrated change program for administrative, professional, ICT and infrastructure functions. It will do so with a clear view to having those same functions perform in a manner that delivers a seamless, professional, highly-responsive and technology-
savvy operational performance for all those involved: students, staff and the wider University.

In so doing, it will take care to capitalise on work already put in train in a range of support environments over the last twelve months.

---

Enhancing the Quality of Experience: A Closer Association between Education and Research

The University is determined ‘…to embed [its] research excellence within the core of [its] teaching to gain cutting-edge knowledge with a highly-valued and distinctive skill set’\(^4\), an ambition which it sees as a distinct initiative that aims to ‘…create inquiry-based learning opportunities that incorporate UQ’s cutting edge research to build student’s advanced knowledge base and skills critical to employability’. \(^5, 6\)

The Faculty shares the University’s view regarding the many benefits to be had for all involved in bringing about an effective rapprochement between its education and research endeavours. The close association of education with research is expected to act as:

- A powerful motivator in the development of a sense of purpose, that will also give added impetus to learning
- An extraordinary aid to discovery for the students involved
- A critical driver in the experience of engagement in a community of science-based and human-directed endeavour
- A generating source of added capability, creativity and intellectual horsepower from which the research endeavour itself can only benefit.

---

\(^4\) Our Students’ Challenges are Our Challenges, Student Strategy, University of Queensland
\(^5\) Ibid., Initiative 2, Goal 1: Game-Changing Graduates
\(^6\) Using a vehicle such as the University’s Undergraduate Research Program, for instance
All faculties look for the opportunity to see their students ‘engage’ with the real world. Through its network of clinical care providers, research institutes and research centres, the Faculty of Medicine is particularly well-positioned to bridge the education-research divide and make engagement in research an integral part of its education process.

Resolution 18

The Faculty recognises the breadth and depth of the benefits that would accrue to all participants, were its education effort to be better meshed with its research effort.

As part of the review of curricula discussed earlier in this document and of the pedagogies used to pass on the knowledge and skills involved, the Faculty will look to devise the means whereby its students can be exposed to, and participate in, purposeful research by drawing, in particular, on the opportunity that its research centres and institutes present.

Enhancing the Quality of Experience:
Fostering a Sense of Community

The Faculty is a vast body, a large beast of many geographically distinct (and distant) parts, into which it can be difficult to find one’s feet – an environment too wide to encompass and attach oneself to, to meaningful effect, even where a program is concerned given the size of the cohorts involved.

This is the terrain in which personalisation can lead to isolation, unless a counterbalancing sense of community can be made to prevail – a concern that rejoins, in a roundabout way, the Faculty’s stated desire to tend to its students’ general well-being.

Some of our most formative, influential and lasting friendships develop during university years, as do some of the associations and networks that will be precious in later life. With that in mind, the Faculty wishes to provide, as best it can, the conditions that will
enable students to derive maximum benefit from the human side of their membership in the Faculty. To that end, it will look to:

- Encourage learning in team and project environments, with particular attention to the multidisciplinarity of both teams and projects

- Introduce a mentor or ‘buddy’ system capable of providing students with the precious guidance and support that (somewhat) senior peers can offer; and

- Put to good and productive use the information it gathers on student performance as a means of better-targeting the individual support it can offer them.

Resolution 19

The Faculty acknowledges the importance of a sense of community as a fundamental element in the quality of student experience; as a material contributor to later professional life through the networks and connections established; and as a critical component of overall well-being during students’ involvement with the Faculty.

With that in mind, the Faculty will seek to use teams and projects as vehicles for the broadening of students’ connections and the formation of his or her support groups; to introduce support mechanisms such as assigned mentors or buddies; and, more generally, to have a particular care for the students’ well-being and successful adaptation to University and Faculty life, as a fundamental ingredient in their ultimate success in their chosen course of study.

Enhancing the Quality of Experience:
The Broadening of Experiential Horizons
The University’s Student Strategy calls for ‘global extension experiences’ that involve studying, working or volunteering in cross-cultural and multi-cultural environments.7

The Faculty sees such experiences not only as an important means of personal enrichment, but also as an important element in the education and formation of health professionals. Exposure to different environments, circumstances, conditions and systems complements the formal learning that takes place within the confines of University and Faculty facilities, as well as those of partner institutions, by deepening and broadening it.

The Faculty is well aware of the value that attaches to these ‘extension experiences’ – a value well-recognised furthermore by those who benefit from the Faculty’s association with the Ochsner hospital system in the United States.

That said, the extension experiences on offer through the Faculty need not be as formally structured as the Ochsner one. They can take the form of local practicums or placements and internships in partner organisations, from research centres to commercial, private-sector enterprises operating in a kindred field. They can be local (i.e. occurring in Australia) or international.

The point is simple: The Faculty should draw on its extensive network of participating organisations and ‘install’ itself at the centre of a web of diverse extension opportunities that it will encourage students to take up. In some instances, it may even choose to integrate such experiences into the curriculum, and recognise their value as credits towards the completion of a specific course of studies.

---

Resolution 20

The Faculty understands the importance and the benefits that students derive from the acquisition of study-related (or professional development-related) experience in circumstances that differ from their immediate ones, however rewarding these may be.

---

7 See Initiative 5, Goal 1: Game-Changing Graduates, Student Strategy 2016-2020
The Faculty will enhance and promote the meaningful extension experiences on offer to its students, given the important and integral part they play in the education and human development of job-ready, ‘game-changing’ health professionals.

On the Role of the Faculty’s Educators

[The University will...] ‘develop contemporary and comprehensive ongoing professional development provisions that support and reward reaching and learning performance and facilitate career progression.’

Initiative 4, Staff Professional Development and Recognition Provisions,
Goal 3: Dynamic People and Partnerships,
Student Strategy 2016-2020

[The University will...] ‘support a greater involvement in direct teaching by more of UQ’s staff to help embed our research excellence within our teaching capability.’

Initiative 5, A Teaching-Engaged Staff Profile,
Goal 3: Dynamic People and Partnerships,
Student Strategy 2016-2020

[The University will...] ‘involve more research-focused staff in teaching activities, and invest in support staff who can assist academics with best-practice digital delivery tools and content design’.

Goal 3: Dynamic People and Partnerships,
Changing How Higher Education is Imagined,
University of Queensland
There is no doubt that the days of ‘magisterial’ knowledge delivery – and those of near-monopolistic access to science and information – are well and truly gone. Universities no longer have a corner on the information market; those who attend them have different learning habits and expectations; and digital communications have redefined a great many interaction behaviours for good.

In the process, the nature of teaching has evolved, as has the role of those who are tasked with teaching in higher-learning institutions: from undisputed authorities dispensing truth in their subject matter, they have increasingly become guides in the vast fields of knowledge and information pertinent to their disciplines, facilitators of learning, development mentors and curators of the education process.

Excelling in that newly-defined capacity requires a substantial, considered and co-ordinated approach to change. It is a journey that the Faculty is determined to make; but not only that: in so doing, it wants to:

- Earn a reputation for advanced curriculum design and excellence in innovative delivery
- Achieve excellence in the productive fusing of its teaching and research endeavour, across disciplines and Schools
- See the quality of its teaching endeavour recognised in national and international teaching awards; and, ultimately,
- Find itself in a position where there is healthy competition for a place within the ranks of its teachers.

In that respect and with the future in mind, three fundamental positions arrived at in the course of Workshop 1 discussions bear restating:

- The Faculty is concerned with the education of students enrolled in its programs, a process that includes, but is clearly not limited to, teaching alone
The Faculty sees its responsibility for education as a shared, Faculty-wide one, in which all have a role to play, irrespective of discipline or School affiliation.

The Faculty’s aspiration in matters of education is one of excellence, in a construct that values equally education and research as the two enduring facets of its wider function.

There is work to do if the Faculty is to attain excellence in education in general and teaching in particular: for instance, the Faculty’s teaching, as experienced by students, is of variable quality, as ratings attest; while some Schools have a more structured, systematic and better-organised approach than others to the practice of teaching, the same cannot be said of standards at Faculty level, which lack cohesion; and a particularly heavy reliance on sessional staff works makes it difficult to obtain and maintain consistency of approach, practice, materials, formats and technology usage – all of this moreover, in a system that has tended to treat teaching as a poor cousin to research, where recognition, prestige and promotion opportunities have traditionally lain.

Faculty-wide, there is a ship to turn around when it comes to teaching. ‘Turning that ship around’ means, inter alia:

- Developing and articulating a Faculty-wide approach to teaching: its purpose, its intended outcomes and its anchor philosophies, pedagogies and practices, for both the academic and clinical branches of the teaching endeavour.

- Developing and articulating the standards and metrics that will test and measure the delivery of teaching in accordance with the above.

- Recognising and harnessing to best effect the full educational capability that the Faculty can draw upon: academics and clinicians certainly, but also alumni, PhD students and partner organisations, introducing students to the rich mix of knowledge sources and expertise they can access via the Faculty.
● Developing the materials and introducing the mechanisms that will define the Faculty’s specific expectations of those who teach; and introduce those who teach to the whole of the curriculum, so that their contribution is contextualised and harmonised with the other parts of that curriculum (much as the School of Biomedical Sciences already does, although in a manner ‘adjusted’ to Faculty and discipline-specific levels)

● Identifying and implementing the technological base (specialist, technology-savvy support expertise, platforms, tools, facilities) needed to support effective, up-to-date teaching practice and delivery at scale in a digital age – material design included

● Developing and introducing the performance monitoring and improvement methods that will serve to lift the quality of teaching through means such as mentoring, ‘buddying’ and peer review

● Developing and implementing a career model that acknowledges the contribution of educators to the Faculty’s (and the University’s) endeavours, be those educators academics or clinicians; recognises the importance of on-going professional development; rewards excellence in the provision of education and teaching; and offers attractive career prospects for those whose gifts and passion lie in the field of education rather than that of research

● Develop and introduce Faculty-wide provisions for the protection and enhancement of the Faculty’s teaching capability through strategically-minded succession planning, so that the ‘teaching asset’ it holds grows in value and strength, and does not face depletion for lack of foresight.

---

**Resolution 21**

The Faculty will give effect to an operating model in which the value of teaching is recognised on a par with that of research.

It will do so in an integrated and comprehensive manner that recognises the many parts involved in the proper structuring of its teaching endeavour, including: teaching philosophy, objectives and pedagogic...
methods; teaching standards and metrics; the harnessing of all resources available for application to teaching; the integration of individual teaching contributions into the curriculum as a whole; digital technology platforms, tools, facilities and support expertise; teaching-oriented career recognition, rewards and progression; and protection and enhancement of the sustainability of the Faculty’s teaching capability in the longer term.
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Preparatory Notes

We will meet as a cross-Faculty body on Thursday 10 August 2017. The event will be the second in the series of workshops that aim to define the Faculty’s fundamental directions for the decade ahead.

The first workshop, held in late May 2017, gave us the opportunity to reflect on what we think will be the dominant features of the landscape in which the Faculty will operate between now and 2027-2028. The outcomes of that reflection were set out in the Record of Proceedings (‘Meeting the Need and the Challenge: What Decadal Future for the Faculty of Medicine?’ Paper 1, Early Reflections, 30 June 2017), included in the reading material that accompanies these notes.

The conversation of Thursday the 10th of August will deepen our May discussions by focusing them on our educational endeavour. Our particular task will be to interpret the key themes isolated in the first workshop for their particular meaning when it comes to the education the Faculty dispenses and the learning experience that flows from, and characterises, that education.

If the discussion is to yield the fruits expected of it, it is important that we locate our exploration of education in its proper context, and not lose sight of three considerations in particular:

- **First, we are looking out ten years.** The frame of reference is intentionally decadal. Thinking in decades broadens the view. It makes possible the realistic contemplation of significant change and the prospect of building rather than merely ‘fixing’. It also recognises
that significant changes that have the future in mind – i.e. genuinely *strategic* changes – need time for them to take root and work their transformation, in the process of becoming part of the fabric of a different experience.

- **Second, we are crafting the future of our Faculty as a body of fundamentally-shared, overarching goals and interests** – a body made rich in opportunity by virtue of the distinct, yet complementary, areas of knowledge and skills gathered under its umbrella. That there is a common envelope in no way diminishes the importance of the parts within it. Rather, it is a case of crafting the envelope in question so that the activities that take place within support each other better than they do at present and, in so doing, generate defining opportunities for all who participate in it – ‘jointly and severally’, as the legal form would have it.

- **Third, we are proceeding with education in mind.** ‘Education’, in our understanding, is greater than teaching, which it certainly includes. Put differently, teaching is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition of education. This is true in many fields, but nowhere perhaps more so than in those endeavours that have the care, health and well-being of humans at their centre – and where we look for far more than the acquisition of a body of knowledge as the basis and definition of competence.

The day’s agenda has four key parts distributed across equal blocks of time:

- **The first is concerned with the Faculty’s product offering** (i.e. its fitness for purpose, its attractiveness, its substance and its composition)

- **The second addresses the organisational and operational arrangements involved in delivering the Faculty’s education ‘product’** (i.e. program commonalities vs specialisations, what should be the shared attributes of offerings, the general efficiency and effectiveness of the design of our program pathways and structures, and so on)

- **The third goes to the experiential dimension of the Faculty’s education process** and the quality that characterises it (or ought to do so). In discussing experience, we intend to consider both its student and its staff dimensions – complementary sides of a single coin

- **The fourth looks at the manner in which the Faculty should protect, nurture, develop and extend its teaching capability**, that fundamental asset in the conduct of its business,
the discharge of its responsibility within the social contract that is higher education, and the achievement of excellence.

The purpose of the day’s deliberations is for us to develop and articulate the principles upon which supporting strategies are to be constructed. These principles (effectively, statements of intent) will provide the ‘hooks’ from which to hang the subsidiary parcels of work which, once completed, will mean realisation of the strategic intent we have in mind. These same hooks will also help us to place current initiatives in their rightful place as part of the Faculty’s overall strategic intent. We’ll have more to say about that on the day.

One thing should be clear, however: the matters we discuss and the position we come to will carry over into the way in which the Faculty thinks about its activities and conducts them. Our deliberations are meant to be meaningful: their outcomes will point the way to beneficial and purposeful change.

The day will pass quickly, considering the weight and importance of the matters we must consider. Your active participation and your candid contributions will be essential to the success it meets with.

To assist that participation, I ask that you familiarise yourself beforehand with the reading material provided and, in particular, with the document summarising the outcomes of Workshop 1 and the proposed agenda.

I look very much forward to our exchanges.

Benoit Trudeau
Facilitator,
Managing Director,
Trudeau & Associates

3 August 2017
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**Agenda:**
Thursday 10 August 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0850</td>
<td>Workshop 1 opens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 0845-0900 (10 minutes) | Welcome and Opening Comments | - Benoit Trudeau, Facilitator  
- Professor Robyn Ward AM, Acting Executive Dean, Faculty of Medicine  
- Associate Professor Geoffrey Marks, Associate Dean, Academic  
- Professor Stuart Carney, Deputy Executive Dean, Medical Dean |
| 0900-0915 (15 minutes) | Introduction Facilitated Discussion | Statement of ‘first principles’ articulated during Workshop 1, by way of framing the day’s discussions. Articulation of our answer to two fundamental questions:  
What is the Faculty’s fundamental ambition when it comes to education?  
Who participates in the fulfilment of that ambition? |
## Agenda: Thursday 10 August 2017 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0915-1030</td>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>The Faculty’s Education Offerings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(75 minutes)</td>
<td>Facilitated Discussion</td>
<td>By ‘offering’, we understand the nature and make-up of the Faculty’s programs and courses. Students have choices. How compelling is the Faculty’s educational offer in a demanding and competitive market? By way of providing discussion points, consider possible answers to questions such as: Do our programs address the needs of the groups we target and are there gaps to be filled? Are our programs fit for the future we anticipate? Should they be updated, restructured or rationalised to meet it? How shall we assess outcomes and competence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030-1100</td>
<td>Morning Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100-1215</td>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>Commonalities, Differences, Combinations and Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(75 minutes)</td>
<td>Facilitated Discussion</td>
<td>The conversation in Session 2 extends the outcomes of Session 1 by embracing the organisational and operational context within which the education process takes place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In essence, we wish to examine the enabling ‘machine and mechanics’ behind the provision of programs. We will concern ourselves with questions such as:

- Can we be more effective and efficient in our provision of education, even in a complex environment?
- What can we do to function better as a Faculty, proud of its suite of different, yet well-integrated specialisations, when it comes to education and teaching?
- What attributes do (or should) all our programs share? Should they have a particular ‘stamp’?
- Are there commonalities between programs? How should we exploit and capitalise on these commonalities to best effect?
- How shall we achieve pathway flexibility?
- How shall we balance early ‘exploration’ by students as the prelude to specialisation?
- How should we think about the resourcing and funding of our education effort?
### Session 3: A Vital, Two-Sided Coin: The ‘Experience’ Dimension of the Faculty’s Education Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1215-1230</td>
<td>Summation</td>
<td>Summation of the morning’s discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230-1315</td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1315-1430</td>
<td>Session 3: Facilitated Discussion</td>
<td>A Vital, Two-Sided Coin: The ‘Experience’ Dimension of the Faculty’s Education Process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is more to the education contract than the provision of knowledge and the development of skills. Both of these fundamentals occur within, and construct, the dynamic envelope of experience. Experience and its quality shape perceptions — of transactional ease, of organisational competence, of value (including value for money), for instance.

Experience is a coin of sorts: it has two sides — that of the student and that of staff. The experience of both groups features in conversations. It goes to the reputation of the provider, and it influences choices. In the case of students, we can criticise the instruments or the validity of the response sample; but rankings are a fact of life, and prospective students use them in their decision-making.
Agenda: Thursday 10 August 2017 (continued)

1315-1430  
(75 minutes)  
Session 3  
(continued)  

A Vital, Two-Sided Coin: The 'Experience' Dimension of the Faculty's Education Process (continued)

There are mixed reviews as to the quality of experience the Faculty's education process generates:

- Are there universal requirements across school, faculty and university?
- What aspects of it lie within the control of the Faculty?
- What should be the key features of a positive student and staff experience under the Faculty’s roof?
- Where do the strengths and weaknesses of the education experience the Faculty produces lie?
- How shall we improve the student experience?
- How shall we improve the staff experience?
- How shall we measure the Faculty’s contribution to student and staff experience?
Agenda: Thursday 10 August 2017 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1430-1500</td>
<td>Afternoon Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-1615</td>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td>Protecting and Nurturing the Faculty’s Education Capability – the ‘Asset’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                  | Facilitated Discussion                        | The Faculty’s ability to offer education in the disciplines gathered under its banner rests on a total capability – a capability that is critically dependent on academic staff and the bodies of knowledge and experience they hold, along with their expertise in the passing on of both of these to students.
|                  |                                               | This education capability (the ‘asset’ referred to in the session title) operates in an environment that has traditionally tended to favour research as the value standard. There is an ambiguity there, an unresolved tension. It is a tension that should be addressed, given a Faculty ambition to excel at education and teaching. We should consider: |
### Agenda: Thursday 10 August 2017 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1615-1645 (30 minutes)</th>
<th>Session 5</th>
<th>Where to from here? Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitated Discussion</td>
<td>An outline of the next steps with respect to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Progressing the work identified in regard to education and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Opening the consultation further (information sessions with School audiences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrating the outcomes of workshops 1 and 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1645-1700 (15 minutes)</th>
<th>Closing Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benoit Trudeau, Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor Geoffrey Marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Stuart Carney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Robyn Ward AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Workshop 2 Participants
(in alphabetical order by surname)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, M.</td>
<td>Srn Mgr, Student &amp; Acad. Adm.</td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carney, S.</td>
<td>Dep-Exec Dean, Medical Dean</td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colthorpe, K.</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>School of Biomed. Sc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coombe, L.</td>
<td>Academic Lead, Curric. Support</td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford, D.</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>School of Clinical Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eakin, E.</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Research</td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emery, S.</td>
<td>D-Exec Dean, Research Dean</td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilks, C.</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallos, J.</td>
<td>Proj. Off., Curric. &amp; Client Serv.</td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins, N.</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Off. Medical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard, R.</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>PHA Southside Clinical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobi, M.</td>
<td>Faculty Executive Manager</td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lluka, L.</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof, T&amp;L Chair</td>
<td>School of Biomed. Sc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks, G.</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Academic</td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton, L.</td>
<td>Project Manager, MD Program</td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeves, M.</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid, S.</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof, T&amp;L Chair</td>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan, L.</td>
<td>Manager, Student Admin.</td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Seoane, L.</td>
<td>Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Smith, T.</td>
<td>Academic Lead, Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Strasser, S.</td>
<td>Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ward, R.</td>
<td>Exec. Dean (Acting), DVC Res.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Williams, J.</td>
<td>Academic Lead, Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Wozniak, H.</td>
<td>Academic Lead, Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Yang, I.</td>
<td>Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Trudeau, B.</td>
<td>Consultant, Facilitator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Pre-Workshop 2 Interviews
(in alphabetical order by surname)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Carney, S.</td>
<td>Dep.-Exec Dean, Medical Dean</td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cooke, G.</td>
<td>Dr, Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>PA Southside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Eakin, L.</td>
<td>Prof., Assoc. Dean (Research)</td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hawkins, N.</td>
<td>Director, Office of Med. Educ.</td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hill, P.</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Hubbard, R.</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>PA Southside Cl. Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Jacoby, M.</td>
<td>Faculty Executive Manager</td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Lluka, L.</td>
<td>Chair, Teaching &amp; Learning Co.</td>
<td>School of Biomed. Sc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Macdonald, D.</td>
<td>PVC, Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>Uni. Of Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Marks, G.</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Academic</td>
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